



MUNK  
SCHOOL  
OF  
GLOBAL  
AFFAIRS

*Join the Global Conversation*

G8 Research Group  
G20 Research Group

---

## **G8/G20 Reference Manual for Commitment and Compliance Coding**

By  
John Kirton, Director,  
Ella Kokotsis, PhD, Director of External Affairs,  
Jenilee Guebert, Director of Research,  
and Caroline Bracht, Researcher  
G8 Research Group  
G20 Research Group  
Munk School of Global Affairs at Trinity College  
University of Toronto

September 22, 2011

---

## Contents

G8/G20 Reference Manual for Commitment and Compliance Coding.....	0
Preface.....	2
Introduction: Why Study Compliance?.....	3
Why Study G8 Compliance?.....	3
Why Study G20 Compliance?.....	3
What are G8 and G20 Summit Commitments?.....	4
How to Define and Identify Commitments from the G7/8 and G20 Communiqué.....	4
How to Measure the Overall Significance of a Commitment.....	7
What are Compliance Catalysts?.....	8
List of Compliance Catalysts.....	8
Notes.....	10
What are Priority Commitments?.....	11
How to Choose Priority Commitments.....	11
What Constitutes Summit Compliance?.....	13
First Order Compliance.....	13
Measuring Compliance.....	15
What Is the Compliance Time Frame?.....	15
Translated G8 and G20 Research Group Scores into a Percentage.....	16
General Interpretive Guidelines for Compliance Measurement.....	17
Multiyear Financial Commitments.....	17
Multiyear “Other” Commitments.....	18
Double Counting.....	18
Burden Sharing.....	19
Definitions.....	21
Specific Interpretive Guidelines.....	25
Anatomy of a Typical Interpretive Guideline.....	26
Writing the Interpretive Guidelines.....	26
Interim vs. Final Compliance Reports.....	30
How to Write a Compliance Report.....	31
Special Considerations.....	33
Appendix A: Compliance Report Template.....	35
Appendix B: Where to Find G8 and G20 Compliance Information Online.....	36
Appendix C: G8 Compliance Bibliographical References.....	45
Appendix D: G20 Compliance Bibliographical References.....	49
Appendix E: G8/G20 Summit Performance Indicators by Function.....	51
Appendix F: Causal Models of Summit Performance.....	52
Appendix G: Indicators of Major Causal Variables.....	54
Appendix H: Summary of Variables, Methods and Sources.....	55

## Preface

Each year since 1996, the University of Toronto G8 Research Group has produced compliance reports on the progress made by G8 members in meeting the commitments reached at their annual G8 Summits. Since 2002, the G8 Research Group has published an interim compliance report, timed to assess progress at the transition point between one country hosting and the next in the hosting rotation. Building on the interim compliance report, a final compliance report is issued just prior to the annual Summit meeting. These reports monitor and assess each country's compliance on a carefully chosen selection of priority commitments. They are offered to the general public, policy makers, scholars, researchers, civil society, the media, interested citizens and other stakeholders around the world in an effort to make the work of the G8 more transparent and accessible. They are also conducted to provide systemic data to enable meaningful social science analysis of this unique informal institution. Compliance reports are available on the G8 Information Centre web site at [www.g8.utoronto.ca](http://www.g8.utoronto.ca).

Since 2010, the University of Toronto G20 Research Group has produced compliance reports on the progress made by G20 members in meeting the commitments reached at their annual G20 Summits. These reports monitor and assess each country's compliance on a carefully chosen selection of priority commitments. They are offered to the general public, policy makers, scholars, researchers, civil society, the media, interested citizens and other stakeholders around the world in an effort to make the work of the G20 more transparent and accessible. They are also conducted to provide systemic data to enable meaningful social science analysis of this unique informal institution. Compliance reports are available on the G20 Information Centre website at [www.g20.utoronto.ca](http://www.g20.utoronto.ca).

The G8 and G20 Information Centres ([www.g8.utoronto.ca](http://www.g8.utoronto.ca) and [www.g20.utoronto.ca](http://www.g20.utoronto.ca)) contain the world's most comprehensive and authoritative online collection of information and analyses on the G7/G8, G20 and related institutions. The Centres assemble, verify and post documents from the meetings, leading up to and at each summit. They make available official documentation of all past summits and ministerial meetings (in several G8 and G20 languages), scholarly writings and policy analyses, research studies, data sets, fact sheets, scholarship, information and links to related websites.

The G8 Research Group and G20 Research Group are global networks of scholars, students and professionals in the academic, research, media, business, government and NGO communities, which follow the work of the G8, G20 and its related institutions. Founded in 1987 and 2008, the G8 Research Group and G20 Research Group are coordinated from the University of Toronto through the International Relations Program, the Centre for International Studies and the John Graham Library based at the Munk School of Global Affairs in Trinity College. The G8 Research Group and G20 Research Group have satellites in London, Paris, Tokyo, Moscow, Shanghai, Mexico City, Seoul and Montreal.

Professor John Kirton, Ella Kokotsis, Jenilee Guebert and Caroline Bracht  
Toronto, September 9, 2010

## **Introduction: Why Study Compliance?**

### **Why Study G8 Compliance?**

Every year since the Lyon Summit in 1996, the University of Toronto's G8 Research Group has conducted compliance studies as an important part of the analysis it produces. Why do we embark on this task every year? What is it we and the world derive from our efforts?

The G8 Summit annually produces a series of written, public communiqués or declarations used at the summit that bind the leaders in many cases to hard commitments. Can the impact of these commitments be measured once the Summit is over, the media have dispersed and the leaders have returned home? Are there limits to how much or how often the G8 can comply with their Summit commitments, particularly given that they are autonomous, sovereign states whose leaders are driven by differing domestic and international demands?

It makes little sense for G8 leaders to invest their time and resources, while potentially risking their political and personal reputations, to generate these agreements if they have no intention of complying with them once the Summit is done. Our compliance reports therefore allow us to assess how much credibility the leaders bring to the Summit table, and whether the products of the Summit (communiqués and declarations), deserve to be treated with any attention or seriousness at all.

The empirical findings on compliance therefore offer explanations to three important questions:

1. To what extent and under what conditions do G8 members live up to the commitments, those are the collective decisions that the leaders reach or authorize at the Summit?
2. How does the pattern of Summit compliance vary over time by issue area, and by member?
3. What causes high and low Summit compliance?

Determining how much compliance has happened, when, where and by which country, allows one to draw some important conclusions about the overall effectiveness of the Summit process. But before one can describe and explain patterns of Summit compliance, one must first define what is meant by a commitment, since commitments form the basis of the compliance assessments.

### **Why Study G20 Compliance?**

The G20 Research Group has conducted compliance analysis on G20 commitments since the 2008 Washington D.C summit when the summit transitioned from the ministerial level to the leader's level summit. The G20 was created in 1999 as a meeting of finance ministers and was elevated to a meeting of leaders in the wake of the 2007 US-turned-global financial crisis. Even though the G20 ministers produced a communiqué at the end of each meeting, the G20 Research Group along with its partners started producing compliance reports on each G20 communiqué starting with the 2008 Washington Summit.

## What are G8 and G20 Summit Commitments?

### How to Define and Identify Commitments from the G7/8 and G20 Communiqué

Commitments *are* defined as a discrete, specific, publicly expressed, collectively agreed to statements of intent; a “promise” or “undertaking” by summit members that they will undertake future action to move toward, meet or adjust to meet an identified welfare target (Kokotsis 1999). There are several key criteria contained in this definition.

*First*, commitments must be discrete, in that each specified action represents a separate commitment even if multiple actions will all help reach one target or aim. Each specific action represents a separate commitment, which is often defined by a given target. Many statements in summit documents specify both a policy instrument and a corresponding welfare target. For example, the following statement consists of two separate policy instruments and one welfare target.

“We pledge to reduce our dependence on imported energy (welfare target) through conservation (policy instrument #1) and the development of alternative energy sources (policy instrument #2).”

This statement classifies two discrete commitments because it contains two measurable instruments, even though there is one shared welfare target.

It is not necessary to extract a policy instrument and a corresponding welfare target in every case. A welfare target can be classified as a commitment without specifying a policy instrument, and a policy instrument or action can be classified as a commitment without specifying a welfare target. A target or instrument/action can be implied or inferred. It may also be specified in past statements. When identifying the issue area and assessing compliance for these commitments it is critical to take this into consideration.

What is a welfare target in one instance may be an instrument in another and vice versa. For example, the G8 might commit to reducing greenhouse emissions (instrument) to tackle climate change (target). For example, in 1990, the following commitment was made: “Climate change is of key importance. We are committed to undertake common efforts to limit emissions of greenhouse gases, such as carbon dioxide.” In another instance the G8 might commit to setting targets (instrument) to reduce greenhouse gases (target). For example, in 1998, they made the following commitment: “we will each undertake domestically the steps necessary to reduce significantly greenhouse gas emissions;”

A commitment can only exist if it is specified in a communiqué or G8/G20 leaders statement. It is not appropriate to create a commitment simply on the basis that it is implicit due to the existence of a corresponding policy instrument or welfare target.

The discreteness test is important in determining how many commitments fall under one statement. The question the coder must ask him/herself when determining whether one or more commitments should be identified in a statement is: “Would I use different data or evidence to

determine compliance for this/these commitments?”<sup>1</sup> If the answer is yes, then they represent separate commitments. If the answer is no, then it represents a single commitment. The paragraph from the G20 Seoul Summit below, for example, actually contains ten commitments (1. “we have agreed to work further on macro-prudential policy frameworks; 2. better reflect the perspective of emerging market economies in financial regulatory reforms; 3. strengthen regulation and oversight of shadow banking; 4. further work on regulation and supervision of commodity derivatives markets; 5. improve market integrity and efficiency; 6. enhance consumer protection; 7. pursue all outstanding governance reform issues at the IMF and 8. World Bank; and 9. build a more stable and resilient international monetary system, including by further strengthening global financial safety nets. 10. We will also expand our MAP based on the indicative guidelines to be agreed.”).

“Building on our achievements to date, we have agreed to work further on macro-prudential policy frameworks; better reflect the perspective of emerging market economies in financial regulatory reforms; strengthen regulation and oversight of shadow banking; further work on regulation and supervision of commodity derivatives markets; improve market integrity and efficiency; enhance consumer protection; pursue all outstanding governance reform issues at the IMF and World Bank; and build a more stable and resilient international monetary system, including by further strengthening global financial safety nets. We will also expand our MAP based on the indicative guidelines to be agreed” (The G20 Seoul Summit Leaders’ Declaration 2011).

**Second**, commitments must be sufficiently *specific* and the target needs to be both *identifiable* and *measurable*. Actions need to include changes in members’ behaviour. General statements of aspiration are excluded, while statements with specified parameters are included.

When assessing the summit’s communiqués and declarations, the following points are helpful in determining how to identify measurable commitments:

**Commitment =**

“...commit...”  
 “...agree...”  
 “...pledge...”  
 “...seek...”  
 “...reaffirm commitment...”  
 “...create...”  
 “...will...”  
 “...insist on...”  
 “...renew...”  
 “...stand ready to...”  
 “... support...”  
 “...remain determined”

**No Commitment =**

“...welcome...”  
 “...encourage...”  
 “...reflected upon...”  
 “... discussed...”  
 “... are aware...”  
 “...look forward to...”  
 “...emphasize...”  
 “...recognize the importance of...”  
 “...we gave particular emphasis to...”  
 “...call on...”  
 “...urge...”

<sup>1</sup> Different data or evidence is not the same thing as multiple sources. Multiple sources should be used to assess compliance for each individual commitment. At the same time, one source can be used to assess compliance for multiple commitments. The discreteness test is meant to ensure that commitments are not lumped together simply because they fall within the same sentence of paragraph. For example, if the leaders agree to cut the incidence of malaria and tuberculosis in half. These are in fact two commitments that require different data or evidence for monitoring – one of malaria, the other on tuberculosis.

However, there are no hard and fast rules when it comes to the wording of a commitment. A statement that uses the term “pledge” or “commit” is *not* necessarily a commitment if it is not measurable to the extent that the “measurability rule” is satisfied. It is important to note that it is not always necessary for a commitment to be numerically or quantitatively measurable (although “quantitativeness” is generally sufficient to ensure the “measurability test” is satisfied). Non-quantitative statements such as the following should be classified as a commitment:

“We look to an orderly and fruitful increase in our economic relations with socialist countries as an important element in progress in détente.”

It is also critical to take the context of the summit and the statement into consideration. For example,

“We recall our strong commitment to the sovereignty, independence, territorial integrity and national unity of Libya” (G8 Deauville Summit 2011)

is a commitment because at the time of the 2011 Deauville Summit the leaders were reaffirming their support for this initiative (G8 Deauville 2011). However, ‘recall’ will not always indicate a new commitment. It can be used to highlight a past, as opposed to future, actions and therefore does not fit into the commitment criteria.

Many statements in the communiqué use the verb “should.”

“Our capacity to deal with short-term oil market problems *should* be improved, particularly through the holding of adequate levels of stocks.”

In real life, “should” does not always imply intent. When coding Summit documents, however, it often can imply a commitment to do what is specified. Hence, “should” statements can be classified as commitments if they meet the other appropriate criteria. Each “should” statement should be assessed individually to determine if it is a commitment.

**Third**, commitments must be future-oriented, rather than represent endorsements of previous action. However, reaffirmations or pledges to continue an action are included, because they indicate a bound pattern for future action. They rest on an assumption that in the absence of summit reaffirmation or re-articulation each year, they would normally expire (or be taken less seriously and dwindle).<sup>2</sup> Excluded are actions or decisions that the summit members “welcome.”

**Fourth**, while action by summit members is assumed to be required in the future, this does not need to be specified. It is assumed by the tense used.

**Finally**, who is “we”? The G8 and the G20 often state that international institutions or groups other than themselves should take a particular course of action. If it is understood to mean that the G8 and G20 countries will try to pressure for a course of action from within the institution they are part of, then this entails a commitment. If they are simply giving a suggestion to another country or institution to which they do not have sufficient influence over, then it should not be coded as a commitment. The individual members of the G8 or G20 need to take action.

---

<sup>2</sup> Multi-year commitments also require more time to monitor than the annual summit-to-summit timelines. However, they are not considered “new commitments” at each summit unless they are renewed or referenced by the leaders.

*Example:* This is a commitment:

“We are committed to a shift in International Monetary Fund (IMF) quota share to dynamic emerging markets and developing countries of at least 5% from over-represented countries to under-represented countries using the current quota formula as the basis to work from.” (Pittsburgh G20 2009).

*Example:* This is not a commitment:

Trade plays a key role in development. We encourage the developing countries, especially the newly industrializing economies, to undertake increased commitments and obligations and a greater role in the GATT, commensurate with their importance in international trade and in the international adjustment process, as well as with their respective stages of development.

**Note:** If the G8 or the G20 specifies a carrot and/or stick (e.g. structural adjustment as a condition of debt-restructuring) with which they will influence other countries, then this is typically sufficient to justify a commitment. E.g. “The industrialized economies will open up their markets as part of structural adjustment. Debt-relief will be provided on the basis of them doing so.”

The G8 Research Group and the G20 Research Group identifies commitments based on the aforementioned criteria. An individual or group of individuals identifies the commitments from the G8 and G20 leaders’ documents. Ministerial documents and working group documents are not included.

### **How to Measure the Overall Significance of a Commitment**

There tend to be numerous commitments, often hundreds, in the G8 and G20 communiqués and statements released in the leaders’ names at each summit. Because of this, it is useful to assess each according to their ambition and signification. In order to do so, one should ask the following:

1. Ambition: How far reaching is the commitment?
2. Timeliness: Does the commitment address current issues?
3. Clarity: Is the commitment easily identifiable and measurable?

While the sheer number of commitments can give a useful indication of how productive a summit was on reaching agreement (creating co-operation), it is important to know how ambitious these commitments were, both individually and overall. Work thus far on commitments has now dealt with the degree of ambition of the commitments, treating instead each individual commitment as being of equal importance (Kokotsis 1999, Kokotsis and Daniels 1999, Juricevic). To make this analytic advance, it is important to develop a scale of level of ambition by which each individual commitment can be scored. The following are some proposed criteria that can help to determine where each commitment fits on such a scale.

1. No Backsliding versus new forward movement
2. Instruments versus targets are included
3. Includes both a target and a timetable
4. Using existing international institutions versus creating new ones
5. Relating to a new agenda or principle rather than an old agenda or principle.

## What are Compliance Catalysts?

For analytical purposes, it is also useful to assess each commitment for the number and type of compliance catalysts they contain. Compliance catalysts are words, phrases, or factors that are embedded in and guide a commitment. They provide instruction(s) on how to implement, proceed or comply with the commitment. There are a number of different compliance catalysts that can appear within a commitment, and at times, more than one catalyst will appear (Kirton 2006, Kirton et al. 2007). A list of compliance catalysts can be found below.

## List of Compliance Catalysts

### *Definitions of Catalysts*

*Total Catalysts:* The total number of compliance catalysts (see list above) in the said commitment.

*Priority Placement:* When a commitment is highlighted in the preamble or is stated in the Chair's Summary it is considered a priority placement.

*Past Reference to Summit:* This refers to commitments that mention past summits. They are considered iterations. For example, just like at the G8 Evian Summit, we stress... (from a more recent summit)

*Past Reference to Ministerial:* This refers to commitments that mention past ministerial meetings. See above catalyst.

*Targets:* When a commitment refers to a set goal, percentage or numerical allocation it is considered a target. For instance, we will reduce; we will cut in half; or we will increase by 75%. It does not include time targets, which are considered time tables. See below.

*Time Tables:* When a commitment refers to a time target, it is considered to include a time table. This can be short term (1 year or less) or long term (more than 1 year). Some may include both short- and long-term break downs. It includes phrases such as "within a year," "by the next summit," "by 2015" and specific dates. It also includes references to words and phrases such as the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), which include well-known time targets.

*Self-monitoring:* These refer to commitments where the institution in question pledges to monitor their actions on the said commitment. They could pledge to "monitor," or provide a report, to follow up on said promises.

*Remit Mandates:* These include commitments that refer to future assessment, most often at a future summit. For example: "We will review progress on our Action Plan at our next summit."

*Money Mobilized:* When a commitment refers to funds or a set dollar value it is considered money mobilized. This includes commitments to replenish funds and provide monetary aid.

*Specified Agents:* When a commitment refers to a specific agent through which it will work with or through it is considered to be involving an agent. For example, with the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis or Malaria or with the International

Fund for Agriculture and Development. It does not include general references to agencies, such as the private sector or civil society.

*Institutional Body:* a commitment that refers to an agent that was created by the institution to deal with the particular issue area. For example, the G8-created Gleneagles dialogue on climate change or the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria. It includes bodies that are referred to in commitments that are created at the summits in question.

*Core International Organization:* when a commitment refers to a separate international organization (as an organization) that has a particular focus on the issue in the commitment at hand. For example, in the area of health, this would include the World Health Organization (WHO); in development, it would include the World Bank; in trade it would refer to the World Trade Organization. It does not include references to an international organization when they are NOT institutional references. For example, a reference to WTO inconsistent measures is not a reference to an IO. It is a reference to international law. References to regional or other international organizations are not core international organizations. They are considered other international organizations or regional organizations. See below.

*Other International Organization:* when a commitment refers to a separate international organization (as an organization) that is *not* the core international organization for the issue in the commitment at hand. For example, in the area of health, this would include the references to the World Bank, International Monetary Fund or Financial Stability Board.

*Regional Organization:* When a commitment refers to a regional organization, such as the African Union, NEPAD or the European Union. It does not include regional

*International Law:* International law includes both general references to international law and references to specific legal instruments (Kyoto, for example). Only codified law, not customary law, is included since it is neither specific or binding within the international setting (the content of the codified instrument has international agreements that take clear precedence over national discretion). Example of this catalyst include the following: charters, conventions, treaties, protocols, declarations, agreements, frameworks, guidelines, internationally recognized principles or standards. Also included are the calls for the implementation or development of specific international legal instruments.

*Ministers:* Commitment refers to a group of ministers. For example, “we ask our energy ministers to...”

*International Organization Accountability Ask:* Refers to commitments that ask international organizations to monitor the groups’ compliance with the commitment. For example, we ask the WTO to monitor our compliance with this commitment.

*Civil Society:* Commitments that make general reference to working with civil society, including nongovernmental organizations and academia.

*Private Sector:* Commitments that make general reference to working with the private sector, public-private partnerships, business (including the pharmaceutical industry).

*County or Regional Specification:* Commitments that make references to working with or in a particular country or region, such as Africa. It does not include broad references to developed or developing countries.

**Notes**

Compliance catalysts are coded as either a 0 or a 1. They are either present or they are not. If they are in the commitment repeated times, there are still coded as 1 (i.e., present), not multiple times. Catalysts should be coded with the broader context of the commitment in mind; therefore, the coder needs to read the commitment in its broader context, which may include the surrounding sentences, paragraphs or documents. A catalyst that applies to a particular commitment may lay outside of the specific commitment text.

## What are Priority Commitments?

Priority commitments are commitments that are determined a “priority” in the sense that they together best capture what the G8 or G20 summit as a whole did on the decision-making dimension of its global governance. They are therefore measured for compliance during the subsequent year. Due to the vast number of commitments that appear in a communiqué, it is impossible to measure every commitment for compliance. Therefore, it is important to be able to choose commitments that best capture the essence of the summit communiqué and do so in a reasonably representative way. The G8 Research Group and the G20 Research Group determine how many commitments it will be able to measure for the upcoming year (based on the number individuals available as compliance assessors, access to reliable information and other available resources). Once this number has been determined, a number of interested parties, including the G8 Research Group Executive, the G8 Research Group Student Executive, the G20 Research Group Executive and the G20 Research Group Student Executive, including the Compliance Chair(s) from the University of Toronto, the G8/G20 Research Group Administrators, G8 and G20 Research Group affiliate members from the Higher School of Economics in Moscow, Tor Veta University in Italy, and the Shanghai International Studies University in China, members from Civil Society Groups such as the Canadian Council of Churches and Green Cross, and government officials who choose to participate, select and rank commitments which they believe are a priority from the standpoint of their particular purposes for the year’s summit overall.

The following provides a set of guidelines for how to choose priority commitments on a primary, secondary, and tertiary basis. Other considerations may also be applied, especially in relation to civil society and government groups who may tend to choose commitments that reflect their own interests. These guidelines cover both the composite set of priority commitments selected and the individual commitments that make them up.

## How to Choose Priority Commitments

### *Primary Selection Criteria*

Priority commitments should be chosen in terms of their importance in the summit, the G8, the G20 and the world at large. At least two commitments should be chosen from each of the priority themes from the summit being assessed. Priority commitments should, collectively, be comprehensive. They should come from the economic, global and political-security domains. At least one should come from each part of the traditional, built-in agenda (i.e. finance, macroeconomics, microeconomics, trade, development, environment/climate change, energy, crime and drugs, terrorism, arms control and proliferation, regional security, international institutional reform). There should be balance amongst the priority commitments. Priority commitments should be selected from each of the separate documents issued at the summit (that contain commitments). The number of priority commitments selected from each document should roughly reflect the percentage of overall commitments from that document at the summit as a whole. For example, if twenty percent of the commitments come from the growth and development document, then approximately twenty percent of the priority commitments should come from that same document. Priority commitments should include those that reflect current crises as well as preventative measures, and long term change. Priority commitments should include commitments that affect the G8 and G20 members, non-G8/G20 members and the world as a whole. At least one priority commitment should reflect domestic intrusiveness within distant countries such as Kosovo, Sudan, Zimbabwe or Iran. There should be a range of levels reflected

amongst the priority commitments of analysis from individual country action to the structure of global governance as a whole. They should take into account the preparatory process of the summit. They should take into account past commitments, so that comparisons and extended compliance can be monitored. They should also consider the priority themes for next years summit, when they have already been announced by the host for that year. They should take into consideration current scientific research, such as compliance catalysts mentioned in the previous section.

### *Secondary Selection Criteria*

Secondary selection criteria are to be taken into consideration only after primary selection criteria have been applied. Commitments should be chosen that take into account the key interests of the Heiligendamm Process Partners (historically referred to as the Group of 5, Outreach 5 and Plus 5), so that monitoring and comparison can be made with these respective countries.

G20 commitments that apply to various subsets of countries within the group should be chosen. For example, commitments that apply to advanced, emerging and surplus economies should all be considered, so that compliance comparisons can be made and studied.

Individual, as well as collective compliance should be considered. In the case of the G8 the ability to commit fully to the commitment within a year can and should be considered to simplify the compliance analysis. Since the G20 was elevated to the leaders' level the meetings have been more frequent. In this case, the analysis should be based on a summit to summit timeframe. Availability of reliable information can be considered as it assists in the accuracy of the compliance report. Commitments should be selected for which interpretive guidelines already exist or can be constructed easily.

### *Tertiary Selection Criteria*

Once primary and secondary selection criteria have been applied for primary commitment selection, tertiary selection criteria may also be applied. These include: significance as identified by scientific teams in the host country, significance as identified by experts in the host country, and significance as identified by relevant ministries and G8 and G20 team members in the host country.

## What Constitutes Summit Compliance?

Given the definition of a commitment, what constitutes Summit compliance?

### First Order Compliance

First order compliance is national government action geared towards the domestic implementation of the necessary formal legislative and administrative regulations designed to execute Summit commitments. National governments alter their own behaviour and that of their societies and outsiders, in order to reach Summit-specified welfare targets.

Compliance requires conscious new or altered effort by national governments in the post-Summit period. Summit members must actively and consciously endeavour to implement the provisions contained in Summit communiqués. Should a government arrive at fulfilling one of its Summit commitments by chance, this does not constitute compliance.

Compliance is measured according to governmental actions designed to modify existing instruments within the executive branch to accommodate the commitments reached. Compliance therefore requires new or altered efforts by national governments where leaders very *actively* and *consciously* plan to implement their G8 or G20 commitments. These actions need to be *deliberate*. A commitment can be said to have been fully complied with if a Summit member succeeds in achieving the specific goal set out in the commitment. However, there can still be varying degrees of compliance in the absence of a complete fulfillment of the commitment. Compliance is therefore assessed according to the following criteria:

*Official Reaffirmation:* Reaffirmation of a Summit commitment is made by individuals working in an official capacity. This may occur either at the national or international context. The government demonstrates its intention to fulfill a Summit commitment by stating its plans to include the commitment in the national agenda. By publicly referring to a Summit commitment, through internal policy debates, speeches or press releases, a leader legitimizes the commitment. Such evidence of remembrance indicates that officials are still mindful of the Summit commitment. A reaffirmation of a G8/G20 commitment represents moral suasion to inside and outside officials as well as the public.

*Internal bureaucratic review and representation:* The earlier remembrance and reaffirmation of the G8/G20 commitment are then backed by review — a systematic monitoring mechanism that includes processes such as public consultation. A national government internally reviews the Summit commitment through a formal policy review or the formation of a task force or working group. Personnel are assigned to these tasks and are given new negotiating mandates. These persons are charged with studying and implementing the commitment. Any new diplomatic initiatives required to reach the welfare target are launched.

*Budgetary and resource allocations are made or changed:* A national government allocates, or diverts from another use, a notable sum of its own money for the purpose of achieving the commitment. Further alterations are made with regard to the distribution of money and other resources to international organizations from the national government.

*New or Altered Programs, Legislation and Regulations:* Broader changes are made in fiscal and monetary policy, to the extent that governments control the latter. International negotiating

positions are changed. Programs, necessary for the implementation of the Summit commitment are introduced or altered. Recommendations are made for increased research and development projects.

*Over-implementation:* Over-implementation occurs when a national government surpasses the established welfare target. This may be desirable if over-implementation compensates for the failures of other Summit members (for example, decreasing one's carbon dioxide emissions by 10% instead of 5% as outlined in the communiqué will be beneficial to other states). However, over-implementation is not always advantageous as it can produce a runaway syndrome.

Although most G8/G20 communiqués contain a number of commitments across a wide range of issues, in order to make the compliance studies more manageable, the reports are limited to one (or, at the most, two) “core” commitments for each of the selected issue areas. “Core” commitments are determined according to three criteria:

1. ambition — how far-reaching is the commitment?
2. timeliness — does the commitment address current or “hot” issues?
3. clarity — is the commitment easily identifiable and measurable?

## Measuring Compliance

How do we measure compliance? The compliance studies build on the methodology first developed by George Von Furstenberg and Joseph Daniels in *“The Meaning and Reliability of Economic Summit Undertakings, 1975-1989”* and essentially follow a three-level measurement process:

1. Full or nearly full compliance with a commitment is assigned a score of +1.
2. A score of -1 indicates complete or nearly complete failure to implement a commitment.
3. An “inability to commit” or a “work in progress” is given a score of 0.

An “*inability to commit*” refers to factors outside of the executive branch that impede implementation. A “*work in progress*” refers to an initiative that has been launched by a government but has not yet been completed by the time of the next Summit, and whose results therefore cannot be judged.

### What Is the Compliance Time Frame?

#### *G8 Compliance Time Frame*

G8 commitments are assessed from the conclusion of one Summit to the beginning of the next — so the time frame spans one year. Why? Because commitments in the leaders’ documents are made on an annual basis, so the span of one full year is used to assess whether compliance has in fact occurred. Some commitments may be “*re-iterated*” — which means they were made at previous Summits but haven’t yet been completed because one year didn’t allow enough time for their implementation. If the leaders re-iterate their commitments, they are still counted as distinct commitments and hence measured.

A one year time frame also coincides with the annual cycle of national political agendas — such as budgets and state of the union addresses — which vary from year to year — so the annual Summit cycle accounts for variations that occur on a yearly basis.

#### *G20 Compliance Timeframe*

G20 commitments are assessed from the conclusion of one Summit to the beginning of the next. Since 2008 the time lapse between G20 summits has varied from 5 months to 8 months. Why? The frequency of G20 summits has varied due to the global financial crisis and the increased necessity of cooperation.

The G20 communiqué has outlined specific as well as general timeframes for implementation. Generally speaking, the assessment is based on a summit to summit timeframe. To reiterate, if there is no specific reference made to a past/future date, it should be interpreted as to mean since the last/at the next summit. In certain instance the G20 has identified specific timeframes of; short-term, medium-term and long-term. Each is defined as follows: short-term is measured from summit to summit, medium-term, is from the summit cycle until five years. Long term is any commitment with a delivery date of over five years. Like the G8, some commitments may be reiterated. If the leaders reiterate their commitments, they are still counted as distinct commitments and hence measured.

*Currency*

When reporting currency, if it is not outlined in the guidelines it should be in constant US dollars for the most recent year.

*Scoring*

Compliance is measured on a three-point scale, where each member is awarded a -1, 0 or +1 for each commitment. Thus when average scores for each commitment and member are being calculated, they can range between -1 and +1.<sup>3</sup>

The following is an example of how compliance should be reported for an individual commitment:

Country	Lack of Compliance	Work in Progress	Full Compliance
Canada			+1
France			+1
Germany			+1
Italy	-1		
Japan			+1
Russia		0	
United Kingdom			+1
United States			+1
European Union			+1
Average Score			+0.67

**Translated G8 and G20 Research Group Scores into a Percentage**

Because the -1 to +1 scale is not familiar to many, it can be helpful to translate this scale into a percentage. This can be done by adding +1 to any score G8/G20 score, dividing it by 2 and multiplying it by 100.

Example 1. The above score of +0.67 would equate to 83.5%

$$0.67 + 1.00 = 1.67/2.00 = 0.835 * 100 = 83.5\%$$

G8/G20 Research Group Score	Percentage
-1.00	0%
-0.50	25%
0.00	50%
+0.50	75%
+1.00	100%

Example 2. A Score of -0.33 would equate to 33.5%

$$-0.33 + 1.00 = 0.67/2.00 = 0.335 * 100 = 33.5\%$$

<sup>3</sup> Scores should be reported in decimal form. They are not to be reported as percentages or on a scale from -100 to +100.

## General Interpretive Guidelines for Compliance Measurement

The compliance scale (+1,-1, 0) and timeline have been established, the next step is to identify a set of interpretive guidelines. Interpretive guidelines help individuals score commitments for compliance. While commitments change on a year-to-year basis, there are several general categories that commitments tend to fit within that can help determine how to score commitments. Other times, common concerns and questions arise in regards to the commitments, and these should also fit within the interpretive guidelines and categories. Such categories include the ones described below.

### Multiyear Financial Commitments

Multiyear financial commitments are commitments that declare they are going to give a set amount of money over a set number of years. There have been a number of these commitments that have been measured for compliance in the past. In 2006, a commitment on the Global Partnership and Non-proliferation serves as one example: “We remain committed to our pledges in Kananaskis to raise up to \$20 billion through 2012 for the Global Partnership, initially in Russia, to support projects to address priority areas identified in Kananaskis and to continue to turn these pledges into concrete actions.” Another example comes from the 2005 priority commitments: “Supporting the Polio Eradication Initiative for the post eradication period in 2006-8 through continuing or increasing our own contributions toward the \$829 million target and mobilizing the support of others.”

In these instances, formulas should be established based on initial commitments that measure how much money should be given by each actor. These should first and foremost be based on what it actually says in the commitment. If different countries commit different amounts of money, or if the commitment states that funds will be based on country GDP, this is what should be measured. However, this formula should not be applied if it is not explicitly stated in the text of the commitment. In particular, assessments of funding should take into account a government’s previous pledges with regards to the specific topic. This is important when various funding formulas are possible, such as lump-sum funding versus annual disbursements. The author of the Interpretive Guidelines should ascertain which funding structures have been declared permissible by the recipients/brokers of the funds in question.

A simple linear model should not be used to evaluate multi-year financial commitments. First, such a model is contrary to the geometric progression of many budget allocations (i.e. many governments plan on year-on-year percentage increases rather than set increases in the absolute value of their disbursements). Secondly, linear models understate the nominal commitments made by governments. In inflationary environments, governments will have to provide increasingly large nominal disbursements in order to ensure that the same quantity of *resources* is targeted at a specific issue or problem. As such, it is preferable to have a geometric progression of the increases in resources committed to a specific issue area. This geometric progression should take into account inflationary trends if these are problematic (i.e. inflation of 5% or more per year). For example, if G8 countries promise to double ODA funds over 6 years, the ideal progression of increases should not be assumed to be 18% of the initial year for each of the 6 years. Rather, the ideal progression should be assumed to be 12.5% year on year in the ODA budget, controlling for inflation. In other words, the current year’s ODA budget should be deflated to last year’s price level and a +1 award only if the increase from last year’s budget is approximately 12.5% or higher. This allows for analysts to consider a country’s actions on two levels: progress towards

the stated goal since the commitment was first made; and changes in progress from one year to the next. A +1 may therefore also be awarded if the year-on-year increase is considerably smaller than 12.5% but previous increases in ODA budgets have been far greater than expected.

The following is an illustration of the various funding mechanisms that might be employed in the fulfillment of a multiyear financial commitment. The hypothetical situation is one in which a funding initiative with a baseline value of \$1 billion is to be doubled over six years.

Year	Even Yearly Payments	Geometric Progression	Random Progression	Lump-Sum
0	\$1 billion	\$1 billion	\$1 billion	\$1 billion
1	\$1.17 billion	\$1.12 billion	\$1.4 billion	\$2 billion
2	\$1.34 billion	\$1.26 billion	\$1.4 billion	\$2 billion
3	\$1.5 billion	\$1.41 billion	\$1.5 billion	\$2 billion
4	\$1.67 billion	\$1.59 billion	\$1.65 billion	\$2 billion
5	\$1.84 billion	\$1.78 billion	\$1.8 billion	\$2 billion
6	\$2 billion	\$2 billion	\$2 billion	\$2 billion

The crux of evaluation, therefore, is to determine if (1) progress has been made towards the ultimate goal; and (2) if it is still feasible for the given country to achieve that goal. These two criteria can be met under any one of the four funding schemes shown above.

### **Multiyear “Other” Commitments**

Multiyear ‘other’ commitments are commitments that declare they are going to accomplish a non-monetary goal over a set number of years. There have been a number of these commitments that have been measured for compliance in the past. In 2000 one such commitment read as follows: “We therefore commit ourselves in working in strengthened partnership with governments, the World Health Organization (WHO) and other international organizations and other relevant actors in civil society to deliver three critical UN targets: a) reduce the number of HIV/AIDS-infected young people by 25% by 2010; b) Reduce TB deaths and prevalence of the disease by 50% by 2010; c) reduce the burden of disease associated with malaria by 2010.”

In these instances, formulas should be established based on initial commitments that measure how much should be done by each actor. These should first and foremost be based on what it actually says in the commitment. If different countries commit different levels of involvement, or if the commitment states that actions will be taken through an allocated organization, this is what should be measured. Next, a simple model which assumes equal distribution of action over the set length of the commitment should be established. If an actor fails to commit to the previously promised action(s) or it fails to commit in any new way and is behind the minimum formula, it will receive a score of -1. If a country takes new actions and is behind on the minimum funding formula it will receive a 0. If an actor commits in new ways and/or is ahead or on track with the formula it will receive a score or +1. It should be noted that in multiyear ‘other’ commitment cases, funding may be an indicator of compliance, but does not necessary need to be, if the commitment itself does not specify funds as part of the action.

### **Double Counting**

Over the years, concerns have arisen over double counting. Double counting refers to actors who consider a single contribution as fulfillment of more than one commitment. Most recently this

concern refers to ODA and debt relief. It should first be noted that at the Gleneagles Summit in 2005 when such initiatives took form, it was outright established that ODA and debt relief were to be considered separately. And it can be assumed that because the commitments are referred to separately in the communiqués, they are indeed meant to be committed to individually. For instance, in the 2007 Heiligendamm document, commitments for debt relief and ODA were both identified, and there were done so separately (Commitment 143 stating: “These include the historic multilateral debt relief of up to US \$60 billion, the implementation of which is now well underway. Commitment 144 stating: “They also include increasing, compared to 2004, with other donors, ODA to Africa by US \$25 billion a year by 2010.”). Therefore, funding allocation must be specified to each area by each actor to be considered compliance in both areas. Any indication by an actor that one donation should be considered to fulfill more than one commitment is not the case, and should be considered for only one commitment. See the DCD-DAC branch of the OECD for more information: <http://www.oecd.org/dac>.

### Burden Sharing

Actors are to be held responsible according to their relative capability at the time of the Summit. Although relative capability may change from the time of the Summit to when commitments are measured for compliance, commitments are made with the understanding that certain situations and crises may arise in the future that cause changes in the respective countries/areas. Governing officials are aware of this possibility, and therefore no excuse(s) should be interpreted, justified or accepted for not complying with a commitment, and no adjustments should be made to compensate for changes in capability (in regards to an actors level of allocation, whether it be funding or otherwise).

The relative weight of individual countries’ contributions should not be determined based on PPP GDP alone, unless explicitly stated in the commitment. This method is deceptive, as GDP represents the total wealth of the economy, held by the public and private sectors, and by nationals and foreigners alike. A preferable method is to use the PPP value of the various governments’ revenues, which is a better metric of fiscal capacity to fund new projects or increase funding of existing initiatives. Although the ordinal ranking of the G8 member states is not altered substantially by using revenues instead of GDP, the proportional weight of each country changes considerably when revenues are used instead of GDP:

Example of G8 Member Countries:

Member	GDP (PPP, 2007)	Ranking by GDP	Proportion of total GDP	Government Revenue (PPP, 2007)	Ranking by Revenue	Proportion of total fiscal capacity
Canada	\$1.27 trillion	8	4.2%	\$0.57 trillion	7	5.8%
France	\$2.07 trillion	6	6.8%	\$1.31 trillion	4	13.3%
Germany	\$2.83 trillion	3	9.3%	\$1.47 trillion	2	15.0%
Italy	\$1.8 trillion	7	5.9%	\$0.98 trillion	6	10.0%
Japan	\$4.34 trillion	2	14.3%	\$1.46 trillion	3	14.9%
Russia	\$2.08 trillion	5	6.8%	\$0.30 trillion	8	3.1%
United States	\$13.86 trillion	1	45.6%	\$2.57 trillion	1	26.2%
United Kingdom	\$2.15 trillion	4	7.1%	\$1.16 trillion	5	11.8%
European Union	\$14.45 trillion			N/A	N/A	

Interpretive Guidelines should be written by a single individual (the Director of Compliance Studies) as soon as possible after the confirmation of the final list of commitments to be assessed in the current year's compliance report. This ensures consistency in the language and level of detail used for all commitments. The Interpretive Guidelines should also be marked as draft until they are reviewed by the various components of the Group (Chair, Management, and partners at the Higher School of Economics in Moscow). Analysts should be sent the draft Guidelines soon after selection of Group members has been completed, and they should be sent the final version of the Guidelines once all corrections and feedback have been incorporated into the document.

## Definitions

Words or phrases used in commitments should be interpreted as they are meant. Words and/or phrases that have a deeper underlying meaning and cannot be understood upon first reading should be researched and interpreted as the leader's intended. If a word or phrase is still ambiguous the following can be used as a guide for how to interpret and measure such word and/or phrases.

**Access:** access should be interpreted to mean the right to obtain or make use of the entity in reference. In terms of health, according to the *World Health Organisation* "Access" is a broad concept, which, measures three dimensions of key health sector interventions:

1. *Availability*, defined in terms of the reachability (physical access), affordability (economic access) and acceptability (socio-cultural access) of services that meet a minimum standard of quality. Making services available, affordable and acceptable is an essential precondition for universal access.

2. *Coverage*, defined as the proportion of a population needing an intervention who receive it. Coverage is influenced by supply (provision of services) and by demand from people in need of services.

3. *Impact*, defined as reduced new infection rates or as improvements in survival. It results from the coverage of services, modulated by the efficiency and effectiveness of interventions and changes in other relevant factors. Impact goals have been set in the context of the MDGs.

**As needed:** according to need

**Associate:** is intended to identify a common purpose, action, or condition which the parties agree to unite over.

**Call on:** to promote or motion others (depending on the commitment) to associate with the mentioned requirement.

**Certain:** when a reference is made to a 'certain' entity or group of entities, there is a specific actor/group that is being referenced. In these cases, additional information should be obtained from sources to clarify the member(s) referenced. It should not be interpreted to mean all countries.

**Close as possible:** should be interpreted to mean to come near or close to the goal without there being a major hindrance, obstacle or circumstance of some kind. It should not be interpreted to mean any effort made.

**Continue to provide:** refers to commitments that are established and implemented. It should be interpreted to mean new actions will be added to the already existing ones. It should not be interpreted to mean no new allocations.

**Cooperation:** the action or process of working together to the same end

**Cross-border:** involving movement or activity across a border between two countries

**Defeat:** should be interpreted to mean to overcome or eliminate.

**Develop:** when a commitment states it will ‘develop,’ it should be interpreted to mean that a new initiative will be established in the area. It should not apply to old initiatives.

**Effectively:** should be interpreted to mean operating in a way that produces the intended result. It does not mean any effort, especially thoughtless ones.

**Encourage:** to say ‘encourage’ does not imply strong measurability in the commitment. It should be taken as a soft commitment where no concrete action is to be taken.

**Equitable:** should be interpreted to mean fair and just as indicated by law.

**Few:** should be interpreted to mean not many, but more than one. An indefinitely small number.

**Fraud:** wrongful or criminal deception intended to result in financial or personal gain

**Implement:** when a reference is made to ‘implement,’ it should be interpreted to mean taking steps forward. While the commitment may be a part of a longer-term initiative and actions on it may continue into the prolonged future, steps need to be taken in the near future to be considered implementation. This should not, therefore, be interpreted to mean only prolonged or delayed action.

**Improve:** when a commitment states that it will ‘improve’ it should be interpreted to mean that old initiatives will be updated. It should not be interpreted to mean a brand new initiative.

**Increasing:** when a commitment indicates that it will ‘increase’ efforts, it should be interpreted to mean additional efforts to an old commitment. It should not be interpreted as adding new efforts in new ways.

**Inefficient:** not producing the effect intended or desired

**Inclusive:** all parties are included in the discussion and decision making process taking into account relative capabilities.

**Initiate:** when a commitments states that it will ‘initiate,’ it should be interpreted to mean new efforts. It should not apply to old efforts or initiatives that have been referred to in the past.

**Make effort:** when a commitment states it will ‘make efforts,’ this should be interpreted to mean efforts in the immediate future. It could be based on old efforts, but new steps or initiatives need to accompany the commitment. It should not be interpreted to apply to compliance that has already taken place in the area.

**Meaningful:** should be interpreted to mean in an important or significant way. See *significantly* for further instruction.

**Measure:** when a commitment states that it will ‘measure’ it should be interpreted to mean that steps should be made towards something that is assessable . It should be clear and not vague. It should be shown that measurement is possible, either by past examples, or clear descriptions of how it will be implemented in the future.

**Meet shortfall:** when a commitment states it will ‘meet shortfalls,’ it should be interpreted as referring to past initiatives that have failed to be met. It should not be interpreted to apply to new initiatives or old initiatives that have met full compliance.

**Moving forward:** when a reference is made to ‘moving forward’ it should be interpreted to mean taking additional steps and should include new initiatives in the area. It should not include past compliance efforts, or continued fulfillment of old promises.

**Openness:** the term should be interpreted within the context of the commitment and taken to mean either, unrestricted access to something or to be transparent.

**Phase out:** To bring or come to an end, one stage at a time. The particular time may or may not be specified in the commitment itself. Eg. Phase-out over medium term.

**Promote:** when a commitment states that it will promote, it should be interpreted to mean that it will either support or renew old efforts or create new efforts in the area. It should not have to be have to be a brand new initiative.

**Rationalize:** to rationalize is to justify, or to give an explanation as to the meaning of the issue/items being discussed.

**Realistic:** should be interpreted to mean practical or obtainable. It should not be interpreted to mean far-reaching or ideal.

**Review:** a formal assessment of something with the intention of instating change if necessary

**Remain committed, reaffirm commitment or reiterate:** refers to commitments that have been established in the past. It should not be considered a new initiative, however new efforts in the area should be made.

**Robust:** should be interpreted as an inclusive action. Something embodying strength.

**Scaling up:** should be interpreted to mean progression or movement forward. It does not include past or previous performance. It does not include action already taken. It can include past measures if further or additional attention is applied to them.

**Significantly:** when a commitment states that it will achieve or work ‘significantly’ or in a ‘significant way’ the work must be meaningful or to an important degree, suggesting it must matter in the eyes of the public. It must not occur by accident or chance and therefore it should be statistically significant.

**Strengthening:** to make or become stronger

**Subsidy:** financial aid given by the government to individuals or groups.

**Substantially:** an ample or considerable amount in the eyes of the public. Considered of importance. It should be essential to the whole. It should not be minimal or small in comparison to the other parts.

**Support:** the action, or act of providing aid, assistance, or backing up an initiative, or entity.

**Take concrete steps:** when a commitment states that it will take concrete steps, it should be interpreted to mean visible new steps, which could apply to new or old initiatives. It should not be interpreted to mean questionable compliance or half-hearted actions.

**Transparent:** open; frank; candid

**Universal:** when a commitment states a target of ‘universal’ access it should be interpreted to mean all of the intended group. It should not be interpreted to mean a partial or percentage of the whole. It should not be interpreted to mean a small amount or a minority.

**Urgently:** when a reference states it must be employed urgently, it should be interpreted as a short-term initiative that should be put into action in the present and/or very near future. It should not include prolonged and/or delayed efforts and compliance.

**Work towards:** when a commitment states it will ‘work towards’ this should be interpreted to mean that actors are applying international diplomacy, such as drafting proposals, putting forth new ideas, encouraging new initiatives, etc. It does not include putting forward no effort, resisting or destroying efforts put forth by other actors, or merely tagging along with the consensus reached.

## Specific Interpretive Guidelines

In addition to the general interpretive guidelines, brand new commitment specific guidelines are necessary. It is necessary to breakdown the commitment and define the relevant words or phrases to increase the clarity for measurement purposes. The following terms have been defined from previously made commitments.

**Aid for Trade:** development assistance funding that finances trade related initiatives. This includes funding for; the building of infrastructure, trade policy and regulations and trade-related adjustment, economic infrastructure and building productive capacity.

**Copenhagen Accord:** an international climate change accord reached on 18 December 2009 at UNFCCC conference.

**Common but differentiated:** there is an understanding outlined in the UNFCCC that each country depending on their social and economic conditions has different capacities, strengths and weaknesses when it comes to implementing the Convention. It also acknowledged that the global nature of climate change calls for the widest possible cooperation by all countries

**Development assistance or international aid, overseas aid, Official Development Assistance (ODA) or foreign aid:** aid given by governments and other agencies to support the economic, environmental, social and political development of developing countries. It is distinguished from humanitarian aid by focusing on alleviating poverty in the long term, rather than a short term response.

**Fossil fuel subsidy:** a form of financial assistance paid to fossil fuel producers or consumers.

**Green recovery:** a synergistic relationship between economic recovery and environmental protection. Financial contributions to the transition to a green economy through investment in any sustainable development initiative.

**Liquidity risk:** a financial term to mean the risk that a given security or asset cannot be traded quickly enough in the market to prevent loss.

**Liquidity cushion:** a reserve fund containing money market and highly liquid investments.

**Market manipulation:** a deliberate attempt to interfere with the free and fair operation of the market and create artificial, false or misleading appearances with respect to the price of, or market for, a security, commodity or currency

**Objective provisions and principles:** Outlined in the Convention are unbiased democratically negotiated commitments and statements developed by the parties associated with the convention. These clauses are agreed upon by the group and therefore objective as they have not been developed by one party alone.

**Regulators:** are supervisors who are to assess the adequacy and functioning of the institutional body and are expected to take action when necessary.

**Review business conduct rules:** an assessment of the manner in which a business operates, to ensure that the business does not act against the interests of its clients. While circumstances will

vary from country to country, key issues to address include: margin lending, blackout trading, “rumourage,” short selling, bribery, predatory lending practices, excessive executive pay practices (bonuses, dividends, share options, severance pay), and more generally, a lack of transparency in the business sector, and a lack of oversight and supervision of market practices and regulatory standards.

**Sustainable global growth:** the pursuit of sustainable development where the pattern of resource use aims to meet human needs while preserving the environment; where this pursuit expands from domestic policy to the broader scope of international cooperation.

**Strengthening cross-border cooperation:** the process of working together to address issues including: cross-border tax evasion, money laundering, financing and providing of safe havens for terrorists, and illicit finance emanating from states.

**Stress tests:** test that assess bank resilience and include a “comprehensive firm-wide perspective across risks and different books.” Also includes tests across credit, market and liquidity risks and include severe and extreme market events. Banks should, at a minimum, outline details of the methodologies, models and scenarios selected for the conduct of the particular stress tests, as well as summary of the findings and results.

**UNFCCC (United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change):** a convention to unify countries in an effort to mitigate, adapt and finance climate change. The Conference of the Parties (COP) is the body that oversees the implementation of the convention and monitors progress.

### **Anatomy of a Typical Interpretive Guideline**

The Interpretive Guideline should consist of four components: (1) the actual commitment text, drawn from the most recent commitment bank; (2) a breakdown of the commitment text and explanation of the components, with definitions if necessary; (3) a background section on the commitment topic; and (4) scoring guidelines specific to the commitment.

Although the Interpretive Guidelines have not included citations in the past, it is advisable that future versions of the Interpretive Guidelines include footnotes for the commitment text, background section and commitment breakdown (if necessary). The Interpretive Guidelines are frequently posted along with the Interim and Final Compliance Report. Citations help to ensure that the material can be verified and they also reduce the workload of editors for the Interim Compliance Report, as the Interpretive Guidelines background sections are used by team leaders as the basis of the background sections in the Interim Compliance Report.

### **Writing the Interpretive Guidelines**

The commitment text component is self-explanatory. The Director of Compliance should use only the text included in the Commitment Bank. This may or may not include the context sections placed in square brackets in the Commitment Bank.

#### *Commitment Breakdown*

The commitment breakdown is an important precursor to the scoring guidelines. It provides a concise study of the goals of the commitment and the tools or policy that are to be employed in the completion of the goals.

For example, G20 Toronto Commitment 2007-26:

We agreed to strengthen financial market infrastructure by accelerating the implementation of strong measures to improve transparency and regulatory oversight of hedge fund, credit rating agencies and over-the-counter derivatives, in an internationally consistent and nondiscriminatory way.

The breakdown for this commitment was as follows:

Although the commitment to strengthening the financial market infrastructure is large, the action to which the G20 member states have committed is quite simple: accelerating the implementation of measures to improve transparency and regulation to strengthen the financial market infrastructure. These measures include, but are not limited to:

1. Accelerating the implementation of strong measures to improve transparency and regulatory oversight of hedge fund
2. Improving transparency and oversight of “credit rating agencies”
3. Improving transparency and oversight of “over-the-counter derivatives”
4. Doing this all in an “international consistent and non-discriminatory way”

The breakdown is not simply a reorganization of the commitment. It should separate the commitment into two parts: (1) goals to be attained; (2) means by which those goals are to be reached. In the case of the above commitment, the second component is easy, as the commitment itself contains the means of encouraging the strengthening of the financial market infrastructure. As well, the actors and parties involved should be made explicit. In the above example, the only actors are the G20 member states. Sometimes, however, the commitments call for several different parties to be addressed. G20 Commitment 2010-33 highlights this issue:

We have strengthened our commitment to the IMF/World Bank Financial Sector Assessment Program (FSAP) and pledge to support robust and transparent peer review through the FSB.

The commitment makes explicit mention of the Financial Stability Board, International Monetary Fund and the World Bank. This is made clear in the commitment breakdown:

The commitment contains one action, to “strengthen our commitment to the IMF/World Bank Financial Sector Assessment Program (FSAP).” One aspect of this action requires the “pledge to support robust and transparent peer review through the FSB” from the G20 members. Fulfillment is not limited to these actions and may take other forms, but fulfillment is dependent on the FSB, World Bank and IMF process.

Some of the commitments contain technical terms or jargon that may not be readily understood by laypeople or by those not familiar with the given commitment topic. Confusion may be avoided by clarifying this language in the commitment breakdown. For example, the 2007 commitment on renewable energy, G8; 2009-100:

work to identify sources of financing for CCS demonstration projects

The breakdown for this commitment clarifies what is meant by the phrase “CCS demonstration projects,” which is core to the commitment but not widely understood by those without technical knowledge:

The component to watch for in this commitment:

1. The financing must go towards CCS demonstration projects: Carbon Capture and Storage demonstration projects. Other renewable, or energy efficient initiatives are not acceptable.

These projects must have an identified source of funding. Identifying a possible project is only part of the commitment.

Thus, the commitment breakdowns should provide textual analysis of the commitments with the goal of clarifying the meaning rather than the context of the commitment. Context is to be addressed in the background section.

### *Background for a given commitment*

The commitment breakdowns are often not sufficient to provide analysts with the information needed to understand the evolution of a commitment or the context in which the commitment was created. Background sections help to fill this knowledge gap. Unlike the breakdown sections, these parts of the Interpretive Guidelines should have historical components and should examine the evolution of the commitment topic — including areas that are not explicitly mentioned in the commitment text. Although the background section may include general information, it should always contain the names of the documents from previous summits in which the topic appeared.

This does not mean that issues that have not been addressed at previous summits should have small or superficial background sections. Rather, information should be taken from the organizations that do work in the relevant field. For example, UNIFEM and the UN were used as sources for information on which the background section of the 2007 Sexual and Reproduction Education (2007-233) commitment was based.

### *Scoring Guidelines*

The scoring guidelines are both the most controversial and the most important part of the Interpretive Guidelines. They provide Team Leaders and Analysts with instruction on how to weigh the various components of their reports and come up with an evaluation that they feel accurately reflects the progress of a given country towards the completion of the promises and goals included in the commitment.

The general guidelines for scoring are as follows:

-1	No progress towards compliance or actions counter to compliance
0	Partial compliance with the stated goals of the commitment
+1	Complete or near complete compliance with the stated goals of the commitment

Although not explicitly stated, countries that are constitutionally prohibited from complying with a commitment (i.e. Canada with commitments on the minutiae of financial regulation) have been awarded a score of 0. The scoring guidelines should include this information when there is a potential for a government to be constitutionally limited in its actions.

Similarly, if a country has already fulfilled all components of a commitment, it should be awarded a score of +1. Such situations may arise in commitments concerning trade, convention/treaty ratifications, economic reforms or “consultations” (i.e. a commitment to hold consultations on a specific reform or policy) and are fairly rare. In general, commitments contain at least one component that has not been completed in full by any of the G8/G20 member states.

Nevertheless, if this caveat may be added into the scoring guidelines if it is likely to affect compliance with a specific commitment, such as for simple, single action commitments calling for the ratification (but not implementation) of a convention.

The scoring guidelines included in the Interpretive Guidelines should be tailored to each of the commitments. Do not seek to include extremely detailed information about the actions that have been taken in the past to meet the specified goals of the commitment — such information should be provided by the team leader. Rather, use the components of the commitment outlined in the *Commitment Breakdown* section in generalized examples for each of the scores listed above.

For example: G20 Toronto Commitment 2010-26:

We agreed to strengthen financial market infrastructure by accelerating the implementation of strong measures to improve transparency and regulatory oversight of hedge fund, credit rating agencies and over-the-counter derivatives, in an internationally consistent and nondiscriminatory way

The breakdown for this commitment was as follows:

Although the strengthening the financial market infrastructure commitment is large, the action to which the G20 member states have committed is quite simple: accelerating the implementation of measures to improve transparency and regulation to strengthen the financial market infrastructure. These measures include, but are not limited to:

1. Accelerating the implementation of strong measures to improve transparency and regulatory oversight of hedge fund
2. Improving transparency and oversight of “credit rating agencies”
3. Improving transparency and oversight of “over-the-counter derivatives”
4. Doing this all in an “international consistent and non-discriminatory way”

The corresponding scoring guidelines are:

-1	Country implements no new measures to strengthen the financial market infrastructure.
0	Country implements few new policies directed towards strengthening financial market infrastructure. State concentrates exclusively on implementing measures to improve transparency and regulatory oversight, but does not do it in an internationally consistent and nondiscriminatory way.
+1	Country implements new policies directed towards strengthening the financial market infrastructure. The state concentrates on implementing measures to improve transparency and regulatory oversight and does it in an internationally consistent and nondiscriminatory way.

The guidelines do not use the specific components of the breakdown, but each score is supplemented by a generalized example of the sort of actions that states may take and programs implemented that warrant a given score. Remember that the scores are awarded in a *holistic* manner — thus individual actions rarely warrant a score on their own. A number of actions and statements must be weighed together and their cumulative effect must be evaluated before a score is awarded.

## **Interim vs. Final Compliance Reports**

In 2002, the G8 Research Group completed — for the first time — an Interim Compliance Report, which focused on the extent to which the previous Summit’s commitments were complied with by the time the G8’s hosting chair had passed on to the next member — which happens on January 1 of each year.

The G20 Research Group has not completed a G20 Interim Compliance Report. Since 2008 G20 summits have occurred every 5-8 months. When the G20 starts to convene once a year a Interim Compliance Report will be completed.

The G8 Interim compliance Report provide an assessment of how the commitments are evolving in the post-Summit period with respect to their implementation up until January 1, when the G8 presidency changes to the next country in the hosting rotation. These reports are posted on the web and are produced as a preliminary diagnostic — as an invitation for others to provide more complete information on their country’s compliance performance to date. Final compliance reports — typically issued two to three weeks prior to the next Summit, take the interim reports and build on them to assess the extent to which compliance has evolved from January 1 to the period directly prior to the next Summit. The same template is used for both the interim and final compliance reports. The G20 Interim Compliance Report will take the same format using its own summit cycle.

## How to Write a Compliance Report

The first step in writing a compliance report is to set up a compliance template. At the top of the page clearly state the Summit period being assessed and the subject area being evaluated. Following the title, include a definition of the issue area, and a summary chart of all the commitments involved. Then provide a rationale, by country, for each of the core commitments assessed (see Appendix A).

After the template is completed, the research process begins. Analysts should always familiarize themselves with the agencies and ministries responsible for the topics and issues addressed by the commitment. Commitments often span the jurisdictions of various government ministries and agencies. For example, a pledge to increase energy efficiency among consumers, businesses and generators may involve the ministries of the environment, industry, natural resources, consumer affairs and of the economy. Commitments that address development issues may require analysts to follow press releases and news stories emanating from the ministries of foreign affairs and/or international cooperation, agencies tasked with the implementation of government projects (i.e. USAID, CIDA, Agenzia Italiana della Cooperazione) and non-profit organizations awarded contracts and grants by government agencies. Before serious and in-depth research can begin, analysts should have a complete list of the pertinent organizations and independent news media to follow throughout the compliance cycle.

Analysts are instructed to collect information from a restricted set of sources. Press releases and news items issued by government sources directly are to be given priority in the research process, as this allows for analysts to include information that has not been analyzed and processed by a third party in their compliance reports. Next, analysts collect information from international organizations such as the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank, the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development and the African Union. Finally, analysts use articles from major news media from around the world. Analysts are extremely selective in their use of press sources and seek to take articles from news services that are generally recognized as being reliable and as having a strong editorial board. Furthermore, the use of online sources only for the compilation of the Compliance Report greatly enhances the ability of readers to verify the information included in the Report.

Analysts collect information about their specific commitment over a period that ranges from two to five months. The actual compilation of the compliance report does not begin until a week or two weeks prior to the due date for submission of the report to the Team Leader. This allows for analysts to include the most current and up-to-date information possible in their reports. Analysts sort through the research they have conducted and select the most current and salient items with respect to the focus of the commitment. Pertinent facts are then arranged according to relevance to the commitment, relative importance in the fulfillment of the stated commitment, and time of issuance. Statements or press releases by the Minister or ministry directly charged with compliance should come first, then those made by the Head of Government, followed by officials, ministries or agencies of lesser importance in terms of their relationship to the commitment. Similarly, statements about funding directly related to the commitment should be prioritized, followed by tangential or over-arching funding (i.e. disbursements targeted at the general commitment area rather than the specific topic), statements of support or reiteration, and joint press releases with other political figures or international organizations.

Once research has been sorted and categorized, writing the actual compliance report is a simple affair. The report must always begin with a clear statement about the actor's performance:

“Country X has complied with its commitment on Y as agreed at the Z Summit.” This statement may be followed by a brief explanation of the reasons for compliance/noncompliance, particularly if the report is long or contains a description of a large number of disparate programs. The following paragraphs should contain the information collected and arranged according to the guidelines above. Analysts are instructed to use neutral language in their reports, such that programs, statements and initiatives are presented according to their relevance to the topic at hand, rather than as a subjective evaluation of the policies and priorities of a given government. The prose of the body of the report should be clear and concise, with short sentences preferred over complex ones. Analysts should describe programs and funding with a few sentences and, if possible, provide quotes from speeches or press releases by the appropriate government officials.

All information included in the body of the compliance report must be cited. Analysts are encouraged to cite as often as they feel necessary, particularly when figures and official statements are used. Although the style of citation has undergone minor changes from one year to the next, the basic format for the footnotes included in the Report is as follows:

Title of Article, Source of Article (City of Publication) Date of Publication. Date of Access: Date Accessed. <web address>.

For example, the citation for the 2005 Gleneagles Summit Document entitled *Africa* would be:

Africa, G8 Information Centre (Toronto) 8 July 2005. Date of Access: 15 March 2008. <<http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/summit/2005gleneagles/africa.html>>.

The source of the article should be the organization that maintains the website on which the article was posted — regardless of whether the original document was issued by a different organization. This ensures that any discrepancies between the original document and the one used by the analyst will not be ascribed to error on the part of the analyst.

The last part of the compliance report is the concluding statement. The concluding statement should reiterate the score awarded to the actor in question and provide a brief explanation of why the score has been awarded. It should be no longer than one sentence. For example:

Thus, Country X has been awarded a score of 0 for its contributions to Fund Y and its lack of a comprehensive policy on Z.

This provides a firm reassertion of main points of the compliance report.

## Special Considerations

In evaluating the results of the compliance reports, the following considerations should be kept in mind:

- Compliance is assessed against a selected set of priority commitments, rather than all commitments the last Summit produced. The priority commitments selected are not randomly chosen but identified according to a disciplined and systematic process intended to produce a representative subset of the total according to such dimensions as issue areas, ambition, specified time for completion, instruments used and, more generally, the degree of precision, obligation and delegation of each. The aim is to provide a comprehensive portrait of the compliance performance of the Summit as a whole. As such, the individual commitments selected cannot in all cases claim to be the most important ones in their appropriate issue area, nor do they necessarily represent that issue area lodged.
- In addition to the specific commitments assessed in the compliance reports, Summits have value in establishing new principles in normative directions, in creating and highlighting issue areas and agenda items, and in altering the publicly allowable discourse used. Furthermore, some of the most important decisions reached and consensus forged at Summits may be done entirely in private and not encoded in the public communiqué record.
- Some commitments inherently take longer to be complied with than the time available between one Summit and the next.
- In some cases, it may be wise not to comply with a Summit commitment, if global conditions have dramatically changed since the commitment was made or if new knowledge has become available about how a particular problem can best be solved.
- As each of the member countries has its own constitutional, legal and institutional processes for undertaking action at the national level, each is free to act in particular cases on a distinctive national time scale. Of particular importance here is the annual cycle for the creation of budgets, legislative approval and the appropriation of funds.
- Commitments encoded in the G8/G20 communiqué may also be encoded precisely or partially in communiqués from other international forums, the decisions of other international organizations, or even national statements such as the State of the Union Address in the U.S., the Queen's Speech in the UK and the Speech from the Throne in Canada. Without detailed process-tracing, it cannot be assumed that compliant behaviour on the part of countries is fully caused by the single fact of a previous G8/20 commitment.
- Compliance is assessed against the precise, particular commitments made by the G8/G20, rather than what some might regard as necessary or appropriate action to solve the problem being addressed.
- With compliance assessed on a three-point scale, judgments inevitably arise about whether particular actions warrant the specific numerical value assigned. As individual members can sometimes take different actions to comply with the same commitment, no standardized cross-national evaluative criterion can always be used. Comments regarding the judgments in each case, detailed in the extensive accompanying notes, are always welcomed by our global audience.

- Because the evaluative scale used in this compliance report runs from –100 percent to +100 percent, it should be assumed that any score in the positive range represents at least some compliance with the specific commitments made by the G8. It is not known if commitments in other international forums or at the national level on occasions such as the State of the Union Address, Queen’s Speech or Speech from the Throne, etc., are complied with to a greater or lesser degree than the commitments made by the G8/G20.
- It may be that commitments containing high degrees of precision, obligation and delegation, with short specified timetables for implementation, may induce governments to act simply to meet the specified commitment rather than in ways best designed to address core and underlying problems over a longer term.
- In some cases, full compliance by all members of the G8 or the G20 with a commitment is contingent on co-operative behaviour on the part of other actors.
- Although G8/G20 Research Group analysts make an exceptional effort to seek relevant information on the Summit countries, credible commentary on the information offered about the compliance-related activity of some G8/G20 countries remains at times incomplete. The greater such incompleteness, the lower the scores would likely be as a result.

## Appendix A: Compliance Report Template

This template refers only to the G8. For G20 compliance, add change as appropriate but follow the same format, listing the countries in alphabetical order with the European Union at the end.

**[Year of Summit] [Location of Summit] [G8 or G20] [Interim or Final] Compliance Report [Issue Area]**

### Commitment

*Copy exact commitment, including a reference to the document it comes from as well as the year it was issued (e.g., G8 2008: Chair's Statement).*

### Assessment

Country	Lack of Compliance -1	Work in Progress 0	Full Compliance +1
Canada			
France			
Germany			
Italy			
Japan			
Russia			
United Kingdom			
United States			
European Union			
Overall Score			

The overall score is determined by averaging the total scores by country and issue area and converting that score to a %. Exclude N/A (due to lack of available data) from the calculation.

### Background

*Provide a brief overview of the issue area and the triggers leading to this commitment appearing in the final communiqué or declaration.*

### Individual Country Compliance Breakdown

*Provide a 1/2 page–1 page analysis for each country, in the order below, including endnotes for each empirical reference. Include for each country concrete examples of how compliance has been achieved (if any). If compliance has not been achieved, provide a rationale (if available).*

**Canada**  
**France**  
**Germany**  
**Italy**  
**Japan**  
**Russia**  
**United Kingdom**  
**United States**  
**European Union**

Compiled by [team leader, analysts' names listed alphabetically, academic institution, date]

## Appendix B: Where to Find G8 and G20 Compliance Information Online

This reference guide contains useful online sources that can be used in preparing compliance reports as well as G8 and G20 country and issue area studies.

### G8-Specific Sites

- University of Toronto G8 Information Centre: <http://www.g8.utoronto.ca>
- Official G8 host website

### G20-Specific Sites

- University of Toronto G20 Information Centre: <http://www.g20.utoronto.ca>
- Group of 20 (G20): <http://www.g20.org>
- Official G20 Host website

### General Sources

- Strategies for Locating Foreign Government Information on the Internet:  
<http://www.libraries.psu.edu/crsweb/docs/forgate.htm>
- Foreign Government Statistics  
<http://www.lib.umich.edu/libhome/Documents.center/forstats.html>
- U.S. Census Bureau International Database:  
<http://www.census.gov/ftp/pub/ipc/www/idbnew.html>
- Political Reference Almanac:  
<http://www.polisci.com/almanac/almanac.htm>
- Political Resources on the Web:  
<http://www.politicalresources.net/>
- Country at a Glance:  
[http://www.un.org/Pubs/CyberSchoolBus/infonation/e\\_glance.htm](http://www.un.org/Pubs/CyberSchoolBus/infonation/e_glance.htm)
- Library of Congress Country Studies:  
<http://lcweb2.loc.gov/frd/cs/cshome.html#toc>
- The CIA World Fact Book:  
<http://www.odci.gov/cia/publications/factbook/>
- U.S. State Department Background Notes:  
<http://www.odci.gov/cia/publications/factbook/>

### International Organizations

- United Nations: <http://www.un.org/>
- IMF: <http://www.imf.org>
- World Bank: <http://www.worldbank.org>
- World Health Organization: <http://www.who.int/>
- UNESCO: <http://www.unesco.org/>
- UNEP: <http://www.unep.org/>
- WTO: <http://www.wto.org>
- OECD: <http://www.oecd.org>
- NATO: <http://www.nato.int>
- Group of 77 (G77): <http://www.g77.org/>
- Financial Stability Board (G20): <http://www.financialstabilityboard.org/>
- Basel Committee on Banking Supervision: <http://www.bis.org/bcbs/>
- Bank for International Settlements: <http://www.bis.org/>
- International Energy Agency: <http://www.iea.org/>

**International News Sources & Newswires**

- International Herald Tribune: <http://www.iht.com/frontpage.htm>
- New York Times: <http://www.nytimes.com/>
- Financial Times: <http://www.usa.ft.com/>
- Reuters: <http://www.reuters.com/>
- Associated Press: <http://www.ap.org/>
- Canada Newswire: <http://www.newswire.ca/>
- Agence France-Presse: <http://www.afp.com/english/home/>
- UPI World: [http://www.vny.com/cf/News/upisearch.cfm?content=srv\\_intnews](http://www.vny.com/cf/News/upisearch.cfm?content=srv_intnews)

**Country-Specific Online Resources***Argentina*

## Government Resources

- General Secretariat to the Presidency: [www.secretariageneral.gov.ar](http://www.secretariageneral.gov.ar)
- Office of the Cabinet Chief: [www.jgm.gov.ar](http://www.jgm.gov.ar)
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs, International Trade and Worship: <http://www.cancilleria.gov.ar/>
- Ministry of Economy and Public Finance: [infoprensa@mecon.gov.ar](mailto:infoprensa@mecon.gov.ar)
- Ministry of Health: [www.msal.gov.ar](http://www.msal.gov.ar)
- Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries: [www.minagri.gob.ar](http://www.minagri.gob.ar)
- Ministry of Defense: [www.mindef.gov.ar](http://www.mindef.gov.ar)
- Banco Central de la Republica Argentina: [www.bcra.gov.ar](http://www.bcra.gov.ar)

## Online News Sources

- Buenos Aires Herald: [www.buenosairesherald.com](http://www.buenosairesherald.com)
- Clarin: [www.clarin.com](http://www.clarin.com)
- Ambino Financiero: [www.ambito.com.ar](http://www.ambito.com.ar)

*Australia*

- Government of Australia: <http://australia.gov.au/>
- Parliament of Australia: <http://www.aph.gov.au/>
- AusAID: <http://www.ausaid.gov.au/>
- Australian Ministry of Trade: <http://www.austrade.gov.au/>

## Online News Sources

- The Australian: <http://www.theaustralian.com.au/>
- The Australian Financial Review: <http://afr.com/>

*Brazil*

## Government Resources

- Brazil Government: [http://www.brasil.gov.br/?set\\_language=en](http://www.brasil.gov.br/?set_language=en)
- Banco Central do Brasil: <http://www.bcb.gov.br/?english>
- Ministry of Finance: <http://www.fazenda.gov.br/>
- Ministry of the Environment: <http://www.mma.gov.br/sitio/en/>
- Ministry of External Relations: <http://www.itamaraty.gov.br/english>
- Federal Senate: <http://www.senado.gov.br/>

### Online News Sources

- Brasil em Folhas: <http://www.folha.info>
- Correio Braziliense: <http://www.correiobraziliense.com.br>
- Diário Oficial da União: <http://www.dou.com.br>
- Estado de Minas: <http://www.em.com.br>

### *Canada*

#### Government Resources

- Government of Canada (primary page): <http://canada.gc.ca/>
- Federal Dept. index page: [http://canada.gc.ca/depts/major/depind\\_e.html](http://canada.gc.ca/depts/major/depind_e.html)
- DFAIT: <http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/menu-e.asp>
- Department of Finance: <http://www.fin.gc.ca>
- Prime Minister: [http://pm.gc.ca/prime\\_minister/-ssi](http://pm.gc.ca/prime_minister/-ssi)
- Parliament: <http://www.parl.gc.ca/36/main-e.htm>
- Statistics Canada: <http://www.statcan.ca/>
- Federal Information by subject: <http://dsp-psd.pwgsc.gc.ca/dsp-psd/Reference/fed-e.html>
- Federal Budget Information: <http://www.fin.gc.ca/access/budinfoe.html>
- Government Electronic Publications: <http://dsp-psd.pwgsc.gc.ca/dsp-psd/epubs-e.html>

### Online News Sources

- Globe and Mail: <http://www.GlobeAndMail.CA>
- Toronto Star: <http://www.thestar.com>
- National Post: <http://www.nationalpost.com>
- Vancouver Sun: <http://www.vancouversun.com>
- Ottawa Citizen: <http://www.ottawacitizen.com>
- CBC News: <http://cbc.ca>
- CTV: <http://www.ctvnews.com/>

### *China*

#### Government Resources

- People's Republic of China Government: <http://www.gov.cn/english/>
- Ministry of Finance: <http://www.mof.gov.cn/>
- Ministry of Environmental Protection: <http://english.mep.gov.cn/>
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs: <http://www.fmprc.gov.cn/eng/>
- People's Bank of China: <http://www.pbc.gov.cn/publish/english/963/index.html>
- Ministry of Industry and Information Technology: <http://www.miit.gov.cn/>

### Online News Sources

- China Daily: <http://www.chinadaily.com.cn/>

### *France*

#### Government Resources

- Main Government Page: <http://www.admifrance.gouv.fr>
- President: <http://www.elysee.fr/ang/index.shtm>
- Prime Minister: <http://www.premier-ministre.gouv.fr/>
- Bank of France: <http://www.banque-france.fr/gb/home.htm>
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs: <http://www.diplomatie.gouv.fr/mae/index.gb.html>
- Ministry of the Economy, Finance, and Industry: <http://www.telecom.gouv.fr/francais.htm>
- Ministry of the Environment: <http://www.environnement.gouv.fr/>
- National Assembly: <http://www.assemblee-nat.fr/0>
- Senate: <http://www.senat.fr/>

- National Institute of Statistics: <http://www.insee.fr/>
- Service des Statistiques Industrielles (SESSI): <http://www.evariste.anvar.fr>

#### Online News Sources

- International Herald Tribune: <http://www.ihf.com/frontpage.htm>
- La Tribune: <http://www.latribune.fr/>
- Le Monde: <http://www.lemonde.fr/>
- Le Monde Diplomatique: <http://www.monde-diplomatique.fr/>
- Tocqueville Connection: <http://www.ttc.org/> (english language analysis of French News)

#### *Germany*

##### Government Resources

- Der Bundeskanzler: <http://www.bundeskanzler.de/>
- Federal German Government: <http://www.bundesregierung.de>
- Federal Statistical Office: [http://www.statistik-bund.de/e\\_home.htm](http://www.statistik-bund.de/e_home.htm)
- Foreign Office: <http://www.auswaertiges-amt.government.de/>
- Federal Ministry of Economics: <http://www.bmwi.de/>
- Federal Ministry of Finance: <http://www.bundesfinanzministerium.de/>
- German Central Bank: [http://www.bundesbank.de/index\\_e.html](http://www.bundesbank.de/index_e.html)

#### Online News Sources

- Handelsblatt: <http://www.handelsblatt.de/cgi-bin/hbi.exe?FN=hb&SFN=hp>
- German News (english edition): <http://www.mathematik.uni-ulm.de/de-news/>
- Frankfurter Allgemeine: <http://www.faz.de/>
- Frankfurter Rundschau: <http://www.f-r.de/>
- Die Welt: <http://www.welt.de>
- Germany Online: <http://www.germany-info.org>

#### *India*

##### Government Resources

- Government of India: <http://india.gov.in/>
- Ministry of External Affairs: <http://meaindia.nic.in/>
- Ministry of Finance: <http://finmin.nic.in/>
- Ministry of Environment and Forest: <http://moef.nic.in/index.php>
- Central Bank of India: <https://www.centralbankofindia.co.in/site/IndexCBI.aspx>
- Ministry of Statistics and Program Implementation:  
[http://mospi.nic.in/Mospi\\_New/site/home.aspx](http://mospi.nic.in/Mospi_New/site/home.aspx)

#### Online News Sources

- The Times of India: <http://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/>
- The Economic Times: <http://economictimes.indiatimes.com/>

#### *Indonesia*

##### Government Resources

- Government website: <http://www.indonesia.go.id/en/>
- President of Republic of Indonesia: <http://www.presidentri.go.id/index.php/eng/>
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs: <http://www.deplu.go.id/Pages/Mission.aspx?l=en>
- Ministry of Finance: <http://www.depkeu.go.id/Eng/>
- Ministry of Energy and Natural Resources: <http://www.esdm.go.id/index-en.html?>
- Directorate General for National Export Development: <http://www.nafed.go.id/>

### Online News Sources

- Inside Indonesia: <http://www.insideindonesia.org/>
- Jakarta Globe: <http://www.thejakartaglobe.com/home/>
- The Jakarta Post: <http://www.thejakartapost.com/>

### *Italy*

#### Government Resources

- Government Page: <http://www.parlamento.it/>
- Presidenza del Consiglio dei Ministri: <http://www.palazzochigi.it/>
- Ministero Degli Affari Esteri: <http://www.esteri.it/>
- Italian Trade Commission of Canada: <http://www.italcomm.com/e/>
- Italian Political Parties: <http://www.agora.stm.it/politic/italy1.htm>
- Ministry of Finance/Ministero delle Finanze: <http://www.finanze.it/>

### Online News Sources

- La Buvette: <http://www.axnet.it/buvette/>
- Milano Finanza: <http://www.milanofinanza.it/>
- Il Manifesto: <http://www.mir.it/>
- La Padania: <http://www.lapadania.com>

### *Japan*

#### Government Resources

- Prime Minister's Official Residence: <http://www.kantei.go.jp/foreign/index-e.html>
- Ministry of Finance: <http://www.mof.go.jp/english/>
- Ministry of International Trade and Industry: <http://www.miti.go.jp/index-e.html>
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs: <http://www.mofa.go.jp>
- Japanese Market Information: <http://www.csjapan.doc.gov/links/market.html>
- The Information Technology Promotion Agency: <http://www.ipa.go.jp/>

### Online News Sources

- Asahi Shinbun: <http://www.asahi.com/english/english.html>
- Daily Yomiuri: <http://www.yomiuri.com.jp/index-e.htm>
- Mainichi Newspapers: <http://www.mainichi.com.jp/english/>
- Japan Times: <http://www.japantimes.co.jp/>
- Foreign Press Centre: <http://www.nttls.co.jp/fpc/>
- NHK: <http://www.nhk.or.jp/index-e.html>
- Kyodo News: <http://home.kyodo.co.jp/>
- Nikkei Net: <http://www.nni.nikkei.co.jp/>

### *Korea*

#### Government Resources

- Office of the President: <http://english.president.go.kr/main.php>
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade: <http://www.mofat.go.kr/english/main/index.jsp>
- Ministry of Strategy and Finance: <http://english.mosf.go.kr/>
- Ministry of the Environment: <http://eng.me.go.kr/>
- Statistics Korea: <http://kostat.go.kr/eng/>

### Online News Sources

- The Seoul Times: <http://theseoultimes.com/ST/index.html>
- Maeil Business Newspaper: <http://www.mk.co.kr/>
- Korea Times: <http://www.mk.co.kr/>

Korea Herald: <http://www.koreaherald.com/>  
Yonhap News: <http://english.yonhapnews.co.kr/>

### *Mexico*

#### Government Resources

- President's webpage: <http://presidencia.gob.mx/?DNA=118>
- Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources:  
<http://www.semarnat.gob.mx/English/Pages/home.aspx>
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs: <http://www.sre.gob.mx/en/>
- Bank of Mexico: <http://www.banxico.org.mx/>
- Ministry of Finance and Public Credit: <http://www.shcp.gob.mx/Paginas/Default.aspx>

#### Online News Sources

- El Universal: <http://www.eluniversal.com.mx/pre-home.html>
- Reforma: <http://www.reforma.com/>
- La Jornada: <http://www.jornada.unam.mx/ultimas/>

### *Russia*

#### Government Resources

- Government Site: <http://www.gov.ru>
- President: <http://president.kremlin.ru/>
- Duma: <http://www.duma.ru/>
- Council of the Russian Federation: <http://www.akdi.ru/sf/>
- Central Bank: <http://www.cbr.ru/eng/>
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs: [http://www.mid.ru/mid/eng/BOD\\_1.HTM](http://www.mid.ru/mid/eng/BOD_1.HTM)
- Ministry of Finance: <http://www.minfin.ru/>

#### Online News Sources

- All News Russia: <http://www.allnews.ru/>
- Interfax: <http://www.interfax-news.com/>
- Russia Today: <http://www.russiatoday.com>
- Radio Free Europe: <http://www.rferl.org/bd/ru/>
- TASS: <http://www.tass.net/>
- ITAR/TASS: <http://www.itar-tass.com/>
- Russian National News Service: <http://www.russianstory.com>

### *Saudi Arabia*

#### Government Resources

- Saudi Arabia Monetary Agency: <http://www.sama.gov.sa/sites/SAMAEN/Pages/Home.aspx>
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs:  
<http://www.mofa.gov.sa/detail.asp?InServiceID=205&intemplatekey=MainPage>
- Ministry of Finance: <http://www.mof.gov.sa/en/default.asp>
- Ministry of Information: <http://www.saudinf.com/>
- Ministry of Petroleum and Mineral Resources: <http://www.mopm.gov.sa/mopm/main.do>

#### Online News Sources

- Arab News: <http://www.arabnews.com/>
- Saudi Gazette: <http://www.saudigazette.com.sa/>

*South Africa*

## Government Resources

- Department of Environmental Affairs: <http://www.environment.gov.za/>
- Department of National Treasury: <http://www.treasury.gov.za/>
- International Relations and Cooperation: <http://www.dfa.gov.za/>
- Statistics South Africa: <http://www.statssa.gov.za/>

## Online News Sources

- Cape Argus: <http://www.capeargus.co.za/>
- Business Day: <http://www.businessday.co.za/>
- The Star: <http://www.thestar.co.za/>
- Mail and Guardian: <http://www.mg.co.za/>

*Turkey*

## Government Resources

- Turkish Parliament: <http://www.tbmm.gov.tr/english/english.htm>
- Republic of Turkey Ministry of Foreign Affairs: <http://www.mfa.gov.tr/default.en.mfa>
- Ministry of Finance: <http://www.maliye.gov.tr/>
- Ministry of Environment and Forests:  
<http://www.cevreorman.gov.tr/cob/anasayfa.aspx?sflang=en>
- Central Bank of the Republic of Turkey: <http://www.tcmb.gov.tr/yeni/eng/>

## Online News Sources

- Akşam: <http://www.aksam.com.tr/>
- Milliyet: <http://www.milliyet.com.tr/2010/12/08/index.html>
- Hurriyet: <http://www.hurriyet.com.tr/anasayfa/>

*United Kingdom*

## Government Resources

- No. 10 Downing St.: <http://www.number-10.gov.uk/>
- Main Parliament site: <http://www.parliament.uk/>
- House of Commons: <http://www.parliament.uk/commons/HSECOM.HTM>
- House of Lords: <http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/ld/ldhome.htm>
- Department of Trade and Industry: <http://www.dti.gov.uk/>
- Foreign & Commonwealth Office: <http://www.fco.gov.uk/>
- Ministry of Defense: <http://www.mod.uk/>
- Her Majesty's Treasury: <http://www.hm-treasury.gov.uk/>

## Online News Sources

- Financial Times: <http://www.usa.ft.com/>
- The Guardian: <http://www.guardian.co.uk/>
- The Herald: <http://www.theherald.co.uk/>
- The Times of London: <http://www.thetimes.co.uk/>
- The Sunday Times: <http://www.sunday-times.co.uk/>

*United States*

## Government Resources

- The President and the White House: <http://www.whitehouse.gov/>
- Senate: <http://www.senate.gov>
- House of Representatives: <http://www.house.gov/>
- Congress.org: <http://congress.org/main.html>

- C-Span: <http://www.c-span.org/guide/congress>
- Fednet: <http://www.fednet.net>
- U.S. State Department: <http://www.state.gov/>
- Office of Management and Budget: <http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/>
- NAFTA Secretariat: <http://www.nafta-sec-alena.org/english/>
- Federal Web Locator: <http://www.infoctr.edu/FWL/>
- You can also try the “hot documents” site at the University of Michigan’s U.S. Document Centre: <http://www.lib.umich.edu/libhome/Documents.center/federal.html>

#### Online News Sources

- New York Times: <http://www.nytimes.com/>
- Washington Post: <http://www.washingtonpost.com/>
- USA Today: <http://www.usatoday.com>
- Wall Street Journal: <http://public.wsj.com/home.html>
- Los Angeles Times: <http://www.latimes.com>
- CNN: <http://www.cnn.com>
- ABCnews: <http://abcnews.go.com>
- MSNBC: <http://msnbc.com/news/default.asp?nocookies>
- Drudge Report: <http://www.drudgereport.com/>

#### *European Union*

##### Government Resources

- The European Commission: [http://europa.eu.int/comm/index\\_en.htm](http://europa.eu.int/comm/index_en.htm)
- Council of the European Union: <http://ue.eu.int/>
- Economic and Social Committee: <http://www.esc.eu.int/>
- European Parliament: <http://www.europarl.eu.int/default.htm>
- Court of Auditors: <http://www.eca.eu.int/>
- Court of Justice: <http://curia.eu.int/>
- Committee of Regions: <http://www.cor.eu.int/>
- European Investment Bank: <http://eib.eu.int/>
- European Central Bank: <http://www.ecb.int/>
- Europa (the EU’s server): <http://europa.eu.int/index-en.htm>
- Directorates-General (DGs) of the European Commission: [http://www.europa.eu.int/comm/dgs\\_en.htm](http://www.europa.eu.int/comm/dgs_en.htm)

#### Online News Sources

- Press releases: <http://www.europa.eu.int/news/pr-en.htm>
- Publications Office: <http://eur-op.eu.int/general/en/>

#### **If the Web Fails**

- Consult with reference librarians
- Email web administrators, NGOs, international organizations and governments
  - most governments and larger NGOs have staff hired specifically to answer questions
  - provide detailed explanations of the information required and the research already completed
- Contact relevant organizations and embassies
  - ask to speak to the media liaison or press relations person
  - explain in detail the research question and the sources already researched
  - while some embassies may not be helpful at the outset — and it is possible to be passed from official to official — normally, the embassies eventually forward the necessary information

- Contact relevant professors and scholars
  - explain the specific research question and why they have been chosen as a contact
  - ask if they are aware of anyone conducting research in this area or if they themselves know where to find the necessary information

If the information is not forthcoming after exhausting all of these channels, it is quite likely that the information is not available in the public domain. When information is not available, the countries receive a compliance score of N/A and the score is excluded from the final calculations that determine the overall compliance levels.

## Appendix C: G8 Compliance Bibliographical References

Baliamoune, Mina (2000), "Economics of Summitry: An Empirical Assessment of the Economic Effects of Summits," *Empirica* 27: 295-314.

Barnes, James (1994), *Promise, Promises: A Review: G-7 Economic Summit Declarations on Environment and Development* (Friends of the Earth: Washington, D.C.).

Buxton, G.V. "Sustainable Development and the Summit: A Canadian Perspective on Progress." *International Journal*, XLVII, no. 4 (Fall 1992); 776-795.

Chayes, Abram and Antonia Handler Chayes. *The New Sovereignty: Compliance with International Regulatory Agreements*.

Chayes, Abram. "On Compliance." *International Organization*, 47, no. 2 (Spring 1993): 175-205.

Chayes, Abram and Ronald B. Mitchell. "Improving Compliance with the Climate Change Treaty," in Henry Lee, ed. *Shaping National Responses to Climate Change: A Post-Rio Guide*. Washington, D.C., Island Press. 1995.

Daniels, Joe (1993), *The Meaning and Reliability of Economic Summit Undertakings* (Hamden, Connecticut: Garland Publishing).

G8 Online 2002 Lecture 6, 2004 Lecture 3

G8 Research Group, *Compliance with G8 Commitments: From Köln 1999 to Okinawa 2000* <http://www.library.utoronto.ca/g7/evaluations/2000okinawa/compliance/>

G8 Research Group, Compliance Assessments, <http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/compliance/>

G8 Research Group, Compliance Assessment, 1996- web

*G7, Napoli Summit 1994: The Record, Key Players, Preliminaries and Expectations*, Agenzia ANSA, Roma, 1994.

*Independent NGO Evaluations of National Plans for Climate Change Mitigation: G7 Countries — Summit Meeting, Halifax, June 1995*. Report Coordinated by the United States Climate Action Network and Climate Network Europe. 1995.

Ikenberry, John (1988), "Market Solutions for State Problems: The International and Domestic Politics of American Oil decontrol," *International Organization* 42 (Winter): 151-178.

Juricevic, Diana, "Controlling For Domestic-Level Commitments: An Analysis of the Authoritative National Commitments Made in Canada and the United States from 1995-2000," November 7, 2000. <http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/scholar/juricevic2000/juricevic.pdf>

Juricevic, Diana, "Compliance with G8 Commitments: Ascertaining the degree of compliance With Summit debt and international trade commitments For Canada and the United States 1996-1999," June 24, 2000. <http://www.library.utoronto.ca/g7/scholar/juricevic2000/>

Kirton, John and Ella Kokotsis (2004), "Keeping Faith with Africa: Assessing Compliance with the G8's Commitments at Kananaskis and Evian," in Princeton Lyman and Robert Browne, eds., *Freedom, Prosperity and Security: The G8 Partnership with Africa* (Council on Foreign Relations: New York, September).

Kirton, John, Ella Kokotsis and Diana Juricevic (2002), "Okinawa's Promises Kept: The 2001 G8 Compliance Report," in John Kirton and Junichi Takase, eds., *New Directions in Global Political Governance* (Ashgate: Aldershot), pp. 269-280.

Kirton, John, Ella Kokotsis and Diana Juricevic (2003), "G7/G8 Commitments and Their Significance," in John Kirton, Michele Fratianni and Paola Savona, eds. *Governing Global Finance: New Challenges, G7 and IMF Contributions* (Ashgate, Aldershot), pp. 227-231.

Kirton, John, Ella Kokotsis and Diana Juricevic (2002), "Okinawa's Promises Kept: The 2001 G8 Compliance Report" in John Kirton and Junichi Takase, eds. *New Directions in Global Political Governance: The G8 and International Order in the 21st Century* (Ashgate, Aldershot), pp 269-282.

Kirton, John, Ella Kokotsis, Gina Stevens with Diana Juricevic (2004), "The G8 and Conflict Prevention: Commitment, Compliance and Systemic Contribution," in *The G8, the United Nations and Conflict Prevention* (Ashgate, Aldershot), pp. 59-84.

Kokotsis, Ella (2002), "Compliance with G8 Commitments," *G8 Online 2002*

Kirton, John and Ella Kokotsis (2001), "Compliance with G8 Commitments: The Peace and Security and Conflict Prevention Agenda, Okinawa-Genoa," Paper prepared for the DFAIT's Policy Planning Division in Preparation for the Canadian Presidency of the G8 Foreign Ministers' Process in 2002, for June 26.

Kokotsis, Ella (1999), *Keeping International Commitments: Compliance, Credibility and the G7, 1988-1995* (New York: Garland).

Kokotsis, Ella and Joseph Daniels (1999), "G8 Summits and Compliance," in Michael Hodges and John Kirton, *The G8's Role in the New Millennium* (Ashgate: Aldershot), pp. 75-94.

Kokotsis, Ella (1995), "Keeping Sustainable Development Commitments: The Recent G7 Record," in John Kirton and Sarah Richardson, eds., *The Halifax Summit, Sustainable Development and International Institutional Reform* (Ottawa: National Round Table on the Environment and the Economy, 1995), pp. 117-133. on web

Kokotsis, Ella and Joseph Daniels (1999), "G8 Summits and Compliance," in *The G8's Role in the New Millennium*, Michael Hodges, John Kirton and Joseph Daniels eds. (Ashgate, Aldershot), pp. 75-91.

Kokotsis, Ella and John Kirton (1997), "National Compliance with Environmental Regimes: The Case of the G7, 1988-1995," Paper prepared for the Annual Convention of the International Studies Association, Toronto, March 18-22, 1997.

Kokotsis, Ella (2004), "Explaining G8 Effectiveness: The Democratic Institutional Model of Compliance with G8 Commitments," Paper prepared for the Annual Convention of the International Studies Association, Montreal, March 18, 2004.

Kirton, John and Ella Kokotsis, "Producing International Commitments and Compliance without Legalization: G7/8 Performance from 1975 to 2002," Paper prepared for the Annual Convention of the International Studies Association, Portland, Oregon, March 1, 2003.

Koremenos, Barbara (1996), "On the Duration and Renegotiation of International Agreements," Paper for the International Studies Association, San Diego, April 1996.

Labonte, Ronald and Ted Schrecker, *The G8, Africa and Global Health: A Platform for Global Health Equity for the 2005 Summit*. London: Nuffield Trust, forthcoming 28 February 2005; <http://www.nuffieldtrust.org.uk>.

Labonte, Ronald and Ted Schrecker, "Committed to Health for All? How the G7/G8 Rate," *Social Science and Medicine* 59 (2004): 1661-1676.

R. Labonte, T. Schrecker, D. Sanders and W. Meeus. *Fatal Indifference: The G8, Africa and Global Health* Cape Town: University of Cape Town Press/IDRC Books, January 2004.

Labonte, Ronald, Ted Schrecker and A. Sen Gupta, "A Global Health Equity Agenda for the G8 Summit," *British Medical Journal*, in press.

Labonte, Ronald, Ted Schrecker and D. McCoy, "Health and HIV/AIDS: Fine words and fatal indifference" in G. Hubbard and D. Miller, eds., *Arguments Against G8* (London: Pluto Press, in press): 182-197.

Labonte, Ronald, David Sanders and Ted Schrecker (2002). "Health and development: How are the G7/G8 doing?" *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health* 56(5) (2002): 322-322.

Li, Quan (2001), "Commitment Compliance in G-7 Summit Macroeconomic Policy Coordination," *Political Research Quarterly* 54 (June): 355-378.

Schrecker Ted and Ronald Labonte, "What's Politics Got to Do with It? Health, the G8 and the Global Economy" in I. Kawachi and S. Wamala, eds., *Globalisation and Health* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, in press).

*The Halifax Initiative. First Annual G7 Report Card on Bretton Woods Reform: Report on the Commitments Made by the G7 Leaders at the Halifax Summit, June 1995*. Canadian Coalition for Global Economic Democracy. Ottawa, June 25, 1996.

Von Furstenberg, George (1995), "Accountability and a Metric for Credibility and Compliance," *Journal of Institutional and Theoretical Economics* 151 (June): 304-25.

Von Furstenberg, George and Joseph Daniels (1992), "Can You Trust G-7 Promises?" *International Economic Insights* 3 (September/October): 24-27.

Von Furstenberg, George and Joseph Daniels (1992), *Economic Summit Declarations, 1975-1989: Examining the Written Record of International Co-operation*, Princeton Studies in International Finance 72, Princeton, N.J., Department of Economics.

Von Furstenberg, George and Joseph Daniels (1991), "Policy undertakings by the seven "Summit" countries: ascertaining the degree of compliance," *Carnegie-Rochester Conference Series of Public Policy* 35: 267-308, North Holland.

## Appendix D: G20 Compliance Bibliographical References

Bradford, Colin and Johannes Linn (2004). "Global Economic Governance at a Crossroads: Replacing the G7 with the G20," Brookings Institute Policy Brief 131. <[www.brookings.edu/papers/2004/04globaleconomics\\_colin-i-bradford-jr.aspx](http://www.brookings.edu/papers/2004/04globaleconomics_colin-i-bradford-jr.aspx)> (October 2007).

Engelen, Klaus (2008), "Letter from the G20 Summit: Rift Barley Avoided," *The International Economy* 22 (fall 2008): 10-11.

English, John, Ramesh Thakur and Andrew F. Cooper, eds. (2005). *Reforming from the Top: A Leader's 20 Summit*. Tokyo: United Nations University Press.

English, John, Ramesh Thakur and Andrew F. Cooper, eds. *Reforming Multilateral Institutions from the Top: A Leaders 20 Summit*, Tokyo: United Nations University Press.

Fischer, Fritz (2004). 'Thinking the Unthinkable.' *The International Economy* 18(4):60-65, 87.

Hajnal, Peter I. (2007). *The G8 System and the G20: Evolution, Role and Documentation*. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Kirton, John (2005b). "From G7 to G20: Capacity, Leadership and Normative Diffusion in Global Financial Governance." Paper prepared for a panel on "Expanding Capacity and Leadership in Global Financial Governance: From G7 to G20." International Studies Association Annual Convention, Hawaii, United States, March 1-5, 2005.

Kirton, John J. (2004b). "Toward Multilateral Reform: The G20's Role and Place." Paper prepared for a conference on "The Ideas-Institutional Nexus: The Case of the G20," sponsored by the Centre of International Governance Innovation, United Nations University FLASCO and the University of Waterloo, Buenos Aires, May 19–21. <[www.g8.utoronto.ca/scholar/kirton2004/kirton\\_g20\\_2004.pdf](http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/scholar/kirton2004/kirton_g20_2004.pdf)> (October 2007).

Kirton, John (2002b). "Global Community Outreach: The G20 and Africa." Paper prepared for G8 Online 2002 Course. Available from:  
[www.g8.utoronto.ca/g8online/2002/english/2002/09.html](http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/g8online/2002/english/2002/09.html)

Kirton, John (2002c), "Guiding Global Economic Governance: The G20, G7 and IMF at century's Dawn," in John Kirton and George Von Furstenberg, eds., *New Directions in Global Economic Governance* (Ashgate: Aldershot).

Kirton, John (2001f). "The G20: Representativeness, Effectiveness and Leadership in Global Governance." In John J. Kirton, Joseph P. Daniels and Andreas Freytag, eds. *Guiding Global Order: G8 Governance in the Twenty-First Century*, 143-172. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Kirton, John (1999d). "What is the G20." Adapted from "The G7, China and the International Financial System." Paper presented at an International Think Tank Forum on "China in the

Twenty-First Century.” China Development Institute, November 10-12, 1999. Available from: [www.g7.utoronto.ca/g20/g20whatisit.html](http://www.g7.utoronto.ca/g20/g20whatisit.html)

Kirton, John and Madeline Koch, eds. (2008-), series of publications on the G8 and G20 published by Newsdesk, London. Available at <http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/newsdesk>.

Martin, Paul (2008), “Time for the G20 to Take the Mantle from the G8,” in John Kirton and Madeline Koch, eds. (2008), *Growth, Innovation, Inclusion: The G20 at Ten* (Newsdesk: London), pp. 22-8.

Oldani, Chiara (2008). “Global Credit Market Disruption: Challenges and Risks.” G20 Meeting of 2008 Commentary Papers. <[ssrn.com/abstract=1322078](http://ssrn.com/abstract=1322078)> (February 2009).

Porter, Tony (2000). “The G7, the Financial Stability Forum, the G20, and the Politics of International Financial Regulation.” Paper prepared for the International Studies Association Annual Meeting, Los Angeles, California, March 15, 2000.

Summers, Lawrence (2008), “The Birth of the G20,” in John Kirton and Madeline Koch, eds. (2008), *Growth, Innovation, Inclusion: The G20 at Ten* (Newsdesk: London), pp. 29-31.

Summers, Lawrence (2008), “The Birth of the G20,” in John Kirton and Madeline Koch, eds. (2008), *Growth, Innovation, Inclusion: The G20 at Ten* (Newsdesk: London), pp. 29-31.

Woods, Ngaire (2004). “The Orderly Resolution of Financial Crisis.” Paper prepared for “The G20 Architecture in 2020-Securing a Legitimate Role for the G-20, ‘The G20 at the Leaders’ Level.”” Ottawa, Ontario, February 29, 2004.

## **Appendix E: G8/G20 Summit Performance Indicators by Function**

### ***1. The Domestic Political Summit***

- A. Media Coverage at Home
- B. Elite Editorial Consensus
- C. Public Opinion Poll Change
- D. Election Record During and After
- E. Civil Society Participation and Protest
- F. Societal Behaviour Changed

### ***2. The Deliberative Summit***

- A. Length of Leaders Participation
- B. Length of Summit in Days
- C. Length of Summit in Hours
- D. Length of Summit Working Sessions
- E. Location of Summit
- F. Level of Spontaneity

### ***3. The Directional Summit***

- A. Number of Words in Leaders' Collective Summit-Released Documentation
- B. Number of Separate Summit Released Collective Documents by Leaders
- C. Number of Priority Values Identified and Affirmed in Communiqué Chapeau
- D. Number of Linkages Identified and Affirmed in Communiqué Chapeau

### ***4. The Decisional Summit***

- A. Number of Commitments
- B. Breadth of Commitments (by domain, and issue area)
- C. Ambition-Significance of Commitments
- D. Money Mandated

### ***5. The Delivery Summit***

- A. Compliance
- B. Money Mobilized and Disbursed
- C. Member Behaviour Reinforced, Constrained and Altered
- D. Member's Conception of Interests and Identities Changed
- E. Outside Country Behaviour Altered

### ***6. The Development of Global Governance Summit***

- A. ReMIT Mandates
- B. G8 Ministerial Institutions Created, Adjusted Affirmed
- C. G8 Official Institutions Created, Adjusted, Affirmed
- D. Instructions to Outside Intergovernmental Institutions

### ***7. Overall Assessments***

- A. Bayne Grades (1987, 2000, 2001-) and Grid (2001-)
- B. Sherpa Consensus (Kirton 1989)
- C. G8 Research Group Summit Performance Assessment, 1996-)

## **Appendix F: Causal Models of Summit Performance**

### **1. American Leadership (Putnam and Bayne, 1984, 1987)**

Decisional Performance, Occasionally High, due to:

- A. U.S. able and willing to lead with support of a strong second;
- B. Reigning ideas and historical lessons as interpreted by leaders;
- C. Electoral certainty
- D. Transnational actors alliances

### **2. Concert Equality (Wallace 1984, Kirton 1989)**

Comprehensive Performance, High, Low, then Very High, due to:

- A. Collectively predominant and internally equal capabilities
- B. Equal vulnerability activated by shocks
- C. Common principles of open democracy, individual liberty, social advancement
- D. Constricted participation
- E. Domestic political capital and control

### **3. False New Consensus (Bergsten and Henning 1996)**

Decisional Performance, Declining During 1990s, due to:

- A. False new consensus that economic globalization makes governments impotent;
- B. American economic and political decline due to cold war's end and poor policy;
- C. Traditional differences between the U.S. and Germany

### **4. Democratic Institutionalism (Ikenberry 1993, Kokotsis 1998)**

Delivery Performance, Increasing into 1990s, due to:

- A. Effective multilateral organizations controlled by G7/G8;
- B. G7 institutionalization at ministerial and official level;
- C. Strong G8 bureaucratic units in domestic governments;
- D. Leader's commitments to international co-operation, G7/G8 institutions, individual issue;
- E. Popular support for leaders and issue

### **5. G8 Nexus (Gill 1998)**

Directional and Decisional Performance, Increasingly Effective but Contested, due to:

- A. Marketization, globalization and liberalization, producing a global concentration of wealth and power
- B. Similar political outlook and congruent political/economic principles of elite
- C. Dominance of financial-asset (bond-currency) market interests in leading states

### **6. Collective Management (Bayne 2000, 2001, 2002)**

Comprehensive (Five Function) Performance, Increasingly Effective, due to:

- A. Complexity of new and unexpected global problems;
- B. Inadequacy of other global institutions;
- C. Globalization constraint on independent major power action;
- D. G8 iteration, agenda focus, leaders-only format; institutionalization;

### **7. Ginger Group (Baker 2000, Hodges 1999)**

Deliberative Performance, Increasingly Effective, due to:

- A. Financial market globalization;

- B. Small private club of governmental agents:
- C. Common worldview

### **8. Group Hegemony (Bailin 2002, 2003)**

Decisional Performance, Constantly High, due to:

- A. Concentration of power > small group size > designate K-Group
- B. Group Identity > small group size > designate K-Group
- C. Economic Liberalism > mutual interests > reach mutual agreements
- D. Preparatory Process > mutual interests > reach mutual agreements
- E. System of Interaction > shadow of the future > develop trustworthy relations
- F. Documentation > shadow of the future > develop trustworthy relations

### **9. Meta Institution (Pentilla, 2003)**

Decisional Performance, Increasingly High, due to:

- A. Concerted power of G8 members;
- B. Failure of established international organizations

## **Appendix G: Indicators of Major Causal Variables**

### **Relative Capability**

#### *Collective Predominance:*

- G7/8 GDP per World Total (current US\$)
- G7/8 GDP per World Total (1995 base US\$)
- G20 GDP per World Total (current US\$)

#### *Internal Equality:*

- GDP Inequality Within the G7/8 and G20 (current \$, sigma GDP)
- GDP Inequality within the G7/8 (1995 base sigma)
- US GDP Share of G7/8 Total GDP
- US GDP Share of G20 Total GDP
- Average US\$ Depreciation
- Cumulative US\$ Depreciation

### **Relative Vulnerability**

#### *Collective Vulnerability:*

- Energy Dependence (NEI/DEC)
- Terrorist Attacks by Number, Global Total
- Deaths from Human-Induced Ecological Disasters
- Annual Average Change in NYSE, NIKKEI, and LSE Indexes

#### *Internal Equality of Vulnerability:*

- US Bank Failures by Number

### **Interdependence**

- G7-bound Trade as % of total (average for G7)G20-bound Trade as % of total (average for G20)

### **Common Principles (Shared Social Purpose)**

- Freedom House Democratization Index
- Ideological Consensus

### **Political Control and Capital**

- Years Since Last Election

## Appendix H: Summary of Variables, Methods and Sources

**Bayne Grade** — Numerical equivalent of the letter-grade assessment of Summit performance compiled by the G8RG and Sir Nicholas Bayne (source: <http://www.g8.utoronto.ca>)

**Summit Length (days)** — Length of the G7/8 Summit in days (source: Fact Sheet at <http://www.g8.utoronto.ca>)

**Number of Summit Communiqués** — Number of official documents issued at the Summit (source: Internal G8RG compilation available by request from [g8@utoronto.ca](mailto:g8@utoronto.ca) or [g20info@library.utoronto.ca](mailto:g20info@library.utoronto.ca))

**Number of Words in Summit Documents** — Length of the official documents produced at the Summit measured in words (source: Internal G8RG compilation; available by request from [g8@utoronto.ca](mailto:g8@utoronto.ca)).

**Number of Commitments** — Number of total commitments identified in the Summit documents (for methodology see Kokotsis, Ella. *Keeping International Commitments: Compliance, Credibility, and the G7, 1988-1995*. Transnational Business and Corporate Culture series. New York: Garland Pub., 1999; source: Internal G8RG compilation available by request from [g8@utoronto.ca](mailto:g8@utoronto.ca)).

**Compliance** — Average standardized compliance with the commitments undertaken by Summit members (for methodology see Kokotsis, Ella. *Keeping International Commitments: Compliance, Credibility, and the G7, 1988-1995*. Transnational Business and Corporate Culture series. New York: Garland Pub., 1999; source: Internal G8RG compilation at <http://www.g8.utoronto.ca>).

**Remit Mandates** — Remit mandates are formal instructions contained in the documents the leaders collectively issue at the annual G7/8 Summit, specifying that they will deal with an item at their Summit the following year or in subsequent years. (source: Fact Sheet at <http://www.g8.utoronto.ca>).

**Ministerial Bodies Created** — Number of ministerial bodies created at the Summit. Inter-Summit ministerials and equivalents are meetings of G7/8 ministers or heads or equivalents from these actors (collective statements issued in the name of the G7/8, conference calls) between the end of one year's annual Summit and the start of the Summit the regularly scheduled annual following year. (source: Fact Sheet at <http://www.g8.utoronto.ca>).

**Leadership Bodies Created, Approved or Adjusted** (source: Internal G8RG compilation available by request from [g8@utoronto.ca](mailto:g8@utoronto.ca)).

**Average Depreciation of the US\$ and Cumulative Depreciation of the US\$** — Denotes the average depreciation of the US\$ against the basket of G8 currencies between the end of a Summit and the start of the next one. The formula used is:  $AVERAGE([E_{S/i}^{t+1} - E_{S/i}^t] / E_{S/i}^t)$ , where  $i$  iterates through all 7 other currencies, and  $t$  and  $t+1$  are the days on which the Summit ends and the next one starts, respectively. (source: The UBC Pacific Exchange Rate Service located at <http://fx.sauder.ubc.ca/>).

**U.S. Bank Failures** — Number of U.S. Commercial and Savings Banks and Insurance Trusts Failures, as defined by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. For methodology and data see the “Historical Banking Statistics” series at <http://www.fdic.gov>

**G7/8 GDP as percentage of total world GDP (in current US\$ and in 1995-base year US\$)** — Denotes the ratio of the cumulative G7/8 GDP to the total world GDP as reported by the World Development Indicators Database of the World Bank. The two variables measure GDPs in current and real (1995 base-year) US dollars. (complete methodology and source: <http://www.worldbank.org>). **Methodological note:** Because base-year deflation uses a fixed consumption pattern (an assumption likely to introduce distortions for years significantly removed from the 1995 base-year), the “real US\$” deflated numbers should be interpreted with caution.

**Inequality of G7/8 GDP composition (in current US\$ and in 1995-base year US\$)** — This is the standard deviation of the set of the individual G7/8 members GDP shares in the G7/8 cumulative GDP in each year. The two variables measure GDPs in current and real (1995 base-year) US dollars. (complete methodology and source: <http://www.worldbank.org>). **Methodological note:** Because base-year deflation uses a fixed consumption pattern (an assumption likely to introduce distortions for years significantly removed from the 1995 base-year), the “real US\$” deflated numbers should be interpreted with caution.

**Terrorist Attacks** — Total terrorist attacks worldwide (series covers 1981-2002 only) as reported by the U.S. Department of State in its *Patterns of Global Terrorism* report in 2003 (source: <http://www.state.gov>, Statistical Appendix).

**Ideological Consensus of G7/8 Leaders** — This number signifies the ideological likeness of the leaders of the G7/8 countries defined as the ratio of leaders of same or similar ideological/political persuasion to the total number of Summit leaders. (source: contact [G8@utoronto.ca](mailto:G8@utoronto.ca)).

**Average Years since Last Election** — Average of the years since the last election of each of the leaders attending the Summit. (source: Internal G8RG compilation available by request from [g8@utoronto.ca](mailto:g8@utoronto.ca)).

**Freedom House Democratization Index** — An index of global democratization developed by the Freedom House Foundation (methodology and source: <http://www.freedomhouse.org>)

**Energy Dependence** — Measures the dependence of the G7/8 on outside (non-G7/8 produced) energy imports. The data used for the compilation of this time-series covers tradable energy (oil, natural gas and coal) measured in Mtoe (millions of tons of oil equivalent). The following formula is used to arrive at the aggregate annual ratio: Total G7/8 energy consumption [Mtoe] — Total G7/8 energy production [Mtoe] = Net G7/8 Energy Imports [NEI in Mtoe] —> Energy dependence = [ (NEI) / (Total G7/8 energy consumption) ]. Data source: British Petroleum Database, <http://www.bp.com>; UNCTAD TRAINS Database, <http://www.unctad.org>; Euromonitor Database, <http://www.euromonitor.com>.

**G7/8-Bound Trade as Percentage of Total Trade of G7/8 Members** — The share of G7/8-bound trade in the total trade of G7/8 members (annual average for the G7/8; trade measured in customs-reported value). Source: UN Common Database, <http://unstats.un.org>; Euromonitor Database, <http://www.euromonitor.org>.

**Deaths and Injuries from Human-Induced Ecological Disasters Worldwide** — Total number of deaths and injuries from human-precipitated ecological disasters; annual aggregate. Data source: The UNEP GEO Data Portal, <http://geodata.grid.unep.ch/>

**Average Change in Major Stock Indexes (NYSE, NIKKEI and London Stock Exchange)** — Data is compiled for value of transactions, annual averages. Data source: Wren Research Database, <http://www.wrenresearch.com.au/>

**US GDP as percentage of G7/8 Total GDP** — Calculated in current US\$. Source: World Development Indicators Database, <http://www.worldbank.org>