Global Economy and Development
at BROOKINGS

THE GROUP OF TWENTY:
Origins, Prospects and Challenges for Global Governance

Homi Kharas and Domenico Lombardi | Brookings Institution

Homi Kharas is a senior fellow and deputy director for the Global Economy and Development program at the Brookings Institution.

Domenico Lombardi is a senior fellow in the Global Economy and Development program at the Brookings Institution.

Acknowledgements:

The Brookings Institution is a private non-profit organization. Its mission is to conduct high-quality, independent research and, based on that research, to provide innovative, practical recommendations for policymakers and the public. The conclusions and recommendations of any Brookings publication are solely those of its author(s), and do not reflect the views of the Institution, its management, or its other scholars.

Support for this publication was generously provided by the Embassy of Denmark.

Brookings recognizes that the value it provides is in its absolute commitment to quality, independence and impact. Activities supported by its donors reflect this commitment and the analysis and recommendations are not determined or influenced by any donation.

Cover Photo Credit: Roberto Stuckert Filho/PR

ABSTRACT

At the height of the global financial and economic crisis of 2008–09, the Group of Twenty was elevated to country leaders' level and acknowledged itself as the "premier forum for . . . international economic cooperation." This self-acknowledgment reflected the long-felt need to institutionalize the dialogue between the advanced and emerging economies in a more effective setting. However, the ad hoc nature of the G-20 and the extent to which an informal and self-selected club of nations can provide a stable framework for facilitating global cooperation has been questioned. Against this backdrop, the study traces the G-20's historical evolution, situates the dynamics of its institutional arrangements, and reviews the emerging literature on G-20 reform. Building on this analysis, the study then assesses the expansion of the G-20's scope to global development and appraises the Group's evolution in the broader context of the current global governance framework.

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

At the worst point of the recent international financial crisis, the Group of Twenty was elevated to the country leaders' level and acknowledged itself as the "premier forum for . . . international economic cooperation."[1] This self-acknowledgment reflected, beyond the emergency of the moment, the long-felt need to institutionalize the dialogue between advanced and emerging economies in a more effective setting than is possible in the large and diffuse forums of the United Nations and in a more equal setting than can be found among the imbalanced constituencies of the international financial institutions. Thus, within months of the G-20's first leaders' meeting, held in Washington in November 2008, the Group managed to expedite an agreement on the Basel III supervisory framework; establish a new organization—the Financial Stability Board (FSB)—with a stronger mandate and an enlarged membership than its predecessor, the Financial Stability Forum (FSF); expand the membership of the Basel Committee on Banking Supervision; strengthen the governance and finances of the International Monetary Fund; and, later in 2009, lay down a new foundation for economic policy coordination through the Framework for Strong, Sustainable, and Balanced Growth.

As we look back, however, there is a sense that, although the G-20 was quite effective as a crisis manager, its effectiveness as an enduring facilitating framework for international cooperation has proved mixed at best. Progress on international financial regulation has been uneven, while the mutual assessment process embedded in the Framework for Strong, Sustainable, and Balanced Growth has simply failed to deliver on its promises for many of the same reasons that its intellectual predecessor, the IMF's 2006 multilateral surveillance mechanism,[2] also failed.

The G-20's greatest strength has been to quickly integrate emerging powers in global governance decision-making by serving as a forum and testing ground for these powers' potential expanded role in multilateral bodies, including the IMF and a reformed UN Security Council. However, the ad hoc nature of the G-20 and the extent to which an informal and self-selected club of nations, albeit with expanded participation compared to the G-8, can provide a stable framework for facilitating global cooperation has been questioned. The G-20 does, in fact, include many of the world's largest economies; however, not all its members are among the largest in the world,[3] and membership criteria are rather unclear. This raises important issues for countries that are not part of the G-20. Should they push for formal representation by encouraging the G-20 to move to a constituency-based membership? Are there other avenues for influencing the G-20? Or should they simply free-ride on the actions of those countries that are prepared to take upon themselves the responsibility for ensuring global economic stability and growth, secure in the knowledge that if the diverse interests of individual G-20 countries are met, the interests of most other economies will also likely be met?

Against this backdrop, this paper traces the G-20's historical evolution and situates the dynamics of its institutional arrangements (section 1), as well as reviews the emerging literature on G-20 reform (section 2). Building on this analysis, the study then assesses the expansion of the G-20's scope to development (section 3), appraises its evolution in the broader context of the current global governance framework (section 4), and finally offers conclusions (section 5).

1. A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE G-20

The historical underpinnings of the Group of Twenty can be traced back to the mid-1970s, at the origin of the G-7/G-8. The Group consisted of the largest economic powers at the time and started to meet to discuss the global economy following the collapse of the Bretton Woods System of fixed exchange rates and the spikes in food and fuel prices of the time. The Group's composition remained relatively unchanged between 1976 and 1996, consisting of Canada, France, (West) Germany, Italy, Japan, the United Kingdom and the United States. In 1996 Russia joined the Group, although economic consultations were still held within the G-7 members.

In the late 1990s, following financial crises that had affected a number of emerging economies from Latin America to Asia, and that threatened to spill over to advanced economies, the members of the G-8 recognized the need to expand representation. In response, various other "G" arrangements were organized, including the G-22 and G-33. Neither followed a formal agenda, however, and both received criticism for their ad hoc structure and unbalanced representation. It was in this context that the first G-20 meeting of finance ministers and central bank governors was held in Berlin in September 1999.

With the leadership of its first chairman, then-Finance Minister Paul Martin of Canada, the governance of the G-20 structure, including the rotating Troika, took shape. The focus of their meetings, up until the 2008 financial crisis, mostly centered on crisis prevention and resolution, globalization and combating the financing of terrorists. When the 2008 financial crisis hit, participation within the G-20 was elevated from central bank governors and finance ministers to the country leaders' level. The subsequent section provides a summary of the historical evolution of the G-20 with the aim to shed light on its prospects and challenges.

The G-7/G-8: An Imperfect Precursor

The origin of the G-7 can be traced to the 1971 collapse of the Bretton Woods system of fixed international exchange rates and to the 1973 oil crisis. On March 25, 1973, the finance ministers of France, West Germany, the United Kingdom and the United States met and formed the "Library Group," named after the venue of their initial meeting—the White House Library. In September of that same year, the Japanese finance minister joined them, forming the group known as the G-5. In 1974, French president Valery Giscard d'Estaing invited the heads of governments of Japan, the United Kingdom, the United States and West Germany, along with Italy, to a summit the following year at Rambouillet, France. In 1976, the group was expanded to seven, with the addition of Canada (Boughton 2001).

The initial composition of the Group clearly represented the dominant economic powers of the day, and these countries shared the additional characteristics of being democratic, largely "Atlantic-oriented" and militarily allied to the United States. The "club" was relatively small, and the opportunity to talk informally and directly to counterparts was viewed as invaluable (Smith 2011). The modus operandi of the G-7 during the 1980s, in which the U.S. acted as the undisputed first among equals—a status reinforced by the demise of the Soviet Union—persisted well into the 1990s (Culpeper 2000).

In the early 1990s, Russia began participating in some of the sessions with the G-7 leaders at their summits and, upon their invitation, the country formally joined the Group in 1997. As a result, the G-7 became the G-8, although financial matters would still be discussed within the realm of the early market-based G-7 economies (Bradford and Linn 2012). The G-7 became synonymous with economic policy coordination and exchange rate agreements, largely as a result of the Plaza Agreement of 1985 and the Louvre Accord of 1987, both designed to stabilize the dollar. More broadly, macroeconomic policies discussed within the G-7 included exchange rates, balance of payments, globalization, trade and economic relations with developing countries (Nelson 2012). In the context of those discussions, the G-7 finance ministers and central bank governors typically used their meetings to maximize their influence by arriving at collective consensual views and then publicizing and rationalizing these collective views in terms of economic data and future policy priorities (Baker 2006).

By the late 1990s, a series of financial crises centered largely in Latin America and especially Asia highlighted the need for key emerging economies to be included in global economic management efforts. Led by Canadian Finance Minister Paul Martin and U.S. Treasury Secretary Lawrence Summers, discussions focused on how to broaden participation to include the emerging economies (Smith 2011).

Early Efforts at Expanding the Club: The G-22 and the G-33

Those discussions led to meetings in 1998 and 1999 involving broader groups of countries in the context of the G-22[4] and the G-33.[5] In November 1997, in recognition of the global dimensions of the crisis, U.S. President Bill Clinton called upon Treasury Secretary Robert Rubin to organize a special meeting of finance ministers from around the world to examine the problems besetting the global economy and, possibly, to seek a consensus on solutions. In response to President Clinton's call, the U.S. Treasury organized two meetings of what then became known as the G-22—or the Willard Group—composed of finance ministers and central bank governors from advanced and emerging economies. The purpose of the G-22 was to examine issues related to the stability of the international financial system and the effective functioning of global capital markets. The first meeting, which was addressed by President Clinton, was held in Washington in April 1998 on the fringes of the spring meetings of the IMF and the World Bank. Ministers and governors informally discussed key issues facing the global economy (Culpeper 2000).

The G-22 broadened international cooperation beyond the industrial countries, and gave emerging economies a sense of partnership in the process. Its work also helped to provide direction and support to the international financial institutions, such as the IMF, in their efforts to promote reforms aimed at strengthening domestic and international financial markets (G-20 2008d). More specifically, a G-22 report on the strengthening of financial systems suggested the establishment of a Financial Sector Policy Forum that would meet periodically to discuss financial sector issues (Working Group on Strengthening Financial Systems 1998).[6] Later on, in response to the report drafted by Hans Tietmeyer,[7] at the request of G-7 ministers and governors, the G-7 established the FSF in February 1999 (Lombardi 2011a). Another report recommended that the IMF prepare a Transparency Report summarizing the extent to which an economy meets internationally recognized disclosure standards, presaging the "Reports on Observance of Standards and Codes" launched by the IMF early in 1999 (Culpeper 2000).

The G-22 was created at the personal initiative of President Bill Clinton at the November 1997 Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation forum leaders' meeting in Vancouver to discuss the unfolding of the Asian financial crisis and ways to strengthen the international financial architecture (Kirton 2004; Baker 2008).[8] Not surprisingly, East Asian countries were heavily represented. When Clinton proposed the formation of the G-22, it was just as the crisis was spreading to the region and his proposal found general support among G-7 countries (Kirton 2000).

The success of the G-22's working groups demonstrated the value of fresh, practical and less institutionally based dialogue and cooperation. But its provenance and the inclusion of so many East Asian countries made it unacceptable to the Europeans (De Brouwer 2005). Nonetheless, the G-22's activities proved instrumental in the creation of the G-20, as a successor body more closely integrated with the work of the established international financial institutions (Kirton 2000).

To evaluate recommendations made at the G-22 level, the G-7 agreed in early 1999 to hold seminars on the international financial architecture, involving a much larger group, called the G-33. This alternative was accepted over that of an extraordinary meeting of the Interim Committee (the IMF's advisory Ministerial Committee) to carry forward the work of the G-22. The Interim Committee was considered an inappropriate forum to evaluate G-22 recommendations because issues under discussion extended beyond the Interim Committee's mandate and Asian members did not feel they were properly represented in the institution. As it turned out, the G-33 met twice by convening two ad hoc seminars on the international financial architecture in Bonn (March) and Washington (April) in the spring of 1999 (Martinez-Diaz 2007). The issues covered at these seminars included improving prudential oversight of financial markets; strengthening financial systems, especially in emerging-market economies; and encouraging the adoption of policies to better protect the most vulnerable countries.

Dissatisfaction with the ad hoc nature of both the G-22 and G-33 processes among both advanced and emerging economies was an important reason for the establishment of the G-20 (G-20 2008d). The 1998–99 work of the G-22 and the two G-33 seminars, when juxtaposed against the cascading global financial crisis that was devastating emerging markets at that time, suggested to many the need for a more effective forum. It further suggested that such a forum's work needed to be focused on reducing vulnerability to crises by creating appropriate exchange rate arrangements, liability management, and international codes and standards, as it became increasingly clear to many both inside and outside the G-7 that weakness in these areas had created and compounded the current crisis (Kirton 2000).

Efforts to transform the G-33 into the G-20 were pursued starting in early 1999 because the G-33 was believed to be too ad hoc and unwieldy—with European views that it was too skewed toward Asian representation (Beeson and Bell 2009). According to Kirton (2005), the G-20 reflected American dissatisfaction with the slow, conservative, Eurocentric Bretton Woods institutions, and the U.S. unilateralist initiative in creating—as well as hosting and making invitations to—the G-22 and the G-33 as informal clubs to bypass the old ones (Kirton 2005).

The final formula satisfied the "G-X"-catalytic Americans; the enthusiastically supportive Canadians; the favorably disposed British, Germans and Japanese; and the resistant French and Italians, wedded to their pre-eminence and prerogatives in the smaller G-7 club. All in all, experience with the G-22 and G-33 highlighted the advantages that would be gained from a regular international consultative forum with a broader membership than the G-7 and one integrated into the governance structures of the IMF and World Bank (Kirton 2000, 2005).

The Establishment of the G-20

In June 1999, following passages welcoming the creation of the FSF and the IMF's International Monetary and Financial Committee (IMFC), the G-7 finance ministers at Cologne announced that they would "work together to establish an informal mechanism for dialogue among systemically important countries within the framework of the Bretton Woods institutional system" (Kirton 1999; G-7 1999). They also stated that a "broad range of countries should be involved in discussions on how to adapt the international financial system to the changing global environment" (G-7 1999).

Accordingly, the G-7 countries invited their "counterparts from a number of systemically important countries from regions around the world" to the first G-20 meeting in Berlin in December 1999. A new ministerial level G-20 forum was formally created in September 1999.[9] In the ensuing communiqué, the G-20 finance ministers and central bank governors reiterated that "the G-20 was established to provide a new mechanism for informal dialogue in the framework of the Bretton Woods institutional system, to broaden the discussions on key economic and financial policy issues among systemically significant economies and promote cooperation to achieve stable and sustainable world economic growth that benefits all" (Canada 1999a).

This statement is remarkable for its reference to "systemically significant economies" and the absence of a reference to the G-20 as a "representative" forum. The question of legitimacy, in terms of "representing" a large share of the global economy, was not really an issue in 1999. It was a club of the "systemically significant" (Vastergaard 2011). Moreover, the fact that for the first decade, from 1999 to 2008, the G-20 forum attracted little public attention would lend support to those who claim that the G-20 was born to legitimate G-7 initiatives to the wider world by securing a broader consensus for G-7-generated ideas. The G-20's 12 non-G-7 members would thus be destined to affect issues at the margin, be kept abreast of G-7 initiatives and be given only a semblance of participation (Kirton 1999).

Like the G-7, the G-20 was established as an informal forum with no formal rules of membership, no formal authority to make rules, and no formal processes for making decisions or resolving disputes (Woods 2011). Because the Group has no permanent secretariat or staff, the chair country provides secretariat and agenda-setting services. Moreover, there was no codified list of criteria to determine which countries would be invited to join the new forum. It was accepted, however, that countries should be "systemically important" to the global economy and would have the ability to contribute to global economic and financial stability. Other considerations were that the Group would be broadly representative of the global economy and regionally "balanced."

Also key was to keep the Group small enough to facilitate frank and open discussion and raise the level of trust among its members. With 19 countries participating, one regional representative (the European Union) and four ex officio members—the chairs of the IMFC and development committees, along with the IMF's managing director and the president of the World Bank—the choice of a name for the new forum was not immediately obvious (G-20 2008d). "G-20" was adopted on the basis that it was a round number, suggesting finality, and was consistent with the number of countries represented plus the European Union (G-20 2008d).

Some question the legitimacy of the G-20 because the great majority of countries have no voice and influence.[10] For example, Gerry Helleiner referred to the G-20 as "a small step toward improved global governance" but argued that the group "fails completely" on "all major requirements of appropriate process" (G-20 2008d). In his opinion, the G-20 was severely, if not irretrievably, flawed, because its G-7 architects had ignored the already-existing G-24 group of developing countries, had not included representation from the poorest countries and did "not possess any mechanisms either for reporting or for accountability to the broader international community" (G-20 2008d). However, for Angeloni and Pisani-Ferry (2011), the composition of the G-20 strikes a difficult compromise between representation and efficiency.[11]

The G-20 Shapes Its Governance

In September 1999, the finance ministers of the G-7 chose Canadian Finance Minister Paul Martin to be the first chairperson of the G-20 for a two-year term. Martin stated that the G-20's work "will focus on translating the benefits of globalization into higher incomes and better opportunities everywhere" (Canada 1999b). He also declared that "there is virtually no major aspect of the global economy or international financial system that will be outside of the group's purview" (Canada 1999b).

The early emphasis by the Canadian chair suggested an effort to turn the new institution into an influential forum. Its relationship with other bodies also suggested a robust role for its members. Several options were proposed to link the new Group to the Bretton Woods institutions. The G-7 deputies adopted an option of rotating the G-20 chair and inviting the chairs of the two Bretton Woods committees and the heads of the two institutions as ex officio members. This governance setup had the advantage of embedding the new Group strongly "within the structure of the Bretton Woods framework" (Kirton 1999).

At the October 2001 meeting, Minister Martin informed his colleagues that he did not consider it in the best interest of the G-20 for him to remain as chair beyond his two-year term. With Europeans already in prominent positions in the international financial institutions, including the IMF, and Germany holding the EU Presidency during the first half of 1999 and chairing the G-7 that year, a European candidate for the chairmanship was not advanced. In the absence of a consensus on a successor, Canada organized a subcommittee of treasury deputies from Brazil, China and the United Kingdom to consult their counterparts in other member countries about their preference for a future chair. Because Canada had supplied the first chair of the Group, it was seen as appropriate that the second chair of the G-20 would come from an emerging economy (G-20, 2008d).

After extensive consultations, a consensus emerged in early 2002 that Yashwant Sinha, India's finance minister, would become the G-20's chairman for 2002. And a consensus also arose on the principles to guide the selection of future chairs, which would be selected well in advance to ensure continuity and to allow the designated country time to prepare for the task. G-20 members also agreed that there should be an equitable annual rotation among all regions and between countries at different levels of development. For that reason, five groups of countries were established from which a chair would be drawn each year (G-20 2008d).[12]

In 2002, the deputies also agreed to establish a "Troika" consisting of the previous, current and immediately upcoming chairs. Among its duties, the Troika proposes agenda items for the G-20, selects speakers in consultation with members and deals with the logistics of meetings. The establishment of the Troika helps to ensure that the experience of the chair is passed on to successors so as to enhance continuity in the absence of a permanent secretariat. It also gives the current and upcoming chairs ready access to the experience of the previous year's chair.

On balance, the meetings in the first 10 years focused on crisis prevention and resolution, globalization and combating terrorist financing. Starting in mid-2005, with China chairing the G-20, the Group broadened its focus to the governance of international financial institutions—an emphasis that continued with the Australian chair (2006) and the South African chair (2007), and has now become a distinctive feature of the Group. Nevertheless, G-20 members also began to pay more attention to the second part of the G-20's mandate—"stable and sustainable world economic growth that benefits all"—with the addition of development and aid to the agenda (G-20 2002). With the "Monterrey Consensus"[13] on financing for development having been reached earlier that year, at the New Delhi ministerial meeting G-20 members reaffirmed their commitment to achieve the United Nations' Millennium Development Goals and their continuing support for Africa through the New Partnership for Africa's Development (G-20 2008d). Appendix tables A.1 and A.2 report the priorities of the G-20 by country chair and by summit in greater detail.

The G-20 Goes Higher

As the international financial crisis was escalating in 2008–09, the G-20 was upgraded to the country leaders' level, although to some the decision did not come as a surprise. In the early 2000s, the elevation of the G-20 to leaders' level—also referred to as the "L-20"—had already been proposed. The idea was embraced by Canadian Prime Minister Paul Martin in 2005 and had been previously promoted by some think tanks.[14] On a political level, plans to upgrade the G-20 to the leaders' level received a generally positive, albeit low-key, response among the major emerging powers. Competing structures—such as the Heiligendamm process of a G-8+5 or a United Nations Economic Security Council, proposed by Joseph Stiglitz—were also under consideration.

The 2004 report by the UN High-level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change warned that, although "the annual meetings of the G-8 group at head of state and government level fulfill some characteristics required to give greater coherence and impetus to the necessary policies, it would be helpful to have a larger forum bringing together the heads of the major developed and developing countries" (Jokela 2011). The panel concluded that one way to achieve this could be to transform the ministerial-level G-20 into a forum that would bring together the leaders of key countries collectively accounting for 80 percent of the world's population and 90 percent of its economic activity.

At the end of October 2008, just before the U.S. presidential election, then-President George W. Bush called together the leaders of the G-20 countries to "review progress being made to address the current financial crisis, advance a common understanding of its causes and, in order to avoid a repetition, agree on a common set of principles for reform of the regulatory and institutional regimes for the world's financial sectors" (Perino 2008). The meeting in November 2008 included the leaders of the IMF and the World Bank, as well UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon and the chair of the FSF. In addition, Spain and the Netherlands insisted on being present and were supported in this effort by the French president, who also held the chair of the European Union at the time.

The Washington G-20 communiqué conveyed a sense of urgency that could not be found in traditional G-7/G-8 declarations, resulting in an extremely focused action plan with precise language: Technical, specialized institutions in charge of carrying out works were named and given strict deadlines for implementation (Angeloni and Pisani-Ferry 2012). The agenda set at the meeting could not have been formulated at the IMF, the United Nations, the World Bank or the World Trade Organization—not least of all because each of those organizations has some formal authority delegated to them by governments, on condition that the power be used only in their own decision-making processes and structures. That condition makes the institution difficult to use, to change and to adapt at high speed (Woods 2011). In contrast, not being a traditional international organization with conferred powers, the G-20 can focus on activities such as agenda setting, policy coordination, consensus building and task distribution across existing institutions (Geraets and Wouters 2012).

The initial period of summits, including the Washington and London meetings, resulted in swift action on financial reform. Conversely, the Pittsburgh Summit marked the transition to the second period, which, in the context of economic recovery and reduced financial market tension, again led to a divergence of priorities between the advanced and emerging countries. In this second stage, the G-20 predominantly focused on macroeconomic coordination. But progress stalled, generating an emerging stream of analysis and contributions on how to reform the G-20.

2. A SELECTIVE REVIEW OF THE EMERGING LITERATURE ON G-20 REFORM

Despite the G-20's few years of existence as the premier forum for international economic cooperation, a body of literature has already emerged indicating possible ways to reform it while leveraging its accomplishments. Broadly speaking, one can group the contributions to the emerging literature on G-20 reform according to whether they focus on the broader scope of the G-20 or on its sectoral dimensions. Among the former, Suominen and Dadush (2012) assert that the main role of the G-20 is that of mediator, so as to protect common interests in an increasingly globalized economy.

Accordingly, the G-20 is not meant to be a decision-making body whose deliberations are binding agreements to be ratified by parliaments; rather, its communications are statements of intent. As a result, the G-20 is well placed to serve as a steering committee or international board of nonexecutive directors, rather than as a forum for implementation or micromanagement. The more it goes into detail, the more it risks losing the authoritativeness granted by its members and encroaching upon the mandate of established multilateral institutions with far greater technical expertise. Its energies are better directed toward broad strategies, and thus it should make efforts to engage with those institutions that can translate its vision into specific actions, agreeable both technically and politically to the parties involved. In this respect, the G-20's track record so far has been mixed at best; nevertheless, according to Suominen and Dadush (2012), the Group has in fact succeeded in promoting mutual understanding and more personal relationships between the leaders of the systemically important countries, an achievement that can only enhance their response to the next crisis.

Vestergaard and Wade (2011) focus on the need for "constitutional" foundations by proposing a Global Economic Council (GEC) with the legitimacy to act as a political body overseeing the work of the Bretton Woods institutions. As distinct from the G-20, the GEC would have a constituency structure in line with the representation principles of the Bretton Woods institutions. As a result, it would be able to combine effectiveness—due to the relatively small number of chairs, mirroring the sizes of the executive boards of the IMF and World Bank—and legitimacy, because each member country would be represented in this leader-level body. As in the Bretton Woods institutions, there would be weighted voting based on a country's share of global gross domestic product.

In their proposal, they divide the world into four main regions and allocate four chairs to each region. Next, they allocate the remaining nine chairs according to a region's economic weight. At current levels of gross domestic product, this would give the Americas, Asia and Europe a total of seven chairs each and Africa four. Countries would then form constituencies within the four world regions on the basis of voting shares. Constituencies would be congruent with those of fully reformed Bretton Woods organizations and have the same basis of representational legitimacy. By design, Vestergaard and Wade's proposal would build on a substantial reform of the mechanisms to compute weighted voting in the Bretton Woods institutions. It would also entail a redesign of the constituencies that have taken shape during these institutions' decades-long histories.

Ocampo and Stiglitz (2012) share a similar perspective with Vestergaard and Wade (2011). First, assessing the G-20 on the basis of various criteria, they find that it scores quite high on leadership and effectiveness, on account of its earlier record as a forum for crisis management. It also scores high on its ability to carry out systemic coordination, given that it is well placed to manage spillovers arising either from a country's policies or from those of an international organization vis-à-vis the rest of the system. However, the G-20 does poorly in terms of representational legitimacy.

Against this background, Ocampo and Stiglitz propose a Global Economic Coordination Council (GECC), along the lines of an analogous proposal put forward by the Stiglitz Commission (Stiglitz 2009). In contrast to the GEC proposed by Vestergaard and Wade (2011), the GECC would have a greater scope by coordinating the UN system broadly defined (i.e., including the UN-specialized agencies of the IMF and the World Bank and the World Trade Organization, which would become a UN agency for this purpose). Like Vestergaard and Wade, representation in their proposed GECC would be based on constituencies so as to reconcile universal representation with legitimacy.

The GECC would have a special responsibility for identifying spillovers—for instance, environmental effects of trade policies or social effects of budgetary policies—and proposing ways to address them. Yet it would leave to the more specialized bodies specific decisions in their respective areas. As in Vestergaard and Wade's proposal, this GECC would also work on the principle of weighted voting. For smaller countries, this would entail giving away the "one country, one vote" principle in exchange for broader representation in the systemic economic, social and environmental decision making ensured through a constituency-based system.

A second stream of the G-20 reform literature has focused on the sectoral aspects of G-20 involvement, such as international financial regulation, the international monetary system, international macroeconomic coordination and development. On financial regulation, Helleiner (2012) acknowledges that the G-20 has encouraged a greater focus on macroprudential supervision, with the aim of addressing wider systemic risks. Along these lines, the G-20 has been instrumental in leveraging its political weight behind the rapid negotiations leading to a new set of international bank capital and liquidity standards known as "Basel III," and in spearheading efforts through the FSB to regulate systemically important financial institutions more effectively. Helleiner, however, cautions that the G-20's emphasis on macroprudential goals might not in practice translate into a thorough implementation of a new, more effective supervisory framework, given its inability to enforce financial regulation standards, whose implementation is ultimately left to national authorities. As a case in point, Helleiner notes that two key G-20 members, China and the U.S., have not yet properly implemented the Basel II standards.

Turning to the international monetary system, Mistral (2012) outlines an action plan for the international community that could be facilitated by the political impetus provided by the G-20 leaders. On IMF reform, he advocates a Ministerial Council, as provided in Schedule D of the IMF's Articles of Agreement. For one thing, this would bring greater clarity to the work of the G-20 finance ministers, namely, the task of supervising the IMF's activities, overseeing the work of its managing director, and steering the launch of new initiatives such as a new monetary system based on Special Drawing Rights (SDRs). A better division of responsibilities would more effectively delineate the focus of the G-20 finance ministers, who would meet among themselves to prepare their summits and meetings in the format of a council, with an institutional focus on the matters of international economic cooperation that fall squarely under the IMF's purview.

The overlaps and complementarities between the G-20 and the IMF have also been analyzed by Lombardi (2011b). On international macroeconomic coordination, he notes, the G-20 has tried to implement the Framework for Strong, Sustainable, and Balanced Growth, following the proposal made by U.S. President Barack Obama at the Pittsburgh Summit in September 2009. The mutual assessment process (MAP) that was established in this regard could have represented the first multilateral surveillance on a global scale. Even in the context of the Jamaica Amendment, when the current IMF surveillance framework was discussed and approved in 1978, the United States only reluctantly accepted its basic premise.

Yet, a few years later, there is a sense that the MAP has not delivered on its expectations. The exercise has been mainly geared toward making policymakers aware of international spillovers from their policies and providing a context in which they could exercise mutual pressure. However, the extent to which the G-20 could have ultimately contributed to substantially revised national frameworks is uncertain at best, given that such a contribution would have presupposed a Group-shared vision of not only the benefits but also the costs of coordination.

3. THE GROUP OF TWENTY AND GLOBAL DEVELOPMENT

The theme of global development was taken up by the G-20 leaders at the Seoul Summit in 2009. Birdsall and Kharas (2012) suggest that the decision by South Korea to advance this as a cornerstone of its chairmanship reflected a number of factors. First, the global economic agenda and the development agenda had started to merge as the interdependencies among countries had become more important. Second, the G-20 was still struggling to gain broad acceptance of its role as the pre-eminent forum for global economic management vis-à-vis the G-8. Development was a blurred line separating the agendas of the two bodies, with a strong economic dimension that would place it in the G-20 orbit, coupled with a strong security and foreign affairs dimension that continued to be addressed in the G-8. Development was seen as a popular agenda item, with widespread support within each G-20 country as well as around the world. Indeed, the development achievements of the G-8, at its Gleneagles Summit and in its focus on Africa, were seen as among its signature successes. By taking on the development agenda at Seoul, the G-20 looked to consolidate its position as a global forum, not just one concerned with the economic outcomes of its own members, and, at the same time, to differentiate itself from the G-8.

At the time of the Seoul summit, the development agenda was also seen as in flux, with enormous changes in the developing world. The hugely visible Millennium Development Goals advanced by the United Nations were seen by many in Asia and elsewhere as being overly tilted toward social and human welfare investments in development. Since quantitative, time-bound targets for global development were put forth in the MDGs, the development discourse has changed significantly. There is more emphasis on growth and infrastructure development, especially because many African countries were experiencing rapid growth thanks to improving commodity prices, sound domestic policies and improvements in governance. Food security has emerged as a major global issue with important social consequences; and, as a result, the priority of increasing agricultural productivity had risen. Finally, developing countries have been seeing the impact of disasters, some of which are related to climate change, on development and have been eager to tackle new agendas for achieving resilience to shocks.

One other challenge is that the process of globalization has affected developing countries in sharply divergent ways. An increasing number of developing countries are benefiting from globalization, but face new challenges in sustaining growth, dealing with the inequities that can occur with globalization and managing volatility. But other developing countries, especially fragile and conflict-affected states, are failing to benefit from globalization and, in some cases, are being held back because of the corruption and distortions generated by groups taking advantage of huge natural resource rents that globalization generates.

The Seoul Development Consensus brought many of these agenda items to the fore of the development discussion, with the exception of the fragile states issue. South Korea, as G-20 chair, went to great lengths to communicate with and listen to the Committee of Ten Finance Ministers and Governors, representing the Sub-Saharan African countries (C-10). The C-10 applauded the emphasis given to shared growth, new growth poles and national policy ownership. The G-20 focus on low-income countries (none of which are members of the G-20) was also seen as a clear signal that the interests and views of nonmembers would be taken seriously by the group.

The Seoul Development Consensus could be taken as a sign that the G-20 members had arrived at a common approach toward development. That is not the case; nor was it the intention. Each G-20 country has its own experience with development, either as a recipient or as a donor or both, and these experiences are quite varied. Countries like China have bundled together aid, trade and investment in a package of instruments constituting development cooperation, with turn-key implementation at speed. That contrasts with the far slower pace of development cooperation from the Organization for Economic Cooperation and

Development (OECD)'s Development Assistance Committee member countries, which emphasize inclusive and participatory processes, and deliberate efforts to model high environmental and social standards in their projects. The fact that the G-20 has not tried to mediate these disputes or approaches to achieve greater harmonization has come as a disappointment to some, but the reality is that the G-20 is not an appropriate forum for such discussions. It has, instead, attempted to provide a space for dialogue, reaching a common understanding and sharing experiences under its knowledge platform pillar, avoiding judgments as to the effectiveness of various approaches.

The G-20's approach to development has contrasted deliberately with the G-8's approach (Kharas 2011). Whereas the G-8 focused on human welfare, country structural adjustment and shock impact mitigation, the G-20 has focused on national growth, global adjustment of imbalances and systemic risk management. Whereas the G-8 pursued an agenda of aid, common standards and global rules for development, the G-20 has embraced the modeling of good practices and a coherent package of aid, trade, investment and finance or development. The G-8 had a fresh agenda for each meeting, while the G-20 has proposed an overall multiyear action plan addressing nine key pillars. And though the G-20 focused on low-income countries, the G-20's development agenda is far broader and of interest to middle-income countries as well. The G-20 has also actively promoted the role of regional groupings and has tried to give momentum to the reform of the international financial institutions concerned with development.

There have been concerns that the G-20 does not have the mechanisms and instruments to achieve results and that consequently it is viewed as a "talking shop." But that is a misreading of the G-20's comparative advantage on development. The G-20 can try to build a consensus by highlighting issues that are important for the global economy, such as infrastructure and food security. But building a consensus involves an inclusive process that the G-20 itself cannot easily provide. Instead, it has chosen to work with other, more inclusive forums and institutions to provide the technical proposals for its consideration. Once agreement is reached on what needs to be done, the G-20 can become an effective force for providing the political impetus for implementation.

If the G-20 is viewed as a body that provides political support for decisions made in other forums, then it becomes easier to understand how emerging economies relate to it. On one hand, some emerging economies remain strong sovereignty "hawks," anxious to ensure that no decisions made by the G-20 affect their own scope for domestic policy determination. On the other hand, other emerging economies are eager to use the G-20's development agenda as an opportunity to showcase their influence on global affairs to their own populations. For example, after the Cannes G-20 Summit, which was dominated by the eurozone crisis, Chinese president Hu Jintao stressed to his domestic audience his country's focus on development issues, whereas South African president Zuma emphasized his stance on least-developed countries and support of jobs and skills.

Interestingly, members of the G-20 have not formed united political factions to advance their joint interests. Although the BRICS (i.e., Brazil, Russia, India, China and South Africa—the world's largest fast-growing countries) have formed an alliance of sorts outside the G-20 to discuss issues of common interest, including most recently the idea of a new Bank of the South for funding green infrastructure in developing countries, they have not tried to maintain a common front across all issues and have kept to a tradition of viewing each issue on its own merits.

In implementing the development agenda, which is inevitably long term, the G-20 has faced difficulties in communicating results. Unlike crisis management, where actions and impact can be readily traced, the development agenda is by its nature more long term. The G-20 is not the arena for mobilizing resources, unlike the G-8, because it does not have a membership committed to joint coordinated action on development. Nor can it "solve" infrastructure, food security or job creation problems. The G-20 has resisted becoming a short-cut mechanism for achieving compromises in areas where global compromises have been hard to achieve, such as the Doha Development Round of trade negotiations. That resistance has the distinct advantage of allowing the G-20 to work with and through existing institutions, rather than supplanting them, but the disadvantage of making it appear as if the G-20 cannot add value to the current system of global governance and force tangible results with announcement value. The G-20's actions, therefore, can appear small relative to the scale of the development challenges it is trying to address; for example, the High-Level Panel on Infrastructure had some useful proposals on infrastructure financing and engagement by the private sector, but it fell far short of being a game changer for infrastructure financing. Similarly, the forward momentum on agricultural productivity and food security has come from the G-8 rather than from the G-20.

The development agenda faces other challenges. The Development Working Group (DWG) of the G-20 is typically attended by the sherpas, but that divorces those discussions from the ones conducted with the major international financial institutions (in which officials of ministries of finance or treasuries take the lead), or with the United Nations or the Development Assistance Committee of the OECD (where officials/ministers of foreign affairs or state take the lead). For those G-20 members that are emerging economies, which may be both providers and recipients of development cooperation, the institutional split within their own governments makes it difficult to have a coherent position within the DWG. Perhaps as a result, as noted by Schulz (2011), the DWG lacks a compelling narrative and implementation capacity.[15]

In fact, the development agenda is increasingly viewed as too broad, and the nine pillars of the Seoul Consensus are disconnected from each other. That can generate unstructured and unproductive discussions that undercut the very premise of the G-20: to provide an informal forum where a focused and sustained conversation can take place in an efficient way. It is still too early to tell whether this will ultimately prove to be a fatal flaw in the G-20's approach to development. As the group returns to crisis management and problems in the eurozone, the development discussions have been relegated to a lower priority and the agenda setting, representation and other processes of the development working group have been allowed to drift. At some point, however, these issues will need to be addressed.

4. GLOBAL GOVERNANCE AND THE GROUP OF TWENTY: PROSPECTS AND CHALLENGES

In the earlier part of this paper, it was noted that a number of scholars and experts have pointed to the need to better institutionalize the relationship between the G-20 and the established, technically proficient international organizations. Although their proposals differ, their common aim is to strengthen the G-20's infusion of political capital into these international organizations while bridging the legitimacy gap that the current, ad hoc setup poses.

Admittedly, the relationship between the G-20 and those international organizations has been much more meaningful than the one between the latter and the G-7/G-8. Both the heads of the Bretton Woods institutions and the chairpersons of their respective ministerial committees are ex officio members of the G-20. The secretary-general of the United Nations regularly attends G-20 summits, as does the chairman of the FSB. Other international organizations, such as the OECD and International Labor Organization, also participate in G-20 meetings on an ad hoc basis, depending on the issues being discussed.

Among the various international organizations, the IMF has distinctly emerged as the high-level adviser to the G-20 leaders, and thus its analyses served as the basis for official, concerted action at the height of the 2008–09 global financial crisis. In contrast, as the IMF historian James Boughton (2001) recalls, the IMF's managing director had to leave the meeting room after having explained to the G-7 finance ministers his institution's economic assessment of the global economy.

As a reflection of a more meaningful working relationship with international institutions, the G-20 has also been instrumental in catalyzing a consensus on governance reforms. In the case of the IMF, the latest "Seoul package"[16] will make China the institution's third shareholder, while the other BRICS will all feature among the top 10 shareholders once the reform package is ratified by the IMF's membership.[17] Along similar lines, the G-20 leaders established the FSB[18] while making the new organization accountable directly to themselves.[19]

The current setup, however, presents some challenges that, although apparently less immediate, may well erode the legitimacy, and thus the effectiveness, of the very institutions the G-20 aims to support in the medium term. For instance, the "Seoul package" was recommended by the G-20 leaders in Seoul in November 2010 and only afterward did the IMF's own governance bodies approve it. Along similar lines, the recent negotiations to strengthen the IMF's finances have taken place in the context of the G-20, with the IMF's governance bodies following suit.[20] As Ocampo and Stiglitz (2012) note, no matter how representative or powerful a given informal dialogue forum, it can never substitute for multilateral decision making within treaty-based international organizations.

Building on these considerations, a path for reforming both the G-20 and the IMF can be envisaged in a way that nests the two bodies together in a mutually reinforcing way. It has long been advocated that the IMF's membership should establish the Ministerial Council, whose activation is already foreseen in the IMF's Articles of Agreement if supported by an 85 percent qualified supermajority. In fact, there appears to be an overwhelming consensus that the establishment of the Ministerial Council would strengthen political support for the pursuit of the IMF's own mandate.[21] The IMF's own Independent Evaluation Office (IEO 2008), in its assessment of the institution's governance, underscored a lack of clarity on the roles and responsibilities of the current Ministerial Committee—the International Monetary Financial Committee, which functions as an advisory body to the Board of Governors. The IMFC's ambiguous status limits the degree to which the Executive Board and Management can be held accountable for implementing (or not) the IMFC's initiatives; nor can the latter exercise any proper oversight over the former. Against this backdrop, the IEO recommended establishing a ministerial-level governing council to spur active and systematic high-level involvement in setting broad strategic goals and in overseeing performance. Thus, this Ministerial Council would be a formal decision-making body—rather than an advisory one—and its pronouncements would have legal status. Its responsibilities would include setting the IMF's overarching strategic goals; making decisions that require support at the highest political levels (i.e., selection of the managing director); and exercising oversight over the institution, including its Executive Board.

These findings and ensuing recommendations have been basically shared by the Manuel Report (Committee on IMF Governance Reform 2009) and are in line with the Fourth Pillar Report (Lombardi 2009) requested by the IMF's managing director to summarize the outcomes of consultations with global civil society on governance reforms. Although both reports share the thrust of the IEO's recommendation, they also raise different nuances. For instance, the Manuel Report underscores that the absence of a fully empowered council not only contributes to the perception of a "democratic deficit" but also limits the engagement of senior policymakers on critical and systemic issues. The Fourth Pillar Report, however, cautioned that the Ministerial Council should be established only after addressing the more fundamental problems in the IMF's governance such as the asymmetric distribution of voting power and, to a varying degree, lack of intraconstituency accountability mechanisms.

At the IMF, in fact, the U.S., Japan, Germany, the U.K. and France are represented through their own appointing chairs, while China, Russia and Saudi Arabia have single-country constituency seats. The remaining 179 member countries have formed multicountry constituencies.[22] Thus, because most countries are represented on the Executive Board through multicountry constituencies, the governance arrangements within constituencies are critical to the effectiveness of their representation. Recent studies have found, however, that their quality tends to be very uneven, especially in those seats where voting power is skewed toward a dominant country. In those constituencies, executive directors tend to be accountable to their respective national authorities rather than to the constituency as a whole. In contrast, other constituencies whose members' voting power is more evenly distributed tend to exhibit a stronger participatory dimension and score better on intraconstituency accountability.[23]

Although existing intraconstituency mechanisms should undoubtedly be strengthened, nonetheless, the IMF's constituency structure offers an interesting starting point for thinking about how to reconcile universality of representation with effectiveness in decision making. Through constituencies, the IMF's Executive Board (and the Ministerial Council, if established) manages to reduce the number of voting members to a feasible size of 24. Thus, all member countries are able to contribute and affect the institution's decision making depending on the strength of intraconstituency accountability mechanisms. In exchange, member countries represented through multicountry constituencies have to accept to delegate to a common representative the role of promoting consensus through the executive director holding the constituency chair.[24]

Clearly, if the G-20's finance ministers and central bank governors were to meet as members of a newly established IMF Ministerial Council, the requirements of universal representation and legitimacy conferred by a treaty-based organization and its constituency-based representation system would add to the "systemic" character of the G-20. The proposed configuration would already build on the substantial overlaps between members of the current IMFC and of the G-20. The difference would, of course, be that when the Canadian or Italian finance ministers meet in the context of the G-20 they do not do so as representatives of their respective constituencies while in the Ministerial Council they would.

The Ministerial Council would have a full mandate from the IMF's 188 country members to discuss and decide on issues related to the international monetary system and international macroeconomic policies. Its membership would be based to a large extent on the G-20's current membership, although two aspects are noteworthy in this respect. First, because the composition of the Ministerial Council would parallel that of the IMF's Executive Board, this would imply a slight increase in the number of G-20 countries, from 19 to 24. However, in practice, this may overstate the issue if one considers that the G-20 already includes a few countries as de facto permanent invitees. Spain is akin to a permanent invitee; moreover, the African Union and ASEAN chairs are also invited to G-20 meetings. In the end, the size of the ministerial meeting would not substantially differ under this proposal. In addition, Mexico, the current chair, has invited Chile and Colombia to join the Los Cabos Summit as other G-20 chairs have done with other, regional members. Then, because the African Union's seat would be filled by the two

African chairs, this would imply a net gain in the voice and representation of low-income countries, as advocated by many analysts.

The proposed reform would embed an intrinsic dynamism in the composition of the ministerial steering committee. Given that fast-growing economies would be awarded higher quotas at each five-year review, as per the IMF's legal framework, the composition of the Ministerial Council would be "dynamically systemic." Thus, economies rising faster relative to the rest of the membership would be given higher status in the organization, as reflected in a higher quota increase. This, in turn, would provide the basis for greater intraconstituency leverage, enabling faster-growing countries to chair their respective groups, if they managed to foster the required consensus. The criteria for acceding to this ministerial body would, moreover, be transparent and universally accepted. In this event, they could be changed by the membership at any point in time consistent with the IMF's own governance framework.

As Table 1 shows, most G-20 members already have seats on the IMF Executive Board and on the current (advisory) Ministerial Committee, the IMFC. This is the case for the United States, Japan, Germany, France and the United Kingdom, which enjoy the privilege of single-country representation, as do China, Russia and Saudi Arabia. Other countries—such as Italy, Brazil, Canada, India and Switzerland—also have overlapping representation given that they permanently chair their respective multicountry constituencies at the IMF.

There are, then, a few countries that chair their constituencies on a rotating basis while being members of the G-20: Indonesia, Argentina, Mexico, Spain, Australia, South Korea and South Africa. Turkey is the only G-20 member that does not currently have a seat on the IMF Executive Board; but it is represented via Belgium. This asymmetry could be dealt with in the context of the imminent recomposition of the Executive Board, whereby Western Europe has agreed to cede two seats to emerging and underrepresented economies, as well as in the context of subsequent recompositions.[25]

Finally, there are chairs that are not members of the G-20; this is the case for the Nordic-Baltic constituency, the Netherlands, Algeria, the United Arab Emirates and the smaller African constituency currently chaired by Gabon. The net increase in the size of the Ministerial Council vis-à-vis the current G-20 due to the latter chairs could be compensated for in light of the fact that some additional seats in the G-20 would have no reason to be kept in light of the considerably more legitimate and better-represented structure of the Ministerial Council itself.

Table 1. The G-20's Membership and IMF Constituency Arrangements

Country	G-20 Membership	IMFC*	Executive Board Chair†	Executive Board Internal Governance Arrangements	Voting Power
United States	x	x	x	Executive director appointed by the respective country authorities; serves at his or her pleasure.	16.75
Japan	x	x	x		6.23
Germany	x	x	x		5.81
France	x	x	x		4.29
United Kingdom	x	x	x		4.29
China	x	x	x	Single-country constituencies	3.81
Saudi Arabia	x	x	x		2.80
Russia	x	x	x		2.39
Italy	x	x	x	Multicountry constituency chaired by Italy	3.16
Belgium		x	x	Multicountry constituency chaired by Belgium	1.86
Brazil	x	x	x	Multicountry constituency chaired by Brazil	1.72
Netherlands		x	x	Multicountry constituency chaired by the Netherlands	2.08
Spain		x		Multicountry constituency with chair rotating among Mexico, Spain, and Venezuela	1.63
Canada	x	x	x	Multicountry constituency chaired by Canada	2.56
India	x	x	x	Multicountry constituency chaired by India	2.34
Mexico	x		x	Multicountry constituency with chair rotating among Mexico, Spain, and Venezuela	1.47
Switzerland		x	x	Multicountry constituency chaired by Switzerland	1.4
South Korea	x			Multicountry constituency with chair rotating between Australia and South Korea.	1.37
Australia	x	x	x	Multicountry constituency with chair rotating between Australia and South Korea.	1.31
Argentina	x	x	x	Multicountry constituency with chair rotating among Argentina, Chile and Peru	0.87
Indonesia	x	x		Multicountry constituency with chair rotating among Indonesia, Malaysia, Singapore and Thailand	0.85
Denmark		x	x	Multicountry constituency with chair rotating among Denmark, Finland, Iceland and Sweden	0.78
South Africa	x			Multicountry constituency with chair rotating among all members	0.77
Turkey	x			Multicountry constituency chaired by Belgium	0.61
Singapore		x	x	Multicountry constituency with chair rotating among Indonesia, Malaysia, Singapore, and Thailand	0.59
Algeria		x		Multicountry constituency chaired by Iran	0.53
United Arab Emirates		x		Multicountry constituency chaired by Egypt	0.33
Gabon		x		Multicountry constituency with chair rotating among all members	0.09
European Union	x	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	

Sources: IMF.org and G-20.org. * = as of April 18, 2012; † = as of June 5, 2012.

5. CONCLUSIONS

The G-20 is still experimenting with ways to balance legitimacy and effectiveness. It is trying to complement other international institutions but also to compete with some, such as the G-8, that continue to wield considerable influence over economic affairs. The G-20 gained considerable credibility from its success in fighting the global financial and economic crisis of 2008–09, but the prolonged nature of that crisis and its recent recurrence in Europe have again called into question the effectiveness and relevance of the Group.

The G-20 does not operate on the basis of setting specific goals, financial commitments or timelines in the same fashion as the G-8. That is because it has organized itself as a process-oriented forum for first helping to build a consensus and then providing the required political momentum to ensure implementation. This approach should come as a relief to non-G-20 countries, which might otherwise feel that decisions being made at the G-20 would implicitly bind them. In fact, those decisions are being made through an engagement with other forums and treaty-based institutions where there are established governance procedures for representation and voice.

For non-G-20 countries, there are several avenues for influencing the global agenda. First, they should encourage the G-20 to continue with its practice of actively listening to nonmembers through broad consultations, as has happened with the C-10 and other bodies. For reasons of efficiency, such consultations are more likely to take place between the G-20 chair and regional bodies rather than on a strictly bilateral basis, so nonmembers must take the initiative to organize themselves into groupings that can best carry out a dialogue with the G-20.

Such groupings can be sector specific as well as broad based. For example, the G-24, an informal group of developing countries, is typically invited to participate in the G-20's finance ministers' workstream, even though it does not participate at the Leaders' Summit because issues with important spillovers into developing countries are discussed there. Increasingly, the working groups are inviting selected experts and hosting seminars and consultations to bring outside expertise into their discussions. In the development domain, the multiyear action plan provides an advance program for each of the nine pillars. With this agenda in hand, nonmembers can plan to influence selected topics on which they have experience to share.

The G-20's development agenda will converge more closely with a broader global growth agenda once more progress is made on topics like climate change, green growth and other global public goods. Once an agenda is defined, it will become easier for the G-20 to mobilize the political will of its members to drive implementation.

The G-20's workstreams are heavily influenced by international institutions that are called upon by the G-20 to develop proposals for discussion and action by the leaders. Most countries are represented in these international institutions through a constituency-based approach. The degree of representation may vary across constituencies because each has its own process for reflecting the views of members and thus ensuring that within-constituency representation functions effectively for the voice of non-G-20 members. The G-20 has been instrumental in bringing together several international institutions to address each topic, so the jockeying for influence between institutions that has occasionally bedeviled international cooperation has been lessened.

For the time being, the G-20 appears to be the "best available option" for global economic governance. It is not designed to achieve institutional legitimacy per se, and thus it has chosen to work with other bodies that have a more inclusive and universal representation. It is not an implementing body, but it encourages others to rise to the challenge of addressing the issues that its agenda advances. The G-20 receives the greatest media coverage during times of crisis, but the leaders who now participate in it are finding ways to demonstrate to their own electorates that they are making a difference in the conduct of global affairs through the stance they take at its summit meetings. This link between global and domestic dialogues, and the building of popular support to address global challenges, may yet become the greatest value that the G-20 adds.

APPENDIX TABLE A.1. PRIORITIES OF THE G-20'S MINISTERIAL MEETINGS

Year	Country	Priorities by Chair
1999-2001	Canada	Canada put particular attention on practices and procedures that would better promote the G-20's effectiveness (G-20 2008d). At the outset, it was agreed that the G-20 Secretariat would be provided by the host country. It was also agreed that at the ministerial meeting attendance would be limited to the Minister and Governor and a single official per delegation (G-20 2008d). The G-20 chairman stated that, "there is virtually no major aspect of the global economy or international financial system that will be outside of the group's purview" (G-20 2008a). He mentioned that the Group would "focus on translating the benefits of globalization into higher incomes and better opportunities for people everywhere." During Canada's stewardship, G-20 members envisaged that the Group's mandate would encompass both financial stability concerns and longer-term growth-related issues (G-20 2008d). Canada also focused on (1) crisis prevention and resolution, (2) globalization and (3) the interdiction of terrorist financing. The principal substantive issue for discussion at the first meeting of ministers and governors was crisis prevention and resolution, with an emphasis on prevention. The Group's focus on the adoption by countries of "best practices" to reduce countries' vulnerability to financial crises continued through 2000 and 2001 (G-20 2008d). Best practices included appropriate exchange rate arrangements, prudent liability management, the development and implementation of international standards and codes, and the appropriate involvement of the private sector (G-20 2008d). Another prominent issue that emerged in 2000 was the challenges posed by globalization. G-20 ministers and governors reiterated their support for global economic and financial integration in their 2000 press statement (G-20 2008d). They identified specific follow-up initiatives (i.e., globalization case studies, a roadmap for orderly capital account liberalization, and a review of institutional arrangements supporting the global economy) (G-20 2008d). Ministers also emphasized the importance of social programs in addition to sound macroeconomic policies and open markets to achieve broad-based and sustainable prosperity (the so-called Montreal Consensus) (G-20 2008d). In response to the 2001 terrorist attacks, G-20 ministers and governors announced their determination to combat the financing of terrorism. They adopted a comprehensive action plan of multilateral cooperation to deny terrorists access to financial systems and to stop abuse of informal banking networks (G-20 2008d).
2002	India	During India's stewardship, four topics were selected for discussion for the ministerial meeting on November 2002. These included (1) globalization, (2) crisis prevention and resolution, (3) combating the financing of terrorism and (4) development and aid (G-20 2008d). This was the first time that an international forum had been chaired by a developing country (G-20 2008d). In the deputies' meeting of (July 15–17, 2002), India suggested the preparation of case studies on the origins of recent crises and, accordingly, encouraged member countries to prepare reports that examined their individual experiences (G-20 2008d). During this chairmanship, G-20 members began to pay more attention to the second part of the G-20's mandate, specifically "stable and sustainable world economic growth that benefits all," with the addition of "development and aid" to the agenda (G-20 2008d). Members reaffirmed their commitment to achieve the United Nation's Millennium Development Goals and their continuing support for Africa through the New Partnership for Africa's Development (G-20 2008d). Ministers recognized that it was important to initiate measures for enhancing official development assistance flows to implement the Monterrey Consensus (G-20 2008d). During India's year as Chair the first G-20 Troika was formed, composed of Canada, India and Mexico (G-20 2008d).

Year	Country	Priorities by Chair
2003	Mexico	Under Mexico's leadership, the following issues were under discussion: (1) crisis prevention and resolution, (2) globalization (including economic growth and the role of institution building in the financial sector), (3) combating terrorist financing, (4) financing for development, (5) preventing abuses of the international financial system (with focus on promoting transparency and information exchange) and (6) future strategic priorities of the G-20 (G-20 2008d). Under Mexico's stewardship, the G-20 launched an initiative to share member countries' experiences on the role of institution-building in the financial sector (G-20 2008d). Mexico also hosted in May 2003 a workshop on Debt Restructuring, which was a central topic of the Group's agenda during the year (G-20 2008d). Discussions on a possible Sovereign Debt Restructuring Mechanism (SDRM) intensified during Mexico's presidency. Owing to the lack of progress with the SDRM, the idea to establish a voluntary code of conduct was launched, initially by the Banque de France, and later followed up and promoted by the Institute of International Finance (G-20 2008d). Mexico announced at the G-20 deputies' meeting in March 2003 that, for the first time, the country had included collective action clauses (CACs) in its international bonds (G-20 2008d). Other G-20 countries, including Brazil, Korea and South Africa, followed suit. G-20 ministers and governors indicated in their Morelia Communiqué that they welcomed the increasingly widespread use of CACs, and that they supported their inclusion in future sovereign bonds issued under foreign jurisdiction (G-20 2003). CACs were included in bond issues of emerging countries in the New York market for the first time (G-20 2008d).
2004	Germany	The German work program included (1) promoting stability and growth in the context of globalization, (2) institution building in the financial sector (with particular interest in the question of how to strengthen domestic financial markets), (3) regional integration in a global framework, (4) strengthening the framework for crisis prevention and resolution, (5) combating the abuse of the financial system (focusing on harmful tax competition and money laundering and terrorist financing) and (6) demographic challenges and migration (G-20 2008d). An innovation during the 2004 German stewardship was an economic surveillance session at the ministerial meeting (a practice that has continued under subsequent chairs) (G-20 2008d). The key outcomes of Germany's chairmanship were the following three agreements: (1) the G-20 Accord for Sustained Growth (members set out a framework describing the requirements and priorities of sustained strong growth), (2) the G-20 Reform Agenda (which translated the framework into concrete policy measures) and (3) the G-20 Statement on Transparency and Exchange of Information for Tax Purposes (with the intention to enhance good governance and to fight illicit use of the financial system in all its forms) (G-20 2008d).

Year	Country	Priorities by Chair
2005	China	The premise under China's leadership was "Global Cooperation: Promoting Balanced and Orderly World Economic Development." Five topics were chosen for discussion at the ministerial meeting: (1) current economic and development issues (with issues related to oil prices and production), (2) 60 years of Bretton Woods institutions: strategic review and reform agenda, (3) achieving the MDGs: development assistance and innovative financing mechanisms, (4) demographic challenges and migration (with a focus on the economic impact of aging populations, on labor mobility, and on improving remittance services) and (5) innovation of development approaches for sustained growth (G-20 Accord) (G-20 2008d). Meeting discussions under China's leadership were mainly focused on two areas: the international development agenda and the reform of the Bretton Woods institutions (G-20 2008d). Development and growth took on a higher priority during this stewardship. Following a workshop on economic growth, G-20 finance ministers and governors issued a statement on global development in which they underscored the "diversity of growth models," and committed themselves to "strengthening the dialogue on development philosophies, strategies, and policies, from which all countries can benefit" (G-20 2008d). A new issue discussed was the reform of the Bretton Woods institutions—the IMF and the World Bank. G-20 finance ministers issued a statement on reforming the IMF and World Bank, in which they reaffirmed "the principle that the governance structure of the [Bretton Woods institutions]—both quotas and representation—should reflect . . . changes in economic weight" (G-20 2005b). Ministers also indicated that the two institutions should enhance their effectiveness by improving their internal governance and stated that "the selection of senior management should be based on merit and ensure broad representation of all member countries" (G-20 2005b). Three documents were endorsed at the 2005 meeting of G-20 finance ministers and central bank governors: (1) the Communiqué, (2) the G-20 Statement on Reforming the Bretton Woods institutions, and (3) the G-20 Statement on Global Development Issues. In addition, an updated Reform Agenda of the G-20 was also circulated.

Year	Country	Priorities by Chair
2006	Australia	The theme under Australia's leadership was "Building and Sustaining Prosperity." The work program focused on (1) reform of the Bretton Woods institutions, (2) energy and resource commodities, (3) demographic change, (4) domestic economic policies and principles and (5) aid effectiveness (G-20 2006b). Australia had two main objectives for the Group: (1) to pursue relevant and practical issues in support of global development and (2) to strengthen the G-20's position as a key forum in the governance framework of the international economic and financial system, with a strong focus on encouraging rules-based and market-focused national policies and international cooperation among members (G-20 2008d). To support discussions on these issues, three workshops involving academics and the private sector were organized on the reform of the Bretton Woods institutions (in Tokyo), energy and resources (in Banff), and demographics and financial markets (in Sydney). In a review of the Australian G-20 stewardship, senior Australian Treasury officials noted that G-20 pressure "helped break a long-standing deadlock within the IMF" (G-20 2008d). IMF governors agreed to quota increases for the most seriously underrepresented members (i.e., China, South Korea, Mexico and Turkey). In their November 2006 communiqué, G-20 ministers and governors stated that they were "pleased that the G-20 has been able to make a contribution to this historic outcome." They also mentioned that they were "committed to the successful completion of a comprehensive set of reforms under the second stage of this process, delivered within the time frames agreed by IMF Governors" (G-20 2006a). According to the communiqué, key issues on which agreement needed to be achieved in order to implement second-stage reforms included: "the main considerations underlying a new, transparent and simple quota formula which captures IMF members' relative economic positions; how to implement the new quota formula; and agreement on the increase in basic votes and how the share of basic votes can be protected over time" (G-20 2006a). Australia maintained the regular session on examining current challenges in the global economic and financial outlook. This country sought to encourage policy-relevant discussion through a theme-based conversation on the challenges of managing monetary and fiscal policy in the face of sustained above-trend global growth (G-20 2008d). Early in 2006, Australia proposed the use of informal study groups within the G-20 to support discussion at deputies' meetings (G-20 2008d). For example, the Study Group on demographic change, coordinated by this chair, proved a useful vehicle for informal and frank exchanges on the demographics issues. Australia found the format of the Troika management group particularly useful throughout the year (G-20 2008d). Bringing together the previous, current and next year's hosts made it possible to "learn the ropes," and ensure some consistency in themes being brought to ministers and governors (G-20 2008d). Therefore, the Troika's support and consultation roles were strengthened during Australia's tenure, through the development of the "Proposal for Coordination of G-20 Workshops" (G-20 2008d). During this stewardship, substantial effort was directed to build a comprehensive website, which included archives from previous years, providing timely and centralized information (G-20 2008d). Another innovation was the introduction of the *G-20 Policy Manual* providing guidance for chairing the G-20 (G-20 2008d).

Year	Country	Priorities by Chair
2007	South Africa	South Africa assumed the chair under the banner "Sharing Influence, Responsibility, and Knowledge." The following topics for the 2007 work program were identified: (1) global and domestic economic developments, (2) reform of the Bretton Woods institutions (the objective was to build consensus toward the completion of the second phase of IMF reform and to open debate on the reform of the World Bank), (3) fiscal elements of growth and development (issues addressed included mechanisms for improving the efficiency and effectiveness of government spending, the design of medium-term fiscal frameworks, and the coordination of spending across different levels of government) and (4) commodities and Financial Stability (G-20 2007). South Africa also hosted a joint World Economic Forum and Reinventing Bretton Woods Committee roundtable on "New Features of the International Monetary System." South Africa developed proposals for two study groups—one on the history of the G-20 and one on the macroeconomic impact of climate change—to facilitate discussion between G-20 member countries on issues not on the formal work program (G-20 2008d). In addition to the three official G-20 workshops—the reform of the Bretton Woods institutions, fiscal elements of growth and development, and commodities and financial stability—South Africa hosted two African policy workshops on themes of particular interest to African policymakers (G-20 2008d). Although these workshops were not held under the auspices of the G-20, senior G-20 officials participated (G-20 2008d).

Year	Country	Priorities by Chair
2008	Brazil	The G-20's minister meeting was held in São Paulo on November 9, 2008. In this gathering U.S. President George Bush had already decided that in the wake of the American-turned-global financial crisis, the leaders of the G-20 countries would meet in Washington on November 14 (Kirton 2011). São Paulo thus added to its agenda the recent crisis in the credit market and financial sector (Kirton 2011). Therefore, the agenda for the finance ministers meeting of November 9 included the discussion of the following issues: (1) financial stability and the global economy: developments and policy responses; (2) fiscal policy responses to the global financial crisis; (3) global markets and inflation: developments and policy responses; (4) improving international governance and enhancing the effectiveness of the G-20; (5) preparing for the leaders' G-20 meeting and (6) other business (e.g., clean energy, implementing the G-20 Accord and a study group on debt sustainability) (G-20 2008a). According to the November Communiqué, finance ministers discussed the causes of and policy responses to the global financial crisis, with a particular focus on ensuring financial stability, supporting global growth, and maintaining recent achievements in poverty reduction and social inclusion (G-20 2008b). It was recognized that "measures must be designed not only to restore growth and financial stability, but also to minimize the negative social impact, particularly in emerging and low-income countries" (G-20 2008b). Finance ministers agreed on the need "to improve the supervision and governance of financial institutions, at both national and international levels" (G-20 2008b). They urged all countries to resist protectionist pressures, reiterating strong support for a prompt conclusion of the Doha Development Round. Ministers recognized that many low-income countries are vulnerable to commodity price volatility and changes in investor sentiment due to the financial crisis (G-20 2008b). Finance ministers noted that fiscal policies have served as an important instrument to address the financial crisis and recognized the relevance of adopting sound monetary policies (G-20 2008b). They endorsed additional fiscal measures for some countries, while recognizing the importance of fiscal sustainability for macroeconomic stability and growth (G-20 2008b). During Brazil's leadership the reform of the Bretton Woods institutions was underscored, particularly with regard to voice and representation of emerging and developing countries. According to the communiqué, the IMF was urged to continue to review and adapt its lending instruments to adequately meet its member needs and revise its lending role in the light of the financial crisis (G-20 2008b). It was agreed that the FSF "must expand to a broader membership of emerging economies" (G-20 2008b). After the ministerial meeting of November 9, leaders of the G-20 met in Washington on November 14–15 (also called the Washington Summit). On November 15, 2008, Brazil presented a proposal on "Global Financial Governance" (Brazil 2008). The proposal stated that short-term actions should focus on countercyclical policies that boost aggregate demand and avoid excessive reduction of economic activity. The general objectives of the Brazilian governance proposal were: the reform of international financial institutions (IFIs) in order to improve global financial cooperation, with particular focus on greater legitimacy and representation; the review of national regulatory, supervisory and risk-assessment frameworks and the creation of multilateral normative references; the development of normative frameworks and crisis prevention mechanisms in a coordinated fashion by IFIs; and the development of domestic instruments that minimize the costs of eventually needed intervention in financial markets by Governments, with a view to protecting taxpayers from a harmful "profit privatization and socialization of losses" logic (Brazil 2008). Brazil also set forth guiding principles for the reform (i.e., representation and legitimacy, effectiveness, collective actions to implement coordinated national policies, good governance in the domestic markets, accountability, transparency and crisis prevention) (Brazil 2008). Within the context of the aforementioned principles, Brazil suggested changes to the forums and IFIs. Brazil also proposed changes in the supervision and regulation of domestic and international financial markets with particular focus on crisis prevention, correction of insufficient supervision and regulation, macroeconomic instruments, transparency of balance-sheet rules and accountability (Brazil 2008).

Year	Country	Priorities by Chair
2009	United Kingdom	Under British leadership, the agenda still focused heavily on financial regulation and supervision and macroeconomic stimulus. In spite of this, British prime minister and host Gordon Brown brought development to the center stage of the agenda (Kirton 2011). According to the leaders' statement in April 2009, the priorities were to: (1) Restore confidence, growth and jobs; (2) Repair the financial system to restore lending; (3) Strengthen financial regulation to rebuild trust; (4) Reform the IFIs to overcome the crisis and prevent future ones; (5) Promote global trade and investment and reject protectionism, to underpin prosperity; and (6) Build an inclusive, green, and sustainable recovery (G-20 2009b). A letter from UN Secretary General Ban Ki-moon to Prime Minister Brown encouraged the G-20 to lead on development, suggesting a development-oriented stimulus package of $1 trillion (Kirton 2011). The London Summit did indeed mobilize a $1.1 trillion program. London's increased attention to development performance was driven by the fear that economic devastation would destroy the gains made in development and democracy over the preceding two decades (Kirton 2011). There was a sense that the fates of the developed and developing worlds were intricately connected, and that failure in one would mean failure in the other (Kirton 2011). Another cause was the personal commitment of Brown to global poverty reduction and his determination as host to embed development in various aspects of the G-20 agenda (Kirton 2011).
2010	South Korea	Under the banner "Shared Growth Beyond Crisis," South Korea was the first country from outside the G-8 group to chair the G-20 (Myung-bak 2010). During Korea's stewardship, development assumed greater prominence as reflected in the Seoul Summit, particularly with the "Seoul Development Consensus." According to Lee Myung-bak (president of South Korea), Korea intended to place development issues firmly on the agenda and work toward finding agreement (Myung-bak 2010). As reported by the Seoul Summit Document the following subjects were under discussion: (1) the Framework for Strong, Sustainable, and Balanced Growth, (2) the Seoul Action Plan, (3) IFIs reforms, (4) financial sector reforms, (5) fighting protectionism and promoting trade and investment, (6) the Seoul Development Consensus for Shared Growth, (7) financial inclusion, (8) energy, (9) climate change and green growth, (10) the G-20 Business Summit and (11) consultation. Seoul's was the most important G-20 summit for development yet (Kirton 2011). The rise of development in the agenda was reinforced by Korea's position as a country that had recently gone through rapid and successful development, with expertise on strategies for development and on policies for successful recovery from financial crises (Myung-bak 2010; Kirton 2011). Myung-bak was determined from very early on to make his new development consensus the major accomplishment of the summit (Kirton 2011). Korea was in the singular position of having switched from aid recipient to aid donor (Myung-bak 2010). Therefore, it had great ambition to channel its recent successes into a new model that captured the strengths of the Korean approach (Kirton 2011).

Year	Country	Priorities by Chair
2011	France	During France's chairmanship, the priorities were as follows: (1) Reforming the international monetary system to establish collective responses to deficiencies, and to provide support for the sweeping changes that the global economy was experiencing; (2) strengthening financial regulation (particularly in areas where it was still insufficient, for example with respect to regulation of the "shadow banking system" and concerning financial market integrity and transparency); (3) combating commodity price volatility (mainly for prices that undermine world growth and threaten food security for populations); (4) supporting employment and strengthening the social dimension of globalization (with four priority objectives, namely the promotion of employment, stronger social protection, respect for social and labor rights, and improved coordination of strategies among international organizations); (5) fighting corruption; and (6) working on behalf of development (principally making specific efforts to support infrastructure development and to ensure food security in vulnerable countries) (G-20 France 2011b). France put infrastructure and food security at the heart of the G-20 priorities. In relation to the latter, the president of France asked Bruno Le Maire to bring together the G-20 agriculture ministers and the major international organizations responsible for food security, including the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, for the first time (G-20 France 2011a). This first-ever meeting of G-20 agricultural ministers, held in June 2011, provided a firm plan for the leaders to endorse. Based on the French priority of adding the social dimension of globalization to the G-20 agenda, the president of France asked Xavier Bertrand to arrange a meeting between the G-20 Labor and Employment Ministers in Paris on September 26–27 (G-20 France 2011a). Labor and Employment Ministers' conclusions from September 2011 became a point of reference for future G-20 meetings. Cannes' greatest potential impact came from the development of G-20 governance, with the first G-20 agricultural ministerial and the first G-20 development ministerial (together with finance ministers) held in September (Kirton 2011). Cannes also identified the future hosts of the G-20 summits, giving developed and emerging members an equal opportunity (Kirton 2011). France invited some non-G-20 members to the summit (i.e., Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Singapore, Spain and the United Arab Emirates).

Year	Country	Priorities by Chair
2012	Mexico	As chair of the G-20 in 2012, the Mexican government has stated the following priorities: (1) economic stabilization and structural reforms as foundations for growth and employment; (2) strengthening the financial system and fostering financial inclusion to promote economic growth; (3) improving the international financial architecture in an interconnected world; (4) enhancing food security and addressing commodity price volatility; and (5) promoting sustainable development, green growth and the fight against climate change (G-20 Mexico 2012a). Mexico highlighted other topics for the discussion, including disaster risk management, and followed up on previous commitments on issues such as corruption, tourism and multilateral trade (G-20 Mexico 2012b). The Mexican government emphasized that it will work to make the G-20 dialogue process as open, inclusive and transparent as possible, particularly with respect to non-members, the UN system international organizations, think-tanks (Think-20 discussion forum), the private sector (Business-20 Summit), young students and professionals (Youth-20), NGOs and civil society (G-20 Mexico 2012b). Under the Mexican chair, the Development Working Group continued with the priorities set by the French Government on infrastructure and food security. In January 2012, Mexico added green growth. In the first five months of 2012 the Development Working Group met five times: three regular meetings, one workshop on green growth and one meeting on green growth development (Kirton and Kulik 2012a). The Los Cabos Summit held in June 2012, was the first summit hosted by Mexico and the second summit hosted by an emerging member of the G-20. For Kirton and Kulik (2012b), the Summit delivered a double dividend by both controlling an escalating euro crisis and advancing a priority and built-in agenda that it broadened in important ways. Mexico made strengthening the IMF an agenda priority and coordinated, as G-20 chair, the negotiations to increase the assets available to the IMF to more than $450 billion dollars (Calderon 2012). For Felipe Calderon, President of Mexico, “Mexico not only helped the G-20 resolve the most urgent financial problems of advanced economies, but also to formulate solutions that benefits millions of hungry people around the world” (Calderon 2012). According to Calderon (2012), Mexico has concluded the first phase of its G-20 Presidency. For the second phase, he highlighted two main priorities: to implement and comply with the signed agreements of Los Cabos Summit and to hand over a solid agenda to Russia when they assume the Presidency of the Group on December 1st.

APPENDIX TABLE A.2. G-20 SUMMIT PRIORITIES

Summit	Priorities, as per Communiqué
Washington, November 2008	The "Declaration of the Summit on Financial Markets and the World Economy" focused on immediate management of the global financial crisis. The leaders reached a common understating of the root causes of the global crisis. Leaders reviewed the actions countries have taken and will take to address the crisis and strengthen growth. In particular, they agreed to continue to take further actions necessary to stabilize the financial system; recognize the importance of monetary policy support and the use of fiscal measures as appropriate; provide liquidity to help emerging and developing economies gain access to finance; and ensure that the IMF, World Bank and other multilateral development banks (MDBs) have sufficient resources to assist developing countries affected by the crisis, as well as provide trade and infrastructure financing. Leaders agreed on the following common principles for reforming financial markets: strengthening transparency and accountability; enhancing sound regulation; promoting integrity in financial markets; reinforcing international cooperation; and reforming international financial institutions (IFIs). Leaders launched an "Action Plan," which included immediate actions (with a deadline of March 31, 2009) to implement those principles and instructed ministers to develop further specific recommendations to be reviewed by leaders at a subsequent summit. Among others, the Plan included immediate actions to: address weaknesses in accounting and disclosure standards for off-balance-sheet vehicles; ensure that credit-rating agencies meet the highest standards and avoid conflicts of interest, provide greater disclosure to investors, and differentiate ratings for complex products; ensure that firms maintain adequate capital and set out strengthened capital requirements for banks' structured credit and securitization activities; develop enhanced guidance to strengthen banks' risk management practices and ensure that firms develop processes that look at whether they are accumulating too much risk; establish processes whereby national supervisors who oversee globally active financial institutions meet together and share information; and expand the FSF to include a broader membership of emerging economies. The leaders reaffirmed their commitment to free market principles, including the rule of law, respect for private property, open trade and investment, competitive markets and efficient, effectively regulated financial systems.

Summit	Priorities, as per Communiqué
London, April 2009	The “Leaders’ Statement” at the London Summit continued to focus on the management of the financial crisis, but development was brought center stage. Leaders pledged to do whatever is necessary to (1) restore confidence, growth and jobs; (2) repair the financial system to restore lending; (3) strengthen financial regulation to rebuild trust; (4) reform the international financial institutions to overcome the crisis and prevent future ones; (5) promote global trade and investment and reject protectionism, to underpin prosperity; and (6) build an inclusive, green, and sustainable recovery. The Summit announced a $1.1 trillion program to boost the world economy: to treble resources available to the IMF to $750 billion, to support a new SDR allocation of $250 billion, to support at least $100 billion of additional lending by the MDBs, to ensure $250 billion of support for trade finance and to use the additional resources from agreed-on IMF gold sales for concessional finance for the poorest countries. The summit statement was divided into five topics. The first one related to “restoring growth and jobs.” Leaders agreed to undertake an unprecedented and concerted fiscal expansion; to take exceptional actions through central banks; to provide liquidity, recapitalize financial institutions and address the problem of imparted assets; to commit in taking whatever action is necessary to restore growth and jobs; and to refrain from competitive devaluation of currencies and promote a stable and well-functioning international monetary system. The second topic was “strengthening financial supervision and regulation.” Leaders agreed to establish much greater consistency and systematic cooperation between countries and also to establish the framework of internationally agreed-on high standards that a global financial system requires. Leaders issued a “Declaration on the Strengthening of the Financial System.” In particular they agreed to establish a new Financial Stability Board (FSB) with a strengthened mandate including all G-20 countries, FSF members, Spain, and the European Commission; reshape regulatory systems; extend regulation and oversight to all systemically important financial institutions, instruments and markets (i.e., hedge funds); endorse and implement the FSF’s tough new principles on pay and compensation and support sustainable compensation schemes and social responsibility of firms; take action to improve the quality, quantity, and international consistency of capital in the banking system; take action against noncooperative jurisdictions; stand ready to deploy sanctions to protect public finances and financial systems; achieve a single set of high-quality global accounting standards; and extend regulatory oversight and registration to Credit-Rating Agencies. Leaders asked the FSB and the IMF to monitor progress of the aforementioned decisions. The third topic was the “Strengthening of global financial institutions.” Leaders agreed to make available an additional $850 billion of resources through the global financial institutions to support growth in emerging-market and developing countries. To this end they agreed to increase the resources available to the IMF through immediate financing from members of $250 billion, subsequently incorporated into an expanded and more flexible New Arrangements to Borrow (NAB), increased by up to $500 billion. They also supported a substantial increase in lending of at least $100 billion by the MDBs. Leaders agreed to reform and modernize the International Financial Institutions (IFIs) to ensure they can assist members and shareholders effectively in the new challenges they face. The fourth topic was “resisting protectionism and promoting global trade and investment.” Leaders agreed to ensure availability of at least $250 billion over the next two years to support trade finance through export credit and investment agencies and through the MDBs. Finally, the fifth topic referred to “ensuring a fair and sustainable recovery for the world economy.” Among the agreements, leaders reaffirmed their commitment to the Millennium Development Goals and to achieving their respective Overseas Development Aid (ODA) pledges, including commitments on Aid for Trade, debt relief and the Gleneagles commitments, especially to Sub-Saharan Africa. Leaders also agreed to provide $50 billion to support social protection, boost trade and safeguard development in low-income countries. They recognized the human dimension to the crisis and reaffirmed their commitment to address the threat of irreversible climate change.

Summit	Priorities, as per Communiqué
Pittsburgh, September 2009	The G-20 “Leaders Statement” of the Pittsburgh Summit focused principally on G-20 governance, rebalancing of the world economy, international regulatory financial reform, and IFIs reform. There were also pledges on environmental and development goals. The statement designated the G-20 as the “premier forum” for international economic cooperation. Leaders agreed to continue their stimulus until recovery is secured and to start identifying the exit strategies for the G-20 to coordinate efforts to draw on the enormous fiscal, monetary and financial support amassed in response to the crisis. Leaders agreed to launch the new Framework for Strong, Sustainable, and Balanced Growth. This framework combines the commitments of the G-20 members to work together in order to assess how policies fit together, to evaluate whether they are collectively consistent with more sustainable and balanced growth, and to act as necessary to meet common objectives. To put in place this framework leaders agreed to develop a process whereby G-20 members set out their objectives, put forward policies to achieve these objectives and, together, assess progress. Leaders agreed to strengthen the international financial regulatory system, therefore calling on finance ministers to reach agreement on an international framework of reform in the following critical areas: ● Building high-quality capital and mitigating procyclicality: G-20 leaders consented to develop high international standards to improve the quantity and quality of bank capital and to discourage excessive leverage. Leaders committed to adopting the Basel II Capital Framework by 2011. ● Reforming compensation practices to support financial stability: Leaders agreed to strong international standards for compensation aimed at ending practices that lead to excessive risk taking. ● Improving the over-the-counter derivatives markets (OTC): Leaders agreed to improve OTC derivatives markets to make them more transparent. ● Addressing cross-border resolutions and systemically important financial institutions: Leaders agreed to develop procedures for managing the failure of large global financial firms. In each of these areas, the G-20 countries set out strict and precise timetables for reaching international agreement. Leaders decided to modernize the global institutions to reflect today’s Global Economy. The G-20 committed to modernizing the architecture for global economic cooperation. The leaders delivered on their commitment to provide over $500 billion for the IMF’s renewed NAB. They welcomed the reform of the IMF’s lending facilities, including the creation of the innovative Flexible Credit Line. As part of this modernization, they agreed to a shift of at least 5 percent in IMF quota share from overrepresented countries to underrepresented countries, giving dynamic emerging-market and developing economies a say in the IMF. They agreed to an increase of at least 3 percent in the voting power of developing and transition countries at the World Bank and called on a reformed World Bank to play a leading role in responding to challenges that require globally coordinated action (such as climate change and food security). Regarding Energy Security and Climate Change, leaders decided to phase out inefficient fossil fuel subsidies. They also agreed to increase energy market transparency and market stability by publishing complete, accurate and timely data on oil production, consumption, refining and stock levels on a regular basis. The G-20 decided to strengthen support for the most vulnerable citizens. The G-20 made specific commitments to increase access to food, fuel and finance among the world’s poorest. They called on the World Bank to work with interested donors and organizations to develop a multilateral trust fund to scale-up agricultural assistance to low-income countries. Leaders committed to fund programs that expand access to renewable energy. They agreed to launch a G-20 small and medium-sized enterprise finance challenge (a call to the private sector to put forward its best proposals for how public finance can maximize the deployment of private finance on a sustainable and scalable basis). Leaders called for the adoption and enforcement of laws against transnational bribery, such as the OECD Anti-Bribery Convention, and the ratification by the G-20 of the UN Convention against Corruption (UNCAC). G-20 leaders also agreed to put quality jobs at the heart of the recovery. The actions of the G-20 are projected to save or create 7-11 million jobs across their economies by the end of this year. Leaders reiterated their stance against protectionism in all its forms and reaffirmed the importance of an open global economy.

Summit	Priorities, as per Communiqué
Toronto, June 2010	In "The G-20 Toronto Summit Declaration," the group continued its focus on the rebalancing of the world economy, financial sector reform and IFIs reform. In relation to the Framework for Strong, Sustainable, and Balanced Growth, the country leaders completed the first stage of the Mutual Assessment Process and concluded that they could do much better. Leaders agreed to follow through on fiscal stimulus and on communicating "growth friendly" fiscal consolidation plans in advanced countries. They consented to strengthening social safety nets, enhancing corporate governance reform, financial market development, infrastructure spending, and greater exchange rate flexibility in some emerging markets. Leaders decided that the second stage of the mutual assessment process would be conducted at the country and European level and that each G-20 member would identify additional measures in order to achieve strong, sustainable and balanced growth. Regarding "Financial Sector reform," leaders pledged to act together to achieve the commitments to reform the financial sector made at the Washington, London and Pittsburgh Summits. Leaders stated that their reform agenda rested on four pillars: (1) a strong regulatory framework, (2) effective supervision, (3) resolution and addressing systemic institutions, and (4) transparent international assessment and peer review. Concerning the reform of "international financial institutions and development," leaders underscored the decision to ensure ratification of the 2008 IMF Quota and Voice Reforms and expansion of the NAB. They reaffirmed the earlier commitment to open, transparent and merit-based selection processes for the heads and senior leadership of all the IFIs. Leaders developed a set of principles for innovative financial inclusion. Leaders again committed to "fighting protectionism and promoting trade and investment." They called for the ratification and implementation of the UNCAC and reiterated their commitment to a green recovery and to sustainable global growth. Leaders agreed to establish G-20 working groups on corruption and on development.

Summit	Priorities, as per Communiqué
Seoul, November 2010	The "Seoul Summit Document" was particularly oriented on development issues. It also continued focusing on the rebalancing of the world economy, financial sector reforms and IFIs reform. The summit document was structured as follows: (1) Framework for Strong, Sustainable and Balanced Growth, (2) Seoul Action Plan, (3) IFI reforms, (4) financial sector reforms, (5) fighting protectionism and promoting trade and investment, (6) Seoul Development Consensus for Shared Growth, (7) financial inclusion, (8) energy, (9) climate change and green growth, (10) Business Summit and (11) consultation. Leaders launched "the Seoul Action Plan" with the purposes to: ensure an unwavering commitment to cooperation; outline an action-oriented plan with each member's concrete policy commitments; and deliver on all three objectives of strong, sustainable and balanced growth. Leaders agreed to actions in five policy areas (i.e., monetary and exchange rate policies, trade and development policies, fiscal policies, financial reforms. and structural reforms) with details of specific commitments by G-20 members.[26] The G-20 included a commitment to enhance the Mutual Assessment Process to promote external sustainability. Regarding the "IFI reform," the modernization of IMF governance was again on the agenda. Leaders approved the achievements by finance ministers at the Gyeongju meeting, and the subsequent decision by the IMF, on a comprehensive package of IMF quota and governance reforms. The reforms included: shifts in quota shares to dynamic emerging-market and developing countries and to under-represented countries of over 6 percent; doubling of quotas, with a corresponding rollback of the NAB; a comprehensive review of the quota formula; and greater representation for emerging-market and developing countries at the Executive Board and the moving to an all-elected board. In regard to global financial safety nets, leaders asked finance ministers to explore (with input from the IMF) a structured approach to cope with shocks of a systemic nature and ways to improve collaboration between Regional Financing Arrangements and the IMF. As per the "financial sector reforms," leaders endorsed the new rules on the quantity and quality of banking capital, liquidity and leverage of the Basel Committee on Banking Supervision. They agreed to implement these standards within the agreed-on time frame, one consistent with economic recovery and financial stability. Leaders endorsed the policy framework, work processes, and timelines proposed by the FSB to reduce the moral hazard risks posed by systemically important financial institutions (SIFIs). They also guided work on SIFIs and on cross-border resolution regimes and derivatives. Leaders committed to the implementation and international assessment (including peer review) of the new standards and principles in a way that avoids fragmentation of markets, protectionism and regulatory arbitrage. Among others, they also addressed issues related to the commitment to preventing non-cooperative jurisdictions from posing risks to the global financial system. Under the label of the "Seoul Development Consensus for Shared Growth," leaders committed to working in partnership with other developing countries and to helping them build the capacity to achieve and maximize their growth potential, thereby contributing to global rebalancing. Leaders endorsed the "Consensus" and its Multi-Year Action Plan. The Consensus and the Action Plan were based on six core principles defined by the summit. The Consensus identifies nine key pillars where leaders believe actions are necessary to resolve the bottlenecks to inclusive, sustainable and resilient growth in developing countries: infrastructure (including a high-level panel on infrastructure financing), human resource development, trade, private investment and job creation, food security, growth with resilience, financial inclusion, domestic resource mobilization, and knowledge sharing. Regarding "Financial Inclusion," leaders committed to launching the Global Partnership for Financial Inclusion as an inclusive platform for all G-20 countries, interested non-G-20 countries and relevant stakeholders. In relation to "energy," leaders reaffirmed their commitment to phase out inefficient fossil fuel subsidies. They recognized the importance of a well-functioning and transparent market in oil for world economic growth and they supported the Joint Oil Data Initiative. Leaders welcomed the progress achieved by the Global Marine Environment Protection initiative toward the goal of sharing best practices. In connection with "climate change and green growth," leaders reiterated their commitment to take strong and action-oriented measures and to remain fully dedicated to UN climate change negotiations. They committed to supporting country-led green growth policies that promote environmentally sustainable global growth, along with employment creation, while ensuring energy access for the poor. Leaders endorsed "The G-20 Anti-Corruption Action Plan." In the summit, G-20 members also recognized the need to "consult" with the international community. Leaders reached a broad consensus on a set of principles for non-member invitations to Summits.

Summit	Priorities, as per Communiqué
Cannes, 2011	The outcome of the Cannes Summit resulted in the Communiqué and in the Declaration titled "Building our Common Future: Renewed Collective Action for the Benefit of All," along with the Cannes Action Plan for Growth and Jobs. Discussions focused on an Action Plan for Growth and Jobs, reforming the international monetary system, fostering employment, food price volatility, energy markets, environment, development and anticorruption. According to the Communiqué, leaders agreed on an Action Plan for Growth and Jobs to address short-term vulnerabilities and strengthen medium-term foundations for growth. Conforming to the Plan, advanced economies committed to adopting policies to build confidence, support growth, and implement specific measures to achieve fiscal consolidation. Leaders welcomed the decisions by European Leaders in October to restore debt sustainability in Greece, strengthen European banks, build firewalls to avoid contagion, and lay the foundations for robust economic governance reform in the Euro area. As stated in the Plan, countries where public finances remain strong committed to letting automatic stabilizers work and taking discretionary measures to support domestic demand, should economic conditions materially worsen. Countries with large current account surpluses committed to reforms in order to increase domestic demand, coupled with greater exchange rate flexibility. Under the Plan, leaders committed to further structural reforms. Leaders decided to strengthen the social dimension of globalization and agreed to set up a G-20 task force to address youth employment. Leaders committed to a "reform of the international monetary system" in order to make it more representative, stable and resilient. Leaders covered, among others, issues related to SDR basket composition, in order reflect the role of currencies in the global trading, and a more integrated, even-handed and effective IMF surveillance. Leaders continued the discussion on the "reform of the financial sector and the enhancing of market integrity." In particular, leaders decided to develop the regulation and oversight of shadow banking. They committed, among others, to developing further regulation on market integrity and efficiency, including addressing the risks posed by high-frequency trading and dark liquidity. Leaders pledged to strictly monitor the implementation of commitments regarding banks, OTC markets and compensation practices. They agreed to reform the FSB to improve its capacity to coordinate and monitor the financial regulation agenda. This reform included giving it a legal identity and greater financial autonomy. Under the title "addressing commodity price volatility and promoting agriculture," leaders decided to act in the framework of the Action Plan on Food Price Volatility and Agriculture agreed-on by ministers of agriculture in June 2011. They also committed to invest in and support research of agriculture productivity. Under the label "Addressing the Challenges of Development," leaders supported the concrete initiatives mentioned in the Cannes final Declaration, with a view to fostering investments in agriculture and mitigating the impact of price volatility. They supported the recommendations of the High Level Panel for Infrastructure Investment to identify measures to scale up and diversify sources of financing for infrastructure. Other areas of commitment at the Cannes Summit included improving energy markets and pursuing the fight against climate change; avoiding protectionism and strengthening the multilateral trading system; intensifying the fight against corruption and reforming global governance for the 21st century (including formalizing the Troika and pursuing effective engagement with nonmembers).

Summit	Priorities, as per Communiqué
Los Cabos, 2012	The G-20 Leaders Declaration was focused not only on the economic stabilization and the eurozone crisis but also made a specific reference to other areas, including food security and green growth. More specifically, the Declaration was structured in 9 topics: (1) supporting economic stabilization and the global recovery; (2) employment and social protection; (3) trade; (4) strengthening the international financial architecture; (5) reforming the financial sector and fostering financial inclusion; (6) enhancing food security and addressing commodity price volatility; (7) meeting the challenges of development; (8) promoting longer-term prosperity through inclusive green growth; and (9) intensifying the fight against corruption. In relation to the first topic, leaders agreed on the Los Cabos Growth and Jobs Action Plan recognizing that a strong, sustainable and balanced growth remains the top priority of the G-20. Together with the Plan, they agreed on the Los Cabos Accountability Assessment Framework, which established the procedures G-20 members will follow to report on progress in implementing their policy commitments. In connection with the euro crisis, Euro Area members of the G-20 pledged to take all the necessary policy measures to safeguard the integrity and stability of the area, improve the functioning of financial markets and break the feedback loop between sovereigns and banks. Further, Euro Area members committed to foster intra Euro Area adjustment through structural reforms to strengthen competitiveness in deficit countries and to promote demand and growth in surplus countries. G-20 leaders supported the actions of the Euro Area in moving forward with the completion of the Economic and Monetary Union. They also looked forward to the Euro Area working in partnership with the next Greek government. All G-20 members pledged to take the necessary actions to strengthen global growth and restore confidence. G-20 members have put forward structural reform commitments to strengthen and sustain global demand, foster job creation, contribute to global rebalancing and increase growth potential. Under the label “Employment and Social Protection,” leaders endorsed the recommendations of their Labor and Employment Ministers to urgently combat unemployment through appropriate labor market measures and fostering the creation of decent work and quality jobs. In particular, they committed to take concrete actions to overcome the barriers hindering women’s full economic and social participation. In relation to the topic “trade,” leaders committed to open trade and investment, expanding markets and resisting protectionism in all its forms. Under the title “strengthening the international financial architecture,” leaders welcomed the firm commitments to increase the resources available to the IMF. The commitments exceed $450 billion and are in addition to the quota increase under the 2010 Reform. They underscored the importance of rigorous surveillance on exchange rate policies and support a more ample coverage of surveillance activities, including global liquidity, capital flows, capital account measures, reserve, and fiscal, monetary and financial sector policies that could have an impact on external stability. Regarding “reforming the financial sector and fostering financial inclusion,” leaders recognized the substantial progress to date in the priority reform areas identified by the FSB’s Coordination Framework for Implementation Monitoring (CFIM): the Basel capital and liquidity framework; the framework for global systemically important financial institutions (G-SIFIs), resolution regimes, over-the-counter (OTC) derivatives reforms, shadow banking and compensation practices. Leaders called for accelerated progress in ending the mechanicistic reliance on credit ratings. They endorsed the FSB recommendations regarding the framework for development of a global legal entity identifier (LEI) system for parties to financial transactions. Leaders supported the revised FSB Charter for placing the FSB on an enduring organizational footing. They endorsed the renewal of the Financial Action Task Force mandate, thereby sustaining global efforts to combat money laundering and the financing of terrorism and proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. In relation to “enhancing food security and addressing commodity price volatility,” to fight hunger, leaders committed to a variety of initiatives including the Tropical Agriculture Platform, the Platform for Agricultural Risk Management, the GEO Global Agriculture Monitoring, research initiatives for wheat, rice and corn, the Rapid Response Forum, regional emergency food reserves, the Global Agriculture and Food Security Program and support for the Principles of Responsible Agriculture Investment. They welcomed the launch of the “AgResults” Initiative, aimed at improving food security for the poor and vulnerable by encouraging private sector innovation of new agricultural products and systems.

Summit	Priorities, as per Communiqué
Los Cabos, 2012 *continued*	Under the title “meeting the Challenges of Development,” leaders welcomed the initiative of the Development Working Group to build upon the work of previous G-20 presidencies, and its focus on three priorities during the Mexican Presidency—food security, infrastructure and inclusive green growth. They also recognized the value of Disaster Risk Management (DRM) tools and strategies to better prevent disasters, protect populations and assets, and financially manage their economic impacts. On the topic “promoting longer-term prosperity through inclusive green growth,” they committed to continue help developing countries sustain and strengthen their development through appropriate measures, including those that encourage inclusive green growth. Leaders welcomed the creation of the G-20 study group on climate finance and supported the operationalization of the Green Climate Fund. In connection to “intensifying the fight against corruption,” members committed to enforcing anti-corruption legislation and to taking steps to deal with other problems of corruption. Finally, in a section titled “other paragraphs,” leaders highlighted that the informal and flexible character of the G-20 enables it to facilitate international economic and financial cooperation and address the challenges confronting the global economy.

ENDNOTES

The authors acknowledge excellent research assistance provided by Sarah Milsom Puritz and Ana Maria Salamanca.

1. G-20 (2009a).

2. See Press Release 07/72, April 14, 2007, http://www.imf.org/external/np/sec/pr/2007/pr0772.htm.

3. Spain, Iran, Taiwan and Poland are among the largest 20 economies not included in the membership of the G-20. Conversely, the G-20 members of Argentina, Saudi Arabia and South Africa are only the 28th, the 30th, and 32nd largest economies in the world, respectively. The ranking is based on data for gross domestic product at purchasing power parity for the year 2011 from the IMF's World Economic Outlook data set.

4. The countries belonging to the G-22 included Canada, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Russia, the United Kingdom, and the United States, plus Argentina, Australia, Brazil, China, Hong Kong Special Administrative Region (SAR), India, Indonesia, Malaysia, Mexico, Poland, Singapore, South Africa, South Korea and Thailand.

5. The countries belonging to the G-33 included Canada, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Russia, the United Kingdom and the United States, plus Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Chile, China, Côte d'Ivoire, Egypt, Hong Kong SAR, India, Indonesia, Malaysia, Mexico, Morocco, the Netherlands, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, South Africa, South Korea, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand and Turkey.

6. The Working Group on Strengthening Financial Systems report (1998) suggested a "Financial Sector Policy Forum which would meet annually, or semi- annually, to discuss international financial sector stability issues, across functional lines. The forum would consist of representatives of finance ministries, central banks and financial supervisors from interested systemically important industrial and emerging market economies, as well as the IFIs and the international regulatory bodies. The forum could be organized through an existing institution, for example, the BIS."

7. Hans Tietmeyer, the retiring governor of the German Bundesbank, was commissioned to report on international cooperation and coordination in the area of financial market supervision and surveillance.

8. According to Germain (2001), the Willard Group of finance minister deputies was struck after the 1997 Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation forum meeting in Seattle, when the prime minister of Malaysia's call for such a group was picked up by U.S. president Bill Clinton.

9. The countries belonging to the G-20 are Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Canada, China, France, Germany, India, Indonesia, Italy, Japan, Mexico, Russia, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, South Korea, Turkey, the United Kingdom and the United States, plus one regional representative, the European Union.

10. The G-20 is a group of countries that constitute a large part of the world economy and world population, but this is not enough to give it legitimacy as a steering committee for the world economy. A reasonable claim to legitimacy cannot be made for a body of global economic governance when 173 countries are permanently excluded and hence have no voice or influence on deliberations that shape their future. According to Vastergaard (2011), there are several further reasons why the G-20's claim to representational legitimacy is unconvincing: (1) There is only one African member country, South Africa; (2) no low-income countries are included; and (3) not one single "small, open economy" is present in the membership.

11. "Political and geographical representation are supposedly provided by the presence at the table of the political leaders from the largest economies, with a correction in favor of emerging economies—this is, after all, the distinguishing trait of the G-20 relative to the G-7. At the same time, efficiency of debate and decision-making requires the number of seats at the table to be limited; the presence of 20 members (19 countries plus the European Union, not counting invited members and international organizations) has proved to be on the high side of manageability" (Angeloni and Pisani-Ferry 2011).

12. Group One (2001, 2006, etc.) includes Australia, Canada, Saudi Arabia and the United States. Group Two (2002, 2007, etc.) includes India, Russia, South Africa and Turkey. Group Three (2003, 2008, etc.) consists of Argentina, Brazil and Mexico. Group Four (2004, 2009, etc.) consists of France, Germany, Italy and the United Kingdom. Group Five (2005, 2010, etc.) consists of China, Indonesia, Japan and South Korea.

13. The Monterrey Consensus was the result of a U.N. conference held in March 2000 in Mexico on Financing for Development. The Consensus covered a range of subjects, including the mobilization of international and domestic financial resources, debt relief, corruption and policy coherence (G-20 2008d).

14. The role of Canada is notable also in analytical terms. Canadian think tanks and research institutions—namely, the Centre for International Governance Innovation and the Victoria University Centre for Global Studies—have examined in detail the ramifications of the transformation of the G-20 to leaders' level (Jokela 2011). Bradford and Linn (2007) from the Brookings Institution also pushed for a leaders' summit.

15. See Schulz (2011).

16. IMF (2010a).

17. See G-20 (2010a) and IMF (2010b).

18. The G-20 members agreed that "the Financial Stability Forum should be expanded, given a broadened mandate to promote financial stability, and re-established with a stronger institutional basis and enhanced capacity as the Financial Stability Board." See G-20 (2009b, annex 1).

19. At the request of G-20 leaders, finance ministers and central bank governors, the FSB prepares specialist reports on various themes. In so doing, the FSB acts as an implementation and monitoring body whose agenda is set by the G-20 in line with the pursuit of global financial stability. See Lombardi (2011a).

20. See "IMF Managing Director Christine Lagarde Welcomes Pledges by Members to Increase Fund Resources by Over US$430 billion," Press Release 12/147, http://www.imf.org/external/np/sec/pr/2012/pr12147.htm.

21. See King (2010) and Lombardi (2009), among others.

22. South Sudan, which has just joined the IMF, is not included in this count.

23. In their study of IMF constituencies, Woods and Lombardi (2006) found that the Nordic-Baltic constituency regularly consults and solicits input, views and comments from its constituent members, thus leading on best practices as far as intraconstituency accountability is concerned.

24. Although executive directors cannot split their vote, council members would be allowed to do so.

25. The 2010 Resolution No. 66-2 of the Board of Governors states that the composition of the Executive Board will be reassessed every eight years following ratification of the resolution itself. The latter, initially expected to be ratified by the IMF membership in the fall of 2012, should be approved in 2013, following the U.S. presidential elections.

26. See "Policy Commitments by G-20 Members," http://www.G-20.utoronto.ca/summits/2010seoul.html.

REFERENCES

Angeloni, Ignazio, and Jean Pisani-Ferry. 2011. "Wanted: A Stronger and Better G-20 for the Global Economy." Think Tank 20: Beyond Macroeconomic Policy Coordination Discussions in the G-20. Available at http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/Files/rc/reports/2011/11_think_tank_20/11_think_tank_20.pdf.

———. 2012. "The G-20: characters in search of an author." http://www.bruegel.org/publications/publication-detail/publication/714-the-G-20-characters-in-search-of-an-author/.

Baker, Andrew. 2006. *The Group of Seven: Finance Ministries, Central Banks and Global Finance Governance*. London: Routledge.

———. 2008. "The Group of Seven." *New Political Economy* 13, no. 1: 103–15.

Beeson, Mark, and Stephen Bell. 2009. "G-20 and International Economic Governance: Hegemony, Collectivism, or Both?" http://uwa.academia.edu/MarkBeeson/Papers/536999/G-20_and_International_Economic_Governance_Hegemony_Collectivism_or_Both.

Birdsall, Nancy, and Homi Kharas. 2012. "The G-20 and Development." *Journal of Globalization and Development* 2, no. 2, article 12.

Boughton, James. 2001. *Silent Revolution: The International Monetary Fund 1979–1989.* Washington: International Monetary Fund.

Bradford, Colin, and Johannes Linn. 2007. *Global Governance Reform: Breaking the Stalemate*. Washington: Brookings Institution Press.

———. 2012. "A History of G-20 Summits: The Evolving Dynamic of Global Leadership." *Journal of Globalization and Development* 2, no. 2, article 8.

Brazil, Government of. 2008. "Global Financial Governance: Brazilian Proposal to the G-20 Leaders Meeting on Financial Markets and Global Economy." Washington, November 15. http://www.G-20.utoronto.ca/2008/2008proposals.html.

Calderon, Felipe. "Press Statement by President Felipe Calderón to Mark the End of the G-20 Summit." Los Cabos, Baja California Sur, June 19, 2012. Available at http://www.G-20mexico.org/.

Canada, Department of Finance of. 1999a. "Communiqué of the Finance Ministers and Central Bank Governors Meeting, Berlin, December 15–16." http://www.G-20.utoronto.ca/1999/1999communique.htm.

———. 1999b. "Finance Minister Paul Martin Chosen as Inaugural Chairperson of New Group of Twenty." http://www.G-8.utoronto.ca/finance/fm992509.htm.

Committee on IMF Governance Reform. 2009. "Final Report March 24, 2009." http://www.imf.org/external/np/omd/2009/govref/032409.pdf.

Culpeper, Roy. 2000. "Systemic Reform at a Standstill: A Flock Of 'Gs' in Search of Global Financial Stability." http://www.G-8.utoronto.ca/scholar/culpeper2000/index.html.

De Brouwer, Gordon. 2005. "Institutions to Promote Financial Stability: Reflections on East Asia and an Asian Monetary Fund." http://www.adbi.org/conf-seminar-papers/2005/12/19/1619.financial.stability.eastasia/.

Geraets, Dylan, and Jan Wouters. 2012. *The G-20 and Informal International Lawmaking*. Working Paper 86. Leuven: Leuven Centre for Global Governance Studies. http://ghum.kuleuven.be/ggs/publications/working_papers/new_series/wp81-90/wp86.pdf.

Germain, Randall D. 2001. "Reforming the International Financial Architecture: The New Political Agenda." Paper presented at International Studies Association, Chicago, February 20–24.

G-7 (Group of Seven). 1999. “Report of G-7 Finance Ministers to the Koln Economic Summit, Cologne, June 18–20.” http://www.G-8.utoronto.ca/finance/fm992509state.htm.

G-20 (Group of Twenty). 2000. “Communiqué of the G-20 Finance Ministers’ and Central Bank Governors’ Meeting, Montreal, October 24–25.” http://www.G-20.utoronto.ca/ministerials.html.

———. 2001. “Communiqué of the G-20 Finance Ministers’ and Central Bank Governors’ Meeting, Ottawa, November 16–17.” http://www.G-20.utoronto.ca/ministerials.html.

———. 2002. “Communiqué of the G-20 Finance Ministers’ and Central Bank Governors’ Meeting, Delhi, November 23.” http://www.G-20.utoronto.ca/ministerials.html.

———. 2003. “Communiqué of the G-20 Finance Ministers’ and Central Bank Governors’ Meeting, Morelia, Mexico, October 26–27.” http://www.G-20.utoronto.ca/ministerials.html.

———. 2005a. “Communiqué of the Finance Ministers’ and Central Bank Governors’ Meeting, Xianghe, Hebei, China, October 15–16.” http://www.G-20.utoronto.ca/ministerials.html.

———. 2005b. “The G-20 Statement on Reforming the Bretton Woods Institutions, Xianghe, Hebei, China, October 15–16. http://www.G-20.utoronto.ca/ministerials.html.

———. 2006a. “Communiqué of the Finance Ministers’ and Central Bank Governors’ Meeting, Melbourne, November 18–19.” http://www.G-20.utoronto.ca/ministerials.html.

———. 2006b. “G-20 Work Programme for 2006: Building and Sustaining Prosperity, Melbourne, November 19.” http://www.G-20.utoronto.ca/ministerials.html.

———. 2007. “G-20 Work Programme for 2007: Sharing-Influence, Responsibility, Knowledge, South Africa, January 8.” http://www.G-20.utoronto.ca/ministerials.html.

———. 2008a. “Agenda for the G-20 Finance Ministers’ and Central Bank Governors’ Meeting, São Paulo, November 7.” http://www.G-20.utoronto.ca/ministerials.html.

———. 2008b. “Communiqué of the Meeting of Finance Ministers and Central Bank Governors, São Paulo, November 8–9.” http://www.G-20.utoronto.ca/ministerials.html.

———. 2008c. “Declaration of the Summit on Financial Markets and the World Economy, Washington, November 15.” http://www.G-20.utoronto.ca/2008/2008declaration1115.html.

———. 2008d. “The Group of Twenty: A History.” http://www.G-20.utoronto.ca/docs/G-20history.pdf.

———. 2009a. “G-20 Leaders Statement: The Pittsburgh Summit, September 24–25.” http://www.G-20.utoronto.ca/2009/2009communique0925.html.

———. 2009b. “London Summit: Leaders’ Statement, April 2.” http://www.G-20.utoronto.ca/summits/2009london.html.

———. 2010a. “The G-20 Seoul Summit Leaders’ Declaration, November 11–12.” http://www.G-20.utoronto.ca/summits/2010seoul.html.

———. 2010b. “The Toronto Summit Declaration, Toronto, June 27, 2010.” http://www.G-20.utoronto.ca/2010/to-communique.html.

———. 2011a. “Cannes Summit Final Declaration: Building Our Common Future: Renewed Collective Action for the Benefit of All, Cannes, November 4.” http://www.G-20.utoronto.ca/2011/2011-cannes-declaration-111104-en.html.

———. 2011b. “Communiqué: G-20 Leaders Summit, Cannes, November 4.” http://www.G-20.utoronto.ca/2011/2011-cannes-communique-111104-en.html.

———. 2012a. “What Is the G-20?” Available at http://www.G-20.org.

———. 2012b. "G-20 Leaders Declaration Los Cabos, Mexico, June 19, 2012." http://www.G-20.utoronto.ca/2012/2012-0619-loscabos.html

G-20 France. 2011a. "The Cannes Summit: What Outcomes?" http://www.G-20.utoronto.ca/summits/2011cannes.html.

———. 2011b. "Priorities of the French Presidency of the G-20 in 2011." Press Committee on IMF Governance Reform. 2009. Final Report, Chaired by Trevor Manuel, March 24." http://www.imf.org/external/np/omd/2009/govref/032409.pdf.

G-20 Mexico. 2012a. "Mexican Presidency of the G-20." http://www.G-20.org/en/mexican-presidency-of-the-G-20.

———. 2012b. Discussion Paper Mexico's Presidency of the G-20-January 2012. Available at http://www.G-20.utoronto.ca/summits/2012loscabos.html.

Helleiner, Eric. 2012. "The Limits of Incrementalism: The G-20, the FSB, and the International Regulatory Agenda." *Journal of Globalization and Development* 2, no. 2, article 11.

IMF (International Monetary Fund). 2010a. "G-20 Ministers Agree 'Historic' Reforms in IMF Governance" *IMF Survey Magazine*, October 23. http://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/survey/so/2010/new102310a.htm.

———. 2010b. "IMF Executive Board Approves Major Overhaul of Quotas and Governance." Press Release 10/418, November 5. International Monetary Fund, Washington.

IEO (Independent Evaluation Office). 2008. "Governance of the IMF—An Evaluation." Washington: International Monetary Fund.

Jokela, Juha. 2011. "The G-20: A Pathway to Effective Multilateralism?" http://www.iss.europa.eu/uploads/media/The_G-20_-_a_pathway_to_effective_multilateralism.pdf.

Kharas, Homi. 2011. "Bringing Development into the G-20." In *Global Leadership in Transition*, edited by Colin I. Bradford and Wonhyuk Lim. Washington: Brookings Institution Press.

King. Mervyn. 2010. Speech at University of Exeter on January 19. Bank of England, London.

Kirton, John. 1999. "What Is the G-20?" November 30. Available at http://www.G-20.utoronto.ca/.

———. 2000. "The G-20: Representativeness, Effectiveness, and Leadership in Global Governance." In *Guiding Global Order: G-8 Governance in the Twenty-First Century*, edited by John Kirton, Joseph Daniels, P. Freytag, and Andreas Ashgate. Aldershot: Ashgate.

———. 2004. "Toward Multilateral Reform: The G-20's Contribution." In *Reforming Multilateral Institutions from the Top: A Leaders' 20 Summit*, edited by John English, Ramesh Thakur and Andrew F. Cooper. Tokyo: United Nations University Press.

———. 2005. "From G-7 to G-20: Capacity, Leadership and Normative Diffusion in Global Financial Governance." www.G-8.utoronto.ca/scholar/kirton2005/kirton_isa2005.pdf.

———. 2011. "G-20 Development Governance, 1999–2011: Involvement, Innovation, Institutionalization, Impact." Keynote address delivered at a knowledge-sharing conference on "The Global Development Agenda after the Great Recession of 2008–9: Revisiting the Seoul Development Consensus," International Labor Organization, Geneva, November 21. Version of December 3, 2011.

Kirton, John, and Kulik, Julia. 2012a. "Delivering a Double Dividend: Prospects for the G-20 at the Los Cabos Summit." Paper presented at a conference on "Strengthening Sustainable Development by Bringing Business In: From Los Cabos G-20 to Rio Plus 20," sponsored by the Global Institute for Sustainability, Tecnológico de Monterrey, and the Global Governance Program, Trinity College, University of Toronto. Version of June 11, 2012. Available at http://www.G-20.utoronto.ca/biblio/index.html.

———. 2012b. "A Summit of Significant Success: G-20 Los Cabos Leaders Deliver the Desired Double Dividend." June 19, 2012 14:00 MDT. Available at http://www.G-20.utoronto.ca/analysis/120619-kirton-success.html.

Lombardi, Domenico. 2009. *Report on the Civil Society (Fourth Pillar) Consultations with the International Monetary Fund on Reform of IMF Governance*. Washington: International Monetary Fund.

———. 2011a. *The Governance of the Financial Stability Board*. Washington: Brookings Institution.

———. 2011b. "The International Monetary System through the Lens of Emerging Asia." In *Asia and Policymaking for the Global Economy*, edited by Kemal Dervis, Masahiro Kawai, and Domenico Lombardi. Washington: Brookings Institution Press and Asian Development Bank Institute.

Martinez-Diaz, Leonardo. 2007. *The G-20 after Eight Years: How Effective a Vehicle for Developing-Country Influence?* Working Paper 12. Washington: Brookings Institution.

Mistral, Jacques. 2012. "The G-20 and the Reform of the International Monetary System." *Journal of Globalization and Development* 2, no. 2, article 13.

Myung-bak, Lee. 2010. "Seoul G-20 Summit: Priorities and Challenges," Davos Forum Special Address, Davos, January 28. http://www.G-20.utoronto.ca/2010/lee-davos.pdf.

Nelson, Rebecca. 2012. *The G-20 and International Economic Cooperation: Background and Implications for Congress*. Congress Research Service Report. Washington: Library of Congress.

Ocampo, Jose Antonio, and Joseph E. Stiglitz. 2012. "From the G-20 to a Global Economic Coordination Council." *Journal of Globalization and Development* 2, no. 2.

Perino, Dana. 2008. Quoted in the story "White House to Host Summit on World Economy Nov. 15." *Washington Post*, October 22.

Schulz, Nils-Sjard. 2011. *The G-20: Driving Development Behind Closed Doors*. Policy Brief 107. Madrid: FRIDE. http://www.fride.org/publication/966/the-G-20--driving-development-behind-closed-doors..

Smith, Gordon. 2011. *G-7 to G-8: Evolution in Global Governance*. CIGI G-20 Paper No. 6. Waterloo, Ont.: Centre for International Governance Innovation. kms1.isn.ethz.ch/serviceengine/Files/ISN/...c6f1.../G-20No6.pdf.

Stiglitz, Joseph. 2009. Report by the Commission of Experts of the President of the UN General Assembly on Reforms of the International Monetary and Financial System. New York, NY: The United Nations. http://www.un.org/ga/president/63/commission/financial_commission.shtml.

Suominen, Kati, and Uri Dadush. 2012. "Is There Life for the G-20 beyond the Global Financial Crisis?" *Journal of Globalization and Development* 2, no. 2, article 7.

Vestergaard, Jakob. 2011. "The G-20 and Beyond: Towards Effective Global Governance." DIIS Report. www.diis.dk/.../reports2011/rp2011-04-G-20-and-beyond_web.pdf.

Vestergaard, Jakob, and Robert Wade. 2011. "The G-20 Has Served its Purpose and Should Be Replaced." *Journal of Globalization and Development* 2, no. 2, article 10.

Woods, Ngaire. 2011. "The Impact of the G-20 on Global Governance: A History and Prospective." In *Global Leadership in Transition: Making the G-20 More Effective and Responsive*, edited by Colin I. Bradford and Wonhyuk Lim. Washington: Brookings Institution Press and Korean Development Institute.

Woods, Ngaire, and Domenico Lombardi. 2006. "Uneven Patterns of Governance: How Developing Countries Are Represented in the IMF." *Review of International Political Economy* 13, no. 3: 480–515.

Working Group on Strengthening Financial Systems. 1998. "Report of the Working Group on Strengthening Financial Systems." http://www.imf.org/external/np/G-22/index.htm.

BROOKINGS

1775 Massachusetts Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20036
202.797.6000
www.brookings.edu/global