



UNIVERSITY OF
TORONTO

MUNK
SCHOOL
OF
GLOBAL
AFFAIRS

Join the Global Conversation

The
G20 Research Group
at Trinity College at the Munk School of Global Affairs in the University of Toronto
presents the

2015 G20 Antalya Summit Interim Compliance Report: Part 1

16 November 2015 to 5 April 2016

Prepared by
Sarah Scott, Alissa Wang and the G20 Research Group,
Toronto

17 July 2016
www.g20.utoronto.ca
g20@utoronto.ca

“The University of Toronto ... produced a detailed analysis to the extent of which each G20 country has met its commitments since the last summit ... I think this is important; we come to these summits, we make these commitments, we say we are going to do these things and it is important that there is an organisation that checks up on who has done what.”

— *David Cameron, Prime Minister, United Kingdom, at the 2012 Los Cabos Summit*

Contents

Preface.....	3
Research Team Based at the University of Toronto	4
Introduction and Summary	5
Methodology and Scoring System	5
Commitment Breakdown	5
Selection of Commitments.....	5
Interim Compliance Scores	6
Interim Compliance by Member.....	6
Interim Compliance by Commitment.....	6
Table 1: 2015 G20 Antalya Summit Commitments Selected for Compliance Monitoring	7
Table 2: 2015 G20 Antalya Summit Interim Compliance Scores.....	8
Table 3: 2015 G20 Antalya Summit Interim Compliance by Country	9
Table 4: 2015 G20 Antalya Summit Interim Compliance by Commitment	9
Table 5: G20 Compliance by Member, 2008-2015	10
Conclusions	11
Future Research and Reports.....	11
Considerations and Limitations.....	11
Appendix: General Considerations	12
1. Energy: Fossil Fuel Subsidies	13
2. Refugees	38
3. Macroeconomics: Fiscal Policies	65
4. Macroeconomics: International Monetary Fund.....	93
5. Trade: Protectionism	110
6. Financial Regulation: Terrorist Finance.....	131
7. Development: Aid for Trade.....	152
8. Development: Remittances.....	179
9. Development: Tax.....	196
10. Labour and Employment: Gender	213

Preface

Since the G20 leaders met at their first summit in 2008 in Washington, the G20 Research Group at the University of Toronto and the Center for International Institutions Research of the Russian Presidential Academy of National Economy and Public Administration (RANEPA), formerly with the International Organizations Research Institute at the National Research University Higher School of Economics (HSE), in Moscow have produced reports on their progress in implementing the priority commitments made at each summit. These reports monitor each G20 member's efforts to implement a carefully chosen selection of the many commitments produced at each summit. The reports are offered to the general public and to policy makers, academics, civil society, the media and interested citizens around the world in an effort to make the work of the G20 more transparent, accessible and effective, and to provide scientific data to enable the meaningful analysis of the causes of compliance and the impact of this important informal international institution. Previous reports are available at the G20 Information Centre at <http://www.g20.utoronto.ca/analysis>.

The G20 Research Group has been working with Marina Larionova's team at RANEPA and previously at HSE since initiating this G20 compliance research in 2009, after the Washington Summit in November 2008. The initial report, covering only one commitment made at that summit, tested the compliance methodology developed by the G8 Research Group and adapted it to the G20. This current report contains the first of two parts, and has been conducted by the G20 Research Group's team based at the University of Toronto.

To make its assessments, the G20 Research Group relies on publicly available information, documentation and media reports. To ensure accuracy, comprehensiveness and integrity, we encourage comments from stakeholders. Indeed, scores can be recalibrated if new material becomes available. All feedback remains anonymous. Responsibility for the contents of this report lies exclusively with the authors and analysts of the G20 Research Group.

This interim report assesses performance by G20 members with 10 priority commitments among the total of 113 commitments made at the 2015 Antalya Summit, held on 15-16 November 2015. It covers compliant behaviour between 16 November 2015 to 5 April 2016. The final report, will be released on the eve of the 2016 Hangzhou Summit.

I am most grateful to Sarah Scott and our G20 Research Group team, as well as Marina Larionova and her team in Moscow at RANEPA.

Professor John Kirton
Co-director, G20 Research Group

Research Team Based at the University of Toronto

Professor John Kirton, Co-director, G20 Research Group
Sarah Scott, Chair, Summit Studies
Alissa Wang, Editor in Chief
Cindy Ou, Compliance Director
Derakhshan Qurban-Ali, Compliance Director
Phil Gazaleh, Compliance Director
Daniel Park, Compliance Director
Matt Gumley, Compliance Director
Emma Best, Compliance Director
Monica Layarda, Compliance Director

Lead Analysts

Alessandra Harkness	Helene Emorine	Ujwal Ganguly
Andrew Liu	Mridvika Sahajpal	Yashwinie Shivanand
Carol Drumm	Natalia Valencia Caquimbo	
Grace Lee	Sophie Barnett	

Analysts

Adrian DiTommaso	Jinhui Jiao	Nadine Abdel Razek
Alejandra Bellatin	Jinnan Li	Nidhi Varma
Alessandra Jenkins	Jiyoon Han	Novera Khan
Alison Dillman	Jose Isla	Olivier X. Li
Anah Mirza	Joud Hadi	Omar Bitar
Andrew Aulthouse	Joy Lizette Aguilar	Philip Basaric
Angela Hou	Julia Tops	Qasim Sheikh
Anju Xing	Jwjini Wong	Rebecca Dickey
Anna Roach	Kabir Bhatia	Reema Gill
Arthur Lui	Katrina Y.K. Li	Richard Turcsanyi
Aylin Manduric	Kaylee Mak	Rinchen-Dolma Karma
Bojana Radan	Kertia Johnson	Rochelle D'souza
Bushra Ebadi	Keshini Mahesan	Rodrigo Noorani
Cindy Ou	Kyle Van Hooren	Ron Shnaidstein
Coral Cripps	Laila Kanji	Sarah Bear
Daniel Bodirsky	Larissa Parker	Shruti Anandan
Daniel Valls	Lauren Dalgliesh	Sonja Dobson
Doris Li	Lucinda Yae-Rim Ro	Sonu Arora
Eileen (Yijia) Liu	Maria Alexiou	Sunny Jang
Elena Lifshits Carrera	Maria Zelenova	Sydney Anderson
Emile Lavergne	Mariam Jammal,	Tatiana Ferrara
Emilia Lochowska	Mariya-Kvitlana Tsap	Tanzim Rashid
Emily Nickel	Mathieu Sitayai	Thomas Kariunas
Emily Shaw	Michael Switzer	Tina Vulevic
Fatima Saya	Michael Warchol	Trinh Theresa Do
George Mason	Mike Cowan	Yalda Mehran
Germán Andres Guberman	Miranda Bocci	Yolanda Clatworthy
Diaz	Mojann Zibapour	Zachary Skeith
Hivda Ates	Motahareh Nabavi Niaki	Zineb Drissi
Jennifer Kou	Mustafa Sayed	
Jiayang Shan	Nabiha Chowdhury	

Introduction and Summary

The G20 2015 Antalya Interim Compliance Report: Part I, prepared by the G20 Research Group based at the University of Toronto, analyzes compliance by G20 members with a selection of 10 priority commitments of a total of 113 commitments made at the Antalya Summit on 15-16 November 2015. The report covers compliance-relevant actions taken by the G20 members between 16 November 2015 to 5 April 2016. This timeframe allows for an assessment of compliance part way between the 2015 Antalya Summit and the Hangzhou Summit, which will be hosted by China on 4-5 September 2016.

Methodology and Scoring System

This report draws on the methodology developed by the G8 Research Group, which has been monitoring G7/8 compliance since 1996 (IORI HSE joined this multiyear project in 2005, and Bond University participated in 2014). The use of this methodology builds cross-institutional and cross-member consistency and also allows compatibility with compliance assessments of other institutions.

The methodology uses a scale from -1 to +1, where +1 indicates full compliance with the stated commitment, -1 indicates a failure to comply or action taken that is directly opposite to the stated instruments or goal of the commitment, and 0 indicates partial compliance or work in progress, such as initiatives that have been launched but are not yet near completion and whose full results can therefore not be assessed. Each member assessed receives a score of -1, 0 or +1 for each commitment. For convenience, the scores in the tables have been converted to percentages, where -1 equals 0% and +1 equals 100%.¹

A failing compliance score does not necessarily imply an unwillingness to comply on the part of G20 members. In some cases policy actions can take multiple compliance cycles to implement and measure. As the G20 Research Group and IORI HSE continue to monitor developments in this issue area, progress made by members can be recorded in future compliance reports.

The Compliance Coding Manual that describes the methodology in detail is available on the G20 Information Centre website at <http://www.g20.utoronto.ca/analysis/index.html#method>.

Commitment Breakdown

The G20 made a total of 113 commitments at the Antalya Summit.² These commitments, as identified by the G20 Research Group and HSE, are drawn from the official G20 Leaders' Communiqué and the Statement on the Fight Against Terrorism.

Selection of Commitments

For each compliance cycle (that is, the period between summits), the research team selects commitments that reflect the breadth of the G20 agenda and also reflect the priorities of the summit's host, while balancing the selection to allow for comparison with past and future summits, following the methodology developed by the G8 Research Group.³ The selection also replicates the breakdown of issue areas and the proportion of commitments in each one. Primary criteria for priority commitment selection are the comprehensiveness and relevance to the summit, the G20 and the world, as well as individual and collective pledges. Selected commitments must also meet secondary criteria of performance measurability and ability to comply to some degree within a year,

¹ The formula to convert a score into a percentage is $P=50 \times (S+1)$, where P is the percentage and S is the score.

² A commitment is defined as a discrete, specific, publicly expressed, collectively agreed statement of intent — a politically binding promise by summit members that they will undertake future action, often to move toward, meet or adjust to an identified target. More details are contained in the Reference Manual for Summit Commitment and Compliance Coding (available at <http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/evaluations/index.html#manual>).

³ Guidelines for choosing priority commitments, as well as other applicable considerations, are available in the Reference Manual for Summit Commitment and Compliance Coding.

as well as tertiary criteria of significance as identified by scientific teams and relevant stakeholders in the host country.

For the 2015 G20 Antalya Interim Compliance Report: Part I, 10 priority commitments were selected for assessment by the University of Toronto team from the 113 commitments made at the Antalya Summit (see Table 1).

Interim Compliance Scores

The assessment is based on relevant, publicly available information relating to action taken from 16 November 2015 to 5 April 2016. The interim compliance scores by commitment are contained in Table 2. Country rankings are listed in Table 3 and commitment rankings are listed in Table 4.

For the period from 16 November 2015 to 5 April 2016, G20 members achieved an average interim compliance score of +0.25, which translates to 63%.

Interim Compliance by Member

For interim compliance with the Antalya Summit's priority commitments, the United States has the highest rate of compliance at +0.80 (90%), followed by Australia, Germany and Italy tied at +0.60 (80%) and Canada and China at +0.50 (75%). The lowest scoring member is Brazil at -0.30 (35%). The difference between the highest and lowest G20 member compliance scores is +1.00. For more information about compliance by G20 members, see Table 3.

Interim Compliance by Commitment

This particular compliance cycle produced a high level of interim compliance for a few issue areas: aid for trade, tax administration, and labour and employment tied for first place at +0.60 (80%). They were followed by reform of the International Monetary Fund at +0.55 (78%) and financial regulation and antiprotectionism tied at +0.40 (70%) The lowest score was on fossil fuels subsidies at -0.55 (23%). For more information on scoring by commitment, see Table 4.

Table 1: 2015 G20 Antalya Summit Commitments Selected for Compliance Monitoring

1	Energy: Fossil Fuel Subsidies	“We reaffirm our commitment to rationalise and phase-out inefficient fossil fuel subsidies that encourage wasteful consumption, over the medium term, recognising the need to support the poor.” (G20 Antalya Leaders’ Communiqué)
2	Refugees	“We commit to continue further strengthening our support for all efforts to provide protection [for the unprecedented numbers of refugees and internally displaced persons in various parts of the world]” (G20 Antalya Leaders’ Communiqué)
3	Macroeconomics: Fiscal Policies	“We reiterate our commitment to implement fiscal policies flexibly to take into account near-term economic conditions, so as to support growth and job creation, while putting debt as a share of GDP on a sustainable path.” (G20 Antalya Leaders’ Communiqué)
4	Macroeconomics: International Monetary Fund	“We reaffirm our commitment to maintaining a strong, quota-based and adequately resourced IMF.” (G20 Antalya Leaders’ Communiqué)
5	Trade: Protectionism	“We further reaffirm our longstanding commitment to standstill and rollback on protectionist measures” (G20 Antalya Leaders’ Communiqué)
6	Financial Regulation: Terrorist Finance	“We will continue to implement relevant FATF recommendations and instruments.” (G20 Antalya Leaders’ Communiqué)
7	Development: Aid for Trade	“We emphasize the important role of trade in global development efforts and will continue to support mechanisms such as Aid for Trade in developing countries in need of capacity building assistance.” (G20 Antalya Leaders’ Communiqué)
8	Development: Remittances	“Our G20 National Remittance Plans developed this year include concrete actions towards our commitment to reduce the global average cost of transferring remittances to five per cent with a view to align with the SDGs and Addis Ababa Action Agenda.” (G20 Antalya Leaders’ Communiqué)
9	Development: Tax	“We support the efforts for strengthening developing economies’ engagement in the international tax agenda.” (G20 Antalya Leaders’ Communiqué)
10	Labour and Employment: Gender	“We will continue monitoring the implementation of our Employment Plans as well as our goals to reduce gender participation gap.” (G20 Antalya Leaders’ Communiqué)

Table 2: 2015 G20 Antalya Summit Interim Compliance Scores

	Argentina	Australia	Brazil	Canada	China	France	Germany	India	Indonesia	Italy	Japan	Korea	Mexico	Russia	Saudi Arabia	South Africa	Turkey	United Kingdom	United States	European Union	Average	
1 Energy: Fossil Fuel Subsidies	-1	-1	-1	-1	0	0	0	+1	-1	0	-1	-1	-1	-1	0	-1	-1	-1	+1	-1	-0.55	23%
2 Refugees	0	0	0	+1	0	+1	+1	-1	-1	0	0	0	0	-1	0	-1	+1	+1	+1	0	+0.10	55%
3 Macroeconomics: Fiscal Policies	0	+1	+1	0	0	0	+1	0	0	+1	0	0	0	0	0	+1	0	0	0	0	+0.25	63%
4 Macroeconomics: IMF	0	+1	-1	+1	+1	0	+1	+1	0	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	0	0	0	0	+1	+1	+0.55	78%
5 Trade: Protectionism	0	+1	0	+1	+1	0	0	0	+1	0	+1	0	+1	-1	+1	0	0	+1	+1	0	+0.40	70%
6 Financial Regulation: Terrorist Finance	+1	0	-1	+1	0	+1	+1	0	0	+1	-1	0	0	+1	0	0	+1	+1	+1	+1	+0.40	70%
7 Development: Aid for Trade	+1	+1	0	+1	+1	0	+1	0	0	+1	+1	0	-1	+1	+1	0	+1	+1	+1	+1	+0.60	80%
8 Development: Remittances	-1	+1	-1	-1	0	-1	-1	0	0	0	-1	0	-1	-1	-1	0	-1	0	0	0	-0.45	28%
9 Development: Tax Administration	0	+1	0	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	0	+1	0	0	0	0	0	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+0.60	80%
10 Labour and Employment: Gender	0	+1	0	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	-1	-1	0	+1	+1	0	+1	+1	+0.60	80%
Average	0	+0.60	-0.30	+0.50	+0.50	+0.30	+0.60	+0.30	0	+0.60	+0.10	0.10	-0.20	-0.20	+0.10	+0.10	+0.30	+0.40	+0.80	+0.40	+0.25	63%
	50%	80%	35%	75%	75%	65%	80%	65%	50%	80%	55%	55%	40%	40%	55%	55%	65%	70%	90%	70%	+0.63	

Table 3: 2015 G20 Antalya Summit Interim Compliance by Country

Rank	Member	Average	
1	United States	+0.80	90%
2	Australia	+0.60	80%
	Germany	+0.60	80%
	Italy	+0.60	80%
5	Canada	+0.50	75%
	China	+0.50	75%
7	United Kingdom	+0.40	70%
	European Union	+0.40	70%
9	France	+0.30	65%
	India	+0.30	65%
	Turkey	+0.30	65%
12	Japan	+0.10	55%
	Saudi Arabia	+0.10	55%
	South Africa	+0.10	55%
	Korea	+0.10	55%
16	Argentina	0	50%
	Indonesia	0	50%
18	Mexico	-0.20	40%
	Russia	-0.20	40%
20	Brazil	-0.30	35%

Table 4: 2015 G20 Antalya Summit Interim Compliance by Commitment

Rank	Commitment	Average	
1	Development: Aid for Trade	+0.60	80%
	Development: Tax Administration	+0.60	80%
	Labour and Employment: Gender	+0.60	80%
4	Macroeconomics: International Monetary Fund	+0.55	78%
5	Trade: Protectionism	+0.40	70%
	Financial Regulation: Terrorist Finance	+0.40	70%
7	Macroeconomics: Fiscal Policies	+0.25	63%
8	Refugees	+0.10	55%
9	Development: Remittances	-0.45	28%
10	Energy: Fossil Fuel Subsidies	-0.55	23%

Table 5: G20 Compliance by Member, 2008-2015

Member	Final		Final		Final		Final		Final		Final		Interim		Final		Interim		Final		Interim			
	Washington 2008		London 2009		Pittsburgh 2009		Toronto 2010		Seoul 2010		Cannes 2011		Los Cabos 2012		St. Petersburg 2013		St. Petersburg 2013		Brisbane 2014		Brisbane 2014		Antalya 2015	
Argentina	0	50%	-0.60	20%	-0.13	44%	0	50%	-0.08	46%	0	50%	+0.31	66%	+0.06	53%	+0.06	53%	-0.12	44%	+0.06	53%	0	50%
Australia	n/a	–	+0.60	80%	+0.50	75%	+0.56	78%	+0.85	93%	+0.67	84%	+0.94	97%	+0.38	69%	+0.63	81%	+0.47	74%	+0.59	79%	+0.60	80%
Brazil	+1.00	100%	+0.20	60%	-0.63	19%	+0.29	65%	+0.42	71%	+0.60	80%	+0.56	78%	+0.31	66%	+0.31	66%	0	50%	+0.12	56%	-0.30	35%
Canada	+1.00	100%	+0.60	80%	+0.63	82%	+0.78	89%	+0.69	85%	+0.73	87%	+0.75	88%	+0.44	72%	+0.44	72%	+0.59	79%	+0.71	85%	+0.50	75%
China	0	50%	-0.40	30%	+0.13	57%	+0.38	69%	+0.42	71%	+0.53	77%	+0.38	69%	0	50%	+0.19	59%	+0.41	71%	+0.59	79%	+0.50	75%
France	+1.00	100%	+0.80	90%	+0.63	82%	+0.56	78%	+0.77	89%	+0.60	80%	+0.69	85%	+0.69	84%	+0.69	84%	+0.35	68%	+0.63	81%	+0.30	65%
Germany	+1.00	100%	+0.80	90%	+0.63	82%	+0.56	78%	+0.54	77%	+0.67	84%	+0.56	78%	+0.56	78%	+0.75	88%	+0.47	74%	+0.69	84%	+0.60	80%
India	0	50%	-0.40	30%	-0.38	31%	-0.29	36%	+0.42	71%	+0.60	80%	+0.50	75%	+0.19	59%	+0.63	81%	+0.29	65%	+0.59	79%	+0.30	65%
Indonesia	n/a	–	-0.40	30%	-0.63	19%	-0.13	44%	+0.36	68%	+0.14	57%	+0.47	74%	+0.50	75%	+0.50	75%	-0.18	41%	+0.12	56%	0	50%
Italy	+1.00	100%	0	50%	+0.13	57%	+0.56	78%	+0.77	89%	+0.80	90%	+0.19	60%	+0.31	66%	+0.44	72%	-0.12	44%	+0.13	56%	+0.60	80%
Japan	+1.00	100%	+0.20	60%	+0.50	75%	+0.56	78%	+0.62	81%	+0.47	74%	+0.50	75%	+0.31	66%	+0.31	66%	+0.35	68%	+0.65	82%	+0.10	55%
Korea	n/a	–	0	50%	+0.75	88%	+0.56	78%	+0.46	73%	+0.60	80%	+0.63	82%	+0.19	59%	+0.38	69%	+0.47	74%	+0.65	82%	+0.10	55%
Mexico	+1.00	100%	0	50%	+0.25	63%	-0.14	43%	+0.58	79%	+0.67	84%	+0.69	85%	+0.38	69%	+0.38	69%	+0.29	65%	+0.47	74%	-0.20	40%
Russia	0	50%	+0.40	70%	+0.38	69%	+0.13	57%	+0.59	80%	+0.60	80%	+0.63	82%	+0.50	75%	+0.44	72%	+0.53	76%	+0.47	74%	-0.20	40%
Saudi Arabia	n/a	–	+0.20	60%	-0.13	44%	-0.13	44%	+0.08	54%	+0.21	61%	+0.50	75%	-0.06	47%	+0.06	53%	-0.18	41%	-0.24	38%	+0.10	55%
South Africa	+1.00	100%	+0.40	70%	+0.63	82%	-0.14	43%	+0.33	67%	+0.47	74%	+0.47	74%	+0.25	63%	+0.25	63%	-0.29	35%	-0.12	44%	+0.10	55%
Turkey	n/a	–	+0.20	60%	-0.25	38%	-0.14	43%	+0.17	59%	+0.20	60%	+0.25	63%	+0.13	56%	+0.25	63%	-0.06	47%	0	50%	+0.30	65%
UK	+1.00	100%	+1.00	100%	+0.50	75%	+0.78	89%	+0.77	89%	+0.87	94%	+0.81	91%	+0.88	94%	+0.75	88%	+0.65	82%	+0.76	88%	+0.40	70%
US	0	50%	+0.40	70%	+1.00	100%	+0.33	67%	+0.38	69%	+0.53	77%	+0.81	91%	+0.63	81%	+0.69	84%	+0.71	85%	+0.76	88%	+0.80	90%
EU	+1.00	100%	+0.60	80%	+0.38	69%	+0.57	79%	+0.82	91%	+0.85	93%	+0.75	88%	+0.69	84%	+0.63	81%	+0.44	72%	+0.75	88%	+0.40	70%
Average	+0.67	83%	+0.23	62%	+0.24	62%	+0.28	64%	+0.50	75%	+0.54	77%	+0.57	79%	+0.37	68%	+0.44	72%	+0.25	63%	+0.42	71%	+0.25	63%
	Final		Final		Final		Final		Final		Final		Final		Interim		Final		Interim		Final		Interim	

Note: n/a = not available

Conclusions

G20 compliance performance for the chosen priority commitments, measured as a summit average, improved incrementally from the April 2009 London Summit and September 2009 Pittsburgh Summit (both at 62%) to the June 2010 Toronto Summit (64%) and then rose with the November 2010 Seoul Summit (75%) and the November 2011 Cannes Summit (78%). With the St. Petersburg Summit, compliance dropped to 72% and the compliance of the Brisbane summit dropped to 71%. The interim average of 63% for the Antalya Summit is even lower. If the G20 can improve its performance on delivering on its promises, it may validate its claim for legitimacy as a global governance institution.

Many of the commitments assessed in this report have timelines that extend beyond the 2015 Antalya Summit or reflect medium- and long-term priorities. A unique feature of this report is the incorporation of deadlines for commitments monitored over multiple compliance cycles. The convergence of medium- and long-term commitments and those with deadlines in the near future reflects the nature of G20 decisions as a crisis management forum and a global governance steering institution. It also illustrates the multifaceted nature of compliance assessment. As the relationship among short, medium, and long-term commitments becomes clearer, the compliance landscape for many of these priority commitments may change over the course of future compliance periods.

Future Research and Reports

The information contained in this report provides G20 members and other stakeholders with an indication of their compliance in the period immediately following the Antalya Summit. This draft has been produced as an invitation for others to provide additional or more complete information on compliance before the finished final report will be published in near future. Feedback should be sent to g20@utoronto.ca.

Considerations and Limitations

Several elements affect the findings contained in this report. While the purpose of the report is to monitor compliance with G20 commitments, it is necessary to ensure that the monitoring mechanism is realistic and considers the context within which the commitments are made. With new commitments, more attention must be paid to the initial implementation constraints faced by members. One way to accommodate these constraints is to regard the intent to implement policy measures as an illustration of compliance, or being “on track” towards compliance. This initial leeway should only be granted for new commitments; intent is not a suitable indicator of compliance for medium-term or longstanding commitments. Over time as commitments become integrated in the G20 compliance mechanism, compliance guidelines should become more stringent (as members become more accustomed to the nature of the issue and the requirements for compliance).

See also Appendix: General Considerations.

Appendix: General Considerations

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

1. Assessments contained in this report apply to commitment-related actions taken by G20 members only since the commitments were declared publicly at the last summit.
2. Compliance has been assessed against a selected set of priority commitments, rather than all commitments contained in the summit documents. The selection is intended to produce a representative subset of the total body of commitments. An ideal set of priority commitments represents proportionally the amount of attention paid to each policy area in summit documents, reflects the relative ambition of summit commitments, and holds as many G20 members to account for compliance as possible.
3. In addition to producing commitments, summits provide value by establishing new principles and norms, creating and highlighting issues and issue areas and altering the traditional discourse used to discuss priorities. Some of the most important decisions reached at summits may be done in private and not encoded in the public record of the summit documents.
4. Some commitments cover several years and thus compliance takes longer than the summit-to-summit timeframe applied in this report. For this reason, full compliance (denoted by a +1 score) might not require that G20 members carry out a given commitment completely, but might instead demand clear, visible progress commensurate with the overall timetable as well as public statements of support of commitment objectives.
5. In some cases, a G20 member might choose not to comply with a particular summit commitment for good reason, for example if global conditions have changed dramatically since the commitment was made or if new knowledge has become available about how a particular problem can best be solved.
6. As each G20 member has its own constitutional, legal and institutional processes for undertaking action at the national level (and in the case of the European Union at the supranational level), each member is free to act according to its own legislative schedule. Of particular importance here is the annual schedule for creating budgets, seeking legislative approval and appropriating funds.
7. Commitments in G20 summit documents might also be included, in whole or in part, in documents released by other international forums, as the decisions of other international organizations or even national statements such as the State of the Union Address in the United States, the Queen's Speech in the United Kingdom and the Speech from the Throne in Canada. Merely repeating a G20 commitment in another forum does not count fully as compliant behaviour.
8. This report assesses G20 members' action in accordance with the text of actual, specific commitments made in G20 summit documents. Because commitments demand that policymakers and regulators act specifically to meet the identified objectives, this report holds policymakers accountable for pushing and passing recommended policies. Furthermore, compliance is assessed against the precise, particular commitment, rather than what might be regarded as a necessary or appropriate action to solve the problem being addressed.
9. As individual members can take different actions to comply with the same commitment, no standardized cross-national evaluative criterion can be universally applied. The interpretive guidelines attempt to provide an equitable method for assessing compliance.
10. Because the evaluative scale used in this compliance report runs from -1 to +1, any score in the positive range represents at least some degree of compliance.