

G20 International Financial Institution Reform Commitments and Compliance

Research Report by Brittaney Warren,
Researcher and Chief Compliance Analyst, G20 Research Group
January 5, 2017

Introduction

On December 1, 2016, Germany formally assumed the chair of the Group of 20 (G20) to produce its annual G20 summit, scheduled to be held in Hamburg on July 7-8, 2017. Reform of international financial institutions (IFIs) will, as always, be on the agenda, particularly reform of the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and perhaps the World Bank too. What timely, well-tailored and ambitious commitments will the Hamburg Summit make on IFI reform at the Hamburg Summit and will members follow through on them in the following year?

To provide a preliminary answer, this research report systemically analyses of the G20 Research Group's database on G20 commitments and compliance on IFI reform, covering the first G20 summit in 2008 through to its 11th in 2016 ([Kirton et al. 2016](#)). During this time, the G20 made 120 politically binding, collective, future-oriented commitments on IFI reform in the collective documents it issued at each summit in the leaders' name. Of these, five (4%) priority commitments were selected by the G20 Research Group for assessment of G20 members' compliance with them during the time until the next summit was held.

G20 members' compliance with these IFI reform commitments averaged 66%. IFI reform thus ranks slightly below the overall average of 71% across all 191 commitments assessed for compliance. It comes in the mid range of all 18 G20 issue areas assessed for compliance, tied with development, but above only five other issue areas (see [Appendix A](#)). Over time, the number of commitments has dropped since its peak in 2011, and compliance has varied through to 2013. By member, compliance was led by Germany, France and Japan, each at 90%, followed in turn by Canada at 80%, and the United States, China, the United Kingdom, Korea, South Africa, Turkey, Italy, India and Australia all at 70%.

Trends by Summit over Time

Commitments

The G20 made IFI reform commitments every year since the 14 it produced at its first summit in Washington DC in November 2008 (see [Appendix B](#)). It made an all-time high of 29 IFI reform commitments at London in April 2009. It made 11 at the following summit at Pittsburgh in September 2009, dropping to only four commitments at Toronto in June 2010. This rose to 16 at Seoul in November 2010 and then to 22 at Cannes in 2011. After 2011, it made a consistently lower number of IFI reform commitments each summit. Eight commitments were made at Los Cabos in 2012, five at St. Petersburg in 2013, four at Brisbane in 2014, two at Antalya in 2015 and five at Hangzhou in 2016.

Compliance

Of the 120 IFI reform commitments, five priority ones have been assessed for compliance. The one from the Pittsburgh Summit had an average compliance rate of 53% (see [Appendix C](#)). The one from the Toronto Summit had the highest average compliance of 95%. Compliance was the lowest at the Seoul Summit at 48%. At Cannes it rose to 75% and then dropped again to 60% at St. Petersburg.

Patterns by Member

By Individual Member

By individual member, compliance with these five assessed commitments was led by Germany, France and Japan, each with 90% average compliance. Next came Canada with 80%, followed by the United States, China, the United Kingdom, Korea, South Africa, Turkey, Italy, India and Australia each with 70%. Brazil and Mexico came next with 60% each. The lowest complying members were the European Union, Russia and Indonesia with 50% each; and Saudi Arabia and Argentina with 30% each.

By Component Club

All the members of the G20 are also members of other intergovernmental groupings. These “component clubs” include the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), the Group of Seven (G7), the BRICS members of Brazil, Russia, India, China and South Africa, the Organization of American States (OAS) and Summit of the Americas (SOA), the MIKTA group of Mexico, Indonesia, Korea, Turkey and Australia, and the Organization of Petroleum-Exporting Countries (OPEC) (see [Appendix D](#)).

The G7 members with average compliance of 77%, was led by Germany, France and Japan at 90% each. Canada, the UK, the U.S. and Italy had 70% each. The European Union had 50%.

The OECD members, with average compliance of 76%, were led by Germany, France and Japan; followed by Canada, then the UK, Australia, Korea, U.S. and Turkey, and then Mexico.

The two component clubs of MIKTA and BRICS tied for third with 64% each. Compliance among BRICS members was led by China, India and South Africa, each tied with 70%, followed by Brazil with 60% and Russia with 50%. MIKTA members Australia, Korea and Turkey complied at an average of 70%, followed by Mexico with 60% and Indonesia with 50%.

OAS/SOA members, with average compliance of 60%, were led by Canada and the U.S., followed by Mexico and Argentina.

Saudi Arabia, the only OPEC member, ranked the lowest at 30%.

By Host

When a member serves as G20 host, it has an additional opportunity to have the summit as a whole mirror its own compliance performance. Yet the evidence suggests that this opportunity is not regularly taken, as high compliance by the host is not strongly matched by the members’ overall.

The United States hosted the first G20 summit at Washington DC on November 14-15, 2008, where 14 IFI reform commitments were made, but none was assessed for compliance. At Pittsburgh in 2009, the next summit hosted by the U.S., there were 11 IFI reform commitments made. One was assessed, with a compliance average of 53%. Here the U.S. fully complied (see [Appendix E](#)). It fully complied again with the one assessed commitment from the Toronto Summit in 2010, partially

complied with the one assessed from the Seoul Summit also held in 2010, fully complied again with the one assessed from Cannes in 2011 and, finally, did not comply at all with the one assessed from St. Petersburg in 2013. The United States tied with eight other countries for third place with an overall average of 70%.

The United Kingdom hosted the G20's second summit at London in 2009. This summit produced the highest number of IFI reform commitments with 29. No IFI-related commitments were assessed from this summit. Overall, the UK does relatively well on compliance and tied for third place with eight other countries with 70%. It fully complied with the commitments assessed from Pittsburgh, Toronto and Seoul; did not comply at all with those from Cannes; and partially complied with those from St. Petersburg.

Canada hosted at Toronto in June 2010, where four IFI reform commitments were made. Overall compliance with the one commitment assessed for compliance was a high 96%. The host fully complied, reflecting Canada's high overall compliance of 80% and second-place rank. Canada fully complied with the commitments from every summit, apart from Seoul, with which it partially complied.

Korea hosted at Seoul in November 2010 where the number of IFI reform commitments rose to 16. Yet the Seoul Summit's average compliance with the one assessed commitment was significantly lower than at Toronto just a few month earlier and was the lowest overall with 48%. Korea only partially complied. However, this low compliance does not reflect the host country's own compliance overall, with a third place rank of 70%. Indeed, Korea normally complies with its IFI reform commitments. It fully complied with the commitments made at the Pittsburgh and Toronto Summits, partially complied with those from the Seoul Summit, fully complied again with the one from the Cannes Summit, and then did not comply at all with the one from the St. Petersburg Summit.

France hosted the next summit at Cannes in 2011. Twenty-two IFI reform commitments were made — the second highest after the 2009 London Summit. The one commitment assessed for compliance had an overall average of 75%, with the host fully complying. Overall, France complied well with its IFI reform commitments, tying for first place with two other countries at 90%. France fully complied with every commitment assessed apart from the one assessed from Seoul, with which it partially complied.

Mexico hosted at Los Cabos in 2012. Here, the number of commitments made dropped to eight, with none assessed for compliance. Overall, Mexico ranks fourth (of six due to tied scores) with 60%. It sometimes fully complied and sometimes did not comply at all. It fully complied with the commitments made at Toronto, Cannes and St. Petersburg, and did not comply at all with those from Pittsburgh and Seoul.

Russia hosted at St. Petersburg in 2013. Five IFI reform commitments were made. On the one assessed for compliance, Russia partially complied, with an overall average of 60%. Overall, Russia ranks second last, tied with two other countries, at 50%. It partially complied with the commitment made at Pittsburgh, fully complied with the one made at Toronto, did not comply at all with the one made at Seoul, and then partially complied with the one made at Cannes.

Australia hosted the next summit at Brisbane in 2014. Four IFI reform commitments were made here and none was assessed. Australia also ranks third overall with 70%. It partially complied with the commitments made at Pittsburgh, fully complied with those from Toronto, Seoul and Cannes, and then did not comply at all with those from St. Petersburg.

Turkey hosted the next summit at Antalya in 2015. Two commitments were made with none assessed. Turkey ranks third overall with 70%. It did not comply at all with the commitments made at Pittsburgh, fully complied with those from Toronto, partially complied with those from Seoul, and then fully complied with those from both Cannes and St. Petersburg.

China hosted the most recent summit at Hangzhou in 2016. The number of IFI reform commitments made remained low with five. As this compliance cycle is still in progress none has yet been assessed. China ranks third overall with 70%. It did not comply at all with the commitments made at Pittsburgh, fully complied with those from Toronto, partially complied with those from Seoul, and then fully complied with those from both Cannes and St. Petersburg.

Finally, Germany, which will host the next summit in Hamburg in 2017, complies well with the G20's IFI reform commitments, tying for first with France and Japan, with 90%. Germany fully complied with the commitments made at every summit apart from Seoul with which it partially complied.

The rates of host to all members' compliance is thus 100 to 53 in Toronto, 50 to 48 at Seoul, 100 to 75 at Cannes, and 50 to 60 at St. Petersburg.

Patterns by Component Subject

Commitments

Two component subjects can be identified within the G20's IFI reform commitments: reform of the IMF, specifically on increasing quota share, and reform of World Bank governance. Four commitments were made on IMF reform and one commitment was made on World Bank reform (see [Appendix E](#)).

Compliance

The G20's overall compliance with all five IFI reform commitments is 66%, or slightly lower than the G20's overall compliance across all issue areas of 70%. Compliance is much higher with the four assessed IMF reform commitments at 71% than with the one assessed World Bank reform commitment at just 48%.

Trends over Time and over Component Subject

Commitments

Of the 120 IFI reform commitments made since 2008, 71 were on IMF reform and eight were on World Bank reform. Three commitments referenced both the IMF and World Bank and six commitments referenced the IMF and the Financial Stability Forum (FSF) or Financial Stability Board (FSB). Eleven referenced either the FSB or the FSF but no other institution, and four referenced multilateral development banks. The final 17 commitments referred generally to international institutional reform or otherwise did not fit into one of the identified component subjects.

Five IFI reform commitments were assessed for compliance. Four of these commitments referenced IMF reform. One was made at Pittsburgh in 2009, one at Toronto in 2010, one at Cannes in 2011 and one at St. Petersburg in 2013. One commitment referenced World Bank reform and was made at Seoul in 2010 (see [Appendix G](#), [Appendix H](#) and [Appendix I](#)).

Compliance

The United States at 75% ranks third of six (due to tied scores) on compliance with the four assessed IMF reform commitments. It fully complied with those made at Pittsburgh, Toronto and Cannes, but not at all with that at St. Petersburg. On the one assessed World Bank reform commitment, the U.S. partially complied, ranking second along with nine other countries.

The United Kingdom at 63% ranks fourth on IFI reform commitments, tied with three other countries, including the European Union. It fully complied in the first two years, failed to comply with Cannes and partially complied with St. Petersburg. The UK fully complied with the World Bank reform commitment, tying for first also with three other countries.

Canada at 75% ranks third on IFI reform commitments. It fully complied with three summits, not complying at all with Cannes. On World Bank reform Canada also fully complied.

Korea at 75% also ranks third on IFI reform commitments, fully complying with every summit apart from St. Petersburg where it did not comply at all. On World Bank reform Korea partially complied.

France at 100% fully complied with all IFI reform commitments, tying for first place. It partially complied with the World Bank reform commitment.

Mexico at 75% ranks third on IFI reform commitments. It did not comply with the Pittsburgh Summit, but fully complied with Toronto, Cannes and St. Petersburg. It did not comply at all with the World Bank reform commitment.

Russia at 63% ranks third last on IFI reform commitments. It partially complied with the Pittsburgh, Cannes and St. Petersburg summits and fully complied with Toronto. Russia did not comply at all with the World Bank reform commitment.

Turkey at 75% ranks third on IFI reform commitments, not complying with Pittsburgh and fully complying since. It partially complied with the World Bank reform commitment.

China at 75% ranks third on IFI reform commitments, also not complying with Pittsburgh but then fully complying with every assessed summit since. It also partially complied with the World Bank reform commitment.

Germany at 100% ties for first on IFI reform commitments, fully complying with every assessed summit. Germany partially complied with the World Bank reform commitment.

Conclusion

From this analysis flow the following conclusions on IFI reform commitments and compliance.

Companion Commitments

First, companion commitments (on the same subject) do not appear to predict compliance with IFI reform commitments. At the assessed summit with the lowest number of IFI reform commitments (Toronto with four), compliance was the highest at 96%. Where the highest number of commitments were made (Cannes with 22), compliance was lower, if still strong, at 75%. Moreover, the Seoul Summit, with 16 IFI reform commitments (the second highest number of the assessed summits), had the lowest compliance average at 48%. This poor match suggests that the number of commitments does not reliably predict compliance, either positively or negatively. However, as only five of the 120 IFI reform commitments have been assessed, more research needs to be done to provide a more definitive conclusion.

Hosting

Second, hosting may positively predict compliance with IFI reform commitments, but with only half of all members having hosted this trend is unclear. The compliance average of the 10 G20 members that have hosted a summit is 71%. The average of non-host countries is much lower at 58%. Of the countries that have hosted, France leads compliance with 90%; followed by Canada with 80%; then China, the U.S., the UK, Korea, Turkey and Australia all with 70%; Mexico with 60%; and Russia with 50%. Of the non-hosting countries, Germany and Japan lead with 90%; South Africa, Italy and India follow with 70%; Brazil with 60%; the EU and Indonesia with 50%; and finally Saudi Arabia and Argentina with 30%.

Germany will likely continue to have high compliance with its Hamburg Summit and will thus raise the host country groups' overall compliance. However, the same logic would apply to every other non-hosting country that subsequently hosts a summit. Should Saudi Arabia, for instance, host a G20 summit, it may also carry over its low compliance on IFI commitments and reduce the overall compliance of hosting country groups on the issue. It cannot be assumed that a country will change its behaviour regarding compliance when it assumes the G20 chair. It is more likely that the new host will use the opportunity to push its own priorities to the top of the agenda.

Specificity of Commitment

Third, greater specificity of commitments appears to increase compliance. G20 members comply much better with their commitments on IMF reform, at 71%, than those on World Bank reform, at 48%. One possible explanation of the difference is that the assessed commitments on IMF reform are much more specific than the one on World Bank reform. The IMF reform commitment from the 2009 Pittsburgh Summit includes a specific goal to increase the IMF's quota share by 5% from over-represented countries to under-represented countries. Toronto in 2010 and Cannes in 2011 reiterated support for this commitment, with subsequent compliance the highest at 95% and 75%, respectively. The commitment assessed from the St. Petersburg Summit introduced a deadline of January 2014 to reach agreement on the quota formula "[as agreed at the Seoul Summit and reiterated in Cannes and Los Cabos.](#)" Here compliance was lower but still positive at 60%. Conversely, the commitment on World Bank reform stated: "[We have agreed to pursue all outstanding governance reform issues at the World Bank.](#)" It did not specify what the outstanding issues were nor did it specify any timelines or targets.

Iteration

Iteration of commitments at subsequent summits also seems to lead to higher compliance, as the IFI reform commitments suggest. Again, however, as only four IMF reform commitments have been assessed, more research needs to be done. Moreover, with only one World Bank reform commitment assessed it is not possible to make any conclusions about trends or compliance predictors on this component subject.

At Hamburg

Should the trend over the past five years persist, it is not likely that the number of IFI reform commitments made at the upcoming Hamburg Summit in July 2017 will increase significantly. Moreover, [Germany's G20 Agenda](#) does not include IFI reform as a separate subject. However, as the preliminary evidence suggests that an increased number of IFI reform commitments does not reliably predict compliance, the G20 can still make progress here even if only few commitments are made. Crafting IFI reform commitments that include a timetable or a target, or both, and that iterate previous G20 commitments, may help raise compliance with the ones that Hamburg makes.

Appendix A: Commitments and Compliance by Issue Area, 2008-2016

Issue area	Total commitments assessed of total made		Compliance	
			Score	Percentage
Microeconomics	1 of 10	10.0%	+1.00	100
Infrastructure	1 of 36	2.8%	+0.95	98
Terrorism	2 of 16	12.5%	+0.73	87
Macroeconomics	23 of 402	5.8%	+0.60	80
Migration and refugees	1 of 7	14.3%	+0.60	80
Labour and employment	16 of 100	16.0%	+0.55	78
Health	4 of 38	10.5%	+0.53	77
Financial regulation	20 of 271	7.4%	+0.50	75
Energy	16 of 106	15.1%	+0.45	73
Food and agriculture	6 of 64	9.4%	+0.39	70
Gender	5 of 6	83.3%	+0.41	71
Reform of international financial institutions	5 of 120	4.2%	+0.31	66
Development	45 of 193	23.3%	+0.32	66
Climate change	22 of 53	42.0%	+0.29	65
Trade	14 of 133	11.0%	+0.26	63
International cooperation	2 of 39	5.1%	+0.15	58
Crime and corruption	7 of 78	9.0%	+0.14	57
Information and communication technologies	1 of 49	2.0%	+0.10	55
Total/Average	191 of 1,836	10.4%	+0.41	71

Appendix B: Commitments on International Financial Institution Reform by Summit

Summit	Total number of international financial institution commitments		International Monetary Fund reform		World Bank reform		International Monetary Fund/World Bank		Financial Stability Forum/Board		Financial Stability Forum/Financial Stability Board/International Monetary Fund		Multilateral development banks		Other	
	Made	Assessed	Made	Assessed	Made	Assessed	Made	Assessed	Made	Assessed	Made	Assessed	Made	Assessed	Made	Assessed
2008 Washington	14						2		2		5		1		4	
2009 London	29		16		1		1		1		1		2		7	
2009 Pittsburgh	11	1	5	1	5								1			
2010 Toronto	4	1	2	1											2	
2010 Seoul	16	1	15		1	1										
2011 Cannes	22	1	14	1					8							
2012 Los Cabos	8		8													
2013 St. Petersburg	5	1	4	1											1	
2014 Brisbane	4		3												1	
2015 Antalya	2		1												1	
2016 Hangzhou	5		3		1										1	
Total	120	5	71	4	8	1	3		11		6		4		17	

Note:

International Monetary Fund/World Bank = commitments that reference both the International Monetary Fund and World Bank.

Financial Stability Forum/Financial Stability Board/International Monetary Fund = commitments that reference both the Financial Stability Forum/Board and the International Monetary Fund.

Other = general reference to international financial institutions or the Bretton Woods Institutions, accountability request of finance ministers, international accounting standard setting bodies, Basil Committee on Banking Supervision.

Appendix C: International Financial Institution Compliance by Summit

	Average		2009 Pittsburgh	2010 Toronto	2010 Seoul	2011 Cannes	2013 St. Petersburg
Germany	+0.80	90%	+1.00	+1.00	0	+1.00	+1.00
France	+0.80	90%	+1.00	+1.00	0	+1.00	+1.00
Japan	+0.80	90%	+1.00	+1.00	0	+1.00	+1.00
Canada	+0.60	80%	+1.00	+1.00	+1.00	-1.00	+1.00
United States	+0.40	70%	+1.00	+1.00	0	+1.00	-1.00
China	+0.40	70%	-1.00	+1.00	0	+1.00	+1.00
United Kingdom	+0.40	70%	+1.00	+1.00	+1.00	-1.00	0
Korea	+0.40	70%	+1.00	+1.00	0	+1.00	-1.00
South Africa	+0.40	70%	+1.00	+1.00	0	0	0
Turkey	+0.40	70%	-1.00	+1.00	0	+1.00	+1.00
Italy	+0.40	70%	0	+1.00	-1.00	+1.00	+1.00
India	+0.40	70%	-1.00	+1.00	0	+1.00	+1.00
Australia	+0.40	70%	0	+1.00	+1.00	+1.00	-1.00
Brazil	+0.20	60%	-1.00	+1.00	-1.00	+1.00	+1.00
Mexico	+0.20	60%	-1.00	+1.00	-1.00	+1.00	+1.00
European Union	0	50%	0	+1.00	-1.00	+1.00	-1.00
Russia	0	50%	0	+1.00	-1.00	0	0
Indonesia	0	50%	-1.00	+1.00	+1.00	0	-1.00
Saudi Arabia	-0.40	30%	0	0	-1.00	0	-1.00
Argentina	-0.40	30%	-1.00	0	0	-1.00	0
Total	+0.31	66%	+0.05	+0.90	-0.05	+0.50	+0.20

Note: Blank cells indicate the country was not assessed for compliance with any commitment in that year.

Appendix D: International Financial Institution Reform Compliance by Component Club

G20 Member	Average	
	Score	Percentage
BRICS	+0.28	64%
China	+0.40	70%
India	+0.40	70%
South Africa	+0.40	70%
Brazil	+0.20	60%
Russia	0	50%
MIKTA	+0.28	64%
Australia	+0.40	70%
Korea	+0.40	70%
Turkey	+0.40	70%
Mexico	+0.20	60%
Indonesia	0	50%
G7	+0.53	77%
Germany	+0.80	90%
France	+0.80	90%
Japan	+0.80	90%
Canada	+0.60	80%
United Kingdom	+0.40	70%
United States	+0.40	70%
Italy	+0.40	70%
European Union	0	50%
OTHER		
Argentina	-0.40	30%
Saudi Arabia	-0.40	30%

Notes:

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development members in order of compliance, highest to lowest: Germany, France and Japan; Canada; United Kingdom, Australia, Korea, United States and Turkey; Mexico with a collective average compliance of +0.52 or 76%.

Organization of American States and Summit of the Americas members: Canada, United States, Mexico, Argentina with a collective average compliance of +0.20 or 60%.

Organization of Petroleum-Exporting Countries: Saudi Arabia.

Appendix E: International Financial Institution Reform Compliance by Host

Overall compliance by member		Year(s) Hosted			
		City	Date	Compliance by host	Overall compliance at summit
Germany	+0.80	Hamburg	6-9 July 2017		
France	+0.80	Cannes	3-4 November 2011	+1.00	+0.50
Japan	+0.80				
Canada	+0.60	Toronto	26-27 June 2010	+1.00	+0.90
United States	+0.40	Pittsburgh	24-25 September 2009	+1.00	+0.05
China	+0.40		3-4 September 2016		
United Kingdom	+0.40	London	14-15 November 2011		
Korea	+0.40	Seoul	11-12 November 2010	0	-0.05
South Africa	+0.40				
Turkey	+0.40	Antalya	15-16 November 2015		
Italy	+0.40				
India	+0.40				
Australia	+0.40	Brisbane	15-16 November 2011		
Brazil	+0.20				
Mexico	+0.20	Los Cabos	18-19 June 2012		
European Union	0				
Russia	0	St. Petersburg	5-6 September 2013	0	+0.20
Indonesia	0				
Saudi Arabia	-0.40				
Argentina	-0.40				
Total	+0.31				

Notes:

The United States also hosted the first G20 summit at Washington on 14–15 November 2008 where no commitments on international financial institution reform were assessed.

Blank cells indicate the G20 member has not hosted a summit, or has hosted but no international financial institution commitments have been assessed for that year.

Host countries' overall compliance is +0.40 or 70%.

Non-host countries' overall compliance is +0.22 or 61%.

Appendix F: International Financial Institution Commitments by Component Subject

Commitment	Score
International Monetary Fund Reform (4)	
2009P-13: We are committed to a shift in International Monetary Fund (IMF) quota share to dynamic emerging markets and developing countries of at least 5% from over-represented countries to under-represented countries using the current quota formula as the basis to work from	+0.05
2010T-37: We called for an acceleration of the substantial work still needed for the IMF to complete the quota reform by the Seoul Summit in parallel deliver on other governance reforms, in line with commitments made in Pittsburgh	+0.90
2011C-25: We will expeditiously implement in full the 2010 quota and governance reform of the IMF	+0.50
2013SP-109: We remain committed, together with the whole IMF membership, to agree on the quota formula and complete the 15th General Quota Review by January 2014 as agreed at the Seoul Summit and reiterated in Cannes and Los Cabos	+0.20
Average	+0.41
World Bank Reform (1)	
2010S-28: [We have agreed to pursue all outstanding governance reform issues at the] World Bank	-0.05
Average	-0.05
Overall Average	+0.31

Appendix G: International Financial Institution Compliance by Component Subject

	International Monetary Fund Reform	World Bank Reform
Germany	+1.00	0
France	+1.00	0
Japan	+1.00	0
Canada	+0.50	+1.00
United States	+0.50	0
China	+0.50	0
United Kingdom	+0.25	+1.00
Korea	+0.50	0
South Africa	+0.50	0
Turkey	+0.50	0
Italy	+0.75	-1.00
India	+0.50	0
Australia	+0.25	+1.00
Brazil	+0.50	-1.00
Mexico	+0.50	-1.00
European Union	+0.25	-1.00
Russia	+0.25	-1.00
Indonesia	-0.25	+1.00
Saudi Arabia	-0.25	-1.00
Argentina	-0.50	0
Total	+0.41	-0.05

Appendix H: Compliance with International Monetary Fund Reform Commitments

	Average		2009 Pittsburgh	2010 Toronto	2011 Cannes	2013 St. Petersburg
Germany	+1.00	100%	+1.00	+1.00	+1.00	+1.00
France	+1.00	100%	+1.00	+1.00	+1.00	+1.00
Japan	+1.00	100%	+1.00	+1.00	+1.00	+1.00
Italy	+0.75	88%	0	+1.00	+1.00	+1.00
Canada	+0.50	75%	+1.00	+1.00	-1.00	+1.00
United States	+0.50	75%	+1.00	+1.00	+1.00	-1.00
China	+0.50	75%	-1.00	+1.00	+1.00	+1.00
India	+0.50	75%	-1.00	+1.00	+1.00	+1.00
Brazil	+0.50	75%	-1.00	+1.00	+1.00	+1.00
Korea	+0.50	75%	+1.00	+1.00	+1.00	-1.00
South Africa	+0.50	75%	+1.00	+1.00	0	0
Turkey	+0.50	75%	-1.00	+1.00	+1.00	+1.00
Mexico	+0.50	75%	-1.00	+1.00	+1.00	+1.00
United Kingdom	+0.25	63%	+1.00	+1.00	-1.00	0
Australia	+0.25	63%	0	+1.00	+1.00	-1.00
European Union	+0.25	63%	0	+1.00	+1.00	-1.00
Russia	+0.25	63%	0	+1.00	0	0
Indonesia	-0.25	38%	-1.00	+1.00	0	-1.00
Saudi Arabia	-0.25	38%	0	0	0	-1.00
Argentina	-0.50	25%	-1.00	0	-1.00	0
Total	+0.41	71%	+0.05	+0.90	+0.50	+0.20

Appendix I: Compliance with World Bank Reform Commitments

	2010 Seoul
Canada	+1.00
United Kingdom	+1.00
Australia	+1.00
Indonesia	+1.00
United States	0
China	0
Germany	0
France	0
Japan	0
India	0
Argentina	0
Korea	0
South Africa	0
Turkey	0
European Union	-1.00
Italy	-1.00
Brazil	-1.00
Mexico	-1.00
Russia	-1.00
Saudi Arabia	-1.00
Total	-0.05

Note: Because the Seoul Summit produced the only assessed commitment on World Bank Reform, the individual country scores also represent their overall average on this component subject.