



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  
with the  
**International Organisation Research Institute**  
at the National Research University Higher School of Economics, Moscow

present

## **2013 St. Petersburg G20 Summit Interim Compliance Report**

7 September 2013 to 16 June 2014

Prepared by  
Stacey Bocknek, Vera V. Gavrilova, Krystal Montpetit, Theodora Mladenova, Taylor Grott  
and Antonia Tsapralis  
G20 Research Group, Toronto,  
and  
Andrei Sakharov, Andrey Shelepov and Mark Rakhmangulov  
International Organisations Research Institute, Moscow

18 September 2014

[www.g20.utoronto.ca](http://www.g20.utoronto.ca)  
[g20@utoronto.ca](mailto:g20@utoronto.ca)

## Contents

Preface.....	3
Introduction and Summary.....	5
Table 1: 2013 G20 St. Petersburg Summit Commitments Selected for Compliance Monitoring.....	7
Table 2: 2013 G20 St. Petersburg Interim Compliance Scores.....	9
Table 3: 2013 G20 St. Petersburg Summit Interim Compliance Rank by Country.....	10
Table 4: 2013 G20 St. Petersburg Summit Interim Compliance Rank by Commitment.....	10
Table 5: G20 Compliance by Member, 2008-2013.....	11
Appendix: General Considerations .....	13
1. Macroeconomics: Investment.....	15
2. Macroeconomics: Credit Access.....	40
3. Trade.....	60
4. Financial Regulation: Tax Avoidance .....	76
5. Food and Agriculture: Food Price Volatility and Sustainable Agriculture.....	94
6. Climate Change .....	141
7. Energy: Clean Technology .....	156
8. Labour and Employment: Labour Policies.....	179
9. Labour and Employment: Vocational Training Programs .....	227
10. Crime and Corruption.....	250
11. Development: Tax Administration .....	276
12. Employment: Job Creation .....	301
13. Employment: Education.....	323
14. Macroeconomic Policy: Small and Medium-Sized Enterprises .....	343
15. Development: Green Growth .....	360
16. Development: Remittances .....	378

## Preface

Since the G20 leaders met at the Washington Summit in 2008, the G20 Research Group at the University of Toronto and the International Organisations Research Institute of National Research University Higher School of Economics (IORI HSE) in Moscow have produced reports on their progress in implementing the priority commitments issued at each summit. These reports monitor each G20 member's efforts on a carefully chosen selection of the many commitments announced 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 impact of this important informal international institution. Previous reports are available at the G20 Information Centre at <http://www.g20.utoronto.ca/analysis> and the IORI HSE at [http://www.hse.ru/en/org/hse/iori/G20\\_analytics](http://www.hse.ru/en/org/hse/iori/G20_analytics).

The G20 Research Group has been working with the team at IORI HSE since IORI HSE initiated 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.

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. Indeed, scores can be recalibrated if new material becomes available. All feedback remains anonymous. Responsibility for this report's contents lies exclusively with the authors and analysts of the G20 Research Group and its partners at IORI HSE.

This report assesses performance by G20 members with 16 priority commitments of the 281 commitments made at the 2013 St. Petersburg Summit, held on 5-6 September 2013. This interim report covers only the period of 7 September 2013 to 16 June 2014. A final report will be released on the eve of the 2014 Brisbane Summit that will cover the entire time between the St. Petersburg Summit and the Brisbane Summit.

John Kirton  
Co-director, G20 Research Group

## Research Team

Professor John Kirton, Co-director, G20 Research Group  
Professor Marina Larionova, Head, HSE International Organisations Research Institute  
Antonia Tsapralis, Chair, G20 Research Group  
Stacey Bocknek, Co-director, Compliance Unit  
Vera V. Gavrilova, Co-director, Compliance Unit  
Taylor Grott, Director, Communitaction Unit  
Krystel Montpetit, Co-director, Compliance Unit  
Theodora Mladenova, Co-director, Compliance Unit  
Mark Rakhmangulov, HSE Research Team Leader

## Analysts at the University of Toronto

Nana-Yaa Appenteng	Jiyoon Han	Alicia Robinson
Andrei Burloiu	Alessandra Harkness	Hayden Rodenkirchen
Eden Cai	Aurora Hudson	Melissa Rogers
Pin Hui Chen	Jose Isla	Tatiana Rother
Irene Fero Colmenares	Christine Jacob	Jonathan Francis Rybicki
Amelia Cook	Kertia Johnson	Bianca Salazar
Jessica Coper	Monica Layarda	Atena Sadegh
Angel Chu	Rui Kelly Li	Harinya Shanthakumar
Mikael Deprez	Monica Khosravi	Akshay Sharma
Alison Dillman	Darnya Kutsyna	HyunAh Heidi Shim
D. Reid Dobell	Jasper Lim	Sevda Sparks
Jelena Djuric	Stephanie Lim	Max Stern
Carol Drumm	Casmire Legran	Madeline Torrie
Chris D'Souza	Andy Li	Emily Tsui
Justice Durland	Aylin Manduric	Jasmine Vallve
Ifath Fatima	Anthony Marchese	Alissa Xinhe Wang
Ujwal Ganguly	Sarah Mathieu-Comtois	Tracy Wang
Crystal Gao	Colin McEwen	Victoria Wicks
Grace Gao	Iain McCauley	Madeleine Wood
David Gelles	Sabina Mihaescu	Luciano Xavier
Caitlin Gillespie	Liam Moloney	Nancy Xue
Teresa Gomez	Nikhil Pandey	Xue (Snow) Yuan
Ishita Guptan	Chan Park	Freda Zhang
Israa Hamad	Artur Pereira	Pei Zhao

## Analysts at the Higher School of Economics

Natalia Churkina	Yana Nursubina	Andrey Shelepov
Evgeny Guschchin	Julia Ovchinnikova	Nadezhda Sporysheva
Tatyana Lanshina	Alice Prokhorova	Lyudmila Tarasenko
Ekaterina Maslovskaya	Mark Rakhmangulov	Anna Vekshina
Vitaly Nagornov	Elizaveta Safonkina	Anastasia Zhuravleva
Svetlana Nikitina	Andrei Sakharov	

## Introduction and Summary

The G20 2014 St. Petersburg Interim Compliance Report, prepared by the G20 Research Group at the University of Toronto and the International Organisations Research Institute of the National Research University Higher School of Economics (IORI HSE), analyzes compliance by G20 members with a selection of 16 priority commitments out of a total of 281 commitments made at the St. Petersburg Summit on 5-6 September 2013. The report covers relevant actions taken by the G20 members between 7 September 2013 to 16 June 2014. This timeframe allows for an assessment of compliance approximately at the midpoint between the 2013 St. Petersburg Summit and the Brisbane Summit, which will be hosted by Australia on 15-16 November 2014. A final report assessing compliance for the full period between the two summits will be published on the eve of the Brisbane Summit.

## Methodology and Scoring System

This report draws on the methodology developed by the G8 Research Group, which has been monitoring G8 compliance since 1996 (IORI HSE joined this multiyear project in 2005). 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 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 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 per cent and +1 equals 100 per cent.<sup>1</sup>

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 will be recorded in future compliance reports.

## Commitment Breakdown

The G20 made a total of 281 commitments at the St. Petersburg Summit.<sup>2</sup> These commitments, as identified by the G20 Research Group and HSE, are drawn from the official G20 Leaders' Declaration, the St. Petersburg Action Plan and the St. Petersburg Development Outlook.

## 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.<sup>3</sup> The selection also replicates the breakdown of issue areas and the proportion of commitments in each one. Primary criteria for

---

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> A commitment is defined as a discrete, specific, publicly expressed, collectively agreed statement of intent; a promise by summit members that they will undertake future action to move toward, meet or adjust to an identified target. More details are contained in the G8 Commitment/Compliance Coding and Reference Manual (available at <http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/evaluations/index.html#manual>).

<sup>3</sup> Guidelines for choosing priority commitments, as well as other applicable considerations, are available in the G8 Commitment/Compliance Coding and Reference Manual.

priority commitment selection considers 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 commit within a year, as well as tertiary criteria of significance as identified by scientific teams and relevant stakeholders in the host country.

For the 2014 G20 St. Petersburg Interim Compliance Report, 16 priority commitments were selected from the 281 commitments made at the St. Petersburg Summit (see Table 1).

### **Interim Compliance Scores**

The assessment is based on relevant, publicly available information relating to new initiatives taken from 7 September 2013 to 16 June 2014. 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. Table 5 allows a comparison of the 2013 interim compliance scores with the final scores of previous G20 summits.

For the period from 7 September 2013 to 16 June 2014, G20 members achieved an average final compliance score of +0.39, which translates to 69 per cent. This interim compliance score surpasses the final compliance scores for London, Pittsburgh and Toronto summits.

### **Interim Compliance by Member**

For compliance with the St. Petersburg Summit's priority commitments, the United Kingdom is in first place with a score of +0.88 (94 per cent), followed by France at +0.81 (91 per cent), the European Union at +0.69 (84 per cent) and the United States at +0.63 (81 per cent). The lowest scoring member is Saudi Arabia in last place with a score of -0.06 (47 per cent). The difference between the highest and lowest G20 member compliance scores is +0.94, which is the highest gap after Washington and Pittsburgh summits (1 and 1.63 respectively). For more detailed information about compliance by G20 members, see Table 3.

### **Interim Compliance by Commitment**

Many G20 members are engaged in ongoing, multiyear activities that support their commitments, but this assessment applies only to actions taken during this compliance monitoring period that would result in changes to such initiatives. Employment and labour scored among the highest level of compliance: job creation in first place at +0.85 (93 per cent) and education — are tied with the macroeconomic commitment on small and medium-sized enterprises — in second place at +0.80 (90 per cent). The third employment-related commitment on labour activation is in third place at +0.70 (85 per cent). Three commitments scored at or below 0 (50 per cent): crime and corruption at 0 (50 per cent), climate change at -0.20 (40 per cent) and remittances at -0.35 (33 per cent). For more information on scoring by commitment, see Table 4.

**Table 1: 2013 G20 St. Petersburg Summit Commitments Selected for Compliance Monitoring**

1	Macroeconomics: Investment [83]	We [recognize the paramount importance of the investment climate in attracting long-term financing and] will take a comprehensive approach to identifying and addressing impediments to improving underlying investment conditions. (G20 St. Petersburg Leaders' Declaration)
2	Macroeconomics: Credit Access [42]	[Members have committed to a wide range of reforms to strengthen the foundations for strong, sustainable and balanced growth over the long term by improving] credit access. (G20 St. Petersburg Leaders' Declaration)
3	Trade [92]	We recognize the risks of economic slowdown and trade weakening posed by protectionism. We extend until the end of 2016 our standstill commitment. (G20 St. Petersburg Leaders' Declaration)
4	Financial Regulation: Tax Avoidance [7]	"We are committed to take steps to change our rules to tackle tax avoidance, harmful practices, and aggressive tax planning." (G20 St. Petersburg Leaders Declaration)
5	Food and Agriculture: Food Price Volatility and Sustainable Agriculture [149]	"We reaffirm our determination to implement all existing initiatives including that stated in the Action Plan on Food Price Volatility and Agriculture which the G20 endorsed in 2011." (G20 St. Petersburg Leader's Declaration)
6	Climate Change [188]	"We support the operationalization of the Green Climate Fund (GCF)." (G20 St. Petersburg Leaders' Declaration)
7	Energy: Clean Technology [12]	"[We commit] to take steps to support the development of cleaner and more efficient energy technologies to enhance the efficiency of markets and shift towards a more sustainable energy future." (G20 St. Petersburg Leaders Declaration)
8	Labour and Employment: Labour Policies [68]	"[We commit to ensure] effective labour activation policies are in place to help jobseekers find work and bring under-represented and vulnerable groups into the labour market and reduce informality." (G20 St. Petersburg Leaders' Declaration)
9	Labour and Employment: Vocational Training Programs [74]	"We are committed to creating vocational training programs." (G20 St. Petersburg Leaders' Declaration)
10	Crime and Corruption [142]	"We commit to take measures to ensure that we meet the FATF [Financial Action Task Force] standards regarding the identification of the beneficial owners of companies." (G20 St. Petersburg Leaders' Declaration)
11	Development: Tax Administration [107]	"[We are committed to continue to assist developing countries, including through the international organizations, in] building capacity in the area of tax administration (in addition to automatic exchange of information)." (G20 St. Petersburg Leaders Declaration)
12	Employment: Job Creation [60]	"[We commit to] stimulate the creation of formal jobs [through pro-growth structural reforms in product and labour markets, including by promoting labour market adaptability and efficiency, ensuring adequate labour protection, as well as appropriate tax regimes and other government initiatives that may be required according to national circumstances]." (St. Petersburg G20 Leaders' Declaration)

13	Employment: Education [64]	“[We commit to] invest in our people’s skills [to give them skill portability and better prospects, to facilitate mobility and enhance employability].” (St. Petersburg G20 Leaders’ Declaration)
14	Macroeconomic Policy: Small and Medium-Sized Enterprises [78]	“We commit to encourage the private sector, including small and medium sized enterprises as one of our most important partners, in fostering inclusive economic growth including for job creation and labour absorption.” (St. Petersburg G20 Leaders’ Declaration)
15	Development: Green Growth [240]	“Building on the Los Cabos Leaders’ Declaration we will continue to support developing countries in sustaining and strengthening their development through appropriate measures, including those that encourage inclusive green growth in the context of sustainable development.” (St. Petersburg Development Outlook)
16	Development: Remittances [264]	“We will consider in 2014 innovative results-based mechanisms to further reduce the cost of transferring remittances to developing countries.” (St. Petersburg Development Outlook)



**Table 2: 2013 G20 St. Petersburg 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	Macroeconomics: Investment	0	0	+1	+1	0	+1	0	+1	+1	0	+1	+1	0	+1	-1	0	+1	+1	+1	+1	+0.55	78%
2	Macroeconomics: Credit Access	0	0	0	0	0	0	-1	0	0	0	0	0	+1	0	0	0	+1	+1	0	+0.10	55%	
3	Trade	-1	+1	+1	0	-1	+1	0	-1	+1	0	+1	-1	+1	-1	0	-1	0	+1	+1	-1	+0.05	53%
4	Financial Regulation: Tax Avoidance	0	+1	-1	0	0	0	+1	+1	+1	0	+1	0	+1	+1	-1	+1	-1	0	0	+1	+0.30	65%
5	Food and Agriculture: Food Price Volatility and Sustainable Agriculture	+1	0	+1	+1	0	+1	0	+1	+1	+1	0	+1	+1	0	0	0	+1	+1	+1	+0.65	83%	
6	Climate Change	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	+1	+1	-1	+1	+1	+1	-1	-1	-1	0	-1	0	0	0	-0.20	40%	
7	Energy: Clean Technology	+1	0	+1	0	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	0	0	0	+1	+1	+1	+1	0	+1	+1	+1	+0.70	85%
8	Labour and Employment	+1	+1	+1	+1	-1	+1	+1	0	0	0	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+0.75	88%
9	Labour and Employment: Vocational Training Programs	+1	0	+1	+1	0	+1	+1	+1	0	+1	0	0	0	+1	+1	+1	0	+1	0	+1	+0.60	80%
10	Crime and Corruption	0	0	+1	0	0	0	0	+1	0	-1	-1	-1	0	+1	-1	0	-1	+1	0	+1	0.00	50%
11	Development: Tax Administration	+1	+1	0	0	+1	+1	+1	0	0	0	+1	0	0	0	0	0	0	+1	+1	+1	+0.45	73%
12	Employment: Job Creation	0	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	-1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+0.85	93%
13	Employment: Education	0	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	0	+1	0	0	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+0.80	90%
14	Macroeconomic Policy: SMEs	0	+1	0	+1	0	+1	+1	+1	+1	0	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+0.80	90%
15	Development: Green Growth	-1	0	-1	+1	0	+1	+1	0	0	0	0	0	-1	0	-1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+0.15	58%	
16	Development: Remittances	-1	0	-1	-1	-1	+1	0	+1	+1	0	-1	-1	-1	0	-1	-1	-1	+1	-1	0	-0.35	33%
	Average	+0.06	+0.38	+0.31	+0.38	0.00	+0.81	+0.56	+0.50	+0.31	+0.31	+0.19	+0.38	+0.50	-0.06	+0.25	+0.13	+0.88	+0.63	+0.69	+0.39	69%	
		53%	69%	66%	69%	50%	91%	78%	75%	78%	66%	66%	59%	69%	75%	47%	63%	56%	94%	81%	84%	69%	

**Table 3: 2013 G20 St. Petersburg Summit Interim Compliance Rank by Country**

Rank	Member	Average	
1	United Kingdom	+0.88	94%
2	France	+0.81	91%
3	European Union	+0.69	84%
4	United States	+0.63	81%
5	Germany	+0.56	78%
	Indonesia	+0.56	78%
6	Russia	+0.50	75%
	India	+0.50	75%
7	Australia	+0.38	69%
	Canada	+0.38	69%
	Mexico	+0.38	69%
8	Brazil	+0.31	66%
	Japan	+0.31	66%
	Italy	+0.31	66%
9	South Africa	+0.25	63%
10	Korea	+0.19	59%
11	Turkey	+0.13	56%
12	Argentina	+0.06	53%
13	China	0.00	50%
14	Saudi Arabia	-0.06	47%

**Table 4: 2013 G20 St. Petersburg Summit Interim Compliance Rank by Commitment**

Rank	Commitment	Average	
1	Employment: Job Creation	+0.85	93%
2	Employment: Education	+0.80	90%
	Macroeconomic Policy: SMEs	+0.80	90%
3	Labour and Employment	+0.75	88%
4	Energy: Clean Technology	+0.70	85%
5	Food and Agriculture: Food Price Volatility and Sustainable Agriculture	+0.65	83%
6	Labour and Employment: Vocational Training Programs	+0.60	80%
7	Macroeconomics: Investment	+0.55	78%
8	Development: Tax Administration	+0.45	73%
9	Financial Regulation: Tax Avoidance	+0.30	65%
10	Development: Green Growth	+0.15	58%
11	Macroeconomics: Credit Access	+0.10	55%
12	Trade	+0.05	53%
13	Crime and Corruption	0.00	50%
14	Climate Change	-0.20	40%
15	Development: Remittances	-0.35	33%

**Table 5: G20 Compliance by Member, 2008-2013**

	Final		Final		Final		Final		Final		Final		Interim			
Member	Washington		London		Pittsburgh		Toronto		Seoul		Cannes		Los Cabos		St. Petersburg	
Argentina	0	50%	-0.60	20%	-0.13	44%	0	50%	-0.08	46%	0	50%	+0.31	66%	+0.06	53%
Australia	n/a	–	+0.60	80%	+0.50	75%	+0.56	78%	+0.85	93%	+0.67	84%	+0.94	97%	+0.38	69%
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%
Canada	+1.00	100%	+0.60	80%	+0.63	82%	+0.78	89%	+0.69	85%	+0.73	87%	+0.75	88%	+0.38	69%
China	0	50%	-0.40	30%	+0.13	57%	+0.38	69%	+0.42	71%	+0.53	77%	+0.38	69%	0	50%
France	+1.00	100%	+0.80	90%	+0.63	82%	+0.56	78%	+0.77	89%	+0.60	80%	+0.69	85%	+0.81	91%
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%
India	0	50%	-0.40	30%	-0.38	31%	-0.29	36%	+0.42	71%	+0.60	80%	+0.50	75%	+0.50	75%
Indonesia	n/a	–	-0.40	30%	-0.63	19%	-0.13	44%	+0.36	68%	+0.14	57%	+0.47	74%	+0.56	78%
Italy	+1.00	100%	0	50%	+0.13	57%	+0.56	78%	+0.77	89%	+0.80	90%	+0.19	60%	+0.31	66%
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%
Korea	n/a	–	0	50%	+0.75	88%	+0.56	78%	+0.46	73%	+0.60	80%	+0.63	82%	+0.19	59%
Mexico	+1.00	100%	0	50%	+0.25	63%	-0.14	43%	+0.58	79%	+0.67	84%	+0.69	85%	+0.38	69%
Russia	0	50%	+0.40	70%	+0.38	69%	+0.13	57%	+0.59	80%	+0.60	80%	+0.63	82%	+0.50	75%
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%
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%
Turkey	n/a	–	+0.20	60%	-0.25	38%	-0.14	43%	+0.17	59%	+0.20	60%	+0.25	63%	+0.13	56%
United Kingdom	+1.00	100%	+1.00	100%	+0.50	75%	+0.78	89%	+0.77	89%	+0.87	94%	+0.81	91%	+0.88	94%
United States	0	50%	+0.40	70%	+1.00	100%	+0.33	67%	+0.38	69%	+0.53	77%	+0.81	91%	+0.63	81%
European Union	+1.00	100%	+0.60	80%	+0.38	69%	+0.57	79%	+0.82	91%	+0.85	93%	+0.75	88%	+0.69	84%
Average	+0.67	83%	+0.23	62%	+0.24	62%	+0.28	64%	+0.50	75%	+0.54	77%	+0.57	79%	+0.39	69%
	Final		Final		Final		Final		Final		Final		Final		Interim	

n/a = not available

## **Conclusions**

G20 compliance performance for the chosen priority commitments, measured as a country average, has improved incrementally from the April 2009 London Summit (61.5%) through the September 2009 Pittsburgh Summit (62%) to the June 2010 Toronto Summit (64%) to the November 2010 Seoul Summit (75%) and the November 2011 Cannes Summit (77%), which it maintained with the June 2012 Los Cabos Summit (79%). G20 interim compliance with the St. Petersburg commitments stands at +0.38 or 69%. 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 2013 St. Petersburg 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 St. Petersburg 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](mailto: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.

11. These scores represent compliance only with commitments made at the G20 summit and do not indicate whether commitments made elsewhere are complied with to a higher or lower degree than those made at the G20 summit.

12. In some cases, full compliance by all members of the G20 with a commitment is contingent on cooperative behaviour on the part of other actors.