

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

2018 G20 Buenos Aires Summit Final Compliance Report

2 December 2018 to 10 May 2019

Prepared by
Alessandra Cicci, Ji Yoon Han and the G20 Research Group, Toronto,
and Irina Popova, Andrey Shelepov, Andrey Sakharov and Alexander Ignatov and the
Center for International Institutions Research
of the Russian Presidential Academy of National Economy and Public Administration,
Moscow

26 June 2019

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*

munkschool.utoronto.ca



At Trinity College
1 Devonshire Place
Toronto, ON
Canada M5S 3K7
T: 416.946.8900 F: 416.946.8915

At the Observatory
315 Bloor Street West
Toronto, ON
Canada M5S 0A7
T: 416.946.8929 F: 416.946.8877

At the Canadiana Gallery
14 Queen's Park Crescent West
Toronto, ON
Canada M5S 3K9
T: 416.978.5120 F: 416.978.5079

Contents

Contents.....	2
Preface.....	3
Toronto Research Team	4
CIIR G20 Research Team	5
Introduction and Summary.....	6
Commitment Breakdown.....	7
Selection of Commitments	7
Final Compliance Scores.....	7
Final Compliance by Member	7
Final Compliance by Commitment	7
Table 1: 2018 G20 Buenos Aires Summit Commitments Selected for Compliance Monitoring	8
Table 2: 2018 G20 Buenos Aires Summit Final Compliance Scores	10
Table 4: 2018 G20 Buenos Aires Summit Final Compliance by Member	11
Table 5: 2018 G20 Buenos Aires Summit Final Compliance by Commitment	12
Table 6: G20 Compliance by Member, 2008–2017	13
Conclusions.....	14
Future Research and Reports	14
Considerations and Limitations	14
Appendix: General Considerations	15
1. Climate Change: Disaster Resilience.....	16
2. Development: Early Childhood Development	47
3. Digital Economy: Data Governance	74
4. Employment: Skills Development	104
5. Energy: Cleaner, Flexible and Transparent Systems	146
6. Financial Regulation: Tax Administration	208
7. Food Security: Malnutrition	240
8. Gender: Economic Empowerment.....	302
9. Reform of the International Financial Institutions: International Monetary Fund.....	358
10. Macroeconomics: Inclusive Growth.....	379
11. Climate Change: Paris Agreement.....	430
12. Digital Economy: Digital Infrastructure	461
13. Employment: Future of Work.....	490
14. Energy: Energy Security.....	513
15. Financial Regulation: Technology	541
16. Financial Regulation: International Taxation	567
17. Food and Agriculture: Sustainable Agriculture	584
18. Health: Universal Health Coverage.....	616
19. Infrastructure: Infrastructure Investment.....	651
20. Trade: Reform of the World Trade Organization	672

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.

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.

Professor John Kirton
Co-director, G20 Research Group

Toronto Research Team

Professor John Kirton, Co-director, G20 Research Group
Alessandra Cicci, Co-chair, Summit Studies
Jiyoon Han, Co-chair, Summit Studies
Meagan Byrd Compliance Director
Steven Camit, Compliance Director
Sonja Dobson, Compliance Director
Nasser Haidar, Compliance Director
Angela Hou, Compliance Director
David Manocchio, Compliance Director
Sarah Mariani, Compliance Director
Christopher Sims, Compliance Director
Julia Tops, Compliance Director
Kvitlana Tsap, Compliance Director

G20 Research Group Lead Analysts

Lily Amiri	Sofia Lopez	Drishti Thakkar
Emily Chu	Kathryn Mannie	Ivana Yuen
Arshia Hassani	Bianca Meta	
Joanna Ilunga	Ian Stansbury	

G20 Research Group Analysts

Omar Abdellatif	Jane Huang	Omolade Ogunsanya
Farida Abdelmequied	Ilan Hughes	Krishanu Ranwan
Alyssa Atef	Aaron Kivell	Joshua Raghbir
Sophia Bai	Katharina Kuhn	Shubdeep Randhawa
Florence Chan	Amal Ismail-Ladak	Callista Ryan
Isha Chaudhuri	Sarah Jevnikar	Philip Schwarz
Jamie Chen	Alykhan Jetha	Turina Simanduyev
Cheryl Cheung	Wenny Jin	Olivia Smith
Fatima Chohan	Shafna Kallil	Max Somer
Natasha Comeau	Jaivika Kataria	Sophia Spiteri
Leonardo Cosenza	Nammal Khan	Pedro Melo Trindade
Coral Cripps	Vannie Kopalakrishnan	Abhishek Trivedi
Amit Dalaya	Justin Lall	Wing Ka Tsang
Kaylin Dawe	Denise Lee	Olga Tumurova
Isabel Davis	Eunbi Lee	Timur Tursunbayev
Chantal Elias	Abigail Lessard	Saranngan Vaithianathan
Sila Naz Elgin	Yilin Liu	Diego Vasquez
Tasneem Gedi	Areej Malik	Nicole Vucemilo
Wayne George	Jijun Meng	Jennifer Wang
Raluca Gondor	Gayathiri Moorthy	Sebastian Warma
Susha Guan	Anahid Najafizadeh	Brian Wu
Nour Habli	Adrienne Nan	Collin Xia
Katherine Hewitt	Jae Yoon Mary Noh	Emi Yasuda
Andrea Ho	Arnaud Nsamirizi	Brandon Yih
Ruiyang Hu	Ivette Ordóñez Núñez	Gabriella Shiyuan Zhao

CIIR G20 Research Team

Marina Larionova, Director
Irina Popova, Moscow Team Director
Alexander Ignatov
Andrey Sakharov
Andrey Shelepov

CIIR Analysts

Pavel Doronin
Mariva Kalugina
Nadezhda Kamenkovich
Karina Khasanova
Svetlana Kochetkova
Uliana Koptukh
Anna Kotlvarova
Yekaterina Litvintseva

Dmitriy Lukanin
Daria Mvasnikova
Polina Petrova
Anna Piekalnits
Elizaveta Safonkina
Polina Shtanko
Arseniy Zakharov

Introduction and Summary

The G20 2018 Buenos Aires Final Compliance Report is prepared by the G20 Research Group based at the University of Toronto and its Russian partner at the Center for International Institutions Research of the Russian Presidential Academy of National Economy and Public Administration (RANEPA). The report analyzes compliance by G20 members with a selection of 20 priority commitments of a total of 128 commitments made at the Buenos Aires Summit hosted by Argentina on 30 November – 1 December 2018. The report covers relevant actions taken by the G20 members between 2 December 2018 to 10 May 2019.

Due to the short seven-month compliance cycle between the Buenos Aires and Osaka summits, there was not sufficient time to prepare an interim compliance report. As a result, there remain at least two questions regarding the interpretive guidelines and consequent scoring metrics and scores for at least two assessments in this report. One, regarding commitment 17 on food and agriculture, is the inclusion of the actions of state-owned enterprises as qualifying as government implementing action. The second question applies to the two climate change commitments with regard to including the depth as well as breadth of implementing action in the assessments.

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 (the International Organisations Research Institute at the Higher School of Economics (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 per cent and +1 equals 100 per cent.¹

A -1 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 RANEPA (formerly the research team at IORI HSE) continue to monitor developments, 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>.

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 promise by summit members that they will undertake future action to move toward, meet or adjust to an identified target.

Commitment Breakdown

The G20 made a total of 128 commitments at the Buenos Aires Summit.² These commitments, as identified by the G20 Research Group and RANEPa, are drawn from the official Buenos Aires Leaders' Declaration and the G20 Buenos Aires Action Plan.

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

For the 2018 Buenos Aires Final Compliance Report, 20 priority commitments were selected for assessment by the University of Toronto and RANEPa teams from the 128 commitments made at the Buenos Aires Summit (see Table 1).

Final Compliance Scores

The assessment is based on relevant, publicly available information relating to actions taken from 2 December 2018 to 10 May 2019. The final 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 full final report and including all 20 priority commitments, G20 members achieved an average final compliance score of 78%.

Final Compliance by Member

For compliance with the Buenos Aires Summit's priority commitments, the European Union, has the highest rate of compliance at +1.00 (100%), followed by Australia at +0.80 (90%), and Argentina, Canada, China, Germany and the United Kingdom tied with +0.75 (88%). The lowest scoring member is South Africa with +0.05 (53%). The difference between the highest and lowest G20 member compliance scores is +0.95 (47%). All the scores by G20 members are listed in Table 3.

Final Compliance by Commitment

This particular compliance cycle has produced a high level of compliance for several areas so far. The commitments on health (universal health coverage) and digital infrastructure ranked highest at +0.85 (93%), followed by the commitments on energy security and malnutrition at +0.80 (90%), and on clean energy systems at +0.75 (88%). The lowest score was on financial regulation on potential benefits of technology in the financial sector at +0.05 (53%). For more information on scoring by commitment, see Table 8.

² 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 Reference Manual for Summit Commitment and Compliance Coding).

Table 1: 2018 G20 Buenos Aires Summit Commitments Selected for Compliance Monitoring

1	Climate Change: Disaster Resilience	“[We recognize the importance of comprehensive adaptation strategies, including investment in infrastructure that is resilient to extreme weather events and disasters.] In this sense, we support actions and cooperation in developing countries, especially those that are particularly vulnerable, including small island states such as those in the Caribbean.” (Buenos Aires Leaders’ Declaration)
2	Development: Early Childhood Development	“We launch the G20 Initiative for Early Childhood Development and stand ready to join all stakeholders in enhancing quality and sustainably financed early childhood programs that consider the multidimensional approach of ECD, as means of building human capital to break the cycle of intergenerational and structural poverty, and of reducing inequalities, specially where young children are most vulnerable.” (Buenos Aires Leaders’ Declaration)
3	Digital Economy: Data Governance	“We support the free flow of information, ideas and knowledge, while respecting applicable legal frameworks, and working to build consumer trust, privacy, data protection and intellectual property rights protection.” (Buenos Aires Leaders’ Declaration)
4	Employment: Skills Development	[We remain committed to building an inclusive, fair and sustainable Future of Work by promoting...] vocational training and skills development, [including reskilling workers and improving labour conditions in all forms of employment, recognizing the importance of social dialogue in this area, including work delivered through digital platforms, with a focus on promoting labour formalization and making social protection systems strong and portable, subject to national law and circumstances.] (Buenos Aires Leaders’ Declaration)
5	Energy: Cleaner, Flexible and Transparent Systems	“We encourage energy transitions that combine growth with decreasing greenhouse gas emissions towards cleaner, more flexible and transparent systems.” (Buenos Aires Leaders’ Declaration)
6	Financial Regulation: Tax Administration	“We continue to support enhanced tax certainty and tax capacity building in developing countries, including through the Platform for Collaboration on Tax.” (Buenos Aires Leaders’ Declaration)
7	Food Security: Malnutrition	“Building on the G20 Food Security and Nutrition Framework, we reaffirm our commitment to tackling the challenges of food security, which is crucial to achieving a world free of hunger and all forms of malnutrition.” (Buenos Aires Leaders’ Declaration)
8	Gender: Economic Empowerment	“We commit to promoting women’s economic empowerment, including by working with the private sector, to improve labour conditions for all, such as through access to quality and affordable care infrastructure and parental leave, and reducing the gender pay gap.” (Buenos Aires Leaders’ Declaration)
9	International Finance Institution Reform: International Monetary Fund	“We reaffirm our commitment to further strengthening the global financial safety net with a strong, quota-based, and adequately resourced IMF at its centre.” (G20 Buenos Aires Action Plan)
10	Macroeconomics: Inclusive Growth	“We are steadfast in our commitment to ensure that growth is inclusive and that the benefits are shared widely amongst our citizens.” (Buenos Aires Action Plan)

11	Climate Change: Paris Agreement	“Signatories to the Paris Agreement, who have also joined the Hamburg Action Plan], commit to its full implementation, reflecting common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities, in light of different national circumstances.” (G20 Buenos Aires Action Plan)
12	Digital Economy: Digital Infrastructure	“[To maximize the benefits of digitalization and emerging technologies for innovative growth and productivity], we will promote measures to ... improve ... digital infrastructure.” (G20 Buenos Aires Action Plan)
13	Employment: Future of Work	“We endorse the Menu of Policy Options for the Future of Work which we will draw on, considering individual country circumstances, to: harness technology to strengthen growth and productivity.” (G20 Buenos Aires Action Plan)
14	Energy: Energy Security	“We will promote energy security, sustainability, resilience, efficiency, affordability and stability, acknowledging that there are varied sources of energy and technological advances to achieve a low emissions future.” (G20 Buenos Aires Action Plan)
15	Financial Regulation: Technology	“We will step up efforts to ensure that the potential benefits of technology in the financial sector can be realized while risks are mitigated.” (G20 Buenos Aires Action Plan)
16	Financial Regulation: International Taxation	“We will continue our work for a globally fair, sustainable, and modern international tax system based, in particular on tax treaties and transfer pricing rules, and welcome international cooperation to advance pro-growth tax policies.” (G20 Buenos Aires Action Plan)
17	Food and Agriculture: Sustainable Agriculture	“We will promote dynamism in rural areas and sustainable agriculture, conscious of the importance of sustainable soil, water and riverbanks management supported by individual countries voluntarily, taking into consideration the specific needs of family and small-holder farmers.” (G20 Buenos Aires Action Plan)
18	Health: Universal Health Coverage	“We reaffirm the need for stronger health systems providing cost effective and evidence-based intervention to achieve better access to health care and to improve its quality and affordability to move towards Universal Health Coverage (UHC), in line with their national contexts and priorities.” (G20 Buenos Aires Action Plan)
19	Infrastructure: Infrastructure Investment	“To address the persistent infrastructure financing gap, we reaffirm our commitment to attract more private capital to infrastructure investment.” (G20 Buenos Aires Action Plan)
20	Trade: World Trade Organization Reform	“We therefore support the necessary reform of the WTO to improve its functioning.” (G20 Buenos Aires Action Plan)

Table 2: 2018 G20 Buenos Aires Summit Final 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	Climate Change: Disaster Resilience	0	+1	0	+1	0	+1	+1	+1	-1	+1	+1	+1	0	-1	0	-1	0	+1	+1	+1	+0.40	70%
2	Development: Early Childhood Development	+1	+1	+1	+1	0	0	+1	0	0	0	+1	0	0	+1	0	-1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+0.45	73%
3	Digital Economy: Data Governance	0	+1	0	0	+1	0	0	-1	+1	0	0	0	+1	0	-1	0	0	-1	+1	+1	+0.10	55%
4	Employment: Skills Development	0	+1	0	+1	0	+1	+1	+1	0	-1	0	0	+1	0	0	0	0	+1	+1	+1	+0.40	70%
5	Energy: Cleaner, Flexible and Transparent Systems	0	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	0	+1	0	+1	-1	+1	+1	+0.75	88%
6	Financial Regulation: Tax Administration	+1	+1	0	0	+1	+1	+1	+1	0	0	0	0	+1	0	+1	0	+1	0	+1	+1	+0.50	75%
7	Food Security: Malnutrition	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	0	+1	+1	+1	+1	0	+1	0	+1	+1	0	+1	+0.80	90%
8	Gender: Economic Empowerment	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	0	0	+1	0	+1	0	+1	+1	0	0	+1	+1	+1	+0.65	83%
9	IFI Reform: IMF	+1	0	+1	+1	+1	0	0	+1	-1	-1	+1	0	+1	0	+1	0	0	0	0	+1	+0.35	68%
10	Macroeconomics: Inclusive Growth	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	0	0	0	+1	+1	0	0	+1	+1	+1	0	+1	+1	+1	+1	+0.70	85%
11	Climate Change: Paris Agreement	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	0	+1	+1	+1	+1	0	0	0	0	+1	n/a	+1	+1	+0.74	87%
12	Digital Economy: Digital Infrastructure	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	0	+1	+1	+1	0	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	0	+1	+0.85	93%
13	Employment: Future of Work	+1	+1	0	0	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	0	+1	0	0	0	+1	0	+1	+0.65	83%
14	Energy: Energy Security	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	0	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	0	0	0	+1	+1	+1	+0.80	90%
15	Financial Regulation: Technology	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-1	0	0	+1	0	-1	0	0	0	0	+1	0	+1	+0.05	53%
16	Financial Regulation: International Taxation	+1	+1	+1	0	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	0	-1	0	+1	0	0	+1	0	+1	+0.60	80%
17	Food and Agriculture: Sustainable Agriculture	+1	0	+1	+1	+1	0	+1	0	0	+1	+1	0	0	+1	0	+1	+1	0	+1	+1	+0.55	78%
18	Health: UHC	+1	0	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	0	0	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	0	+1	+1	+1	+1	+0.85	93%
19	Infrastructure: Infrastructure Investment	+1	+1	+1	+1	0	+1	0	0	+1	+1	0	+1	+1	+1	0	0	0	+1	+1	+1	+0.65	83%
20	Trade: WTO Reform	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	0	+1	0	+1	0	+1	+1	+1	0	-1	-1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+0.60	80%
	Average	+0.75	+0.80	+0.70	+0.75	+0.75	+0.65	+0.75	+0.45	+0.35	+0.55	+0.60	+0.60	+0.35	+0.45	+0.45	+0.05	+0.25	+0.75	+0.37	+1.00	+0.57	78%
		88%	90%	85%	88%	88%	83%	88%	73%	68%	78%	80%	80%	68%	73%	73%	53%	63%	88%	69%	100%	78%	

Note: IFI = international financial institution; IMF = International Monetary Fund; UHC = universal health coverage; WTO = World Trade Organization.

Table 3: 2018 G20 Buenos Aires Summit Final Compliance by Member

Rank	Member	Average	
1	European Union	+1.00	100%
2	Australia	+0.80	90%
3	Argentina	+0.75	88%
	Canada		
	China		
	Germany		
	United Kingdom		
8	Brazil	+0.70	85%
9	France	+0.65	83%
10	Japan	+0.60	80%
	Korea		
12	Italy	+0.55	78%
13	India	+0.45	73%
	Russia		
	Saudi Arabia		
16	United States	+0.37	69%
17	Indonesia	+0.35	68%
	Mexico		
19	Turkey	+0.25	63%
20	South Africa	+0.05	53%

Table 4: 2018 G20 Buenos Aires Summit Final Compliance by Commitment

Rank	Commitment	Average	
1	Digital Economy: Digital Infrastructure	+0.85	93%
	Health: Universal Health Coverage		
3	Energy: Energy Security	+0.80	90%
	Food Security: Malnutrition		
5	Energy: Cleaner, Flexible and Transparent Systems	+0.75	88%
6	Climate Change: Paris Agreement	+0.74	87%
7	Macroeconomics: Inclusive Growth	+0.70	85%
8	Employment: Future of Work	+0.65	83%
	Gender: Economic Empowerment		
	Infrastructure: Infrastructure Investment		
11	Financial Regulation: International Taxation	+0.60	80%
	Trade: Reform of the World Trade Organization		
13	Food and Agriculture: Sustainable Agriculture	+0.55	78%
14	Development: Early Childhood Development	+0.45	73%
	Financial Regulation: Tax Administration		
16	Climate Change: Disaster Resilience	+0.40	70%
	Employment: Skills Development		
18	IFI Reform: International Monetary Fund	+0.35	68%
19	Digital Economy: Data Governance	+0.10	55%
20	Financial Regulation: Technology	+0.05	53%

Table 5: G20 Compliance by Member, 2008–2017

Member	Final Washington 2008		Final London 2009		Final Pittsburgh 2009		Final Toronto 2010		Final Seoul 2010		Final Cannes 2011		Final Los Cabos 2012		Final St. Petersburg 2013		Final Brisbane 2014		Final Antalya 2015		Final Hangzhou 2016		Final Hamburg 2017	
	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%	+0.53	76%	+0.63	82%	+0.82
Australia	n/a	–	+0.60	80%	+0.50	75%	+0.56	78%	+0.85	93%	+0.67	84%	+0.94	97%	+0.63	81%	+0.59	79%	+0.65	82%	+0.79	89%	+0.71	85%
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%	+0.12	56%	+0.53	76%	+0.58	79%	+0.82	91%
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%	+0.71	85%	+0.65	82%	+0.84	92%	+0.94	97%
China	0	50%	-0.40	30%	+0.13	57%	+0.38	69%	+0.42	71%	+0.53	77%	+0.38	69%	+0.19	59%	+0.59	79%	+0.59	79%	+0.74	87%	+0.76	88%
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%	+0.63	81%	+0.71	85%	+0.63	82%	+0.94	97%
Germany	+1.00	100%	+0.80	90%	+0.63	82%	+0.56	78%	+0.54	77%	+0.67	84%	+0.56	78%	+0.75	88%	+0.69	84%	+0.71	85%	+0.79	89%	+0.88	94%
India	0	50%	-0.40	30%	-0.38	31%	-0.29	36%	+0.42	71%	+0.60	80%	+0.50	75%	+0.63	81%	+0.59	79%	+0.65	82%	+0.63	82%	+0.82	91%
Indonesia	n/a	–	-0.40	30%	-0.63	19%	-0.13	44%	+0.36	68%	+0.14	57%	+0.47	74%	+0.50	75%	+0.12	56%	+0.18	59%	+0.53	76%	+0.94	97%
Italy	+1.00	100%	0	50%	+0.13	57%	+0.56	78%	+0.77	89%	+0.80	90%	+0.19	60%	+0.44	72%	+0.13	56%	+0.71	85%	+0.32	66%	+0.76	88%
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%	+0.65	82%	+0.35	68%	+0.68	84%	+0.76	88%
Korea	n/a	–	0	50%	+0.75	88%	+0.56	78%	+0.46	73%	+0.60	80%	+0.63	82%	+0.38	69%	+0.65	82%	+0.53	76%	+0.68	84%	+0.71	85%
Mexico	+1.00	100%	0	50%	+0.25	63%	-0.14	43%	+0.58	79%	+0.67	84%	+0.69	85%	+0.38	69%	+0.47	74%	+0.53	76%	+0.53	76%	+0.65	82%
Russia	0	50%	+0.40	70%	+0.38	69%	+0.13	57%	+0.59	80%	+0.60	80%	+0.63	82%	+0.44	72%	+0.47	74%	+0.47	74%	+0.68	84%	+0.65	82%
Saudi Arabia	n/a	–	+0.20	60%	-0.13	44%	-0.13	44%	+0.08	54%	+0.21	61%	+0.50	75%	+0.06	53%	-0.24	38%	+0.35	68%	+0.42	71%	+0.59	79%
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%	-0.12	44%	+0.24	62%	+0.37	68%	+0.65	82%
Turkey	n/a	–	+0.20	60%	-0.25	38%	-0.14	43%	+0.17	59%	+0.20	60%	+0.25	63%	+0.25	63%	0	50%	+0.41	71%	+0.37	68%	+0.29	65%
UK	+1.00	100%	+1.00	100%	+0.50	75%	+0.78	89%	+0.77	89%	+0.87	94%	+0.81	91%	+0.75	88%	+0.76	88%	+0.71	85%	+0.47	74%	+0.94	97%
US	0	50%	+0.40	70%	+1.00	100%	+0.33	67%	+0.38	69%	+0.53	77%	+0.81	91%	+0.69	84%	+0.76	88%	+0.71	85%	+0.42	71%	+0.35	68%
EU	+1.00	100%	+0.60	80%	+0.38	69%	+0.57	79%	+0.82	91%	+0.85	93%	+0.75	88%	+0.63	81%	+0.75	88%	+0.81	91%	+0.84	92%	0.94	97%
Average	+0.67	83%	+0.23	62%	+0.24	62%	+0.28	64%	+0.50	75%	+0.54	77%	+0.57	79%	+0.44	72%	+0.42	71%	+0.55	77%	+0.60	80%	0.75	87%

n/a = not available

Conclusions

G20 compliance performance for the chosen priority commitments, measured as a summit average, improved incrementally from the 2009 London Summit and 2009 Pittsburgh Summit (both at 62%) to the 2010 Toronto Summit (64%) and then rose with the 2010 Seoul Summit (75%), the 2011 Cannes Summit (77%) and the 2012 Los Cabos Summit (79%). With the 2013 St. Petersburg Summit, compliance dropped to 72% and the compliance with the 2014 Brisbane Summit commitments dropped to 71%. The final score for the 2015 Antalya Summit was 77%. The final score for the 2016 Hangzhou Summit is 80%. The final score for the 2017 Hamburg Summit is 87%. 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 2018 Buenos Aires 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 Buenos Aires Summit. This report has been produced as an invitation for others to provide additional or more complete information on compliance during the period under study. 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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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 US, the Queen's Speech in the UK and the Speech from the Throne in Canada. Merely repeating a G20 commitment in another forum does not count fully as compliant behaviour.

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.

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.

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.