Implementing the G20 Seoul Development and Employment Commitments: An Assessment

Dr. John Kirton, Caroline Bracht and Leanne Rasmussen

Global Governance Research Program
Trinity College, University of Toronto
October 29, 2012

The authors gratefully acknowledge the financial support of the International Labour Office through ILO–Korea Partnership Program.
The authors are solely responsible for the contents of this report and for any remaining errors and omissions. The report does not necessarily reflect the official views of the G20 members and the ILO.

Implementing the G20 Seoul Development and Employment Commitments: An Assessment / International Labour Office, Employment Policy Department. – Geneva: ILO, 2012

ISBN: 978-92-2-126935-9 (web pdf)

ILO Cataloguing in Publication Data

ILO publications and electronic products can be obtained through major booksellers or ILO local offices in many countries, or direct from ILO Publications, International Labour Office, CH-1211 Geneva 22, Switzerland. Catalogues or lists of new publications are available free of charge from the above address, or by email: pubvente@ilo.org

Visit our web site: www.ilo.org/publns

Printed by the International Labour Office, Geneva, Switzerland

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank Wang Kim, Technical Specialist in the Country Employment Policy Unit of the Employment Policy Department, for managing the project under the guidance of Azita Berar Awad, Director, Employment Policy Department, and Iyanatul Islam, Chief, Country Employment Policy Unit, at the International Labour Office in Geneva.

The authors would also like to thank the authors of the three case studies that fed into this report: Y.K. Alagh, Dev Nathan, A.N. Sharma, Preet Rustagi and Sudha Shrotria in India; Isabel Studer and Talia Contreras in Mexico; and Siphamandla Zondi in South Africa.

They are also grateful for the research assistance of Vy Nguyen, Julia Hein, Sophie Langlois, Khilola Zakhidova, Alec Khachatrian, Nimra Hasan, Zhiying Zhang, Jeffrey Neto, Samantha Ruddick, Sara Amini, Kevin Moraes, Kathleen Broschuk, Bailie McGurn, Misha Potrykus, Amy Kishek, Michelle Li, Talha Aquil, Emily Cox, Tanzina Zaman, Angela Zhang, Zhaonan Qin, Dilbar Sadykova, Ashley Pereira, Julia Kulik, Seher Shafiq, Zaria Shaw, Vasileios Tsianos, Raymond Ziemba, Daiana Kostova, Ifra Jamil, Chris Sungjin Kim, Megan Wallingford, Pam Chaudhri, Polliana Mendonca, Roxanne Desouza, Nadia Bucciarelli, Yukie Suzuki, Inesa Buchyn, Jennifer Vlasiu, Maria Marchyshyn, John Salerno, Alex Grohovsky, Selena Lucien, Maria Marini, Jennifer Green, Sabina Voicu and Elyse Finley.

Finally, the authors appreciate the comments on the first draft of this report from the external reviewer who offered valuable suggestions for improvement.

Contents

Executive Summary

There is a renewed commitment to employment promotion as an integral part of the global development agenda. For example, the World Bank released its much-noted 2012-13 *World Development Report* (WDR) on the theme of jobs. This is only the second time in the 34 years of the WDR that this has happened. It is worth noting that, for a long time in the 2000s, the employment dimension of development was given insufficient attention. This was exemplified by the lack of explicit targets or statements in the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) when they were first unveiled in 2000. It took a long and determined campaign by the International Labour Organization (ILO) to ensure that the eventual attainment of full, productive employment and decent work for all becomes a central aspiration of the MDGs. This campaign came to fruition in 2008 when, for the first time, the global monitoring framework on MDGs incorporated a set of indicators that would enable countries to track progress toward the employment dimensions of development.

The renewed commitment to job creation — in terms of both quality and quantity — has been propelled by the unemployment crisis in the European Union and the sluggish employment recovery in the United States. There is also widespread recognition that, despite significant reductions in poverty and improvement in health, nutrition and education, many developing countries have not satisfactorily dealt with the preponderance of low-productivity jobs. It is thus an appropriate juncture to take stock of the extent to which the global community is seeking to fulfil its development commitments from the perspective of employment promotion. One way of tracking such global collective action as well as its implementation is to focus on the Group of 20 (G20) and the various ways in which its members have articulated a vision of the development-employment nexus, translated them into commitments and engaged in their implementation. Hence, this study seeks to offer an assessment of the implementation of the development and employment commitments that were made at the G20 summit in Seoul on November 11-12, 2010.

The Seoul Development Consensus (SDC) offered a new approach to the central and persistent problem of development. At Seoul, the leaders agreed on 25 clear, future-oriented, collective commitments: 20 on development alone, two on development and the integrally linked component of employment, and three on employment alone. If these pioneering promises are to make a meaningful difference in the real world of development, G20 members must implement them, both in the first year following the summit and then in the months and years beyond.

This study assesses how much the G20 members have done so. Based on an analytic framework and methodology developed and applied by the G20 Research Group since 2008 and by its companion G8 Research Group since 1996, it first identifies and categorizes the specific development and employment commitments G20 leaders made at the Seoul Summit and specifies the method for assessing implementation. It then assesses for two periods the overall degree of implementation, by the G20 as a whole and by each of its individual members, of the development commitments, the development-employment commitments and the employment commitments. It goes on to assess how this implementation compares with that of the G20 in other commitments made at the Seoul Summit, and of the G20 summit commitments on development, employment and other subjects since the leaders' first summit in Washington in 2008. Throughout this analysis the study draws on supporting case studies on India, Mexico and South Africa, commissioned for this purpose.

The results show that the 25 development and employment commitments agreed to by G20 leaders at Seoul in November 2010 have made a real difference in the otherwise autonomous behaviour of the G20 members. The 22 of those commitments measured for this study were implemented at an average of 65.5% one year later. Implementation was led by several advanced members and a few emerging members. It was about equal on the 20 development-alone and the two development-employment commitments, but significantly higher on the three employment-only ones. Implementation of the 22 commitments was, on average, at a lower level than that for the priority commitments (across all subjects) made at Seoul and for all G20 summits from 2008 through 2011 on development and on all subjects combined.

From the end of the initial 12-month period to the end of the extended 18-month period on April 30, 2010, implementation rose from 65.5% to 67%. Enhanced compliance was visible (rising 1.5% in the additional six months), widespread across commitments (with rising compliance for 10 of the 22 assessed commitments), widespread across members (with 8 of the 20 rising) and widespread across subsets of members. The increase was higher among members not in the Group of Seven (G7) or Group of Eight (G8) and among emerging country members, especially those beyond the BRICS group of Brazil, Russia, India, China and South Africa.

The causes of compliance appear to be located less in attributes at the national level, such as a member's economic or population size, per capita wealth or degree of democracy, than in international institutional factors, based on the length of experience and like-mindedness among members in relevant international institutions. This is especially so for those international institutions that contain an institution for finance ministers and development ministers and that place a premium on consensus-oriented, analytically grounded decision making and that link otherwise separate issue areas, including development and employment. Thus compliance in the initial period is highest for those G20 members that belong to the G7, that have hosted a G20 summit, that are members of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) and that have hosted an annual G20 finance ministerial. In the extended period it is highest for those members that have hosted a G20 summit, that have hosted an annual G20 finance ministerial, that belong to the OECD and that belong to the G7.

The consequences of this compliance performance on employment are positive but can be improved. The development-only commitments command about the same level of compliance as the development-employment commitments but less than the employment-only ones. Few of the 25 commitments concentrated on areas such as infrastructure, where the direct employment-generating effects are known to be strong. The implementing action for the commitment with the median compliance score made very little direct reference to jobs as a goal or as a dimension of the development action undertaken by G20 members; it referred more to training and education and to entrepreneurship and skills, but not at all to the ILO. There is thus a need to develop an evidence-based social science model of the development-employment link, match it to the model used by the G20 summit and apply the scientific model to improve the implementation activity of the G20.

This analysis points to several recommendations both for improving the analytic basis for policy action and for immediately introducing policies that are based on current knowledge. The analytic foundation for action could be improved by 1) enriching the quality of the existing data set; 2) monitoring compliance with the Seoul development and employment commitments for a full 24 months; 3) identifying the complex causes and catalysts of G20 development-employment compliance; and 4) matching social science and G20 governance models of the development-employment link. Policy action can be taken immediately to conduct internal implementation assessments by the G20, the ILO and other stakeholders; to encourage the appointment of a national coordinator; to mount systematic compliance monitoring by the G20's Development Working Group; to integrate the work of the Development Working Group and the G20 employment ministers; to focus on youth employment and entrepreneurship effects; to mainstream employment effects into development commitments; and to further implement a partnership-based capacity-building approach to development.

Introduction

There is a renewed commitment to employment promotion as an integral part of the global development agenda. For example, the World Bank released its much-noted 2012-13 *World Development Report* (WDR) on the theme of jobs. This is only the second time in the 34 years of the WDR that this has happened. It is worth noting that, for a long time in the 2000s, the employment dimension of development was given insufficient attention. This was exemplified by the lack of explicit targets or statements in the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) when they were first unveiled in 2000. It took a long and determined campaign by the International Labour Organization (ILO) to ensure that the eventual attainment of full, productive employment and decent work for all becomes a central aspiration of the MDGs. This campaign came to fruition in 2008 when, for the first time, the global monitoring framework on MDGs incorporated a set of indicators that would enable countries to track progress toward the employment dimensions of development.

The renewed commitment to job creation — in terms of both quality and quantity — has been propelled by the unemployment crisis in the European Union and the sluggish employment recovery in the United States. There is also widespread recognition that, despite significant reductions in poverty and improvement in health, nutrition and education, many developing countries have not satisfactorily dealt with the preponderance of low-productivity jobs. It is thus an appropriate juncture to take stock of the extent to which the global community is seeking to fulfil its development commitments from the perspective of employment promotion. One way of tracking such global collective action as well as its implementation is to focus on the Group of 20 (G20) and the various ways in which its members have articulated a vision of the development-employment nexus, translated them into commitments and engaged in their implementation. Hence, this study seeks to offer an assessment of the implementation of the development and employment commitments that were made at the G20 summit in Seoul on November 11-12, 2010.

The G20's Seoul Summit marked a major advance for global development. There the leaders of the world's 19 systemically significant states and the European Union, with their participating partners, approved the Seoul Development Consensus (SDC), which offered a new approach to this central and persistent global challenge. To put this new approach into action, G20 leaders agreed on 25 clear, future-oriented, collective commitments: 20 on development alone, two on development and the integrally linked component of employment, and three on only employment, which is a key cause of development. Yet if these pioneering promises are to make a meaningful difference in the real world of development and employment, G20 members collectively and individually must implement them, both in the year after the Seoul Summit and in the extended six-month period beyond.

This study assesses how much the G20 members have done so. It examines the implementation by the G20 as a whole and by each of its 20 members of the 25 development and employment commitments made at the Seoul Summit, both in the year following that summit and in the six-month period afterward, extending to April 30, 2012. Using an analytic framework and methodology developed and applied by the G20 Research Group since 2008 and by its companion G8 Research Group since 1996, it first identifies and categorizes the specific development and employment commitments made at the Seoul Summit and specifies how their implementation can be assessed. It then assesses for the two periods the overall degree of implementation, by the G20 as a whole and by each individual member, of the development-only commitments, the development-employment commitments and the employment-only commitments. It also assesses how this implementation compares with that of the G20 on other commitments made at the Seoul Summit and of the G20 summit commitments on development, employment and other issues since the leaders' first meeting at the Washington Summit on November 14-15, 2008.

Three case studies were conducted to contribute to this analysis: one on India, led by Yoginder K. Alagh; one on Mexico, led by Isabel Studer; and one on South Africa, led by Siphamandla Zondi (Alagh et al. 2012; Studer and Contreras 2012; Zondi 2012). This report thus draws on the findings produced by these studies.

Identifying Seoul's Development and Employment Commitments

This analysis finds that the G20 Seoul Summit made 25 development and employment commitments: 20 on development alone, two on development with a specific component on employment (and thus termed "development-employment" commitments) and three on employment alone (see Appendix A). Of the 22 development commitments in the first two categories, three required all G20 members to implement them together at the same level and time, while the remaining 19 allowed for different degrees and times of implementation on each member's part. The commitments varied broadly in their level of generality. A few were composite commitments, containing several of the more specific and selective commitments. Nonetheless, it was possible, for each of the 25 commitments, to create appropriate general and commitment-specific interpretive guidelines to guide the search for and interpret each member's implementation-relevant behaviour up to and after the one-year post–Seoul Summit mark. Using publicly available sources, largely obtained through online research, sufficient data for both the initial and extended periods were assembled for all or almost all members' implementation of 22 commitments. This is fully sufficient to permit a reliable assessment of the overall implementation pattern.

Initial Compliance: Implementation during the First Year

Overall Implementation

G20 members implemented their Seoul development and employment commitments in the year following the Seoul Summit at an overall average level of 65.5% (see Appendix B; note that all figures mentioned herein refer to Table B1).[1] In this first year after the

[1] The scores in this report are presented as percentages; the figures provided in the tables in the appendices are the raw scores on a scale of –1.00 to +1.00, before conversion to the more familiar percentages.

Seoul Summit period, 18 of the 20 members had an implementation score in the positive range (see Appendix C). Implementation by country covered a considerable range of 41.5 percentage points, from a high of 83.5% to a low of 42%.

Member Implementation

The compliance performance of the members clustered in three categories: leaders with high compliance, laggards with low compliance and middle-range members with moderate compliance. It is striking that all three clusters of leaders, laggards and middle-range members contain both advanced and emerging members, members that belong to the Group of Seven (G7) and those that do not, and members that belong to the Group of Eight (G8) and those that do not. This suggests that the G20 is becoming a genuine group of equals where development implementation is concerned. It further suggests that the SDC and its corresponding commitments have generated a genuine partnership, with G20 members at different levels of development acting to implement their commitments to a consequential degree. However, high compliance is still skewed toward the advanced, G7/8 members of the G20 and those that belong to the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), save for Japan and Italy.

Issue Area Implementation

Development Only

The 18 development-alone commitments that were assessed have essentially the same implementation scores as reported above.

Three of these development-alone commitments, by their very nature, require that all members implement them to the same degree at the same time. Dealing with the creation of new institutional mechanisms, those commitments read as follows:

- "We agree to establish a High-Level Panel (HLP) to recommend measures to mobilize infrastructure financing and review MDBs' [multilateral development banks'] policy frameworks" (2010-108);
- "We will announce the Chair of the HLP by December 2010" (2010-109); and
- "Working with the Alliance for Financial Inclusion, the Consultative Group to Assist the Poor and the International Finance Corporation, we commit to launch the Global Partnership for Financial Inclusion (GPFI) as an inclusive platform for all G20 countries, interested non-G20 countries and relevant stakeholders to carry forward our work on financial inclusion, including implementation of the Financial Inclusion Action Plan" (2010-125).[2]

Implementation of these three "all at once together" commitments was 83.5% with two implemented fully (2010-108 and 2010-125) and one (2010-109) implemented partially. This suggests that commitments that require all members to act together at the same time, and thus avoid burden sharing and other problems related to collective action, may be

[2] The numbers in parentheses refer to the list of commitments in Appendix A.

implemented to a higher degree than those that allow for member-specific discretion. Some may also suggest that commitments aimed at institutional creation or enhancement are relatively unambitious ones, dealing with intervening processes rather than with action to produce more directly real development results.

Development-Employment

The two development-employment commitments (2010-110, 2010-111) were implemented at an average of 65%. This is marginally below the overall average and the average for the development-only commitments. Compliance is more equal on the development-employment commitments between advanced and emerging members, between G8 and non-G8 ones, and between G7 and non-G7 ones, and between by OECD and non-OECD ones.

The first development-employment commitment reads: "We will improve the development of employable skills matched to employer and labour market needs in order to enhance the ability to attract investment, create decent jobs and increase productivity" (2010-110). It was complied with at a level of 73.5%, well above the overall average. Here 12 members had full compliance.

The second development-employment commitment reads: "We will support the development of internationally comparable skills indicators and the enhancement of national strategies for skills development, building on the G20 Training Strategy" (2010-111). This commitment has an average implementation score of 56%. While still in the positive range, this score is lower than the overall average of 65.5%. It was fully implemented by three members.

Employment Only

The three employment-only commitments (2010-55, 2010-56 and 2010-57) come from outside the SDC portion of the communiqué. They read as follows:

- "[We will implement a range of structural reforms to boost and sustain global demand, foster job creation, contribute to global rebalancing, and increase our growth potential, and where needed undertake:]
- "labor market and human resource development reforms, including better targeted benefits schemes to increase participation" (2010-55).
- "education and training to increase employment in quality jobs, boost productivity and thereby enhance potential growth" (2010-56).
- "tax reform to enhance productivity by removing distortions and improving the incentives to work, invest and innovate" (2010-57).

They have an average compliance score of 77%, significantly above the overall average of 65.5%. Six members fully complied with all three employment-only commitments. South Africa's performance accords with the strong emphasis placed by its government on employment in its national development strategy before, after and during the Seoul development and employment commitments and their implementation in the initial one-year period after the summit (Zondi 2012).

Comparative Implementation in the Context of the Seoul Summit

The seven development commitments made at Seoul, one of which had previously been assessed as a priority commitment by the G20 Research Group, was implemented at an average score of 78% (see appendices D and E). This is substantially higher than the 65.5% average of the 22 development and employment commitments assessed for this report in its more comprehensive, complete issue area analysis. In terms of methodology, the results suggest that the selection of a smaller set of priority commitments to monitor implementation of the central thrust of the summit should be supplemented, at the level of specific issue areas, by a much more extensive assessment of all the commitments made in those issue areas.

In the broader context of the Seoul Summit, implementation one year later of the 19 priority commitments from all issue areas (including selected development commitments) was also higher, at an average of 75%, than the implementation one year later of the 22 development and employment commitments assessed here (see Appendix D). By issue area, implementation of Seoul's priority commitments was led by socioeconomic issues at 95%, financial regulation and supervision at 81%, macroeconomics at 79%, energy and the environment at 77%, and corruption at 73%. This suggests that implementation of the development commitments, whether measured by the seven priority ones at 78% or by the 22 from this broader analysis at 65.5%, requires additional efforts if the implementation of the Seoul development commitments are to become as strong as the many other core and even newer areas of the Seoul Summit's work.

Comparative Implementation in the Full Multi-Summit Context of the G20

The 65.5% average implementation for the 22 assessed development and employment commitments made at Seoul is below the 68% average for the 12 assessed priority development commitments made at all G20 summits, starting with the Washington Summit in November 2008 through to Seoul in November 2010, including the seven made at Seoul (Kirton 2012b) (see Appendix E). Seoul thus marked a meaningful advance for G20 summit governance of development in the decisional domain of commitments, but not a comparable one in the domain of delivery (compliance or implementation).

Moreover, the 65.5% average implementation for Seoul's 22 assessed development and employment commitments is lower than the overall 70% average for the implementation of the 58 priority commitments assessed from all issue areas from all five G20 summits from Washington 2008 through to Seoul 2010. The scores of 65.5% for Seoul's development and employment commitments, 78% for the seven priority development commitments and 68% for the multi-summit priority development commitments compare with the multi-summit average for priority commitments across other issue areas as follows: macroeconomics 82%; trade, energy and climate change at 71% each; financial regulation at 70%; and corruption at 59%. In short, on all issue areas except corruption the G20 performs better than it did on the Seoul development and employment commitments.

Conclusions on One-Year Implementation

These results on implementation in the initial period of one year after the Seoul Summit show that, while G20 summits had delivered poorly on development in general (based on the five assessed priority commitments before Seoul), they delivered somewhat better on the broader, newer, more ambitious development commitments made at Seoul. The Seoul Summit also delivered well on its employment commitments. The policy challenge is to reinforce the way the G20 delivers on Seoul's development commitments, by mobilizing its good performance in employment and by more innovatively forging the link between development and employment.

Extended Compliance: Implementation after the First Year

There are several good reasons to assess implementation, as has been done above, only in the one-year period following the summit at which commitments are made. After a year, or even sooner, another summit is held. Here leaders have a chance to change their commitments or make new ones, with the result that implementation of previous years' commitments can be overwhelmed, rendered irrelevant or otherwise crowded out by the new commitments and the process of implementing them that now begins. Leaders who know that they will have a chance to recommit at the subsequent summit rationally approach commitment and implementation with this short-term time horizon in mind. Knowing that they will meet their colleagues face to face and experience collective peer pressure at the next summit, they may tend to rush to implement as much as possible just before the initial implementation period ends. Consistent with this logic is the evidence that in the comparable, annual G8 summit, when leaders embed a one-year timetable in a commitment, implementation tends to rise, while it does not when they embed a multi-year target (Kirton 2006; Kirton, Roudev and Sunderland 2007). Also consistent is the evidence that the G8 Research Group's assessments of priority G8 summit commitments at both the interim (six month) and then the later (one year) mark show a consistent rise in implementation in the second half of the full assessment period until the next summit arrives.

Yet it is also the case that some commitments may take longer than one year to be implemented. This could be especially so if such commitments are new, ambitious and broad, requiring members to start from scratch rather than scaling up existing measures or relying on those that they know how to do. It could also be the case if, during the first year, members were afflicted by exogenous shocks, such as a financial crisis, that diverted their attention or otherwise compromised their ability to implement. Both these conditions apply to the year following the summit where the Seoul development commitments were made, with the spread of the European financial crisis to Ireland, Italy and Greece again. Moreover, if compliance with G8 commitments rises from the first six months to the second six months until the next summit, could it rise further in the G20's case if the implementing period extends an additional six months, from a cumulative 12 months to 18 months? It is thus important to look at a longer, extended period to see if G20 compliance is continuous and cumulative, if it plateaus or if it retreats rapidly (for example by diverted attention and resources as a result of new summit commitments, fiscal austerity, government downsizing and financial crisis) when more time is allowed for implementation.

An initial test of these respective “continuous cumulative compliance,” “one year plateau” and “rapid retreat” hypotheses can be conducted by assessing compliance with the 25 Seoul development and employment commitments in the additional six months after the subsequent summit (held at Cannes, France, on November 3-4, 2011), for a full 18-month implementation period from November 2010 to April 2012.

Allowing this six-month extension raises the overall average compliance score from 65.5% in the initial 12-month period to 67%. This increase, while very small, offers support for the “continuing cumulative compliance” hypothesis, in a very modest but still meaningful way.

During the extended period, compliance rose for 10 of the 22 assessed commitments and stayed the same for the remaining 12. It declined for none. Compliance rose for eight of the 18 development-only commitments, none of the two development-employment ones and two of the three employment-only ones. Overall compliance thus rose in almost half the commitments. This suggests that the “continuing cumulative compliance” effect, while very modest, is moderately widespread. It further suggests the value of monitoring compliance over the extended period and beyond, and of designing and introducing implementation mechanisms that will increase compliance over this longer term.

From the initial period to the extended period, eight members’ implementation rose and eight stayed the same. Four members’ implementation declined. This was due to a strong increase in the protectionist measures taken in the six-month extension, which offset and overwhelmed rising compliance on those Seoul development and employment commitments not related to trade (see Appendix C). At the end of the extended period, the rank order of members’ compliance was often the same as for the initial period, while six rose in the ranks. All of those that rose were from outside the G8.

The risers in absolute (rather than relative) scores included countries with initial compliance that was high as well as compliance that was low, advanced country members and emerging country members. It also included those inside the G7 and the OECD, as well as that are in neither the G7 nor the OECD. However, the extended period clearly most benefited the compliance of the emerging countries and countries outside the G7/8 and outside the BRICS group of Brazil, Russia, India, China and South Africa.

In short, from the initial 12 months to the extended 18-month period, enhanced compliance was visible, widespread across commitments (10 of the 22), widespread across members (9 of the 20) and widespread across subsets of countries.

Causes of Compliance

It is important to identify the causes of compliance, if only to see which causes are under the control of and can thus be changed by G20 policymakers and stakeholders to improve the modest compliance scores on the Seoul development and employment commitments in the initial period and reinforce the very modest rising compliance evident in the extended period beyond.

Given the limitations of the current data set, it is difficult to identify with strong confidence the specific causes and catalysts of compliance. A minimum of 30 compliance-assessed commitment cases would be necessary to isolate, through the use of multiple regression analysis, the independent effect of individual causal candidates while controlling for the effects of all the rest. However, a more inductive analysis of the patterns of compliance across the 22 cases currently considered does appear to eliminate some likely causal candidates, while pointing to the probable effects that others have.

In general, the causes of compliance do not appear to be located in aggregate attributes at the national level, such as the economic or population size of the member, its per capita wealth or its degree of open democracy. The causes seem to lie more in international institutional factors. These start with the length of experience and like-mindedness among members in relevant international institutions to which various G20 members belong, and above all in the member's experience of hosting the G20 finance ministers' forum and the summit itself.

In the initial period, compliance is highest for those members that, in turn belong to the G7, that have hosted a G20 summit, that belong to the OECD and that have hosted an annual G20 finance ministerial. In the extended period, compliance is highest for those members that have hosted the G20 summit, that have hosted an annual finance ministerial, that belong to the OECD and that belong to the G7. Compliance between the initial and extended periods rises the most for members that have hosted an annual G20 finance ministerial, that have hosted a G20 summit and that belong to the OECD.

Together these results suggest that higher compliance comes from G20 members that have internalized the responsibilities of G20 host at the summit and ministerial levels and have been socialized into and supported in their responsible summitry by their involvement in the continuously operating OECD and the G7, two institutions that have established finance ministers' forums.

More specifically, the sheer economic size of the country, measured by its overall gross domestic product, does not seem important, even though it may reflect a members' ability to comply. For the initial period, the compliance scores of the largest economic powers in the G20 were both slightly above, equal to, and below the G20 average (see Appendix C). The same general pattern holds true for the full extended period.

In terms of per capita income, the compliance results show that the poor countries can comply along with, if not as well as, the rich ones. The poor members may have a particular incentive to comply as they can empathize more with the G20's development work. Sheer population size appears to have no effect on compliance. Nor does the degree of democracy matter.

At the international institutional level, grouping G20 members into the traditional subsets of the G7/8, G8 Plus Five (the G8 plus Brazil, China, India, Mexico and South Africa), the BRICS and the OECD appears to have a strong effect in some cases. To be sure membership in the BRICS and the G8 produces below-average compliance in both the initial and extended periods (see Appendix F). However, membership in the OECD and G7 seems to have a compliance-enhancing effect.

Initial compliance is strongest among members of the G7, presumably because the G7 is the most like-minded of the summit-level institutions, has a vibrant finance ministers' component and gives its members the longest experience in working collectively on development, dating back to 1975. Here the asserted difference in the alleged traditional G7 approach to development and the G20's new SDC approach appears to be small. The compliance score for the full G8 — with Russia added to the G7 summit but not the G7 finance ministers' forum in 1998 — is low. This further suggests that length of experience and degree of like-mindedness may have compliance-inducing effects.

This inference about length of experience and degree of like-mindedness is sustained by the fact that the newer and more heterogeneous BRICS members, meeting at the summit level since 2009, have an average initial compliance score of only 60.5%, compared to 64.5% for the G8 and 72% for the G7. It is further sustained by the fact that the richer G20 members that also belong to the OECD have an above-average initial compliance score and an extended compliance score, which are above the G8 average in both cases. The OECD, established in 1960, has both a finance ministers' forum and the Development Assistance Committee for development ministers. As an intergovernmental organization it has a professional staff that works continuously year round. It is also a consensus-oriented, analytically based body with a particular strength in linking fields that are separated elsewhere, including the development and employment ones.

What also stands out from this pattern of G20 members' compliance is not simply the presence of a country in a similar or related plurilateral institution (such as the G7, G8, G8+5 or BRICS) or an intergovernmental organization such as the OECD, even though these bring important processes of intense interaction, socialization, learning, peer pressure and additional international institutional support. Also important is the way that roles and responsibilities of institutional leadership within the G20 appear to cause compliance. This is seen most clearly in regard to hosting. For both the initial and extended periods, countries that have hosted a G20 summit have a higher compliance score than the overall G20 average.

This explanation of the hosting effect is confirmed by the detailed process tracing produced for the Mexican case study (Studer and Contreras 2012). As host of the Los Cabos Summit in June 2012, President Felipe Calderón a greater interest in Mexico's compliance with past G20 development and other commitments. Mexico's assumption of the G20 presidency catalyzed a review of compliance with past development commitments during the early stages of the extended period analyzed in this report.

Also striking is the apparent compliance-raising effects of having hosted an annual G20 finance ministers' meeting, since their start in 1999. Those countries that have done so have an above-average compliance score for both the initial and extended periods.

These patterns could suggest that dealing with the Seoul development and employment commitments within the G20 finance ministers' process, as distinct from the development ministers and Development Working Group, could raise compliance. They also point to the potential value of involving the OECD more deeply in the G20's development-employment work.

In addition to these causes identified by the overall analysis and confirmed in some cases, the case studies of India, Mexico and South Africa, conducted alongside this analysis, offer a rich array of causal claims and hypothesis that are worth assessing more systematically on a cross-country basis (see Appendix G).

Consequences of Compliance: Employment Effects

Because development can be a powerful cause of employment and because employment is a critical cause of economic growth and development in its many dimensions, it is important to consider the employment and labour market effects of the policy measures taken in relation to the Seoul development and employment commitments and how the positive employment effects could be further enhanced within the G20 members and beyond (particularly in regard to the least developed countries).

Employment and employment effects refer to more broader terms than just job creation, important though that is. For the purposes of this report, the state of employment exists when persons who are of legal age to work are regularly engaged in formal or informal paid labour or self-employment activities, on a daily or longer basis (as the Indian case study highlights) (OECD 2002). Employment effects are defined as measures that affect the quantity or quality of employment and jobs. A distinction is drawn between income effects and employment effects, where the former encompasses measures meant to support stable income through measures other than employment (including unemployment insurance). Measures that focus on income support or supplementation are not included in employment effects but fall under social protection instead.

As such, this assessment of employment effects thus focuses on impacts of actions relating to the creation, continuation or enhancement of employment, including self-employment. It includes the following categories of action:

- demand-side actions and policies to stimulate the demand for labour (including sectoral policies and industrial policies);
- supply-side actions and policies that focus on the quantity, quality or allocation of the labour force (including education, training, skills development, apprenticeships, labour mobility and promotion of gender equality in employment);
- labour market interventions that may encourage participation or create additional opportunities in the labour force (including legislation on the price of labour or

minimum wage, more flexible work arrangements and programs to target demographic groups such as women or youth);
- support for self-employment and entrepreneurship (including support for small and medium-sized enterprises [SMEs] and access to finance and financial inclusion);
- labour standards to improve the quality of employment, such as occupational health and safety standards; and
- social protection, social programs and public services, excluding direct income support, that can expand individuals' abilities and opportunities to work (such as water and sanitation, health services or child care, which can determine how individuals — especially women — spend their day).

It is difficult to determine the extent to which the G20's implementing actions have created, continued or enhanced employment and jobs in developing countries. There are many areas of economic theory including development economics that lack a robust or comprehensive explanation of what determines employment, or how employment can be best promoted; the corollary is that it is difficult to discern empirically why employment rises or falls in quality or quantity. Moreover, it is difficult to claim which employment-effecting actions are a direct, causal result of the G20 commitments even in the case of detailed process tracing of individual countries' implementation, as all the case studies of India, Mexico and South Africa emphasize (Alagh et al. 2012; Studer and Contreras 2012; Zondi 2012). It is also difficult to discern how much of a country's implementing actions are undertaken because the G20 committed to do so, or how much that country was doing or would have done on its own anyway (Zondi 2012). To further complicate matters, it is still too early to assess the impacts of the G20's actions. Lags in policy effects permit only estimates at this point.

Although direct causal links cannot be made, much can be said about the employment effects of the implementing actions of G20 members. It is possible to identify the links using the existing economic literature on employment and thus estimate the G20's impact. If employment policy is divided into categories of actions and the importance or effectiveness of each type of action is assessed, it would be possible to see where the G20 has been effective and where the G20 has overlooked opportunities for action. In some areas, the G20's effects on employment would appear positive and well planned; in other areas, G20 action would be insufficient, largely absent, or even possibly counterproductive.

The Seoul Communiqué's Conception of the Development-Employment Link

The SDC set out the G20's collective new approach to international development. It organized the G20's development work into nine pillars of action according to six guiding principles. The guiding principles inform the approach to development. They comprise a focus on economic growth, equal partnerships with developing countries, global or regional solutions, private sector participation, complementarity and cooperation, and outcome orientation. The nine pillars inform the content of the G20's work. They comprise infrastructure, human resource development, trade, private investment and job creation, food security, growth with resilience, financial inclusion, domestic resource mobilization and knowledge sharing. The SDC was accompanied by the Multi-Year Action Plan, which primarily assigned tasks to international organizations; similar commitments were also included in the leader-level communiqué.

Linking Development and Employment in the Framing of the Seoul Communiqué

In its statements on employment within development, versus wider statements on employment and economics, the G20 frames employment in slightly different ways. Broadly speaking, the G20's commitments typically require country-level action to be implemented domestically or coordinated among G20 members; these commitments tend to be economic or financial in nature. At this broad, "top" level, which often does not include development, employment is mentioned frequently as a major goal, and as an end in itself. Employment goals are also often referred to in preambles or opening statements, indicating their high priority. This view lends itself to a greater integration of employment concerns and effects into the G20's overall statements, compared to its development-specific statements. That there is a difference between overall statements and development statements points to the G20's failure to integrate development fully into its overall economic commitments, statements and goals. This "siloing" of issues may limit the G20's overall positive impacts on employment, growth and development.

Within its work on development, the G20 mentions employment fairly consistently, but employment seems to be a secondary goal or outcome of development. Employment is typically framed as one means of promoting overall development, rather than an end in itself. Instead, the ends typically expressed are the achievement of the MDGs, poverty reduction and narrowing of the development gap. The integration of the goal of employment into development varies across sub-issue areas, which is evident from an analysis of the SDC's nine pillars.

Linking Development and Employment in the Nine Pillars

With regard to the nine pillars, there is a moderate number of references to employment or employment effects. In pillar one on infrastructure, employment effects are absent, although the 2011 Development Working Group report stated that addressing bottlenecks such as infrastructure is a "major requirement" for increasing job creation (G20 Development Working Group 2011, 1).[3] Again, the expansion of activity in infrastructure is likely to create employment, as the Indian case study highlights (Alagh et al. 2012). But this consideration is not visibly integrated into the relevant commitments and is instead only connected by a longer causal chain. This is also the case for the pillars on trade, food security, domestic resource mobilization and knowledge sharing.

This leaves four pillars that refer specifically to employment or have a more direct bearing on it. Pillar two, human resource development, focuses the most directly on employment effects. It commits to developing indicators of skills for employment, matching training to labour market demand, identifying educational gaps for employable skills and enhancing national strategies for skills development. These commitments thus focus on supply-side labour market strategies and on enhancing the employability of

[3] The pillars are numbered according to the order in which they appear in the Multi-Year Action Plan.

workers, versus the (often more vague) demand-side creation of new economic activity and jobs.

Pillar four is explicitly called "Private Investment and Job Creation." This pillar speaks to the G20's core outlook on the sources of employment for development. Here the G20 calls domestic and foreign private investment "key sources of employment, wealth creation and innovation, which in turn contribute to sustainable development and poverty reduction" (G20 2010). This reinforces the fact that employment is viewed as a component contributing to overall development. The Multi-Year Action Plan names investors as the key actors and decision makers in these activities. G20 action on private investment and job creation thus centres on the needs and preferences of investors. In the action plan, the commitment most focused on employment refers to developing indicators of private investment that maximizes employment creation and economic value, a task assigned to the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD), the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the ILO, the OECD and the World Bank. Other employment-related commitments include the establishment of the G20 Challenge on Innovation, the promotion of entrepreneurship and the development of country action plans for boosting SMEs and maximizing the value of private investment. This emphasis on the private sector, which valuably overlooks the direct role of government in creating employment, especially valuable in the wake of a global financial and economic crisis, as seen in the Indian case study (Alagh et al. 2012).

To the extent that social protection actions include the facilitation of employment opportunities, pillar six — entitled "Growth with Resilience" — touches on employment, specifically on income security. Actions will likely promote employment, in addition to smoothing the effects of underemployment or unemployment. However, the G20 does not explicitly name social protection as a factor that influences employment, as it does for the other three relevant pillars.

Finally, pillar seven, which focuses on financial inclusion, affects employment through actions on self-employment and entrepreneurship. The Multi-Year Action Plan acknowledges that SMEs are critical for economic growth and job creation, yet often face exclusion from financial services. Thus, this pillar's commitments focus on expanding access to appropriate financial services that will facilitate entrepreneurial activity.

Involvement of Labour-Related International Organizations

There are some basic patterns in which international organizations are involved in these pillars. Pillars two (on human resource development), four (on private sector and job creation) and six (on growth with resilience) identify the ILO as an implementing actor. This leaves pillar seven (on financial inclusion) as the only direct employment-related pillar that does not involve the ILO. The OECD is involved in human resource development and private investment, and the UNDP in growth with resilience and private investment. The MDBs and the World Bank are involved in human resource development, private investment and growth with resilience. The Global Partnership for Financial Inclusion is referenced in financial inclusion. The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) is a part of human resource development. UNCTAD is a part of private investment and job creation.

The other five pillars call upon the MDBs and the World Bank most frequently, with the World Bank mentioned in all five and the regional development banks mentioned in infrastructure and trade. The International Monetary Fund is also brought in as a secondary partner under domestic resource mobilization and food security. Other institutions are involved as each individual pillar requires. One pillar makes reference to each of the following: the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD), the African Water Facility, the Asian Infrastructure Financing Initiative, the World Trade Organization, the Food and Agriculture Organization, CGIAR, the International Fund for Agricultural Development, the World Food Programme, the Inter-American Centre for Tax Administration and the African Tax Administration Forum. Given the mandates of these organizations, which range from very specific goals such as financing water resource development in Africa to very broad goals of economic development, social progress, poverty reduction and higher growth, there is mixed potential for the role of employment in the Multi-Year Action Plan. Economic and social development is inextricably linked to employment; yet the nature of these mandates and missions means that most employment effects will be indirect at best. Integration of employment effects, either as a measure of effectiveness for the action plan or as a consistent component of project implementation, could help maximize the positive employment impacts of the G20's work.

The statements made in pillar four (private investment and job creation) stress job creation through private sector activity. While this is a positive and reasonable approach to job creation, employment creation as a good within the other pillars is absent. This focus on the private sector may mean that the G20 has passed up other important and potentially high sources of employment growth elsewhere. For example, agriculture is known to be a key area of employment, growth and equitable development in developing countries, particularly smallholder agriculture (Johnston and Mellor 1961; Lipton 1974). Yet the food security pillar focuses minimally on smallholders and also misses many of the key aspects that can drive growth in wealth and employment through agriculture. This provides another example of the poor integration of goals throughout the G20's work, where issues tend to be isolated in separate areas of activity. Because of this poor integration, the G20 may be reducing its potential overall impact on employment.

Conversely, items are missing from the G20 development agenda that could benefit the promotion of employment. The G20's commitments on green growth are geared toward domestic actions for members to undertake on their own, without mention in the SDC or any of its commitments. The G20 has itself mentioned the potential of green growth as a source of new, decent jobs, but it fails to extend this approach to the SDC commitments or action plan. Overall, sustainable development is very weakly integrated into the G20's development agenda.

This is not necessarily to say that the G20's work is not creating employment in these missing areas. Rather, there is a lack of acknowledgement and presumably awareness and importance of the possible employment effects of these areas. Any positive employment effects that result will be indirect and, in some cases, even accidental. The bigger issue is that the lack of integration of employment and employment effects across commitments and sub-issue areas increases the likelihood that there are opportunities being overlooked.

The Development Working Group

Broadly speaking, the G20's own Development Working Group pursues a similar approach to employment and development, as the Multi-Year Action Plan is closely linked to the working group. The Development Working Group is tasked with monitoring progress on the action plan and revisiting its areas of work to make recommendations and further commitments as required.

The Development Working Group report from the Cannes Summit in November 2011 refers to the same issue areas and treats them similarly. But a few differences are worth noting. The Development Working Group claims that the 2009 Pittsburgh Summit's Framework for Strong, Sustainable and Balanced Growth marked the G20's recognition that "development and global economic issues cannot be tackled separately," as development is so closely linked to "global economic growth, poverty reduction and employment creation" (G20 Development Working Group 2011). This statement represents a gap between rhetoric and action for the G20. As already discussed, the G20's work on development is conducted largely outside the wider sphere of G20 actions, relegated to the Development Working Group and the Multi-Year Action Plan. They primarily call for actions from international organizations, rather than from the G20 members as the Mexican case study highlights (Studer and Contreras 2012). This segmentation, along with inadequate integration on issues such as green growth, again illustrates this disconnect and lack of mainstreaming.

On the positive side, the Development Working Group report acknowledges the role of agriculture in employment. It looks superficially at this relationship, however, stating only that "increasing agricultural productivity and expanding the base of agriculture production" can contribute to private investment and job creation, thereby leading to poverty reduction and social stability (G20 Development Working Group 2011). This makes a connection between employment and social development. But it does not go so far as to acknowledge the types of agriculture and agricultural investment most conducive to job creation — typically smallholder agriculture. There are several missed opportunities here. The specificities of agriculture and employment could have been incorporated into the development of indicators for investment that maximizes job creation. Moreover, the G20 could have taken its food security pillar beyond productivity and production increases into commitments that support agriculture's vital role in the early stages of development and employment growth. These two examples again demonstrate the possibilities forfeited from a lack of cross-issue integration.

The Development-Employment Link in the Seoul Development and Employment Commitments and Compliance

A more focused assessment of the employment effects of the Seoul G20's development governance can be made by examining the content of the relevant 25 commitments and the related implementing behaviour.

This can be done first by considering the explicit intended and embedded employment intensity of each of the 25 commitments and how compliance with each varies across them. The development-only commitments and the development-employment commitments have lower compliance than the employment-only ones. This difference can be accounted for by the inherent difficulty of trying to implement a commitment in ways that meet two objectives — both development and employment ones — and the complexity and uncertainty of how to do development comprehensively in a directly employment-enhancing way. This suggests the value of building employment considerations directly into future G20 development commitments, ongoing G20 development work and the continuing compliance of G20 members with the Seoul development and employment commitments. It also suggests the need to analytically develop and mainstream the development-employment link more broadly and deeply in the G20's work.

A second assessment is based on the compliance record with those commitments focused on subjects where the direct employment-increasing effects are known to be high. As the Indian case study argues, one such area is infrastructure, in classic forms such as building roads in rural areas (Alagh et al. 2012). Of the 25 Seoul development and employment commitments, only two deal with infrastructure (2010-108 and 2010-46). The primary one (2010-108) — to establish a panel on infrastructure — did have a perfect compliance score in both the initial and extended periods. But it was not a very ambitious commitment. Of the 25 Seoul development and employment commitments, there were almost none where the employment intensity of the development actions mandated was known to be strong.

A third assessment is based on the degree to which implementing actions taken by G20 members to comply with the 20 development-only commitments explicitly refer to or otherwise recognize the employment dimensions of those actions, positively as a goal or result, negatively as a tradeoff or constraint, or in some other way. For this purpose, a preliminary analysis was conducted of the commitment (2010-107) for which the initial and extended compliance scores most closely reflect the overall average of all 20 development-only commitments. It is also a general commitment that was the first one identified in the communiqué section on the "Seoul Development Consensus for Shared Growth" (see Appendix A). The commitment reads: "We commit to work in partnership with other developing countries, LICs [low-income countries] in particular, to help them build the capacity to achieve and maintain their maximum growth potential."

The results show that in their implementing behaviour, as recorded in the compliance assessments, 18 assessed G20 members made 71 employment-related references. "Jobs" or "job creation" received six references from four members. There was thus very little direct reference to jobs as a goal or a dimension of the development action undertaken by G20 members.

On the employment-enhancing supply side, "training" received 22 references in total from seven members. "Education" received 18 references from seven members. "Entrepreneurship" received four references from four members. "Skills" received four references from two members. There were no references to the ILO.

Across members, those with the most employment-related references included those from the G7, the BRICS and beyond. These results are consistent with the emphasis on employment identified in the case study on India (Alagh et al. 2012).

In all, those members with the highest overall compliance made substantial employment-related references. Those with the lowest overall compliance made none.

These results show that there is much room to improve the link between development and employment and a need to involve the ILO itself in the G20 members' development implementation work.

Matching Expert and G20 Summit Models of the Development-Employment Links

To date, there has been little work done to build a comprehensive or composite economic model of employment in developing countries. The best that can be done is to identify factors that seem to influence employment generally, although not in all countries and under all conditions. Some important points must thus be considered when developing a general model of what promotes or enhances employment in developing countries.

First, as the Indian case study in particular highlights, the informal economy in developing countries is highly important to employment (Alagh et al. 2012). This concept of the informal economy can be seen as a line of thinking in development economics that began in the 1950s and 1960s with the Lewis-Fei-Ranis model, which divided the economy into traditional and modern sectors (Fei and Ranis 1964). The former was underproductive and did not fully utilize labour, whereas the latter was where labour needed to end up in order to make the transition to development. Today's understanding of this "dual sector" approach is much more nuanced. It acknowledges that the informal sector is not always unproductive, although enterprises are likely to remain small. Moreover, the transition to the modern sector is not always simple; the demand for labour can be hard to build. The idea of two economies, rather than sectors, is also more accurate, as the informal economy can encompass agriculture and urban/manufacturing activities.

Thus, the challenge today is less one of a simple reallocation of labour for static efficiency gains, and more one of grabbing hold of the opportunities that employment policies and movement into the formal sector can offer. The informal sector not need be eradicated per se, but should be supported and coupled with the right economic conditions or legal frameworks. Its organic growth can facilitate movement into the formal sector and can encourage growth and create employment as a result.

A large informal economy can often go hand in hand with high underemployment, although it is not the sole determinant of underemployment. The optimal division of labour in an informal enterprise or subsistence farm may be less productive than employment in the formal economy. But regardless of the size of the informal economy, underemployment — where labourers' productive capacities are not being fully utilized — is a function of inadequate demand for labour. Underemployment, which relates to the quality of employment, must be included in assessments of the employment situation in developing countries.

Thus, one central challenge, not well recognized in the SDC commitments, is to move labour out of the informal economy — where it is likely (but not always) underutilized, and where growth prospects for enterprises are limited — and into the formal economy. This developmental transition should be considered when pursuing both demand-side and supply-side employment action. Although stimulating aggregate labour demand is the most difficult part of employment policy, and the most frequently overlooked, it is also the most important (Berry forthcoming).

The most consistently important influences on employment in developing countries, as identified in the classic works in the existing literature, is summarized below:

Supply side:

- Education, skill and experience (Mortensen 1970; Lippman and McCall 1976; Mincer 1974). The quality and content of education at all levels are also important.
- Local demand conditions, i.e., matching labour supply (skills) to labour demand (needs) (Mortensen 1970; Lippman and McCall 1976).
- Race/ethnicity (especially relevant where there are large racial or ethnic minorities in the developing country), gender and age (Kingdon and Knight 2001). Population growth and demographics more broadly are also important. A large youth unemployment problem is forming in many developing countries, and can negatively affect the relative opportunities for employment.
- An individual's need to perform subsistence or domestic activities, which require hours that cannot be devoted to employment. Such activities typically include fetching water and wood, preparing food, child care or care of the elderly. This has a particularly pronounced effect on women (Bhorat 2007). For women with children especially, this can be exacerbated where employers discriminate against part-time workers. This point therefore is closely tied to gender and employment.
- Labour location and internal mobility. This can often be tied to pre-existing family wealth, which can determine location and ability to move (Kingdon and Knight 2001).
- Employment-relevant social protection and public services, such as health care or unemployment insurance.

Demand side:

- Sectoral policies have, under certain circumstances, proved very beneficial for employment creation. The sub-sectoral details often determine the employment payoffs, as small-scale enterprises tend to create more jobs, both in agriculture and elsewhere

(e.g., services). An employment-enhancing sectoral policy directs economic expansion toward labour-intensive industries, sectors or scales of enterprises.
- Economic growth or outlook, including economic confidence or uncertainty, as well as growth in total investment, which can increase employment (Valadkhani 2003).
- Increases in trade or exports, often accompanied by sound export strategies, typically pull more people into high-productivity activities with a very high marginal product of labour. Economic growth can in turn stimulate further demand for labour (Rodrik 2006). This is most clear-cut for labour-abundant countries that export labour-intensive goods. For countries that export natural resources, the "natural resource curse" can render the benefits of trade for employment less obvious, if not absent.
- Distribution of capital is a major determinant of income levels, if not of employment itself, as the concentration of capital tends to reduce the demand for labour and thus reduce wages. Access to finance, financial inclusion efforts and support for SMEs and entrepreneurial enterprises can help ensure that capital reaches all classes of society. It is unclear, however, if greater financial inclusion automatically redistributes capital or if the relative share of capital remains generally constant.
- Labour legislation can either stimulate or reduce the demand for labour, depending on its design, as the Indian case study emphasizes (Alagh et al. 2012). Over-regulation can reorient employers' incentives toward more capital-intensive processes, but under-regulation (such as a very low minimum wage or low levels of protection) unacceptably compromises worker welfare. A balance for all elements is optimal. Labour legislation must also provide a sense of stability in order to encourage employment. Poor labour legislation can have a doubly negative effect by also encouraging movement into the informal sector (Berry forthcoming).

How Well Do G20 Implementing Actions Match the Expert Model?

The G20's implementing actions are strongest in the areas of education and skills development. There are multiple commitments that see high levels of implementing action of this type. The first are the two employment-development commitments that specifically pledge to "improve the development of employable skills" and enhance "national strategies for skills development." One employment-only commitment also focuses significantly on education and skills (2010-56). Its commitment to undertake "education and training to increase employment in quality jobs" specifically calls for actions that prioritize quality versus just quantity. This is an important acknowledgement of the welfare-enhancing effects of satisfying employment.

Several G20 members, however, focus their development on basic education rather than employment-relevant skills. This approach is often accompanied by a fixation on enrolment numbers and statistics, which misses the importance of the quality of education and skills. One commitment on the MDGs falls into this trap of assuming that numeric indicators adequately convey success or failure (2010-121). This is partly a reflection of the way the MDGs are structured, and not a result only of G20 implementing preferences. MDG 2 aims to achieve universal primary education, tracking the number of students in school instead of examining the kind of education they are receiving and whether it can translate into employment-enhancing skills. The G20's prioritization of the

MDGs thus leads to a similar prioritization of quantity rather than quality in country-level implementation.

Similarly, some of the details of the G20's own education and skills commitments are not well acknowledged: G20 members scored exceptionally high on commitment 2010-110, a broad commitment to improve employable skills, but did not fare as well on commitment 2010-111, which called for specific actions to support the development of international skills indicators and enhance national strategies for skills in developing countries. On the positive side, however, implemented actions on employable skills focus generally on both essential and high-quality employment. A few examples are members' approach to service delivery and learning outcomes in education, monitoring of the quality of education and work on promoting skills in technological industries (2010-111). Attention to detail seems to produce attention to quality.

The G20's actions on matching labour supply to labour demand are stronger in the Multi-Year Action Plan than in country-level implementation. For country-level implementation, domestic actions are stronger than international development actions. Domestically, a handful of countries attempted to make labour market supply and demand information more available, or to make training and education reflect in-demand skills better. In international development, the overwhelming majority of initiatives and programs tend to gloss over this important consideration.[4] This could again be a function of focusing on quantity versus quality; that is, of not paying enough attention to the details and just focusing on the number of educated people. It could also reflect a lack of expertise, as G20 members are presumably more knowledgeable and familiar with their own labour markets than with those of outside developing countries. A further possible explanation is simply that G20 members do not state when they have undertaken an assessment of the labour market. However, the thematic approach taken by many advanced countries to development — where the priority focus is on water or health or other narrowly defined objectives — could mean that these assessments are not being carried out. Better mainstreaming of this consideration would be beneficial, as would more transparent information about education and skills initiatives.

There is an absence of connections between race or ethnicity and employment. This is not surprising, given the complicated, delicate nature of the subject. It does not lend itself well to a programmatic approach, as do most development initiatives. Perhaps more surprising is the lack of connections between gender and employment in implementing actions. While some G20 members have sought to mainstream gender issues into all their development work, typically there is no explicit link to employment. However, actions to make water and food more accessible and available, to promote family planning or to assist women in being able to attend school implicitly support this connection. Many such examples are found in efforts to achieve the MDGs (2010-121). Still, the G20's actions here could be expanded significantly. An explicit link between gender and employment (both in workforce participation and in quality of work) could point to areas that could improve the impacts of the G20's employment efforts for women.

[4] In 2010-110, one rare exception is a one member's initiative to support Mozambique's Poverty Reduction Action Plan, which includes improving access to labour market information.

The relatively low level of connection between age, demographics and employment is also noteworthy. Again, the cause may simply be that there is no relevant explicit or stated commitment in most cases. In some countries, demographic issues come through more clearly: one G20 member has worked with Tunisia on its economic stimulus plan, which concentrates on reducing youth unemployment rates by expanding financing mechanisms to support investment and job creation and providing both high-quality education and access to employment (2010-110). A few other programs or initiatives by G20 members in the Middle East and North Africa (MENA) also focus specifically on youth unemployment. But beyond this, the role of age and demographics is only implied, if at all. That the G20 acknowledges this role in the MENA context indicates that members are aware of the potentially explosive effects of high youth unemployment. Thus, this consideration should be integrated more widely, as similar employment problems develop in other areas that have succeeded in educating but not employing.

Only a handful of actions are specifically dedicated to increasing labour mobility. There appear to be no such actions to implement international development commitments. A few European countries and the European Union have touched on labour mobility in the three employment-only commitments (2010-55, 2010-56 and 2010-57), but there is no mention of labour mobility in the remaining commitments. Of course, as development continues and incomes rise, the barrier to employment presented by labour mobility can take care of itself; in this sense, the G20 indirectly supports labour mobility in most of its work. Moreover, this aspect of employment has varying significance for different countries and regions, making it difficult to say definitively that it is an area that needs attention. Thus, although the G20 could be more aware of labour mobility when implementing its development commitments, the current absence of a strong role for labour mobility is not necessarily very damaging.

The G20's actions on social protection are hit-and-miss in their employment effects. A significant portion of social protection actions uncovered in commitments 2010-55, 2010-56, 2010-57 and 2010-116 show a focus on measures that do not contribute to employment creation or enhancement. They focus instead on welfare enhancement or income support. This focus includes implementing actions on cash transfer and subsidy programs, unemployment insurance, minimum wage increases and reduced remittance costs. There is a low-level of action on job retraining and job search programs, parental benefits and other social protection programs that are more pertinent to increasing employment and workforce participation.

Implementing actions on public services also tend to focus on welfare enhancement, although there are some indirect employment-enhancing links. Public services such as water infrastructure or health care have an important gender link as well as an employment link. The provision of these services has a high benefit for women, who would previously be responsible for the supply of water or the care of sick family members, as the Indian case study notes (Alagh et al. 2012). These services thus free up women's time to seek education and employment. Many of the G20's implementing actions focus on these public services, again largely through the MDGs. However, until the employment link is explicitly made, these programs may have limited benefits for employment creation or enhancement.

These types of implementing actions can often be small in scale and less effective overall, depending on the means of implementation. A one-time, short- or medium-term project in one or two cities has little cumulative impact, but a comprehensive approach to building the capacity of developing countries to offer these services may allow for more visible change. Building capacity for governments to provide these services is likely the most beneficial, but the tendency to use a project-based approach to development is still strong. To have a more lasting impact on employment, welfare and growth, the G20 should reorient its development strategies and approaches toward collaborating and partnering with governments and public institutions. Otherwise, these efforts may amount to only temporary relief from pervasive problems, which will not translate into increased employment opportunities.

While the supply side actions discussed thus far are important, it is often more difficult to develop appropriate and effective demand-side employment policies. Here, G20 implementing action is spotty — robust in some areas, but largely absent or weak in others.

After the distinct failures of import substitution regimes in the 1980s, there is still a stigma relating to sectoral policies or the promotion of particular industries. Import substitution and sectoral or industrial policy are often assumed to be the same thing. It is also often assumed that sectoral policies always refer to manufacturing or heavy industry. Many other options exist for strong sectoral policies, so long as significant attention is paid to the differing employment effects. The size of enterprise can have a large impact, as SMEs have strong employment-enhancing potential, but large corporate enterprises tend to use more capital and less labour. Agricultural policy is perhaps the most important depending on a country's stage of development, but manufacturing and services also have significant scope for providing large employment payoffs when public policy seeks to promote them. The success of East Asian countries, which used sectoral policies to develop export industries and move into the ranks of developed economies, points to the potentially large payoffs of such targeted policies (Balassa 1986).

The G20 begins to approach the idea of a sectoral policy when it provides support for the development of, for example, renewable energy or agriculture. But these efforts fail to amount to public support for an entire sector or industry. Typically, such support is small in scale and targeted to particular regions or sub-issues; it might provide localized benefits, but it is highly unlikely that it provides the incentive-based support for the country, or region, to develop as a whole. Again this demonstrates the limited impact of an approach that focuses on bilateral project implementation, rather than direct partnership with the developing country.

On investment, the G20 has performed reasonably well. Commitment 2010-46, which refers to all nine pillars, outlines significant amounts of work on increasing private investment. Commitment 2010-113 demonstrates that most G20 members have taken some action to promote responsible investment. But there is little consideration of the employment effects of investment. There seems to be an underlying assumption that all investment is equally good for employment. For example, various country-level actions focus on the mining and extraction industries. As seen in the South African case study, this type of investment, even when undertaken responsibly, is probably the least beneficial for employment: investment in such capital-intensive industries may produce economic growth, but it is often growth without jobs (Zondi 2012). This can lead to a polarization of wealth and a more unequal distribution of capital, which are often already uneven in developing countries. To be truly effective, the G20 should continue to deepen the scope and scale of its work on investment and act more directly to combat increasing economic inequality. Responsible investment and corporate social responsibility should be the norm, even the expectation. The Multi-Year Action Plan pledged to deliver indicators for measuring the economic and job-creation value of private investment. The G20 should integrate subsequent recommendations at the highest level.

Similarly, there is an assumption in the G20's work that any increase in international trade benefits developing countries. To be sure, the commitment to increase access and availability of trade for developing countries could have very positive results if fully implemented (2010-112). However, trade has both winners and losers, both of whom can be workers. Different situations call for different assessments. Benefits are most clear-cut for labour-abundant countries that export labour-intensive products or services. But for countries where this is not the case, such as those rich in natural resources, trade can be more damaging than beneficial. This is where the so-called natural resource curse comes into play. The results of commitment 2010-112 show little concern with the employment effects of trade expansion in developing countries. As trade is inextricably linked to domestic issues, trade agreements and facilitation with developing countries typically contain an element of national interest, as distinct from a desire simply to improve economic prospects for the developing country. Given this trend, it is perhaps unsurprising that the assessment of commitment 2010-112 also finds that many G20 members continue to raise trade barriers vis-à-vis developing countries.

The G20 has made financial inclusion a major priority of its development work. Implicitly, this had made access to capital a major priority as well. However, the compliance assessments show generally disappointing results from G20 members. While there is significant work on the tasks delegated to various international organizations, member-level actions lack the multidimensional, pro-poor approach needed to advance true financial inclusion. One reason for this may be that several G20 members are still trying to advance financial inclusion domestically. While some commitments have scored equally for developed and emerging members, financial inclusion commitments provide cases of where G20 member capacity is not yet equal. This is not to fault emerging countries: they have a reason and a responsibility to ensure financial inclusion at home. It does, however, reveal a situation where a difference in approach for developed compared to emerging members may be beneficial.

Another reason for the lack of greater results is G20 members' failure to implement a variety of the Principles for Innovative Financial Inclusion. These principles, created by the G20 at the Toronto Summit in June 2010, cover several principles for pursuing financial inclusion. The two most commonly addressed are those of diversity (increasing the variety and volume of services and service providers) and cooperation (encouraging partnerships and multi-stakeholder consultation). Far fewer countries give attention to other principles such as empowerment (developing financial literacy and capacity), protection (for consumers) or leadership (cultivating a broad-based government commitment to financial inclusion to alleviate poverty). Greater attention across these principles could provide more effective support for entrepreneurship and SMEs, which both can potentially create significant numbers of jobs. It could also help bring more enterprises out of the informal sector, a major issue for developing countries that would have large payoffs.

Finally, in terms of labour legislation or standards, there have been few G20 implementing actions. The Seoul commitments analyzed tend not to focus on improved human rights in labour standards, which, in the form of child labour, is a key issue in the Indian case study (Alagh et al. 2012). However, inappropriate labour legislation can significantly affect growth and employment, both in terms of quality and quantity. This could be one untapped area where knowledge and experience sharing could prove useful.

Moving Forward: Agenda for Future Action

The above analysis points to several areas where the G20's implementing actions can be improved. The core need is for better integration of employment effects across issue areas. By mainstreaming employment throughout development work, the G20 can potentially augment the positive, long-term impacts of its actions by a large amount. This should be coupled with a capacity-building approach to all areas of work, to further ensure the sustainability of employment and growth. Commitments on the completion of the MDGs, social protection and public services, and responsible private investment could still be significant in integrating considerations of employment. Commitments on education, skills development and financial inclusion also could enhance their concern with the quality of employment. Overarching commitments on the G20's approach to development can also integrate employment better, in order to ensure that these concerns filter down through any remaining issue areas.

A close relationship and better dialogue among G20 members, the Development Working Group and the international organizations implementing the Multi-Year Action Plan can help streamline and encourage efforts. That close relationship could also help ensure that G20 members implement the recommendations they have tasked these international organizations to devise. There also seems to be a need for greater expertise and understanding of labour and employment issues in developing countries, such as the nature of the informal economy. Working more closely with international organizations, the Development Working Group and other experts will help to fill this knowledge gap. Taken together, these suggestions can not only help G20 members design better implementing actions, but can also help them craft better commitments in the first place.

In addition to this overall analysis, the supporting country case studies offer an array of specific employment-enhancing policies that can be used to guide future analytic and policy work (see Appendix H).

Recommendations

Recommendations for Analytical Improvement

This study points to several ways in which the analytic foundation for policy action can and should be improved. The major recommendations are as follows:

1. Enrich the quality of the existing study's data set. The rise in implementation from the initial post-summit period of 12 months to the extended 18-month period suggests the importance and value of continuing systematic monitoring and assessment of implementation beyond the initial period to the next summit. To improve the quality of the existing data set used in this analysis, it would be useful to have the 22 detailed assessments that underlie this study reviewed and enriched by three assessors: the relevant members of the extensive set of stakeholders that contribute to the regular assessments of the priority commitments made by the G20 Research Group; this study's associates conducting the field studies in Mexico, South Africa and India in regard to their countries; and the G20 Research Group's partner at the National Research University Higher School of Economics in Moscow. It could also involve systematically assessing the implementing behaviour of all 22 development commitments for their explicit employment-related references, following the method applied in this report to commitment 2010-107.

2. Monitor the Seoul development and employment commitments for the full 24 months. As the current study shows that there is a small improvement in compliance in the six months following the first year after the commitment was made, it would be useful to confirm that this continuous cumulative improvement continues even longer, especially beyond April 30, 2012, into those additional months where it could secure a stronger boost from the immediate pre-summit pull effect of the Los Cabos Summit in June 18-19, 2012. The alternative expectation is that the small boost in the first six-month extension is just leftover momentum from the first year, which will retreat rapidly with time. An additional six months of monitoring (to November 30, 2012) would extend the period to a two full years after Seoul and through the end of Mexico's presidency of the G20, allowing an assessment of whether the "continuing cumulative compliance" effect (showing that the Seoul development and employment commitments have become entrenched) or the rapid-retreat approach prevails.

3. Identify the complex causes and catalysts of compliance, at both a systemic level (e.g., global conditions, countries' relative vulnerability and capability) and those causes that the members and leader can control (notably G20 institutionalization and embedding compliance catalysts in the commitment). This would require expanding the existing data base of 25 assessment to over 30 in order to permit multiple regression analysis. This task could be accomplished by assessing compliance with those commitments made at the subsequent Cannes and Los Cabos summits that directly refer or closely relate to the Seoul development and employment commitments. The results would show how much and how future G20 leaders could craft subsequent commitments to improve compliance with the Seoul development and employment ones.

4. Match social science and G20 governance models of the development-employment link at Seoul and beyond. This would involve developing a more robust sense of how employment and development interact and would produce a more complete causal model that better articulates these links. Experts and a range of stakeholders would be consulted and engaged to build this model. The result would be matched in a systematic analysis to the causal model that the G20 itself is using and used to guide the G20 in improving the link between development and employment.

Recommendations for G20 Policy Action

Even without such analytic improvements, the current study suggests several policy steps that can be taken now to improve compliance with the Seoul development and employment commitments and their employment-enhancing effects. The major ones are as follows:

1. Conduct internal implementation assessments by the G20, the ILO and other stakeholders. This study affirms the value of a regular mechanism for compliance assessments. This could be one where the subject-relevant multilateral organization initiates and supports the assessment activity, but conducts it through independent third-party assessors that have the appropriate social scientific competence and no non-scientific (advocacy or policy) stake in the result.

2. Encourage the appointment of a national coordinator by each G20 member to oversee the implementation of all G20 commitments, or at least the Seoul development and employment commitments. In regard to the latter, this individual could be the most senior figure who represents the member on the Development Working Group. However, as such an individual is involved in preparing for the next G20 summit and may lack the relevant authority to secure the necessary information from many relevant internationally oriented and domestic departments, an individual in the office of the leader could be best positioned to take on this task. This recommendation in sustained by the finding that in none of the three country case studies (India, Mexico and South Africa) is there an effective comprehensive coordinating centre at work, and by the compliance-enhancing effects of the ad hoc Mexican assessment as it began its year as host (Alagh et al. 2012; Studer and Contreras 2012; Zondi 2012).

3. Mount systematic compliance monitoring by the Development Working Group. While the Los Cabos Summit endorsed such a step, in this work the Development Working Group should work with the G20 employment ministers, with the results reported regularly to G20 summits, finance ministers' meetings and employment ministers' meetings. This could be done on a multi-stakeholder basis, involving outside experts. It could involve public reporting and public input, including from those in less developed countries themselves. Systematic compliance monitoring should be undertaken by the

Development Working Group for the Multi-Year Action Plan in particular, for transparency, as complete information is currently lacking here.

4. Integrate the work of the Development Working Group and the G20 employment ministers and their component bodies, to improve the employment-enhancing effects of members' development implementing behaviour. Such integration at the G20 level would enhance the relationship between development agencies and employment/labour ministries within members' national governments. One task for such a joint effort would be an improved analytic and empirical assessment of the employment effects of development behaviour under the SDC.

5. Focus on youth employment, youth entrepreneurship effects and economic inequality. In developing and applying improved processes of development compliance monitoring and their employment effects, the critical component of youth employment should be emphasized, for reasons ranging from the present implications for social stability to future productivity, growth and development (Kirton 2012a). Given that government and business currently have limited scope for supplying quality jobs to the required degree, emphasis should be placed on entrepreneurship effects — the environment that enables and encourages young people to create jobs for themselves and for others. There should also be enhanced attention to the distributional effects, notably increasing generational inequality where young people are deprived.

6. Mainstream employment effects into development commitments in the future at G20 summits by referring explicitly in the relevant development commitments to the intended employment objectives or effects. Development effects and objectives could be reciprocally mentioned in the employment commitments. This would, inter alia, encourage those implementing the commitments to be aware of, include and monitor the employment effects of their development compliance behaviour and choose the most employment-enhancing alternative when they implement.

7. Further implement a partnership-based, capacity-building approach to development, to fully replace the prevailing programmatic or thematic approaches to development. This approach would enable the G20 to better integrate employment into its implementing actions, and enhance the potential for achieving lasting, long-term and large-scale impact on employment, growth, and development. This approach is also more in line with the principles of the Seoul Development Consensus.

In addition to these recommendations, the country case studies offer additional candidates worthy of consideration (see Appendix I).

References

Alagh, Yoginder, Dev Nathan, A.N. Sharma, Preet Rustagi and Sudha Shrotria (2012). *G20 Seoul Development Consensus and India: A Preliminary Report,* July 22.

Balassa, Bela (1986), "The Employment Effects of Trade in Manufactured Products between Developed and Developing Countries." *Journal of Policy Modeling* 8(3): 371-390.

Berry, Albert (forthcoming). "Development Economics" (textbook manuscript).
Bhorat, H. (2007), "Unemployment in South Africa: Descriptors and Determinants." Paper presented to the Commission on Growth and Development, World Bank, Washington DC. Cited in Eita and Ashipala, "Determinants of Unemployment in Namibia."
Eita, Joel H. and Ashipala, Johannes M. (2010), "Determinants of Unemployment in Namibia." 5(10): 92-104. http://ccsenet.org/journal/index.php/ijbm/article/view/7635.
G20 (2010). "Annex II: Multi-Year Action Plan on Development," Seoul Summit, November 12. http://www.g20.utoronto.ca/2010/g20seoul-development.html.
G20 Development Working Group (2011). "2011 Report of the Development Working Group." Submitted to the Cannes Summit, November 3-4. http://www.g20.utoronto.ca/2011/2011-cannes-dwg-111028-en.pdf.
Johnston B.F., and Mellor, J.W. (1961). "The Role of Agriculture in Economic Development. *American Economic Review* 51(4): 566–593.
Kingdon, Geeta, and Knight, John (2001). "Race and the Incidence of Unemployment in South Africa." Centre for the Study of African Economies Working Papers, CSAE WPS/2001-18.
Kirton, John (2006). "Explaining Compliance with G8 Finance Commitments: Agency, Institutionalization and Structure," *Open Economies Review* 17 (November): 459-475.
Kirton, John (2012a), "Connecting Young Entrepreneurship with G20 Governance: Innovations in Policy and Process." Paper prepared for a conference on "Young Entrepreneurs: Building Dynamic Businesses that Foster Growth and Job Creation," G20 Young Entrepreneur Summit Mexico 2012, Mexico City, June 2-5.
Kirton, John (2012b). "G20 Development Governance, 1999–2011: Involvement, Innovation, Institutionalization, Impact," in *The Global Development Agenda after the Great Recession of 2008–2009: Revisiting the Seoul Development Consensus,* pp. 12–22 (Geneva: International Labour Organization).
Kirton, John, Nikolai Roudev and Laura Sunderland (2007). "Making Major Powers Deliver: Explaining Compliance with G8 Health Commitments, 1996-2006, *Bulletin of the World Health Organization* 85 (March): 192-199.
Lippman, Steven, and McCall, John (1976). "The Economics of Job Search: A Survey." *Economic Inquiry* 14(2): 155-189.
Lipton, M. (1974). "Towards a Theory of Land Reform." In D. Lehman (ed.), *Agrarian Reform and Agrarian Reformism*. London: Faber and Faber.
Mincer, Jacob (1974). "School, Experience and Earnings." National Bureau of Economic Research. New York: Columbia University.
Mortensen, Dale (1970). "Job Search, the Duration of Unemployment and the Phillips Curve." *American Economic Review* 60(5): 847-862.
Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (2002). "Glossary of Statistical Terms: Employment – ILO." <stats.oecd.org/glossary/detail.asp?ID=778> (October 2012).
Rodrik, Dani (2006). "Understanding South Africa's Economic Puzzles." NBER Working Paper 12565, NBER Working Paper Series. Cited in Eita and Ashipala, "Determinants of Unemployment in Namibia."

Studer, Isabel and Talia Contreras (2012). "Assessing the Impact of the Seoul Summit Development Commitments: Case Study Mexico," July. Tecnológico de Monterrey, Mexico.

Valadkhani, Abbas (2003). "The Causes of Unemployment in Iran: An Empirical Investigation." *International Journal of Applied Business and Economic Research* 1(1): 21-33.

Zondi, Siphamandla (2012). "South Africa's Implementation of the Nine Pillars of the Seoul Development Consensus with Special Reference to Employment," July. Institute for Global Dialogue, Pretoria.

Appendix A: Seoul Summit Development and Employment Commitments

Development-Only Commitments (N = 20)

2010-17: [The Seoul Action] Plan includes our commitment to:] the Seoul Development Consensus for Shared Growth that sets out our commitment to work in partnership with other developing countries, and LICs [low-income countries] in particular, to help them build the capacity to achieve and maximize their growth potential, thereby contributing to global rebalancing.

2010-46: We will focus efforts to resolve the most significant bottlenecks to inclusive, sustainable and resilient growth in developing countries, low-income countries (LICs) in particular: infrastructure, human resources development, trade, private investment and job creation, food security, growth with resilience, financial inclusion, domestic resource mobilization and knowledge sharing.

2010-47: In addition, we will take concrete actions to increase our financial and technical support, including fulfilling the Official Development Assistance (ODA) commitments by advanced countries.

2010-77: We reiterate our commitment to completing an ambitious replenishment for the concessional lending facilities of the MDBs [multilateral development banks], especially the International Development Association, to help ensure that LICs have access to sufficient concessional resources.

Seoul Development Consensus for Shared Growth

2010-107: We commit to work in partnership with other developing countries, LICs in particular, to help them build the capacity to achieve and maintain their maximum economic growth potential.

2010-108: We agree to establish a High-Level Panel (HLP) to recommend measures to mobilize infrastructure financing and review MDBs' policy frameworks.

2010-109: We will announce the Chair of the HLP by December 2010;

2010-112: [We will]: Improve the access and availability to trade with advanced economies and between developing and LICs.

2010-113: [We will]: Identify, enhance and promote responsible private investment in value chains and develop key indicators for measuring and maximizing the economic and employment impact of private sector investment;

2010-116: [We will]: Improve income security and resilience to adverse shocks by assisting developing countries enhance social protection programs, including through further implementation of the UN Global Pulse Initiative, and by facilitating implementation of initiatives aimed at a quantified reduction of the average cost of transferring remittances;

2010-117: [We will] Increase access to finance for the poor and small and medium enterprises (SMEs).

2010-118: [We will] Build sustainable revenue bases for inclusive growth and social equity by improving developing country tax administration systems and policies and highlighting the relationship between non-cooperative jurisdictions and development;

2010-119: [We will] scale up and mainstream sharing of knowledge and experience, especially between developing countries, in order to improve their capacity and ensure that the broadest range of experiences are used to help tailor national policies.

2010-120: We commit to and prioritize full, timely and effective implementation of the Multi-Year Action Plan, understanding its high potential to have a positive transformative impact on people's lives, both through our individual and collective actions and in partnership with other global development stakeholders.

2010-121: We reaffirm our commitment to the achievement of the MDGs [Millennium Development Goals] and will align our work in accordance with globally agreed development principles for sustainable economic, social and environmental development, to complement the outcomes of the UN High-Level Plenary Meeting on the MDGs held in September 2010 in New York, as well as with processes such as the Fourth UN LDC [Least-Developed Countries] Summit in Turkey and the Fourth High-Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness in Korea, both to be held in 2011.

2010-122: We also reaffirm our respective ODA pledges and commitments to assist the poorest countries and mobilize domestic resources made following on from the Monterrey Consensus and other fora.

2010-123: We further mandate the Development Working Group to monitor implementation of the Multi-Year Action Plan, so that we may review progress and consider the need for any further steps at the 2011 Summit in France.

2010-124: We reiterate our strong commitment to financial inclusion and recognize the benefits of improved access to finance to lift the lives of the poor and to support the contribution of SMEs to economic development.

2010-125: Working with the Alliance for Financial Inclusion, the Consultative Group to Assist the Poor and the International Finance Corporation, we commit to launch the Global Partnership for Financial Inclusion (GPFI) as an inclusive platform for all G20 countries, interested non-G20 countries and relevant stakeholders to carry forward our work on financial inclusion, including implementation of the Financial Inclusion Action Plan.

2010-126: We welcome the commitment of Canada, Korea, the United States and the Inter-American Development Bank of $528 million to the Framework through grants and co-financing.

Development-Employment Commitments (N = 2)

2010-110: [We will]: Improve the development of employable skills matched to employer and labor market needs in order to enhance the ability to attract investment, create decent jobs and increase productivity.

2010-111: We will support the development of internationally comparable skills indicators and the enhancement of national strategies for skills development, building on the G20 Training Strategy.

Employment-Only Commitments (N = 3)

2010-55: [We will implement a range of structural reforms to boost and sustain global demand, foster job creation, contribute to global rebalancing, and increase our growth potential, and where needed undertake:] Labor market and human resource development reforms, including better targeted benefits schemes to increase participation.

2010-56: [We will implement a range of structural reforms to boost and sustain global demand, foster job creation, contribute to global rebalancing, and increase our growth potential, and where needed undertake:] education and training to increase employment in quality jobs, boost productivity and thereby enhance potential growth.

2010-57: [We will implement a range of structural reforms to boost and sustain global demand, foster job creation, contribute to global rebalancing, and increase our growth potential, and where needed undertake:] Tax reform to enhance productivity by removing distortions and improving the incentives to work, invest and innovate.

Appendix B: Implementation of Seoul Development and Employment Commitments

Table B1: Initial and Extended Periods

Number of commitments = 22, for both the initial and extended periods for the overall G20 averages and for each country specific average, based on the number of commitments for which both initial and extended date was available at the time of publication. Country-specific scores for each commitment are only included if data was available for both time periods.

	G20 Average		Argentina		Australia		Brazil		Canada		China		France		Germany		India		Indonesia		Italy	
#	S-C	EX	S-C	EX	S-C	EX	S-C	EX	S-C	EX	S-C	EX	S-C	EX	S-C	EX	S-C	EX	S-C	EX	S-C	EX
17																						
46	0.26	0.29	-0.44	-0.44	0.56	0.67	0.44	0.33	0.43	0.29	0.13	0.25	0.50	0.50	0.83	0.83	0.38	0.50	0.00	0.14	0.13	0.13
47	0.33	0.53	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0			-1	1	0	0
55	0.37	0.42	1	1	1	1	-1	-1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	-1	-1	0	1
56	0.60	0.67	1	1	1	1	-1	0	1	1	-1	-1	1	1	1	1					1	1
57	0.65	0.65	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1
77	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
107	0.39	0.44	-1	-1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0			1	1	1	1	0	0
108	1.00	1.00	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
109	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
110	0.47	0.47	-1	-1	1	1	0	0	1	1	-1	-1	1	1			1	1	1	1	1	1
111	0.12	0.12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	-1	-1	0	0
112	0.15	0.20	-1	-1	0	1	1	0	0	-1	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	-1	0	-1	-1
113	0.40	0.45	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	-1	-1
116	-0.33	-0.28	-1	-1	0	0	0	0	-1	-1			0	0	0	0	-1	-1	0	0	0	0
117	0.11	0.11	-1	-1	1	1	0	0			1	1										
118	0.15	0.25	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	-1	-1	1	1
119	0.64	0.64	1	1	1	1	1	1			1	1	0	0			1	1	1	1	0	0
120	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
121	0.21	0.21	-1	-1	0	0	0	0	1	1	-1	-1	0	0	1	1	0	0				
122																						
123	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
124																						
125	1.00	1.00	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
126	0.00	0.33							1	1												
Average	0.31	0.34	-0.07	-0.07	0.50	0.60	0.31	0.30	0.47	0.41	0.31	0.36	0.38	0.38	0.58	0.58	0.30	0.36	0.11	0.29	0.22	0.27

Notes:
The formula to convert scores to percentage is ([score + 1] ÷ 2) x 100.
Blank means not assessed. Scores are included only if the analysis for both the initial and extended periods was available at the time of publication.
S-C = Seoul Summit, November, 12, 2010, to Cannes Summit, November 3, 2011.
EX = Cannes Summit, November 4, 2011, to April 30, 2012.

Continued…

Table B1: Initial and Extended Periods, continued

	G20 Average		Japan		Korea		Mexico		Russia		Saudi Arabia		South Africa		Turkey		United Kingdom		United States		European Union	
#	S-C	EX	S-C	EX	S-C	EX	S-C	EX	S-C	EX	S-C	EX	S-C	EX	S-C	EX	S-C	EX	S-C	EX	S-C	EX
17																						
46	0.26	0.29	0.25	0.25	0.22	0.33	0.00	0.50	-0.22	-0.33	-0.29	-0.29	0.00	0.00	0.13	0.13	0.71	0.86	0.57	0.43	0.78	0.78
47	0.33	0.53	0	0	1	1	1	1							1	1	1	1			0	0
55	0.37	0.42			1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0
56	0.60	0.67			1	1	1	1	0	0			1	1			1	1	1	1	0	0
57	0.65	0.65			1	1	1	1	-1	-1			1	1			1	1	-1	-1	1	1
77	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
107	0.39	0.44	0	0	1	1	0	1	-1	-1			0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1
108	1.00	1.00	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
109	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
110	0.47	0.47	1	1	1	1	1	1	-1	-1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1
111	0.12	0.12			1	1			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			0	0	0	0
112	0.15	0.20	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	-1	-1	-1	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1
113	0.40	0.45	0	0	-1	-1	-1	0	-1	-1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
116	-0.33	-0.28			0	0	-1	0	0	0	-1	-1	-1	-1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
117	0.11	0.11			-1	-1			-1	-1					0	0	1	1			1	1
118	0.15	0.25	0	0	-1	0	-1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-1	-1	1	1	1	1	1	1
119	0.64	0.64			1	1			0	0			0	0	1	1			0	0	1	1
120	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
121	0.21	0.21			1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0					1	1			1	1
122																						
123	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
124																						
125	1.00	1.00	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
126	0.00	0.33			-1	0													0	0		
Average	0.31	0.34	0.25	0.25	0.37	0.47	0.28	0.53	-0.16	-0.22	0.05	0.05	0.28	0.28	0.34	0.34	0.67	0.73	0.35	0.29	0.56	0.56

Notes:

The formula to convert scores to percentage is ([score + 1] ÷ 2) x 100.

Blank means not assessed. Scores are included only if the analysis for both the initial and extended periods was available at the time of publication.

S-C = Seoul Summit, November, 12, 2010, to Cannes Summit, November 3, 2011.

EX = Cannes Summit, November 4, 2011, to April 30, 2012.

Table B2: Initial Compliance Scores

Number of commitments = 23, for initial compliance scores only, as new data from Commitment. Number 122 was added to the data from the 22 commitments reported in Appendix B1 and all country-specific scores are included for each commitment, even if the data for the extended period was not available at the time of publication. Thus overall and some country-specific averages vary from those reported in Appendix B1,

#	AVE	ARG	AUS	BRA	CAN	CHI	FRA	GER	IND	INDO	ITA	JAP	KOR	MEX	RUS	SAU	SAF	TUR	UK	US	EU
17																					
46	0.26	-0.44	0.56	0.44	0.43	0.13	0.5	0.83	0.38	0	0.13	0.25	0.22	0	-0.22	-0.29	0	0.13	0.71	0.57	0.78
47	0.35	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	-1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0
55	0.37	1	1	-1	1	1	0	0	0	-1	0		1	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0
56	0.60	1	1	-1	1	-1	1	1			1		1	1	0		1		1	1	0
57	0.65	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1		1	1	-1		1		1	-1	1
77	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
107	0.42	-1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	-1		0	1	1	0	1
108	1.00	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
109	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
110	0.50	-1	1	0	1	-1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	-1	0	0	0	1	1	1
111	0.16	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	-1	0		1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
112	0.15	-1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	-1	-1	0	1	1	0	-1	1	0	0	1	1
113	0.40	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	-1	0	-1	-1	-1	1	0	1	1	1	1
116	-0.33	-1	0	0	-1		0	0	-1	0	0		0	-1	0	-1	-1	0	0	0	0
117	0.30	-1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	-1	0	-1	0	0	0	1	1	1
118	0.15	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	-1	1	0	-1	-1	0	0	0	-1	1	1	1
119	0.64	1	1	1		1	0		1	1	0		1		0		0	1		0	1
120	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
121	0.20	-1	0	0	1	-1	0	1	0		0		1	0	0	0			1		1
122	0.65	-1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1
123	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
124																					
125	1.00	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
126	0.00				1								-1							0	
Ave	0.33	-0.11	0.53	0.29	0.52	0.34	0.43	0.66	0.30	0.10	0.28	0.28	0.40	0.24	-0.10	0.04	0.33	0.38	0.65	0.39	0.63

Notes:
The formula to convert scores to percentage is ([score + 1] ÷ 2) x 100.
Blank means not assessed. Includes scores for which extended analysis was not complete at the time of publication.
AVE = average; ARG = Argentina; AUS = Australia; BRA = Brazil; CAN = Canada; CHI = China; FRA = France; GER = Germany; IND = India; INDO = Indonesia; ITA = Italy; Japan = Japan; KOR = Korea; MEX = Mexico; RUS = Russia; SAU = Saudi Arabia; SAF = South Africa; TUR = Turkey; UK = United Kingdom; US = United States; EU = European Union.

Appendix C:
G20 Compliance with Seoul Development and Employment Commitments by Member

Number of commitments = 22. The change in scores from the initial to the extended period, as reported below, is based on the data reported in Appendix B1.

	Initial	Extended	Change
United Kingdom	1 (0.67)	1(0.73)	5 (0.06)
Germany	2 (0.58)	3 (0.58)	10 (0)
European Union	3 (0.56)	4 (0.56)	10 (0)
Australia	4 (0.50)	2 (0.60)	3 (0.10)
Canada	5 (0.47)	7 (0.41)	19 (-0.06)
France	6 (0.38)	8 (0.38)	10 (0)
Korea	7 (0.37)	6 (0.47)	3 (0.10)
United States	8 (0.35)	13 (0.29)	19 (-0.06)
Turkey	9 (0.34)	11 (0.34)	10 (0)
Brazil	10 (0.31)	12 (0.30)	18 (-0.01)
China	10 (0.31)	9 (0.36)	8 (0.05)
G20 AVERAGE (initial period)			
India	12 (0.30)	9 (0.36)	5 (0.06)
Mexico	13 (0.28)	5 (0.53)	1 (0.25)
South Africa	13 (0.28)	15 (0.28)	10 (0)
Japan	15 (0.25)	17 (0.25)	10 (0)
Italy	16 (0.22)	16 (0.27)	8 (0.05)
Indonesia	17 (0.11)	13 (0.29)	2 (0.18)
Saudi Arabia	18 (0.05)	18 (0.05)	10 (0)
Argentina	19 (-0.07)	19 (-0.07)	10 (0)
Russia	20 (-0.16)	20 (-0.22)	5 (-0.06)

Notes:
The formula to convert scores to percentage is ([score + 1] ÷ 2) x 100.
Data derived from Appendix B1.

Appendix D:
Implementation of G20 Priority Commitments by Summit, 2008 to 2011

Number of commitments = 58.

Washington, Nov 2008 (n = 4)	AVE	ARG	AUS	BRA	CAN	CHI	FRA	GER	IND	INDO	ITA	JAP	KOR	MEX	RUS	SAU	SAF	TUR	USA	UK	EU
2008-4 (Macroeconomics)	0.75	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	1
2008-5 (Macroeconomics)	0.80	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1
2008-33, 34, 35 (Trade)	0.59	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	1		1	0		1		0	1	1
2008-76 (DFR)	0.47	-1	0		0	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1
Summit Average	0.66	0.25	0.75	1.00	0.75	0.25	0.75	1.00	0.25	0.50	0.75	0.75	0.67	0.50	0.50	0.33	0.75	0.67	0.75	1.00	1.00
London, April 2009 (n = 6)	AVE	ARG	AUS	BRA	CAN	CHI	FRA	GER	IND	INDO	ITA	JAP	KOR	MEX	RUS	SAU	SAF	TUR	USA	UK	EU
2009-19 (Macroeconomics)	0.35	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	-1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	0
2009-62-68 (Trade)	0.50	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	-1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1
2009-39 (DFR)	0.00	-1	0	-1	0	-1	1	0	0	0	-1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0
2009-75-76 (Development)	0.30	-1	1	1	1	-1	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	-1	-1	1	1	1
2009-78 (Development)	0.05	-1	0	0	0	0	1	1	-1	-1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
2009-84 (Climate change)	-0.10	-1	0	-1	0	1	0	0	-1	0	0	0	1	0	-1	0	0	-1	0	0	1
Summit Average	0.18	-0.67	0.50	0.00	0.50	-0.17	0.67	0.67	-0.50	-0.33	0.00	0.17	0.33	0.00	0.17	0.17	0.33	0.00	0.33	0.83	0.67
Pittsburgh, Sep 2009 (n = 15)	AVE	ARG	AUS	BRA	CAN	CHI	FRA	GER	IND	INDO	ITA	JAP	KOR	MEX	RUS	SAU	SAF	TUR	USA	UK	EU
2009-40 (Macroeconomics)	0.78	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		0		0	0	1	1	1	1	1
2009-107 (Trade)	0.10	0	0	-1	0	0	0	0	0	-1	1	-1	1	0	-1	0	1	1	0	1	1
2009-117(Trade)	0.70	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0
2009-9 (DFR)	0.15	0	1	-1	0	0	1	1	-1	-1	0	1	1	0	1	-1	0	-1	0	1	1
2009-96 (Crime)	0.10	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	-1	0	-1	0	-1	0	-1	0	1	-1	1	1	1
2009-98 (Corruption)	0.30	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	-1	0	0	0	1	1	1	-1	1	-1	1	1	0
2009-88 (Development)	-0.05	-1	1	-1	0	0	0	1	-1	-1	-1	0	0	0	0	0	1	-1	1	1	0
2009-97 (Development)	-0.05	-1	0	-1	1	0	0	0	-1	-1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	-1	0	1	1
2009-89 (Climate change)	0.88				1		1							1	1	0		1	1	1	
2009-85 (Climate change)	0.86		1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0		1		1	1			1	1	1	
2009-18 (Energy)	0.05	0	-1	0	-1	1	1	0	0	1	-1	1	1	1	-1	-1	1		1	-1	-1
2009-72 (Energy)	0.45	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0
2009-83 (Energy)	0.44	0	1	1	1	1	1		1	0		1	0	0	-1	-1	0	0	1	1	1
2009-13 (IFI)	0.05	-1	0	-1	1	-1	1	1	-1	-1	0	1	1	-1	0	0	1	-1	1	1	0
2009-68 (IFI)	0.05	-1	0	-1	1	-1	1	1	-1	-1	0	1	1	-1	0	0	1	-1	1	1	0
Summit Average	0.28	-0.23	0.36	-0.21	0.60	0.21	0.73	0.69	-0.21	-0.21	0.00	0.62	0.54	0.29	0.07	-0.21	0.69	-0.14	0.73	0.87	0.38

Notes:
The formula to convert scores to percentage is ([score + 1] ÷ 2) x 100.
Blank means not assessed.
DFR = domestic financial regulation; IFI = international financial institutions.
AVE = average; ARG = Argentina; AUS = Australia; BRA = Brazil; CAN = Canada; CHI = China; FRA = France; GER = Germany; IND = India; INDO = Indonesia; ITA = Italy; Japan = Japan; KOR = Korea; MEX = Mexico; RUS = Russia; SAU = Saudi Arabia; SAF = South Africa; TUR = Turkey; UK = United Kingdom; US = United States; EU = European Union.

Continued…

Appendix D: Implementation of G20 Priority Commitments by Summit, 2008 to 2011, continued

Toronto, June 2010 (n = 14)	AVE	ARG	AUS	BRA	CAN	CHI	FRA	GER	IND	INDO	ITA	JAP	KOR	MEX	RUS	SAU	SAF	TUR	USA	UK	EU
2010-6 (Macroeconomics)	0.67		1		1		0	1			0	1	1						0	1	
2010-16 (Macroeconomics)	0.83		1		1		1				1								0	1	
2010-17 (Macroeconomics)	0.63	1				1		0		0		1	1		1	0					
2010-44 (Trade)	0.15	-1	1	-1	1	1	1	1	-1	0	1	1	1	-1	-1	1	-1	-1	-1	1	1
2010-51 (Trade)	0.95	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
2010-26 (DFR)	0.05	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	-1	1	0	0	-1	0	-1	-1	0	1	0	1
2010-53 (Corruption)	-0.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	-1	-1	0	0	-1	0	0	0	-1	0	0	0	0	0
2010-20 (Development)	0.16	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	-1	0	1	0	-1		-1	-1	0	1	1	1
2010-56 (Climate change)	0.40	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	-1	-1	-1	0	0	1	1	1
2010-57 (Climate change)	-0.06		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-1	0	0	0	0	0		-1		0	0	1
2010-58 (Climate change)	0.89	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		1		0	1	1
2010-60 (Energy)	0.50	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	-1	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	-1
2010-37 (IFI)	0.89	0	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1		1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1
2010-43 (Food & agriculture)	0.20	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-1	1	0	1
Summit Average	0.39	0.27	0.69	0.45	0.69	0.50	0.54	0.50	0.09	0.00	0.62	0.50	0.62	-0.09	0.18	-0.10	0.00	0.11	0.38	0.69	0.73

Notes:
The formula to convert scores to percentage is ([score + 1] ÷ 2) x 100.
Blank means not assessed.
DFR = domestic financial regulation; IFI = international financial institutions.
AVE = average; ARG = Argentina; AUS = Australia; BRA = Brazil; CAN = Canada; CHI = China; FRA = France; GER = Germany; IND = India; INDO = Indonesia; ITA = Italy; Japan = Japan; KOR = Korea; MEX = Mexico; RUS = Russia; SAU = Saudi Arabia; SAF = South Africa; TUR = Turkey; UK = United Kingdom; US = United States; EU = European Union.

Continued…

Appendix D: Implementation of G20 Priority Commitments by Summit, 2008 to 2011, continued

Seoul, Nov 2010 (n = 19)	AVE	ARG	AUS	BRA	CAN	CHI	FRA	GER	IND	INDO	ITA	JAP	KOR	MEX	RUS	SAU	SAF	TUR	USA	UK	EU
2010-40 (Macroeconomics)	0.25	0	1	-1	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	-1	1	-1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
2010-48 (Macroeconomics)	0.90		1		1		1	1			1	1		1					0	1	1
2010-96 (Trade)	-0.05	-1	1	-1	0	-1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	-1	1	-1	0	0	0	0
2010-51 (Finance)	0.65	-1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	1
2010-83 (Finance)	0.70	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	1
2010-90 (Finance)	0.65	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	-1	0	-1	1	1	1
2010-92 (Finance)	0.45	-1	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	-1	0	0	1	1
2010-61 (Socioeconomic)	0.90	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	1
2010-47 (Development)	0.55	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0
2010-108 (Development)	1.00	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
2010-109 (Development)	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2010-113 (Development)	0.47	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	-1	0	-1	-1		1	0	1	1	1	1
2010-117 (Development)	0.30	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	-1	-1	-1	0	0	0	1	1	1
2010-122 (Development)	0.60	-1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	-1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1
2010-125 (Development)	1.00	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
2010-143 (Corruption)	0.45	0	0	1	0	1	0	-1	1	1	1	-1	1	1	1	-1	1	1	0	1	1
2010-152 (Cooperation)	0.05	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
2010-127 (Energy)	0.32	0	1	1	1	-1	1	-1	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	-1	0	1	
2010-135 (Energy)	0.75	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	-1	1	0	1	1	1
Summit Average	0.51	0.11	0.84	0.50	0.68	0.56	0.74	0.58	0.44	0.44	0.63	0.47	0.61	0.21	0.47	0.22	0.33	0.33	0.53	0.74	0.78
Overall Compliance Average	0.40	-0.02	0.64	0.27	0.65	0.35	0.68	0.63	0.08	0.09	0.43	0.50	0.57	0.17	0.26	0.04	0.38	0.14	0.54	0.79	0.67
G8 Average Score	0.58																				
G20 Average	0.25																				

Notes:
The formula to convert scores to percentage is ([score + 1] ÷ 2) x 100.
Blank means not assessed.
DFR = domestic financial regulation; IFI = international financial institutions.
AVE = average; ARG = Argentina; AUS = Australia; BRA = Brazil; CAN = Canada; CHI = China; FRA = France; GER = Germany; IND = India; INDO = Indonesia; ITA = Italy; Japan = Japan; KOR = Korea; MEX = Mexico; RUS = Russia; SAU = Saudi Arabia; SAF = South Africa; TUR = Turkey; UK = United Kingdom; US = United States; EU = European Union.

Appendix E:
Implementation of G20 Priority Commitments by Issue Area, 2008 to 2011

Number of commitments = 58.

Macroeconomic (9)	AVE	ARG	AUS	BRA	CAN	CHI	FRA	GER	IND	INDO	ITA	JAP	KOR	MEX	RUS	SAU	SAF	TUR	USA	UK	EU
2008-4 (Washington)	0.75	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	1
2008-5 (Washington)	0.80	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1
2009-19	0.35	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	-1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	0
2009-40 (Pittsburgh)	0.78	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		0		0	0	1	1	1	1	1
2010-6 (Toronto)	0.67		1		1		0	1			0	1	1						0	1	
2010-16 (Toronto)	0.83		1		1		1				1								0	1	
2010-17 (Toronto)	0.63	1				1		0		0		1	1		1	0					
2010-40 (Seoul)	0.25	0	1	-1	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	-1	1	-1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
2010-48 (Seoul)	0.90		1		1		1	1			1	1		1					0	1	1
Average	0.63	0.50	1.00	0.40	1.00	0.50	0.75	0.88	0.20	0.33	0.63	0.57	0.71	0.20	0.67	0.33	0.60	0.60	0.38	0.88	0.83
Trade (7)	**AVE**	**ARG**	**AUS**	**BRA**	**CAN**	**CHI**	**FRA**	**GER**	**IND**	**INDO**	**ITA**	**JAP**	**KOR**	**MEX**	**RUS**	**SAU**	**SAF**	**TUR**	**USA**	**UK**	**EU**
2008-33,34,35 (Washington)	0.59	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	1		1	0		1		0	1	1
2010-51 (Toronto)	0.95	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
2009-62-68 (London)	0.50	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	-1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1
2009-107 (Pittsburgh)	0.10	0	0	-1	0	0	0	0	0	-1	1	-1	1	0	-1	0	1	1	0	1	1
2009-117 (Pittsburgh)	0.70	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0
2010-44 (Toronto)	0.15	-1	1	-1	1	1	1	1	-1	0	1	1	1	-1	-1	1	-1	-1	-1	1	1
2010-96 (Seoul)	-0.05	-1	1	-1	0	-1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	-1	1	-1	0	0	0	0
Average	0.42	0.00	0.71	0.00	0.71	0.29	0.57	0.71	0.14	-0.14	0.71	0.57	1.00	0.14	-0.14	0.67	0.43	0.50	0.00	0.86	0.71

Note:
The formula to convert scores to percentage is ([score + 1] ÷ 2) x 100.
Blank means not assessed.
AVE = average; ARG = Argentina; AUS = Australia; BRA = Brazil; CAN = Canada; CHI = China; FRA = France; GER = Germany; IND = India; INDO = Indonesia; ITA = Italy; Japan = Japan; KOR = Korea; MEX = Mexico; RUS = Russia; SAU = Saudi Arabia; SAF = South Africa; TUR = Turkey; UK = United Kingdom; US = United States; EU = European Union.

Continued…

Appendix E: Implementation of G20 Priority Commitments by Issue Area, 2008 to 2011, continued

Finance (8)	AVE	ARG	AUS	BRA	CAN	CHI	FRA	GER	IND	INDO	ITA	JAP	KOR	MEX	RUS	SAU	SAF	TUR	USA	UK	EU
2008-76 (Washington)	0.47	-1	0		0	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1
2009-39	0.00	-1	0	-1	0	-1	1	0	0	0	-1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0
2009-9 (Pittsburgh)	0.15	0	1	-1	0	0	1	1	-1	-1	0	1	1	0	1	-1	0	-1	0	1	1
2010-26 (Toronto)	0.05	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	-1	1	0	0	-1	0	-1	-1	0	1	0	1
2010-51 (Seoul)	0.65	-1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	1
2010-83 (Seoul)	0.70	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	1
2010-90 (Seoul)	0.65	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	-1	0	-1	1	1	1
2010-92 (Seoul)	0.45	-1	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	-1	0	0	1	1
Average	0.39	-0.25	0.63	0.14	0.50	0.25	0.88	0.88	0.13	0.13	0.50	0.63	0.50	0.13	0.38	-0.13	0.13	0.00	0.63	0.88	0.88
Development (12)	AVE	ARG	AUS	BRA	CAN	CHI	FRA	GER	IND	INDO	ITA	JAP	KOR	MEX	RUS	SAU	SAF	TUR	USA	UK	EU
2009-75-76	0.30	-1	1	1	1	-1	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	-1	-1	1	1	1
2009L-78 (London)	0.05	-1	0	0	0	0	1	1	-1	-1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
2009P-88 (Pittsburgh)	-0.05	-1	1	-1	0	0	0	1	-1	-1	-1	0	0	0	0	0	1	-1	1	1	0
2009P-97 (Pittsburgh)	-0.05	-1	0	-1	1	0	0	0	-1	-1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	-1	0	1	1
2010T-20 (Toronto)	0.16	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	-1	0	1	0	-1		-1	-1	0	1	1	1
2010S-47 (Seoul)	0.55	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0
2010S-108 (Seoul)	1.00	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
2010S-109 (Seoul)	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2010S-113 (Seoul)	0.47	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	-1	0	-1	-1		1	0	1	1	1	1
2010S-117 (Seoul)	0.30	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	-1	-1	-1	0	0	0	1	1	1
2010S-122 (Seoul)	0.60	-1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	-1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1
2010S-125 (Seoul)	1.00	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Average	0.36	-0.17	0.67	0.25	0.67	0.42	0.67	0.75	0.00	0.00	0.17	0.50	0.17	-0.08	0.30	0.17	0.25	0.17	0.75	0.83	0.75

Note:
The formula to convert scores to percentage is ([score + 1] ÷ 2) x 100.
Blank means not assessed.
AVE = average; ARG = Argentina; AUS = Australia; BRA = Brazil; CAN = Canada; CHI = China; FRA = France; GER = Germany; IND = India; INDO = Indonesia; ITA = Italy; Japan = Japan; KOR = Korea; MEX = Mexico; RUS = Russia; SAU = Saudi Arabia; SAF = South Africa; TUR = Turkey; UK = United Kingdom; US = United States; EU = European Union.

Continued…

Appendix E: Implementation of G20 Priority Commitments by Issue Area, 2008 to 2011, continued

Climate Change (6)	AVE	ARG	AUS	BRA	CAN	CHI	FRA	GER	IND	INDO	ITA	JAP	KOR	MEX	RUS	SAU	SAF	TUR	USA	UK	EU
2009-84 (London)	-0.10	-1	0	-1	0	1	0	0	-1	0	0	0	1	0	-1	0	0	-1	0	0	1
2009-89 (London)	0.88				1		1							1	1	0		1	1	1	
2009-85 (Pittsburgh)	0.86		1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0		1		1	1			1	1	1	
2010-56 (Toronto)	0.40	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	-1	-1	-1	0	0	1	1	1
2010-57 (Toronto)	-0.06		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-1	0	0	0	0	0		-1		0	0	1
2010-58 (Toronto)	0.89	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		1		0	1	1
Average	0.41	0.33	0.60	0.20	0.50	0.80	0.50	0.40	0.40	0.00	0.50	0.40	0.75	0.33	0.17	-0.33	0.00	0.25	0.50	0.67	1.00
Energy (6)	AVE	ARG	AUS	BRA	CAN	CHI	FRA	GER	IND	INDO	ITA	JAP	KOR	MEX	RUS	SAU	SAF	TUR	USA	UK	EU
2009-18 (Pittsburgh)	0.05	0	-1	0	-1	1	1	0	0	1	-1	1	1	1	-1	-1	1		1	-1	-1
2009-72 (Pittsburgh)	0.45	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0
2009-83 (Pittsburgh)	0.44	0	1	1	1	1	1		1	0		1	0	0	-1	-1	0	0	1	1	1
2010-60 (Toronto)	0.50	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	-1	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	-1
2010-127 (Seoul)	0.32	0	1	1	1	-1	1	-1	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	-1	0	1	
2010-135 (Seoul)	0.75	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	-1	1	0	1	1	1
Average	0.42	0.00	0.50	0.67	0.33	0.33	1.00	0.40	0.17	0.33	0.60	0.83	0.83	0.67	0.00	-0.33	0.67	0.00	0.67	0.67	0.00
Corruption (4)	AVE	ARG	AUS	BRA	CAN	CHI	FRA	GER	IND	INDO	ITA	JAP	KOR	MEX	RUS	SAU	SAF	TUR	USA	UK	EU
2009-96 (London)	0.10	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	-1	0	-1	0	-1	0	-1	0	1	-1	1	1	1
2009-98 (Pittsburgh)	0.30	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	-1	0	0	0	1	1	1	-1	1	-1	1	1	0
2010-53 (Toronto)	-0.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	-1	-1	0	0	-1	0	0	0	-1	0	0	0	0	0
2010-143 (Seoul)	0.45	0	0	1	0	1	0	-1	1	1	1	-1	1	1	1	-1	1	1	0	1	1
Average	0.18	0.00	0.25	0.50	0.50	0.25	0.25	-0.25	-0.50	0.25	0.00	-0.50	0.25	0.50	0.25	-0.75	0.75	-0.25	0.50	0.75	0.50
IFI reform (3)	AVE	ARG	AUS	BRA	CAN	CHI	FRA	GER	IND	INDO	ITA	JAP	KOR	MEX	RUS	SAU	SAF	TUR	USA	UK	EU
2009-13 (Pittsburgh)	0.05	-1	0	-1	1	-1	1	1	-1	-1	0	1	1	-1	0	0	1	-1	1	1	0
2009-68 (Pittsburgh)	0.05	-1	0	-1	1	-1	1	1	-1	-1	0	1	1	-1	0	0	1	-1	1	1	0
2010-37 (Toronto)	0.89	0	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1		1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1
Average	0.31	-0.67	0.33	-0.33	1.00	-0.33	1.00	1.00	-0.33	-0.33	0.33	1.00	1.00	-0.33	0.33	0.00	1.00	-0.33	1.00	1.00	0.33

Note:
The formula to convert scores to percentage is ([score + 1] ÷ 2) x 100.
Blank means not assessed.
AVE = average; ARG = Argentina; AUS = Australia; BRA = Brazil; CAN = Canada; CHI = China; FRA = France; GER = Germany; IND = India; INDO = Indonesia; ITA = Italy; Japan = Japan; KOR = Korea; MEX = Mexico; RUS = Russia; SAU = Saudi Arabia; SAF = South Africa; TUR = Turkey; UK = United Kingdom; US = United States; EU = European Union.

Continued…

Appendix E: Implementation of G20 Priority Commitments by Issue Area, 2008 to 2011, continued

Food and Agriculture (1)	AVE	ARG	AUS	BRA	CAN	CHI	FRA	GER	IND	INDO	ITA	JAP	KOR	MEX	RUS	SAU	SAF	TUR	USA	UK	EU
2010-43 (Toronto)	0.20	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-1	1	0	1
Average	0.20	0.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	-1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00
Socioeconomic (1)	AVE	ARG	AUS	BRA	CAN	CHI	FRA	GER	IND	INDO	ITA	JAP	KOR	MEX	RUS	SAU	SAF	TUR	USA	UK	EU
2010-61 (Seoul)	0.90	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	1
Average	0.90	0.90	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
International Cooperation (1)	AVE	ARG	AUS	BRA	CAN	CHI	FRA	GER	IND	INDO	ITA	JAP	KOR	MEX	RUS	SAU	SAF	TUR	USA	UK	EU
2010-152 (Seoul)	0.05	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Average	0.05	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Overall Average	0.40	-0.02	0.64	0.27	0.65	0.35	0.68	0.63	0.08	0.09	0.43	0.50	0.57	0.17	0.26	0.04	0.38	0.14	0.54	0.79	0.67
G8 Average	0.58																				
Non-G8 Average	0.25																				

Note:
The formula to convert scores to percentage is ([score + 1] ÷ 2) x 100.
Blank means not assessed.
AVE = average; ARG = Argentina; AUS = Australia; BRA = Brazil; CAN = Canada; CHI = China; FRA = France; GER = Germany; IND = India; INDO = Indonesia; ITA = Italy; Japan = Japan; KOR = Korea; MEX = Mexico; RUS = Russia; SAU = Saudi Arabia; SAF = South Africa; TUR = Turkey; UK = United Kingdom; US = United States; EU = European Union.

Appendix F:
Compliance with Seoul Development and Employment Commitments by G20 Member Subsets

Number of commitments = 22.

Subset	Initial	Extended	Difference
G7 average	0.44	0.43	-0.009
G20 ministerial host	0.40	0.45	0.050
Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development 10 (11[a]) average	0.41 (0.40[a])	0.45 (0.44[a])	0.044 (0.040[a])
G8 average	0.29	0.28	-0.007
G20 summit host	0.42	0.47	0.048
BRICS average (Brazil, Russia, India, China and South Africa)	0.21	0.22	0.008
G8+5 average (G8 plus Brazil, China, India, Mexico and South Africa)	0.34	0.36	0.020

Notes:
The formula to convert scores to percentage is ([score + 1] ÷ 2) x 100.
a. Includes Turkey.

Appendix G:
Candidate Causes of Compliance

The following factors, which can increase or decrease compliance, are mentioned in the case studies of India, Mexico and South Africa.

International Level

Non-Governmental Organizations

- Bond and financial markets (Zondi 2012).
- Transnational ideational networks (Zondi 2012).

Intergovernmental Organizations

- Country's leadership position in other relevant international organizations, such as South Africa at the International Labour Organization (ILO) (Zondi 2012).
- Consistency of G20 commitments with meta or multiple commitments such as the Millennium Development Goals (Studer and Contreras 2012). This produces a consistency of commitments rather than a conflict of commitments, even or especially if a different office in a domestic government is responsible for implementing the commitments made in different international institutions. More broadly, normative nesting and consistency can create such co-compliance.
- Use of established multilateral organizations that are likely to have established relationships with the relevant ministries within member governments (Alagh et al. 2012).
- The assignment or assumption of responsibility for implementation by an international organization, rather than the domestic government, reduces domestic compliance, as is highlighted throughout the Mexican case study (Studer and Contreras 2012). However, the findings from compliance analyses in a G8 context show that the invocation in a G8 commitment of a core multilateral organization — one with a main mission that matches the subject of the commitment, such as the ILO for labour and employment, or the World Bank for development — increases compliance. In contrast, the invocation of an other international organization — one that does not match — reduces compliance.

G20 Institutionalization

- Consistency of a commitment with other G20 commitments, especially with priority ones (Zondi 2012).
- The G20 summit hosting effect (Studer and Contreras 2012). Hosting allows the country to shape the priorities and commitments it produces at its summit to coincide with previous or prospective domestic priorities and actions. The use of the G20 "troika" system of past, present and subsequent summit hosts working together could extend the hosting effect.
- G20 ministerial and working groups cause compliance as the regular meetings provide a system, for reporting progress as in the business and employment pillars (Alagh et al. 2012). G20 labour ministers helped induce South Africa to use the pension and insurance funds in which workers invested to fund job creation (Zondi 2012).
- G20 institutional leadership, such as a country chairing a G20 ministerial or official body. South Africa's position as a co-chair with Korea of the Development Working Group

encouraged South Africa to prepare for a G20-wide assessment mechanism by the end of 2012 (Zondi 2012). A senior Indian official co-chairs the G20's Framework Working Group (Alagh et al. 2012).

Domestic State Level

- The G20 commitment matching a pre-established national priority (Zondi 2012).
- Pre-compliance (Studer and Contreras 201; Zondi 2012). A G20 commitment can have a reinforcement and enhancement effect by maintaining or expanding the implementing action even as competing demands and forces arise. This effect extends to anticipatory compliance, where a government is already planning or wishing to do what the G20 commitment asks
- A culture of compliance within the government, consisting of an expectation and desire to abide by international norms and commitments and the rule of law in general, as distinct form the specific G20 case. As the Mexican case study shows, Mexico had moved toward developing such a culture in regard to international human rights under previous president Vicente Fox (Studer and Contreras 2012).
- The G20 sherpas' mandate, especially the presence of one official or office responsible to ensure and monitor the implementation of all G20 commitments.
- The institutionalization of development cooperation in a powerful ministry with influence across the government. Mexico's compliance suffered from the absence of assigned responsibility to a department or agency for implementing a set of commitments, such as the Mexican Agency for International Development Cooperation (Studer and Contreras 2012).
- The responsibility for international participation coordinated by an influential centre, often in the foreign ministry (Zondi 2012).
- The professionalization, rather than politicization or patronage base, of the civil service (Studer and Contreras 2012).
- Bureaucratic politics in the absence of a strong comprehensive interdepartmental coordinating mechanism (Zondi 2012).
- Limited bureaucratic resources (Studer and Contreras 2012). This can be due to a surge in demand, such as acquiring the responsibility to host a summit or a sudden increase in G20 commitments in a particular area, as was the case with the Seoul Summit on development relative to those produced by G20 summits before. Here there are concerns in the Indian government about the G20 agenda becoming overloaded and too detailed (Alagh et al. 2012). On the supply side, the size of the relevant civil service matters too, especially in an age of austerity and downsizing. The impact of fiscal deficits and resulting expenditure cutbacks is evident in the Indian case (Alagh et al. 2012).
- Rotation of sherpas and individuals in sherpas offices (Studer and Contreras 2012).
- The strong personal commitment of individual leaders (Studer and Contreras 2012).

State-Society Level

- Political control and capital (of the central bank, independent regulatory agencies and the legislature). The deadlock in India's parliament made it more difficult for the Indian government to implement the SDC (Alagh et al. 2012). Involving the national parliament or legislature and through it other stakeholder can be increase understanding and buy-in (Zondi 2012).
- Government stability, as seen in the Indian case study (Alagh et al. 2012).

- The political support base of the government, such as seen in involvement of unions the South African case study (Zondi 2012).
- Civil society participation can enhance compliance, as in the South African case with the National Economic Development and Labour Council (Zondi 2012).
- Business confidence is a key intervening variable between G20 commitment and domestic compliance (Alagh et al. 2012).

Appendix H: Candidate Causes of Employment Effects from Country Studies

- In Mexico, tariff reductions generated industry savings that in turn have positive employment effects (Studer and Contreras 2102). In general, trade liberalization can have both positive and negative employment effects, in the short and longer terms.
- Regulatory reform that facilitates the rapid opening of new business can have positive effects on entrepreneurship and employment, as the Mexican case study suggests (Studer and Contreras 2012).
- The provision or guarantees of credit for specific sectors, especially those that do not appeal to regular financial intermediaries, could enhance employment and entrepreneurship, as the Mexican case study shows (Studer and Contreras 2012).
- The Mexican case study points to the values of scholarships that fund the unemployed and underemployed to train them for skills that match labour market demands or to create and develop their own small businesses, and of a self-employment program that provides start-ups with furniture, machinery, equipment and tools (Studer and Contreras 2012).
- Direct role of government in visa requirements (Zondi 2012).
- Public-private partnerships with state-owned enterprises involved (Zondi 2012).
- The length of time in education affects employment, inter alia, by keeping more young people in educational institutions and out of the labour force, as the expansion of the Indian educational system shows (Alagh et al. 2012).
- Reform of the socials security system (Alagh et al. 2012).
- Infrastructure creates employment India (Alagh et al 2012).
- Private regulation state and local government affects employment, as seen in India (Alagh et al 2012).
- India’s Rural Employment Guarantee causes employment (Alagh et al. 2012).
- Local ownership matters (Alagh et al. 2012).

Appendix I: Additional Recommendations from Country Studies

- There is a need for comparable statistics for employment and thus employment effects, as the Indian case study shows (Alagh et al. 2012). Concepts such as the Current Daily Status are not used in any other G20 country except India.
- In the division of labour within the G20 hosting troika, G20 governors could assign the previous year's host the responsibility for ensuring and monitoring the implementation of the commitments that were created at the summit it hosted.
- In the Mexican case, more comprehensive and detailed monitoring by the Development Working Group and the International Affairs Office of the Ministry of Labour would capture the positive employment effects of the government's moves to give agricultural workers, including migrant ones, greater access to decent work, labour rights, social security and welfare (Studer and Contreras 2012).
- There is a need for a single individual in the government with the responsibility and authority to ensure and monitor the implementation of all G20 commitments (Studer and Contreras 2012).
- Each of the G20 working groups could be asked or mandated to include in their reports a section on compliance with previous commitments, a step considered but not taken by the Mexican government in its hosting year (Studer and Contreras 2012).
- The consideration of employment effects should be extended to include health, starting with labour standards for occupational health and safety and for treatment of persons with disability (Zondi 2012).
- Parliament could be mobilized as a compliance monitor (Zondi 2012).
- Implementation responsibilities for G20 development commitments should be assigned to those individuals offices already responsible for, adequately resourced for and committed to enhancing employment (Zondi 2012).
- Implementation of the Los Cabos decisions to create accountability mechanisms to monitor implementation of G20 commitments (Zondi 2012).
- Creation of an accountability triumvirate among the leaders' office, the foreign office and the finance ministry (Zondi 2012:16).
- Institutionalization of the meeting of employment ministers and the Labour 20 (L20), and extension of Business 20 (B20) and L20 involvement at the national level and in the implementation of commitments as well as preparations for the summit (Zondi 2012).
- Use multi-stakeholder bodies such as South Africa's National Economic Development and Labour Council to monitor compliance (Zondi 2012).
- Civil society bodies such as the B20 and L20 should take up the task of monitoring compliance with the G20 commitments of most interest to them, as the B20 is now doing with its new Impact and Accountability Task Force (Alagh et al. 2012).