Caribbean Journal of International Relations & Diplomacy
Vol. 2, No. 3, September 2014: pp.43-60

FORUM

The G20 System Still Works: Better Than Ever

John Kirton
Munk School of Global Affairs
University of Toronto

Abstract: *Since its 2008 start, G20 summit performance has grown across a widening, more demanding, more domestically intrusive agenda, and across all the governance functions that such bodies have. This growing performance is due to proliferating shocks that exposed the new, equalizing vulnerabilities of all countries, the failure of older international institutions to cope, the rising capabilities and increasing openness of the non-G7 members, the domestic political cohesion that participants brought, and their rational attachment to a compact G20 club at the hub of a global governance network in an interconnected world.*

Keywords: G20; G7; G8; IMF; Global Governance; Finance

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF G20 GOVERNANCE

On December 15-16, 1999, the finance ministers and central bank governors of the world's 19 systemically significant countries and the European Union (EU) assembled in Berlin, Germany, for the initial meeting of the Group of 20 (G20).[1] Their new group was initiated by two finance ministers, Paul Martin of Canada and Lawrence Summers of the United States, in response to the Asian-turned-global financial crisis that had erupted in Thailand in June 1997, spread to Indonesia and Korea by the end of that year, and engulfed Russia, Brazil and the United States with the collapse of hedge fund Long-Term Capital Management by the autumn of

1998. With the clear failure of the old International Monetary Fund (IMF) and newer Group of Seven (G7) and Group of Eight (G8) to provide financial stability for a new world of globalizing finance, a new, broader permanent group of established and emerging systemically significant states was needed now.

Almost a decade later, on November 14-15, 2008, the heads of state and government of the same members assembled in Washington, DC for the first "G20 Leaders Summit on Financial Markets and the World Economy." This meeting was initiated by France's Nicolas Sarkozy and America's George Bush, with support of Britain's Gordon Brown and Australia's Kevin Rudd. They were responding to an American-turned-global financial crisis far more contagious and destructive than that in 1997 in a now globalized world. A new, summit-level centre of global economic governance was clearly needed to provide financial stability through financial regulation, economic growth, trade liberalization and development.

Competing Assessments of G20 Governance

After eight summits in five years and with the ninth coming to Brisbane, Australia on November 15-16, 2014, it is important to assess how well and why G20 governance has worked. Different answers arise from six competing schools of thought.[2]

The first sees the G20 as redundant, because it is too large, diverse and informal, or has revived the older Bretton Woods bodies, United Nations (UN) and G8.[3] The second school rejects the G20's primacy, given the superior power of the established IMF and G7, and the G20's lack of legitimacy and benefits for G8 states. The third school sees the G20 usefully reinforcing the G8, by helping provide financial stability, making globalization work for all, containing and preventing global economic crises and becoming a broader steering committee for the world.[4] The fourth school sees the G20's effective replacement of the G7/8, IMF and a UN with a Security Council immobilized by the Permanent Five powers of old.

The fifth, now dominant school sees declining G20 performance after initial success, once the great financial crisis that created it receded, power shifted from the G7 to the BRICS summit of Brazil, Russia, India, China and South Africa and the G20 agenda expanded.[5] This school has recently been fuelled by complaints about emerging market instability apparently caused by unilateral US monetary tapering and normalization and about the failure of the US Congress to implement the G20's historic 2010 agreement on IMF voice and vote reform.[6]

A sixth school, however, argues that the G20 system worked in coping with the financial crisis through to at least the Toronto Summit in 2010.[7] But it is largely silent on how the G20 has performed since, beyond its strong success in its seminal field of financial regulation.

The Argument of Systemic Hub Governance

Now that the first full-length books on G20 governance have arrived, it is possible to assess and advance beyond these competing claims.[8] The book with the most systematic and detailed analysis, *G20 Governance for a Globalized World* develops a model of "systemic hub governance" for this task.[9] It argues, as does the updated analysis presented here, that G20 performance has grown across a widening, more demanding, more domestically intrusive agenda and across all the governance functions that such bodies have. This growing performance is due to proliferating shocks that exposed the new, equalizing vulnerabilities of all countries, the failure of older international institutions to cope, the rising capabilities and increasing openness of the non-G7 members, the domestic political cohesion that participants brought, and their rational attachment to a compact G20 club at the hub of a global governance network in an interconnected world.

G20 SUMMIT GOVERNANCE

Since 1999 the G20 system has grown quickly and flexibly to govern a broadening agenda, embracing core security subjects such as terrorist finance, money laundering, corruption, good governance and chemical weapons in Syria by 2013. Especially after G20 summitry started in 2008, the G20 has moved more from domestic political management, deliberation and direction setting into decision making, delivery and the institutional development of global governance within and beyond itself (see Appendix A). It successfully responded to the American-turned-global financial crisis in 2008–09, then prevented an escalating Euro-crisis from going global, and finally became a global steering committee advancing a broad economic, social, ecological and security agenda. Yet with inequality and healthcare costs rising within most G20 members, it still has much to do to fulfill its second distinctive mission of making globalization work for all. The G20's growing performance is seen first in the particular achievements of each of its eight summits from 2008 to 2013.[10]

The Creation

The G20 summit emerged when the American-turned-global financial crisis struck in full force, with the collapse of US investment bank Lehman Brothers in New York City on September 15, 2008. At the UN General Assembly eight days later, French president Nicolas Sarkozy suggested a special summit of the G8 to respond, with a few countries such as China, India and Brazil added. But very quickly, amidst cascading financial collapse and intense high-level diplomacy, the G20 alternative won — because it already existed as a proven performer and because the departing Bush administration knew that it had worked for them, including in their traumatic, terrorist-shocked autumn of 2001.[11]

Washington, November 14–15, 2008

The first G20 summit in Washington, D.C. on November 14-15, 2008, was a strong success.[12] It was the first gathering of so many top world leaders to discuss economics and finance. They focused on ensuring financial stability, by addressing the core cause and the cure of the current crisis — domestic financial regulation. They easily agreed on key principles, notably that regulation must be strengthened and internationally harmonized and supervised. They intruded deeply into the sovereignty of member states and the private sector, to deal with credit default swaps, over-the-counter (OTC) derivatives, credit ratings agencies, bankers' pay and accounting standards. They created a process for financial reform with specific deadlines and deliverables, approved large-scale, simultaneous fiscal spending, renounced protectionism, and dealt with tax havens. Because they knew they needed more time than one hastily assembled gathering of less than 24 hours, they called for a second summit a mere four and a half months hence.

London, April 1–2, 2009

At their second summit in London on April 1–2, 2009, leaders produced a very strong success.[13] Amidst a global economy contracting faster than it had during the Great Depression in the

1930s, and speedily spreading financial shocks with destructive economic effects, British prime minister Gordon Brown, a determined G20 finance ministers' veteran, and a newly elected U.S. president Barack Obama on his first major trip abroad, relied on frank freewheeling, flexible discussions and decisions directly among the leaders. G20 leaders encouraged their central banks to provide massive monetary policy stimulus, agreed on large-scale, simultaneous, discretionary fiscal stimulus by all and produced $1.1 trillion in new financing for hard-hit emerging and developing countries, through $250 billion in new special drawing rights for the IMF, $500 billion for the New Arrangements to Borrow, $250 billion in trade finance and $100 billion for the World Bank. They created the Financial Stability Board (FSB) which included all G20 members, to regulate all systemically important financial institutions, and agreed to reform IMF quotas and voting rights. They more strongly renounced trade protectionism and acted against tax havens. They took up climate change, at the urging of Brown's African Commonwealth colleagues and think tank advocates at home.

Pittsburgh, September 24–25, 2009

Less than six months later, at their third summit in Pittsburgh on September 24–25, 2009, G20 leaders produced a strong success.[14] With the global financial crisis now contained, they proactively declared that the G20 would be the permanent, premier forum for their international economic cooperation. They created the Framework for Strong, Sustainable and Balanced Growth and the Mutual Assessment Process (MAP) to make it work. They agreed to transfer at least 5% of the quota at the IMF from the established powers to the emerging ones and to create a flexible credit line there to strengthen its financial safety net. They agreed on the need for new rules on banking capital, implementation of FSB standards and the completion of OTC derivative reform. They expansively and innovatively agreed to phase out fossil fuel subsidies in the medium term, in a commitment that would bring major gains in climate change control, fiscal consolidation, maternal and child health, and anti-corruption. Obama as host used the summit to show Iran that more sanctions would come if its nuclear weapons program continued.

Toronto, June 26–27, 2010

The fourth summit, held nine months later in Toronto on June 26–27, 2010, was also a strong success. It moved to contain within its regional European home the new financial shock that now erupted from Greece. It thus shifted to the more difficult task of fiscal consolidation. America reluctantly adjusted so that all advanced country members other than Japan agreed to cut their fiscal deficits in half as a percentage of gross domestic product (GDP) by 2013 and stop the growth in their accumulated debt as a percentage of GDP by 2016. Leaders renounced trade protectionism for the next three years. They agreed to a capital increase of $350 billion for the multilateral development banks, to cancel an earthquake-struck Haiti's debts, to meet the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) by their due date of 2015, and to establish new financial safety nets for emerging and developing countries. Institutionally, Toronto transferred G20 hosting beyond the Anglo-American imperial powers of old, embraced emerging members' priorities on the agenda, added a labour and employment ministerial meeting taking place in April 2010, created the Development Working Group (DWG) to pioneer a new approach to development, brought civil society in with the birth of the Business 20 (B20), the Young Entrepreneurs Summit and a post-summit meeting of G20 parliamentarians, and defined the G20's relationship with the G8 summit taking place in nearby Muskoka immediately before.

Seoul, November 11–12, 2010

The fifth G20 summit, held in Seoul, Korea on November 11–12, 2010, was a substantial success, largely in a system-reforming way.[15] Overlooking the escalating Euro-crisis now infecting Ireland, leaders also managed disagreements over current account imbalances and "currency wars." They agreed on the second stage of reforming IMF quota shares by at least 5% and on a larger, more automatic redistribution in a few years. They also agreed on the Basel 3 regime of stronger capital and liquidity ratios for financial institutions. To help make globalization work for all, at the Korean host's initiative they created the Seoul Development Consensus (SDG) and established the precautionary credit line as another preventive financial safety net. At their first summit in Asia and their first hosted by an emerging country, they began moving from working as a rationally calculating to a personally cherished club.

Cannes, November 3–4, 2011

The sixth G20 summit, held a full year later in Cannes, France on November 3–4, 2011, was a substantial success. Defensively, it contained the latest stage of the Euro-crisis by helping Greece decide to stay in the Eurozone, Italy to accept stronger international financial supervision and Italy's discredited leader Silvio Berlusconi to depart. Offensively, G20 leaders moved to augment IMF resources, strengthen the resources, role and status of the FSB, and appoint the highly respected Mark Carney as its new chair. They recommitted to medium-term fiscal consolidation, sought trade assistance for the poorest countries, and wisely rejected a controversial global financial transaction tax and a G20 secretariat. They also started work on improving information to calm volatile commodity markets for food and fuel.

Los Cabos, June 18–19, 2012

The seventh summit, at Los Cabos, Mexico, on June 18-19, 2012, was a strong success, transitioning the G20 from a global crisis prevention to a global steering committee role.[16] As debt-ridden Spain and even France joined Greece and Italy on investors' critical list, G20 leaders induced the European members to promise to take "all necessary policy measures to safeguard the integrity and stability of the area".[17] Preventively, virtually all G20 members contributed to a new IMF firewall fund, to be used should the Europeans or others need financial help. The summit set a credible strategy that emphasized stimulus at the time and fiscal consolidation soon, monetary easing and broad structural reforms. It strengthened action on employment and social protection, trade and investment, the international financial architecture, financial regulation and inclusion, food security and commodity price volatility, development, green growth, corruption and G20 governance, and addressed gender issues for the first time. Institutionally, Mexico's year as host created the Los Cabos Accountability Assessment Framework, added new G20 ministerial meetings for foreign affairs, trade and tourism, established a civil society Think 20, and institutionalized the chairing rotation among geographic regions and between an advanced G8 member and an emerging non-G8 one.

St. Petersburg, September 5-6, 2013

The eighth G20 Summit, held in St. Petersburg, Russia, on September 5-6, was a very strong success, by spontaneously, flexibly and effectively acting as a global steering committee on bigger, broader, burning security concerns. It took the critical step to pave the way to disarm weapons of mass destruction in Syria, as all 20 leaders finally agreed that chemical weapons had been used on August 21 and a fundamental international norm had thus been breached. Barack Obama and Russia's Vladimir Putin were inspired to meet bilaterally, as they had at Los Cabos, to agree on the historic disarmament agreement that quickly followed and was fully implemented within a year. The summit also moved toward coherent growth strategies backed by credible medium-term fiscal consolidation. It newly emphasized jobs, small and medium-sized enterprises, young entrepreneurs and business start-ups. It also forwarded key financial regulatory reforms, extended its anti-protectionist pledge to 2016, spurred a trade facilitation deal at the World Trade Organization ministerial meeting in December, started innovative work on financing for investment, and seriously addressed economic inclusiveness and inequality for the first time. On tax fairness it moved to ensure that rich individuals and firms paid the taxes they owed in a globalized world, and that automatic information exchange, adherence to a multilateral convention and new rules on multinationals' transfer pricing would soon arrive. Institutionally it added a joint meeting for finance and employment ministers and integrated the B20, Labour Twenty (L20), Youth Twenty (Y20) and Civil Twenty (C20) as never before.

DIMENSIONS OF G20 SUMMIT PERFORMANCE, 2008–13

A careful charting of the G20 summit's performance across seven basic dimensions of global governance confirms its growing success (see Appendix A).

In its domestic political management, leaders' attendance had a temporary decline, from the perfect attendance at the first three summits to Toronto when the leaders of Australia and Brazil stayed home. But it then rose. Moreover, in the compliments conferred on individual countries in the summit's concluding communiqué, there was a strong rise, when Toronto awarded 8 and then St. Petersburg 15.

In its deliberation, the leaders' public collective communiqué conclusions saw a steady rise in size, from Washington's 3,567 words to the 28,766 at St. Petersburg contained in the 11 documents issued there. The private deliberative component also surged at St. Petersburg, with the spontaneous, extended, opening night dinner discussion on Syria, where all leaders spoke.

In its principled and normative direction-setting, as measured by affirmations of democratic and human rights principles, there was also a rise. Their number spiked to 29 at Pittsburgh and to an all-time peak of 34 at Los Cabos.

In its decision making through producing precise, politically obligatory, future-oriented commitments, the rise again appears. Starting at Seoul there were higher totals, with peaks of 282 at Cannes, and 281 at St. Petersburg. They concentrated on the G20's economic and financial core subjects, but covered a broadening agenda.

In its delivery of these decisions, as seen in the 109 commitments assessed for compliance thus far, there was a strong start at Washington at +0.66 (on the scientific scale) then a drop at London to 0.17. But then compliance rather steadily rose to 0.34 for Pittsburgh, 0.39 for Toronto and 0.37 for Seoul and to 0.52 (or 76 per cent on the popular scale) for Cannes and Los Cabos.

In its development of global governance, performance also rose. In institutional construction inside the G20, communiqué references grew steadily to peak at 190 in St. Petersburg. References to institutions outside the G20 generally rose, to reach 237 at St. Petersburg.

In doing its distinctive mission, G20 summit performance has also grown. Its first mission of providing financial stability was done through its effective global financial crisis response in 2008–09 and global crisis prevention since 2010.[18] Its second mission of making globalization work for the benefit of all was done more slowly and is still limited. Since Pittsburgh the G20 increased attention to employment. In development it created the DWG at Toronto, adopted the SDC at Seoul and emphasized the post-2015 MDGs for St. Petersburg in 2013. On inclusion and the increasing economic inequality in most G20 members and elsewhere, its start at St. Petersburg left much to do at Brisbane and beyond.[19]

CAUSES OF G20 PERFORMANCE: THE SYSTEMIC HUB MODEL

The causes of the G20's growing performance are well captured by the model of systemic hub governance.[20] The G20's rising performance has been driven first by steadily escalating shocks in finance, economics, terrorism, energy, the environment, food and war, whose sources have shifted from emerging Asia to an established but newly vulnerable United States, Europe and the Middle East. In the face of such shocks that exposed and equalized the vulnerability of the leading powers, the formal multilateral organizations that America and its Atlantic allies had constructed in the 1940s and supplemented with more informal ones such as the G7/G8 could not cope. Unlike its many compact international institutional competitors, the G20 alone contained as full, equal members the emerging countries that increasingly gave it the collectively predominant and internally equal capabilities required to convincingly respond. Its members also increasingly, if unevenly, became more economically, socially, and politically open polities, driven by economic growth within, globalization without and G8 guidance and G20 socialization in between. The G20 further benefited from the domestic political control, capital, continuity, competence, conviction and civil society support of its participants. It increasingly became a club that its members rationally and even personally valued, at the hub of an expanding network of global governance for a globalized world.

Shock-Activated Vulnerability

The Asian-turned-global financial crisis from 1997 to 2001 was central to the G20's creation in 1999 and its early success, while the much larger, faster, bigger American-turned-global financial crisis from 2008 to 2009 was similarly essential for its rapid upgrade to the leaders' level in 2008. The escalating Euro-crises, starting in early 2010 in Greece, then Ireland, Portugal, Spain and Cyprus by March 2013, fuelled the global crisis prevention success from 2010 to 2013 of a G20 now sensitive to such similar if smaller shocks and their rapid contagion, escalation and damage in an interconnected world. Moreover, the sources of these financial shocks shifted, from an emerging Asia to a once hegemonic but now highly vulnerable America and Europe by 2008.

Another set of shocks came in security, starting with terrorism in 2001 and continuing with the escalating use of chemical weapons in Syria, culminating in the massive deadly attack on August 18, 2013. That led the G20 leaders to act surprisingly, spontaneously and successfully on this new but still terrorist-related subject at St. Petersburg soon after, on September 5-6, 2013. Small shocks spurring G20 success also came from spiking food and energy prices, oil rig spills, a natural disaster in Haiti on January 12, 2010 and climate change.

Multilateral Organizational Failure

The second cause was the failure of the old formal multilateral organizations from the 1940s and the more informal, plurilateral institutions created since 1975 to respond adequately to such shocks amidst the rising vulnerability of the established powers. The failure of the European-dominated IMF to preserve financial stability during the Asian-turned-global financial crisis, especially in the eyes of rising Asian powers, spurred the creation of the G20 and its ascendance over the Financial Stability Forum (FSF) and the IMF's International Financial and Monetary Committee (IMFC), both also created in 1999. The inadequacies of the IMF and G8 Plus Five led George Bush to select the G20 over his initial G7-centric instincts for a summit response to the great financial shock in the autumn of 2008. Only with the advent of G20 summitry did the IMF abandon its strategy, there since the start in 1999, of eliminating its G20 rival, in favour of a new strategy of now making itself indispensable to the G20's work. The IMF and the World Bank thus gave the G20 a critical, formal "G192" supporter, to go along with the G20's informal G7 ally. The G20 created the FSB in its image to provide the missing international organization to supply the need for stronger domestic financial regulations in the wake of the 2008 financial shock. And the failure of the regional EU to control its escalating regional crisis from 2010 to 2013 led the G20 increasingly to step in and ultimately succeed.

Predominant Equalizing Capability

The third cause — the globally predominant and internally equalizing capabilities and connectivity of the group compared to the available plurilateral summit institution alternatives — helps explain why these particular 20 members came to create and succeed in a group that continued from its 1999 start with an unchanged membership. These 20 members gave the G20 the critical collective predominance and increasingly internal equality in the relative capabilities of its systemically significant members that its international institutional alternatives lacked, especially as those of the G20's emerging country members soared. Summers and Martin's initial consideration of which countries should be in or out of their new group, the continuing inclusion of South Africa and Argentina, and the closing of the list at 20 countries shows that the dominant selection criteria were both relative capability and global connectivity, as the new category of "systemic significance" described very well. From the 1997 Asian, through the 2008 American crisis, to the 2010 European-initiated financial crisis, the leading Asian powers of China, Japan, India, and Australia along with Mexico, South Africa, Saudi Arabia and Canada did not experience financial failure at home. They thus offered increasingly important economic capability to the G20 and financial support to the established American and European powers that had from 2008 on.

Common Characteristics

The fourth cause was the G20 members' convergence on their desire for recognition as satisfied top-tier powers and on the domestic principles and practices of economic, social and political openness needed to sustain their position, their acceptance as legitimate members of this top tier and their stability and growth at home.[21] The two non-democratic members - Saudi Arabia and China - shared with their G20 colleagues the core conviction about the centrality of political stability, based on underlying social stability, economic growth and financial stability. They slowly if slightly became more economically, socially and politically open from 1998 through to 2013. G7 leaders valued this quality to lock in the results of the post-1975 democratic revolution in Asia, the Americas, Russia and Turkey in 1997–2001, and then in Europe itself from 2008 to 2013.

Domestic Political Cohesion

The fifth cause was domestic political cohesion – its participants' political capital, control, continuity, financial-economic competence, personal commitment to the G20 forum and popular support for governing through the G20. This was led by Paul Martin, who was the chief executive officer of a major internationally operating firm before entering politics, then Canada's finance minister from 1993 to 2002, and subsequently leader between 2003 and 2006. Martin was accompanied by Larry Summers as the U.S. treasury secretary in 1999–2001 and economic advisor to Barack Obama in 2009. They were aided by Gordon Brown, who was Britain's chancellor of the exchequer from 1997 to 2007 and leader from 2007 to 2010, George Bush as U.S. president from 2001 to 2008, Manmohan Singh, who had served as India's finance minister three times and was the prime minister since 2004, and Hu Jintao, president of China from 2003 through to 2012.

The Club at the Hub

The sixth cause was the G20's growth as a club at the hub of a global governance network. Under the initial leadership of its founding visionary, Paul Martin, the G20 became a club with the unchanging membership and constricted participation necessary to reduce transaction costs, foster learning and promote socialization among the established and emerging country members, and confer on them the status, identification and new conceptions of systemic interests that came with membership in a new top-tier club. This was reinforced by the increasing intensity of interaction among leaders, ministers, and officials from 2008 to 2010, joined by business, labour, young entrepreneurs, youth, legislators and think tanks from 2010 onwards. The G20 also became the hub of a growing global network in which combinations of its established and emerging country members connected in overlapping combinations in the many other relevant plurilateral institutions of global relevance and reach that joined the G20 at the centre with the rest of the world all around.

These dynamics fostered the global sensitivity and collegiality that allowed members to search for common solutions to new problems, to align in flexible, issue-specific combinations of advanced and emerging members, and to lead, adjust and govern for their own and the world's greater public good. In doing so they slowly bonded together as individuals since 2008, making the G20 an interpersonal club that its participants started to personally care about and incorporate into their conception of interest and even identity in some respects.

CONCLUSION

Growing G20 governance, from its initial crisis-catalyzed creation in 1999 to its global centrality by 2013, came through five distinct phases. In its first phase from 1999 to 2001, the G20 established itself as an effective group of operational equals, led largely by Canada, the United States and other G7 members and producing financial stability, globalization that worked for many and the suppression of terrorist finance. In its second phase from 2002 to 2007, the G20 became a more genuine group of equals in hosting and chairing, broadened its agenda to embrace emerging members' priorities such as development and trade, and added initiatives from emerging members that met with success, such as IMF reform. In its third phase from 2008 to 2009, the G20 became a successful leader-level, global financial crisis responder, as its relatively unscathed, rapidly rising emerging country members successfully rushed to the assistance of the now afflicted, advanced American-Atlantic-European ones. In its fourth phase from 2010 to 2013, the G20 moved to successful crisis prevention, as hosting passed to the emerging members; the agenda expanded to embrace their priorities and political security issues; key decisions were made on fiscal consolidation, bank capital and IMF reform; and the escalating Euro-crisis was contained and controlled in its regional home. And in its fifth phase starting in 2013, the G20 became a global steering committee, taking up the critical security issue of the use of chemical weapons in Syria and helping pave the way for their elimination in a short time. As the substantive breath, domestic intrusiveness and level of difficulty of its challenges and responses grew, as its achievements accumulated, and as its interaction intensified, the G20 slowly became more of a personal club of participants, not just as a convenient forum for advancing domestic preferences but as a group that they started to value for taking care of themselves, their citizens and the global community as a whole.

Appendix A: G20 Summit Performance

Summit	Grade	Domestic Political Management			Deliberation			Direction-Setting			Decision-Making	Delivery N109	Development of Global Governance			
		Attendance (%)	# compliments	% members complimented	# days	# documents	# words	Democracy	Liberty	Total	# commitments	Compliance	# references (internal)	Spread	# references (outside)	Spread
2008 Wash.	A-	100	0	0	2	2	3,567	10	2	12	95	0.66	0	4	40	11
2009 Lon.	A	100	1	5	2	3	6,155	9	0	9	88	0.17	12	4	116	27
2009 Pitts.	A-	100	0	0	2	2	9,257	28	1	29	128	0.34	47	4	117	26
2010 Tor'to	A-	90	8	1	2	5	11,078	11	1	12	61	0.39	71	4	171	27
2010 Seoul	B	95	5	5	2	5	15,776	18	4	22	153	0.37	99	4	237	31
2011 Cannes	B	95	11	5	2	3	14,107	22	0	22	282	0.52	59	4	251	29
2012 L. Cabos	A-	95	6	15	2	2	12,682	31	3	34	180	0.52	65	4	143	22
2013 St P'bg	A	90	15	55	2	11	28,766	15	3	18	281	0.39*	190	4	237	32
Total	N/A	N/A	46	N/A	16	33	101,388	144	14	158	1268	N/A	543	32	1312	205
Av'ge		96	5.75	17.5	2	4.13	12,673.5	18	5.1	19.7	158.5	0.44	67.8	4	164	25.63

Notes: N/A = not applicable. Compiled by Julia Kulik.

Domestic Political Management: 100 per cent attendance includes all G20 members and at least one representative from the European Union and excludes those invited on a summit-to-summit basis. Number of compliments includes all explicit references by name to the full members of the summit that specifically express the gratitude of the institution to that member. The % of members complimented indicates how many of the 20 full members received compliments within the official documents.

Deliberation refers to the duration of the summit and the documents collectively released in the leaders' name at the summit.

Direction Setting: the number of statements of fact, causation and rectitude relating directly to open democracy and individual liberty.

Decision Making: the number of commitments in all official documents as identified by members of the G20 Research Group in collaboration with the International Organisations Research Institute at the State University Higher School of Economics in Moscow.

Delivery: compliance scores are measured on a scale from -1 (no compliance) to +1 (full compliance). A commitment is fully complied with if a summit member succeeds in achieving the specific goal set out in the commitment. 2013* is the interim compliance score to June 16, 2014.

Development of Global Governance: internal references mean references to G20 institutions in official documents; spread indicates the number of different institutions within the G20 system; external references refers to references made to institutions outside the G20; spread indicates the number of different institutions mentioned.

NOTES ON CONTRIBUTOR

John J. Kirton is a professor of political science and the co-director of the G20 Research Group, the Global Health Diplomacy Program and the BRICS Research Group, and director of the G8 Research Group, all based at Trinity College at the Munk School of Global Affairs at the University of Toronto, and a Non-Resident Senior Fellow at the Chongyang Institute for Financial Studies in Renmin University of China. He is the author of *G20 Governance for a Globalized World* (2012). He holds a PhD in International Affairs from the Paul H. Nitzke School of International Studies at Johns Hopkins University and a MA in International Affairs from the Norman Paterson School of International Affairs at Carleton University.

NOTES

1 Kirton, John J. (2013a). *G20 Governance for a Globalized World*. Farnham: Ashgate.

2 *Ibid.*

3 Strauss-Kahn, Dominique (2013). Keynote address to the conference on 'Major Economies under New Leadership: Policy Priorities and Challenges,' Institute of Global Economics, Seoul, Korea, October 30-31; Gilman, Martin undated. 'A World without G20 Summits.' In Marina Larionova and John Kirton, eds., *The G8-G20 Relationship in Global Governance.* Farnham: Ashgate. forthcoming.

4 Cooper, Andrew F. (2013). 'Working with the Countries of the G20, BRICS and the United Nations.' In *The UK Summit: The G8 at Lough Erne 2013*, edited by John J. Kirton and Madeline Koch. London: Newsdesk. Available at:

http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/newsdesk/g8lougherne2013.pdf; Cooper, Andrew F., and Ramesh Thakur (2013). *Group of Twenty (G20)*. London: Routledge; Vogt, Susanna (2010). 'A Progressive Idea of Style Awaiting Its Embodiment: Global Governance between G8 and G20.' *International Reports* 2010(5). Available at: http://www.kas.de/wf/en/33.19448.

5 Angeloni, Ignazio (2011). 'The Group of 20: Trials of Global Governance in Times of Crisis.' Bruegel Working Paper 2011/12. Available at: http://www.bruegel.org/publications/publication-detail/publication/655-the-group-of-g20-trials-of-global-governance-in-times-of-crisis; Darling, Alistair (2011). *Back from the Brink: 1000 Days at Number 11*. London: Atlantic Books; Wahl, Peter (2012), 'The G20: Overestimated and Underperforming: Drawing a balance of the G20 achievements – four years after the crash,' Discussion Paper, World Economy, Ecology and Development; Pickford, Stephen (2013). 'The G20 and Beyond.' Unpublished paper, Chatham House, London; Callick, Rowan (2013). 'U.S., Chinese Leaders Must Pull Off Market-Oriented Magic When They Meet in California.' *Australian*, June 6. Available at: http://www.theaustralian.com.au/opinion/columnists/us-chinese-leaders-must-pull-off-market-oriented-magic-when-they-meet-in-california/story-e6frg9fo-1226658099963; Tower, Courtney (2013). 'Canada's Harper: G20 Effectiveness Lessens as Members Go Own Ways.' *Market News International*, May 16. Available at: https://mninews.marketnews.com/index.php/canadas-harperg20-effctiveness-lessens-membrs-go-own-ways?q=content/canadas-harperg20-effctiveness-lessens-membrs-go-own-ways; Kawai, Masahiro (2013). 'The G20 Leaders' Process Five Years On: An Assessment from an Asian Perspective.' Opening remarks at a conference on 'The G20 Leaders' Process Five Years On: An Assessment from an Asian Perspective,' Lowy Institute for International Policy Study, Sydney, May 22. Available at: http://www.adbi.org/files/speech.2013.05.22.opening.remarks.kawai.g20.leaders.five.years.on.asian.perspective.pdf; Knaack, Peter and Saori N. Katada (2013), 'Fault Lines and Issue Linkages at the G20: New Challenges for Global Economic Governance,' *Global Policy* 4 (3) (September): 235-246; Patrick, Stewart (2014), 'The Unruled World: The Case for Good Enough Global Governance,' *Foreign Affairs (January/February): 58-73.*

6 Harding, Robin, John Aglionby and Delphine Strauss (2014), 'India's central bank chief hits at US,' *Financial Times*, January 31, p. 1.

7 Drezner, Daniel (2014), 'The System Worked: Global Economic Governance during the Great Recession,' *World Politics* 66: 1 (January): 123-164; Lannoo, Karel (2014), 'G-20 Plus Five,' *Foreign Affairs* February 27.

8 Penttilä, Risto E.J. (2009). 'Multilateralism Light: The Rise of Informal International Governance.' July, Centre for European Reform, London. Available at: http://www.cer.org.uk/pdf/penttila_essay_july09.pdf; Postel-Vinay, Karoline (2011). *Le G20, laboratoire d'un monde émergent*. Paris: Les Presses de Sciences Po; Cooper, Andrew F., and Ramesh Thakur (2013). *Group of Twenty (G20)*. London: Routledge; Kirton, John J. (2013a). *G20 Governance for a Globalized World*. Farnham: Ashgate; Hajnal, Peter I. (2014). *The G20: Evolution, Interrelationships, Documentation*. : eFarnham: Ashgate.

9 Kirton (2013a) *G20 Governance.*

10 *Ibid.*

11 *Ibid.* pp.115-133.

12 Pickford, (2013) 'G20 and Beyond'.

13 Darling (2011) *Back from the Brink;* Bradford, Colin (2013), 'Political Leadership Changes and the Future of the Global Economic Order.' Paper prepared for a

conference on 'Major Economies under New Leadership: Policy Priorities and Challenges,' Institute of Global Economics, Seoul, Korea, October 30-31.

[14] Pickford, (2013) 'G20 and Beyond'.

[15] Bayne, Nicholas, and Stephen Woolcock (2011). 'The Future of Economic Diplomacy.' In *New Economic Diplomacy: Decision-Making and Negotiation in International Economic Relations*, edited by Nicholas Bayne and Stephen Woolcock, pp. 359–78. Farnham: Ashgate.

[16] Kirton, John J. (2013b). 'G20-G8 Partnership in Global Economic Governance.' Background paper for a conference on 'From the G8 to the G20 and Beyond: Setting a Course for Economic Global Governance,' Chatham House, London, May 9. http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/scholar/kirton-chathamhouse-2013.html; Kirton, John J. (2013c). 'Growing G20 Governance for a Globalized World,' *Global Review,* September (in Chinese); Kirton, John J. (2013d). 'Winning Together: Advanced Countries' Approach to G20 Governance.' Paper prepared for the 'G20 Seminar,' Shanghai International Studies University, Shanghai, May 3. Available at: http://www.g20.utoronto.ca/biblio/kirton-sisu-2013.html; Kirton, John, Julia Kulik and Caroline Bracht (2013). 'G20 Social Governance.' Paper prepared for an international workshop on 'Global Social Law and Policy,' University of Bremen, Germany, February 22–23, 2013; Cooper, Andrew F. (2012). 'The G20 as the Global Focus Group: Beyond the Crisis Committee/Steering Committee Framework.' June. Available at: http://www.g20.utoronto.ca/analysis/120619-cooper-focusgroup.html.

[17] G20 (2012). 'G20 Leaders Declaration.' Los Cabos, June 19. Available at: http://www.g20.utoronto.ca/2012/2012-0619-loscabos.html.

[18] Lannoo (2014), 'G-20 Plus Five'.

[19] Civil 20 Task Force on Inequality (2013). 'Civil 20 Proposals for Strong, Sustainable, Balanced and Inclusive Growth.' CIvil 20, Moscow. Available at: http://www.g20.utoronto.ca/c20/C20_proposals_2013_final.pdf.

[20] Kirton (2013a) *G20 Governance.*

[21] Plattner, Marc F. (2011). 'From the G8 to the G20.' *Journal of Democracy* 22(1): 31–38.