



UNIVERSITY OF
TORONTO

MUNK
SCHOOL
OF
GLOBAL
AFFAIRS

Join the Global Conversation

The
G20 Research Group
at Trinity College at the Munk School of Global Affairs in the University of Toronto
with the
International Organisations Research Institute
at the National Research University Higher School of Economics, Moscow
present the

2014 Brisbane G20 Summit Interim Compliance Report

17 November 2014 to 1 March 2015

Prepared by
Krystel Montpetit, Theodora Mladenova, Mickael Deprez, Jonathan Tavone, Phil Gazaleh,
Taylor Grott and Antonia Tsapralis
G20 Research Group, Toronto,
and
Andrei Sakharov, Andrey Shelepov and Mark Rakhmangulov
International Organisations Research Institute, Moscow

27 August 2015
www.g20.utoronto.ca
g20@utoronto.ca

“The University of Toronto ... produced a detailed analysis to the extent of which each G20 country has met its commitments since the last summit ... I think this is important; we come to these summits, we make these commitments, we say we are going to do these things and it is important that there is an organisation that checks up on who has done what.”

— *David Cameron, Prime Minister, United Kingdom, at the 2012 Los Cabos Summit*



UNIVERSITY OF
TORONTO

MUNK
SCHOOL
OF
GLOBAL
AFFAIRS

Join the Global Conversation

The
G20 Research Group
at Trinity College at the Munk School of Global Affairs in the University of Toronto
with the
International Organisations Research Institute
at the National Research University Higher School of Economics, Moscow
present the

2014 Brisbane G20 Summit Interim Compliance Report

17 November 2014 to 1 March 2015

Prepared by
Krystel Montpetit, Theodora Mladenova, Mickael Deprez, Jonathan Tavone, Phil Gazaleh,
Taylor Grott and Antonia Tsapralis
G20 Research Group, Toronto,
and
Andrei Sakharov, Andrey Shelepov and Mark Rakhmangulov
International Organisations Research Institute, Moscow

27 August 2015
www.g20.utoronto.ca
g20@utoronto.ca

“The University of Toronto ... produced a detailed analysis to the extent of which each G20 country has met its commitments since the last summit ... I think this is important; we come to these summits, we make these commitments, we say we are going to do these things and it is important that there is an organisation that checks up on who has done what.”

— *David Cameron, Prime Minister, United Kingdom, at the 2012 Los Cabos Summit*

Contents

Preface.....	3
Introduction and Summary.....	6
Methodology and Scoring System	6
Commitment Breakdown.....	6
Selection of Commitments	6
Interim Compliance Scores	7
Interim Compliance by Member.....	7
Interim Compliance by Commitment.....	7
Table 1: 2014 G20 Brisbane Summit Commitments Selected for Compliance Monitoring.....	8
Table 2: 2014 G20 Brisbane Interim Compliance Scores.....	10
Table 3: 2014 G20 Brisbane Summit Interim Compliance by Country	11
Table 4: 2014 G20 Brisbane Summit Interim Compliance by Commitment	11
Table 5: G20 Compliance by Member, 2008-2014	12
Conclusions	13
Future Research and Reports	13
Considerations and Limitations	13
Appendix: General Considerations	14
1. Macroeconomics: Fiscal Strategies	15
2. Macroeconomics: Investment.....	47
3. Macroeconomics: Exchange Rates.....	67
4. Trade	82
5. Labour and Employment: Youth Unemployment	106
6. Labour and Employment: Social Protection	127
7. Climate Change	157
8. Energy: Fossil Fuels.....	174
9. Energy: Clean Technology	197
10. Health: Ebola.....	218
11. Health: Antimicrobial Resistance	238
12. Gender.....	258
13. Financial Regulation	284
14. Development: Remittances	301
15. Development: Tax Administration	316
16. Development: Aid for Trade	332
17. Infrastructure.....	351

Preface

Since the G20 leaders met at their first summit in 2008 in Washington, the G20 Research Group at the University of Toronto and the International Organisations Research Institute of National Research University Higher School of Economics (IORI HSE) in Moscow have produced reports on their progress in implementing the priority commitments made at each summit. These reports monitor each G20 member's efforts to implement a carefully chosen selection of the many commitments produced at each summit. The reports are offered to the general public and to policy makers, academics, civil society, the media and interested citizens around the world in an effort to make the work of the G20 more transparent, accessible and effective, and to provide scientific data to enable the meaningful analysis of the causes of compliance and the impact of this important informal international institution. Previous reports are available at the G20 Information Centre at www.g20.utoronto.ca/analysis and the IORI HSE at www.hse.ru/en/org/hse/iori/G20_analytics.

The G20 Research Group has been working with the team at IORI HSE since IORI HSE initiated this G20 compliance research in 2009, after the Washington Summit in November 2008. The initial report, covering only one commitment made at that summit, tested the compliance methodology developed by the G8 Research Group and adapted it to the G20.

To make its assessments, the G20 Research Group relies on publicly available information, documentation and media reports. To ensure accuracy, comprehensiveness and integrity, we encourage comments from stakeholders. Indeed, scores can be recalibrated if new material becomes available. All feedback remains anonymous. Responsibility for this report's contents lies exclusively with the authors and analysts of the G20 Research Group and its partners at IORI HSE.

This report assesses performance by G20 members with 17 priority commitments among the total of 205 commitments made at the 2014 Brisbane Summit, held on 15-16 November 2014. This interim report covers compliant behaviour during the period from 16 November 2014 to 1 March 2015. The final report, to be released on the eve of the 2015 Antalya Summit, will cover the entire time between the Brisbane Summit and the Antalya Summit.

I am most grateful to Marina Larionova and her team in Moscow at the National Research University Higher School of Economics, as well as to Antonia Tsapralis and our own team in Toronto.

Professor John Kirton
Co-director, G20 Research Group

Research Team

Professor John Kirton, Co-director, G20 Research Group
Professor Marina Larionova, Head, HSE International Organisations Research Institute
Antonia Tsapralis, Chair, G20 Research Group
Mickael Deprez, Co-director, Compliance Unit
Jonathan Tavone, Co-director, Compliance Unit
Philip Gazaleh, Co-director, Compliance Unit
Krystal Montpetit, Co-director, Compliance Unit
Theodora Mladenova, Co-director, Compliance Unit
Taylor Grott, Director, Communication Unit
Mark Rakhmangulov, Deputy Director, IORI HSE Global Governance Research Centre
Andrey Shelepov, HSE Research Team Leader

Analysts at the University of Toronto

Lead Analysts

Mikael Deprez	David Gelles	Jonathan Tavone
Jelena Djuric	Caitlin Gillespie	Melanie Wallace
Chris D'Souza	Rui Kelly Li	Pei Zhao
Phil Gazaleh	Atena Sadegh	

Analysts

Elisabeth Asselin	Meghan King	Arturo Sparks
Maria Baginska	Elizaveta Klimenko	Katerina Stamadianos
Sophie Barnett	Julia Kochneva	Max Stern
Adam Barrett	John Koester	Julia Stockdale-Otarol
Elise Belzil	Daryna Kutsyna	Madeline Torrie
Alison Blagden	Steven Lampert	Emily Tsui
Frederique Bouchard	Grace Lee	Natalia Valencia
Andrei Burloiu	Luke Tianxing Li	Christopher Villages-Cho
Nour Chehabeddine	Fu Yuan (Andrew) Li	Lukas Weese
Pin Hui Chen	Andy Li	Carmen Wong
Dana Crawhall-Duk	Jasper Lim	Leslie Woods
Kevin Deagle	Celine Lu	Wenjie (Shirley) Wu
Alison Dillman	Aylin Manduric	Nancy Xue
Carol Drumm	Colin McEwen	Yinan Yang
Bushra Ebadi	Sabina Mihaescu	Kei Zamanioor
Helene Emorine	Francesca Morfini	Fred Zhang
Ben Fickling	Mason Nowak	
James Flynn	Cindy Ou	
Mercedes Fogarassy	Daniel C. Park	
Ujwal Gangaly	Rebecca Patrick	
Jasjit Goraya	Artur Pereira	
Jiyoon Han	Harrison Perry-Daiter	
Eimi Harris	Carol Ramchuram	
Daniel Hart	Shahbano Rao	
Anna Hohenadel	Anna Roach	
Jackie Houston	Vitali Selivanov	
Allison Ing	Mariel Seymour	
Jose Isla	Sara Sgambelluri	
Sophie Jackson	Emily Shaw	
Eddie Kawooya	Ariel Sim	
Frances Kessler	Travis Southin	

Analysts at the Higher School of Economics

Sergey Burok

Tatiana Lanshina

Anton Markov

Anastasiia Matiukhina

Vitaly Nagornov

Svetlana Nikitina

Elizaveta Safonkina

Andrei Sakharov

Nadezhda Sporysheva

Lyudmila Tarasenko

Sergei Titov

Introduction and Summary

The G20 2014 Brisbane Interim Compliance Report, prepared by the G20 Research Group at the University of Toronto and the International Organisations Research Institute of the National Research University Higher School of Economics (IORI HSE), analyzes compliance by G20 members with a selection of 17 priority commitments out of a total of 205 commitments made at the Brisbane Summit on 15-16 November 2014. The report covers compliance-relevant actions taken by the G20 members between 16 November 2014 to 1 March 2015. This timeframe allows for an assessment of compliance at approximately the midpoint between the 2014 Brisbane Summit and the Antalya Summit, which will be hosted by Turkey on 15-16 November 2015. A final report assessing compliance for the full period between the two summits will be published on the eve of the Antalya Summit.

Methodology and Scoring System

This report draws on the methodology developed by the G8 Research Group, which has been monitoring G7/8 compliance since 1996 (IORI HSE joined this multiyear project in 2005, and Bond University participated in 2014). The use of this methodology builds cross-institutional and cross-member consistency and also allows compatibility with compliance assessments of other institutions.

The methodology uses a scale from -1 to +1, where +1 indicates full compliance with the stated commitment, -1 indicates a failure to comply or action taken that is directly opposite to the stated instruments or goal of the commitment, and 0 indicates partial compliance or work in progress, such as initiatives that have been launched but are not yet near completion and whose full results can therefore not be assessed. Each member assessed receives a score of -1, 0 or +1 for each commitment. For convenience, the scores in the tables have been converted to percentages, where -1 equals 0% and +1 equals 100%.¹

A failing compliance score does not necessarily imply an unwillingness to comply on the part of G20 members. In some cases policy actions can take multiple compliance cycles to implement and measure. As the G20 Research Group and IORI HSE continue to monitor developments in this issue area, progress made by members can be recorded in future compliance reports.

Commitment Breakdown

The G20 made a total of 205 commitments at the Brisbane Summit.² These commitments, as identified by the G20 Research Group and HSE, are drawn from the official G20 Leaders' Communiqué, the Brisbane Action Plan, the Statement on Ebola, the Note on the Global Infrastructure Initiative and Hub, and the Principles on Energy Collaboration.

Selection of Commitments

For each compliance cycle (that is, the period between summits), the research team selects commitments that reflect the breadth of the G20 agenda and also reflect the priorities of the summit's host, while balancing the selection to allow for comparison with past and future summits,

¹ The formula to convert a score into a percentage is $P=50 \times (S+1)$, where P is the percentage and S is the score.

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

following the methodology developed by the G8 Research Group.³ The selection also replicates the breakdown of issue areas and the proportion of commitments in each one. Primary criteria for priority commitment selection are the comprehensiveness and relevance to the summit, the G20 and the world, as well as individual and collective pledges. Selected commitments must also meet secondary criteria of performance measurability and ability to comply to some degree within a year, as well as tertiary criteria of significance as identified by scientific teams and relevant stakeholders in the host country.

For the 2014 G20 Brisbane Interim Compliance Report, 17 priority commitments were selected from the 205 commitments made at the Brisbane Summit (see Table 1).

Interim Compliance Scores

The assessment is based on relevant, publicly available information relating to action taken from 16 November 2014 to 1 March 2015. The interim compliance scores by commitment are contained in Table 2. Country rankings are listed in Table 3 and commitment rankings are listed in Table 4. Table 5 allows a comparison of the 2014 interim compliance scores with the final scores of previous G20 summits.

For the period from 16 November 2014 to 1 March 2015, G20 members achieved an average interim compliance score of +0.25, which translates to 63%. This interim compliance score surpasses the final compliance score for the London and Pittsburgh summits.

Interim Compliance by Member

For compliance with the Brisbane Summit's priority commitments, the United States is in first place with a score of +0.71 (85%), followed by the United Kingdom at +0.65 (82%) and Canada at +0.59 (79%). The lowest scoring member is South Africa with a score of -0.29 (35%). The difference between the highest and lowest G20 member compliance scores is +1.00. For more information about compliance by G20 members, see Table 2.

Interim Compliance by Commitment

This particular compliance cycle produced a high level of compliance for a few different issue areas: clean energy technology and infrastructure at +0.85 (93%) in first place, followed by the health commitment on antimicrobial resistance in second place at +0.80 (90%). The commitment on youth employment came third place at +0.75 (88%). Four commitments scored at or below 0 (50%): climate change at 0 (50%), a macroeconomic commitment on fiscal strategies at -0.05 (48%), the development commitment on remittances at -0.25 (38%) and, in last place, the commitment on fossil fuel subsidies at -0.35 (33%). For more information on scoring by commitment, see Table 3.

³ Guidelines for choosing priority commitments, as well as other applicable considerations, are available in the Reference Manual for Summit Commitment and Compliance Coding.

Table 1: 2014 G20 Brisbane Summit Commitments Selected for Compliance Monitoring

1	Macroeconomic: Fiscal Strategies	“We will continue to implement fiscal strategies flexibly, taking into account near-term economic conditions, while putting debt as a share of GDP on a sustainable path.” (G20 Brisbane Leaders’ Communiqué)
2	Macroeconomic: Investment	“We are working to facilitate long-term financing from institutional investors ... particularly for small and medium-sized enterprises]” (G20 Brisbane Leaders’ Communiqué)
3	Macroeconomic: Exchange Rates	“We reiterate our commitment to move more rapidly toward more market-determined exchange rate systems and exchange rate flexibility to reflect underlying fundamentals, and avoid persistent exchange rate misalignments.” (G20 Brisbane Action Plan)
4	Trade	“We commit to implement all elements of the Bali package.” (G20 Brisbane Leaders’ Communiqué)
5	Labour and Employment: Youth Unemployment	“We are strongly committed to reducing youth unemployment, which is unacceptably high, by acting to ensure young people are in education, training or employment.” (G20 Brisbane Leaders’ Communiqué)
6	Labour and Employment: Social Protection	“We remain focussed on addressing ... long-term unemployment, by ... having appropriate social protection systems.” (G20 Brisbane Leaders’ Communiqué)
7	Climate Change	“We reaffirm our support for mobilising finance for adaptation ... such as the Green Climate Fund.” (G20 Brisbane Leaders’ Communiqué)
8	Energy: Fossil Fuel Subsidies	“We reaffirm our commitment to rationalise and phase out inefficient fossil fuel subsidies that encourage wasteful consumption, recognising the need to support the poor.” (G20 Brisbane Leaders’ Communiqué)
9	Energy: Clean Energy Technology	“G20 countries agree to work together to ... Encourage and facilitate the design, development, demonstration ... of innovative energy technologies, including clean energy technologies.” (G20 Principles on Energy Collaboration)
10	Health: Ebola	“We will work to expedite the effective and targeted disbursement of funds ... balancing between emergency and long-term needs.” (G20 Brisbane Leaders’ Statement on Ebola)
11	Health: Antimicrobial Resistance	“We also commit to fight anti-microbial resistance.” (G20 Leaders’ Brisbane Statement on Eloba)
12	Gender	“We agree to the goal of reducing the gap in labour force participation rates between men and women in our countries by 25 per cent by 2025, taking into account national circumstances. This will bring more than 100 million women into the labour force [and] significantly increase global growth.” (G20 Brisbane Action Plan)
13	Financial Regulation	“We commit to improve the transparency of ... beneficial ownership by implementing the G20 High-Level Principles on Beneficial Ownership Transparency.” (G20 Brisbane Summit Leaders’ Communiqué)

14	Development: Remittances	“We commit to take strong practical measures to reduce the global average cost of transferring remittances to five per cent and to enhance financial inclusion as a priority.” (G20 Brisbane Leaders’ Communiqué)
15	Development: Tax Administration	“We will work with [developing countries] to build their tax administration.” (G20 Brisbane Summit Leaders’ Communiqué)
16	Development: Aid for Trade	“We will continue to provide aid-for-trade to developing countries in need of assistance.” (G20 Brisbane Leaders’ Communiqué)
17	Infrastructure	“We ... will work on ways to mobilise long-term financing for infrastructure.” (G20 Brisbane Action Plan)

Table 2: 2014 G20 Brisbane Interim Compliance Scores

	Argentina	Australia	Brazil	Canada	China	France	Germany	India	Indonesia	Italy	Japan	Korea	Mexico	Russia	Saudi Arabia	South Africa	Turkey	United Kingdom	United States	European Union	Average	
1	0	0	0	-1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+1	0	-1	0	0	0	0	-0.05	48%
2	-1	+1	-1	+1	+1	0	+1	+1	0	+1	+1	+1	-1	+1	-1	0	+1	+1	+1	+1	+0.45	73%
3	-1	+1	-1	+1	+1	-1	-1	+1	-1	-1	+1	+1	+1	+1	-1	-1	-1	+1	+1	0	+0.05	53%
4	-1	+1	0	+1	0	+1	+1	-1	0	-1	0	0	0	0	-1	+1	-1	+1	+1	-1	+0.05	53%
5	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	0	0	+1	+1	+1	0	+1	0	+1	0	+1	+1	+1	+0.75	88%
6	0	-1	-1	+1	+1	0	+1	+1	0	-1	-1	+1	+1	+1	+1	0	-1	0	+1	-1	+0.15	58%
7	0	+1	-1	+1	-1	+1	0	-1	0	-1	+1	+1	+1	-1	-1	-1	-1	0	+1	+1	0.00	50%
8	-1	-1	0	-1	-1	0	-1	0	0	-1	-1	0	0	+1	-1	-1	-1	0	+1	+1	-0.35	33%
9	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	0	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	-1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+0.85	93%
10	-1	0	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	-1	-1	+1	0	-1	+1	0	0	0	+1	+1	+1	+0.35	68%
11	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	0	+1	+1	0	0	0	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+0.80	90%
12	-1	0	0	0	-1	+1	+1	-1	-1	+1	+1	+1	0	+1	+1	-1	0	0	0	N/A	+0.11	55%
13	0	+1	-1	+1	+1	+1	0	0	0	+1	-1	0	+1	+1	0	0	0	+1	0	0	+0.30	65%
14	-1	0	-1	0	0	0	0	0	-1	0	-1	0	0	0	-1	0	0	0	0	0	-0.25	38%
15	+1	0	+1	0	0	-1	+1	+1	0	-1	0	0	+1	0	-1	-1	0	+1	0	+1	+0.15	58%
16	0	+1	0	+1	+1	0	0	0	-1	0	+1	0	0	-1	-1	-1	0	+1	+1	0	+0.10	55%
17	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	0	+1	+1	+1	0	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	0	+1	+1	+1	+1	+0.85	93%
Average	-0.12	+0.47	0.00	+0.59	+0.41	+0.35	+0.47	+0.29	-0.18	-0.12	+0.35	+0.47	+0.29	+0.53	-0.18	-0.29	-0.06	+0.65	+0.71	+0.44	+0.25	63%
	44%	74%	50%	79%	71%	68%	74%	65%	41%	44%	68%	74%	65%	76%	41%	35%	47%	82%	85%	72%	63%	

N/A = Not applicable.

Table 3: 2014 G20 Brisbane Summit Interim Compliance by Country

Rank	Member	Average	
1	United States	+0.71	85%
2	United Kingdom	+0.65	82%
3	Canada	+0.59	79%
4	Russia	+0.53	76%
5	Australia	+0.47	74%
	Germany	+0.47	74%
	Korea	+0.47	74%
8	European Union	+0.44	72%
9	China	+0.41	71%
10	France	+0.35	68%
	Japan	+0.35	68%
12	India	+0.29	65%
	Mexico	+0.29	65%
14	Brazil	0.00	50%
15	Turkey	-0.06	47%
16	Argentina	-0.12	44%
	Italy	-0.12	44%
18	Indonesia	-0.18	41%
	Saudi Arabia	-0.18	41%
20	South Africa	-0.29	35%

Table 4: 2014 G20 Brisbane Summit Interim Compliance by Commitment

Rank	Commitment	Average	
1	Energy: Clean Energy Technology	+0.85	93%
	Infrastructure	+0.85	93%
3	Health: Antimicrobial Resistance	+0.80	90%
4	Labour and Employment: Youth	+0.75	88%
5	Macroeconomics: Investment	+0.45	73%
6	Health: Ebola	+0.35	68%
7	Financial Regulation	+0.30	65%
8	Labour and Employment: Social Protection	+0.15	58%
	Development: Tax Administration	+0.15	58%
10	Gender	+0.11	55%
11	Development: Aid for Trade	+0.10	55%
12	Macroeconomic: Exchange Rates	+0.05	53%
	Trade	+0.05	53%
14	Climate Change	0.00	50%
15	Macroeconomics: Fiscal Strategies	-0.05	48%
16	Development: Remittances	-0.25	38%
17	Energy: Fossil Fuels	-0.35	33%

Table 5: G20 Compliance by Member, 2008-2014

Member	Final		Final		Final		Final		Final		Final		Final		Interim		Final		Interim	
	Washington		London		Pittsburgh		Toronto		Seoul		Cannes		Los Cabos		St. Petersburg		St. Petersburg		Brisbane	
Argentina	0	50%	-0.60	20%	-0.13	44%	0	50%	-0.08	46%	0	50%	+0.31	66%	+0.06	53%	+0.06	53%	-0.12	44%
Australia	n/a	–	+0.60	80%	+0.50	75%	+0.56	78%	+0.85	93%	+0.67	84%	+0.94	97%	+0.38	69%	+0.63	81%	+0.47	74%
Brazil	+1.00	100%	+0.20	60%	-0.63	19%	+0.29	65%	+0.42	71%	+0.60	80%	+0.56	78%	+0.31	66%	+0.31	66%	0	50%
Canada	+1.00	100%	+0.60	80%	+0.63	82%	+0.78	89%	+0.69	85%	+0.73	87%	+0.75	88%	+0.44	72%	+0.44	72%	+0.59	79%
China	0	50%	-0.40	30%	+0.13	57%	+0.38	69%	+0.42	71%	+0.53	77%	+0.38	69%	0	50%	+0.19	59%	+0.41	71%
France	+1.00	100%	+0.80	90%	+0.63	82%	+0.56	78%	+0.77	89%	+0.60	80%	+0.69	85%	+0.69	84%	+0.69	84%	+0.35	68%
Germany	+1.00	100%	+0.80	90%	+0.63	82%	+0.56	78%	+0.54	77%	+0.67	84%	+0.56	78%	+0.56	78%	+0.75	88%	+0.47	74%
India	0	50%	-0.40	30%	-0.38	31%	-0.29	36%	+0.42	71%	+0.60	80%	+0.50	75%	+0.19	59%	+0.63	81%	+0.29	65%
Indonesia	n/a	–	-0.40	30%	-0.63	19%	-0.13	44%	+0.36	68%	+0.14	57%	+0.47	74%	+0.50	75%	+0.50	75%	-0.18	41%
Italy	+1.00	100%	0	50%	+0.13	57%	+0.56	78%	+0.77	89%	+0.80	90%	+0.19	60%	+0.31	66%	+0.44	72%	-0.12	44%
Japan	+1.00	100%	+0.20	60%	+0.50	75%	+0.56	78%	+0.62	81%	+0.47	74%	+0.50	75%	+0.31	66%	+0.31	66%	+0.35	68%
Korea	n/a	–	0	50%	+0.75	88%	+0.56	78%	+0.46	73%	+0.60	80%	+0.63	82%	+0.19	59%	+0.38	69%	+0.47	74%
Mexico	+1.00	100%	0	50%	+0.25	63%	-0.14	43%	+0.58	79%	+0.67	84%	+0.69	85%	+0.38	69%	+0.38	69%	+0.29	65%
Russia	0	50%	+0.40	70%	+0.38	69%	+0.13	57%	+0.59	80%	+0.60	80%	+0.63	82%	+0.50	75%	+0.44	72%	+0.53	76%
Saudi Arabia	n/a	–	+0.20	60%	-0.13	44%	-0.13	44%	+0.08	54%	+0.21	61%	+0.50	75%	-0.06	47%	+0.06	53%	-0.18	41%
South Africa	+1.00	100%	+0.40	70%	+0.63	82%	-0.14	43%	+0.33	67%	+0.47	74%	+0.47	74%	+0.25	63%	+0.25	63%	-0.29	35%
Turkey	n/a	–	+0.20	60%	-0.25	38%	-0.14	43%	+0.17	59%	+0.20	60%	+0.25	63%	+0.13	56%	+0.25	63%	-0.06	47%
United Kingdom	+1.00	100%	+1.00	100%	+0.50	75%	+0.78	89%	+0.77	89%	+0.87	94%	+0.81	91%	+0.88	94%	+0.75	88%	+0.65	82%
United States	0	50%	+0.40	70%	+1.00	100%	+0.33	67%	+0.38	69%	+0.53	77%	+0.81	91%	+0.63	81%	+0.69	84%	+0.71	85%
European Union	+1.00	100%	+0.60	80%	+0.38	69%	+0.57	79%	+0.82	91%	+0.85	93%	+0.75	88%	+0.69	84%	+0.63	81%	+0.44	72%
Average	+0.67	83%	+0.23	62%	+0.24	62%	+0.28	64%	+0.50	75%	+0.54	77%	+0.57	79%	+0.37	68%	+0.44	72%	+0.25	63%
	Final		Final		Final		Final		Final		Final		Final		Interim		Final		Interim	

n/a = not available

Conclusions

G20 compliance performance for the chosen priority commitments, measured as a summit average, improved incrementally from the April 2009 London Summit and September 2009 Pittsburgh Summit (both at 62%) to the June 2010 Toronto Summit (64%) and then rose with the November 2010 Seoul Summit (75%) and the November 2011 Cannes Summit (78%). With the St. Petersburg Summit, compliance dropped to 72%. The interim average of 64% for the Brisbane Summit is lower than the historical average of 70% for the seven previous summits (excluding Washington), but the scores may improve by the time of the final report, which will be published on the eve of the Antalya Summit. If the G20 can improve its performance on delivering on its promises, it may validate its claim for legitimacy as a global governance institution.

Many of the commitments assessed in this report have timelines that extend beyond the 2014 Brisbane Summit or reflect medium- and long-term priorities. A unique feature of this report is the incorporation of deadlines for commitments monitored over multiple compliance cycles. The convergence of medium- and long-term commitments and those with deadlines in the near future reflects the nature of G20 decisions as a crisis management forum and a global governance steering institution. It also illustrates the multifaceted nature of compliance assessment. As the relationship among short, medium, and long-term commitments becomes clearer, the compliance landscape for many of these priority commitments may change over the course of future compliance periods.

Future Research and Reports

The information contained in this report provides G20 members and other stakeholders with an indication of their compliance in the period immediately following the Brisbane Summit. This draft has been produced as an invitation for others to provide additional or more complete information on compliance before the finished final report will be published in near future. Feedback should be sent to g20@utoronto.ca.

Considerations and Limitations

Several elements affect the findings contained in this report. While the purpose of the report is to monitor compliance with G20 commitments, it is necessary to ensure that the monitoring mechanism is realistic and considers the context within which the commitments are made. With new commitments, more attention must be paid to the initial implementation constraints faced by members. One way to accommodate these constraints is to regard the intent to implement policy measures as an illustration of compliance, or being “on track” towards compliance. This initial leeway should only be granted for new commitments; intent is not a suitable indicator of compliance for medium-term or longstanding commitments. Over time as commitments become integrated in the G20 compliance mechanism, compliance guidelines should become more stringent (as members become more accustomed to the nature of the issue and the requirements for compliance).

See also Appendix: General Considerations.

Appendix: General Considerations

In evaluating the results of this report, the following considerations should be kept in mind.

1. Assessments contained in this report apply to commitment-related actions taken by G20 members only since the commitments were declared publicly at the last summit.
2. Compliance has been assessed against a selected set of priority commitments, rather than all commitments contained in the summit documents. The selection is intended to produce a representative subset of the total body of commitments. An ideal set of priority commitments represents proportionally the amount of attention paid to each policy area in summit documents, reflects the relative ambition of summit commitments, and holds as many G20 members to account for compliance as possible.
3. In addition to producing commitments, summits provide value by establishing new principles and norms, creating and highlighting issues and issue areas and altering the traditional discourse used to discuss priorities. Some of the most important decisions reached at summits may be done in private and not encoded in the public record of the summit documents.
4. Some commitments cover several years and thus compliance takes longer than the summit-to-summit timeframe applied in this report. For this reason, full compliance (denoted by a +1 score) might not require that G20 members carry out a given commitment completely, but might instead demand clear, visible progress commensurate with the overall timetable as well as public statements of support of commitment objectives.
5. In some cases, a G20 member might choose not to comply with a particular summit commitment for good reason, for example if global conditions have changed dramatically since the commitment was made or if new knowledge has become available about how a particular problem can best be solved.
6. As each G20 member has its own constitutional, legal and institutional processes for undertaking action at the national level (and in the case of the European Union at the supranational level), each member is free to act according to its own legislative schedule. Of particular importance here is the annual schedule for creating budgets, seeking legislative approval and appropriating funds.
7. Commitments in G20 summit documents might also be included, in whole or in part, in documents released by other international forums, as the decisions of other international organizations or even national statements such as the State of the Union Address in the United States, the Queen's Speech in the United Kingdom and the Speech from the Throne in Canada. Merely repeating a G20 commitment in another forum does not count fully as compliant behaviour.
8. This report assesses G20 members' action in accordance with the text of actual, specific commitments made in G20 summit documents. Because commitments demand that policymakers and regulators act specifically to meet the identified objectives, this report holds policymakers accountable for pushing and passing recommended policies. Furthermore, compliance is assessed against the precise, particular commitment, rather than what might be regarded as a necessary or appropriate action to solve the problem being addressed.
9. As individual members can take different actions to comply with the same commitment, no standardized cross-national evaluative criterion can be universally applied. The interpretive guidelines attempt to provide an equitable method for assessing compliance.
10. Because the evaluative scale used in this compliance report runs from -1 to +1, any score in the positive range represents at least some degree of compliance.