



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
presents the

2015 G20 Antalya Summit Final Compliance Report

16 November 2015 to 3 September 2016

Prepared by
Sarah Scott, Alissa Xinhe Wang and the G20 Research Group, Toronto
and Mark Rakhmangulov and the Center for International Institutions Research
of the Russian Presidential Academy of National Economy and Public Administration,
Moscow

5 September 2016, revised 10 December 2016

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
Research Team Based at the University of Toronto	4
Introduction and Summary	6
Methodology and Scoring System	6
Commitment Breakdown	6
Selection of Commitments.....	6
Final Compliance Scores.....	7
Final Compliance by Member.....	7
Final Compliance by Commitment.....	7
Table 1: 2015 G20 Antalya Summit Commitments Selected for Compliance Monitoring	8
Table 2: 2015 G20 Antalya Summit Final Compliance Scores	10
Table 3: 2015 G20 Antalya Summit Final Compliance by Member	12
Table 4: 2015 G20 Antalya Summit Final Compliance by Commitment	12
Table 5: G20 Compliance by Member, 2008-2015	13
Conclusions	14
Future Research and Reports.....	14
Considerations and Limitations.....	14
Appendix: General Considerations	15
1. Energy: Fossil Fuel Subsidies	16
2. Refugees	49
3. Macroeconomics: Fiscal Policies	97
4. Reform of International Financial Institutions: International Monetary Fund Reform	143
5. Trade: Anti-protectionism	172
6. Terrorism: Financial Action Task Force Recommendations.....	206
7. Development: Aid for Trade.....	235
8. Development: Remittances.....	277
9. Development: Tax Administration	300
10. Labour and Employment: Gender	334
11. Terrorism: Information Exchange	365
12. Financial Regulation: Information Exchange.....	380
13. Information and Communications Technologies: Digital Divide	393
14. Labour and Employment: Youth	409
15. Macroeconomics: Small and Medium-Sized Enterprises	423
16. Trade: Multilateral Trade System	440
17. Crime and Corruption: Asset Recovery	455

Preface

Since the G20 leaders met at their first summit in 2008 in Washington, the G20 Research Group at the University of Toronto and the Center for International Institutions Research of the Russian Presidential Academy of National Economy and Public Administration (RANEPA), formerly with the International Organizations Research Institute at the National Research University Higher School of Economics (HSE), in Moscow have produced reports on their progress in implementing the priority commitments made at each summit. These reports monitor each G20 member's efforts to implement a carefully chosen selection of the many commitments produced at each summit. The reports are offered to the general public and to policy makers, academics, civil society, the media and interested citizens around the world in an effort to make the work of the G20 more transparent, accessible and effective, and to provide scientific data to enable the meaningful analysis of the causes of compliance and the impact of this important informal international institution. Previous reports are available at the G20 Information Centre at <http://www.g20.utoronto.ca/analysis>.

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

To make its assessments, the G20 Research Group relies on publicly available information, documentation and media reports. To ensure accuracy, comprehensiveness and integrity, we encourage comments from stakeholders. Indeed, scores can be recalibrated if new material becomes available. All feedback remains anonymous. Responsibility for the contents of this report lies exclusively with the authors and analysts of the G20 Research Group. Due to extenuating circumstances, stakeholders had limited time to submit feedback. This report reflects feedback submitted as of 5 September 2016. It includes seven commitments that could not be distributed for stakeholder feedback.

The interim report, published in July 2016, assessed performance by G20 members with 10 priority commitments among the total of 113 commitments made at the 2015 Antalya Summit, held on 15-16 November 2015. It covered the first part of China's G20 presidency up to 5 April 2016.

This final report assesses performance by G20 members on those same 10 commitments plus the seven that did not receive stakeholder feedback, for a total of 17.

I am most grateful to Sarah Scott and our G20 Research Group team, as well as Marina Larionova, Mark Rakhmangulov and their team in Moscow at RANEPA.

Professor John Kirton
Co-director, G20 Research Group

Research Team Based at the University of Toronto

Professor John Kirton, Co-director, G20 Research Group
Sarah Scott, Chair, Summit Studies
Alissa Xinhe Wang, Editor in Chief
Cindy Xinying Ou, Compliance Director
Derakhshan Qurban-Ali, Compliance Director
Phil Gazaleh, Compliance Director
Daniel C. Park, Compliance Director
Matt Gumley, Compliance Director
Emma Best, Compliance Director
Monica Layarda, Compliance Director
Mridvika Sahajpal, Compliance Director

Lead Analysts

Alessandra Harkness	Hélène Emorine	Yashwinie Shivanand
Andrew Liu	Natalia Valencia Caquimbo	Julia Tops
Carol Drumm	Sophie Barnett	
Grace Lee	Ujwal Ganguly	

Analysts

Adrian DiTommaso	Jinnan Li	Nishita Agrawal
Alejandra Bellatin	Jiyoon Han	Novera Khan
Alessandra Jenkins	Jose Isla	Olivier X. Li
Alison Dillman	Joud Hadi	Omar Bitar
Anah Mirza	Joy Lizette Aguilar	Philip Basaric
Andrew Aulthouse	Julia Tops	Phil Gazaleh
Angela Min Yi Hou	Jini Wong	Qasim Sheikh
Anju Xing	Kabir Bhatia	Rebecca Dickey
Anna Roach	Katrina Y.K. Li	Reema Gill
Arthur Lui	Kaylee Mak	Richard Turcsanyi
Aylin Manduric	Kertia Johnson	Rinchen-Dolma Karma
Bojana Radan	Keshini Mahesan	Rochelle D'souza
Bryan Roh	Kyle Van Hooren	Rodrigo Noorani
Bushra Ebadi	Laila Kanji	Ron Shnaidstein
Coral Cripps	Larissa Parker	Sara Fallalah
Daniel Bodirsky	Lauren Dalglish	Sarah Bear
Daniel Valls	Lucinda Yae-Rim Ro	Shruti Anandan
Doris Li	Maria Alexiou	Sonali Gill
Eileen (Yijia) Liu	Mariam Jammal	Sonja Dobson
Elena Lifshits Carrera	Mariya-Kvitlana Tsap	Sonu Arora
Emile Lavergne	Martin Musiol	Sophie Barnett
Emilia Lochowska	Mary Zelenova	Sunny Jang
Emily Nickel	Mathieu Sitaya	Sydney Anderson
Emily Shaw	Michael Switzer	Tatiana Ferrara
Ethan Tsai	Michael Warchol	Tanzeel Fatima
Fatima Saya	Mike Cowan	Tanzim Rashid
George Mason	Miranda Bocci	Thomas Kariunas
Germán Andres Guberman Diaz	Mojann Zibapour	Tina Vulevic
Hasna Sami	Motahareh Nabavi Niaki	Trinh Theresa Do
Hivda Ates	Mustafa Sayedi	Yalda Mehran
Jennifer Kou	Nabiha Chowdhury	Yolanda Clatworthy
Jiayang Shan	Nadine Abdel Razek	Zachary Skeith
Jinhui Jiao	Nidhi Varma	Zineb Drissi

RANEPA analysts

Anastasiya Baum
Anastasiya Kozina
Anastasiya Polovko
Andrei Sakharov
Andrey Loginov
Andrey Shelepov
Dariya Gruzdeva
Dariya Zhdanova
Ekaterina Muravyeva
Elizaveta Safonkina
Irina Popova
Juliya Ponkratova
Marina Ustinova
Mark Rakhmangulov
Pavel Grebenyuk
Vasilisa Nazarova

Introduction and Summary

The G20 2015 Antalya Final Compliance Report prepared by the G20 Research Group based at the University of Toronto and its Russian partners at the Center for International Institutions Research of the Russian Presidential Academy of National Economy and Public Administration (RANEPA) analyzes compliance by G20 members with a selection of 17 priority commitments of a total of 113 commitments made at the Antalya Summit on 15-16 November 2015. The report covers relevant actions taken by the G20 members between 16 November 2015 to 5 September 2016. This timeframe allows for an assessment of compliance of the full period between the 2015 Antalya Summit and the Hangzhou Summit, which will be hosted by China on 4-5 September 2016.

Methodology and Scoring System

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

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

A -1 compliance score does not necessarily imply an unwillingness to comply on the part of G20 members. In some cases, policy actions can take multiple compliance cycles to implement and measure. As the G20 Research Group and RANEPA (formerly the research team at IORI HSE) continue to monitor developments, progress made by members can be recorded in future compliance reports.

Commitment Breakdown

The G20 made a total of 113 commitments at the Antalya Summit. These commitments, as identified by the G20 Research Group and RANEPA, are drawn from the official G20 Leaders' Communiqué and the Statement on the Fight Against Terrorism.

Selection of Commitments

For each compliance cycle (that is, the period between summits), the research team selects commitments that reflect the breadth of the G20 agenda and also reflect the priorities of the summit's host, while balancing the selection to allow for comparison with past and future summits, following the methodology developed by the G8 Research Group. The selection also replicates the breakdown of issue areas and the proportion of commitments in each one. Primary criteria for priority commitment selection are the comprehensiveness and relevance to the summit, the G20 and the world, as well as individual and collective pledges. Selected commitments must also meet secondary criteria of performance measurability and ability to comply to some degree within a year, as well as tertiary criteria of significance as identified by scientific teams and relevant stakeholders in the host country.

For the 2015 G20 Antalya Final Compliance Report, 17 priority commitments were selected for assessment by the University of Toronto team from the 113 commitments made at the Antalya Summit (see Table 1).

Final Compliance Scores

The assessment is based on relevant, publicly available information relating to actions taken from 16 November 2015 to 5 September 2016. The final compliance scores by commitment are contained in Table 2. Country rankings are listed in Table 3 and commitment rankings are listed in Table 4.

For the period from 16 November 2015 to 5 September 2016, G20 members achieved an average final compliance score of +0.55, which translates to 77%.

Final Compliance by Member

For compliance with the Antalya Summit's priority commitments, the European Union has the highest rate of compliance at +0.81 (91%), followed by France, Germany, Italy, the United Kingdom and the United States at +0.71 (85%). Australia, Canada and India scored +0.65 (82%). The lowest scoring member is Indonesia at +0.18 (59%). The difference between the highest and lowest G20 member compliance scores is +0.64. For more information about compliance by G20 members, see Table 3.

Final Compliance by Commitment

This particular compliance cycle produced a high level of compliance for several areas. The commitment on labour and employment (gender) ranked highest at +0.95 (98%), followed by the commitments on aid for trade at +0.90 (95%). The commitment on reforming international financial institutions (International Monetary Fund reform) and development assistance (tax administration) came next at +0.85 (93%). The lowest score was on energy (fossil fuels subsidies) at -0.35 (33%). For more information on scoring by commitment, see Table 4.

Table 1: 2015 G20 Antalya Summit Commitments Selected for Compliance Monitoring

1	Energy: Fossil Fuel Subsidies	We reaffirm our commitment to rationalise and phase-out inefficient fossil fuel subsidies that encourage wasteful consumption, over the medium term, recognising the need to support the poor. (G20 Antalya Leaders' Communiqué)
2	Refugees	We commit to continue further strengthening our support for all efforts to provide protection [for the unprecedented numbers of refugees and internally displaced persons in various parts of the world] (G20 Antalya Leaders' Communiqué)
3	Macroeconomics: Fiscal Policies	We reiterate our commitment to implement fiscal policies flexibly to take into account near-term economic conditions, so as to support growth and job creation, while putting debt as a share of [gross domestic product] on a sustainable path. (G20 Antalya Leaders' Communiqué)
4	Reform of International Financial Institutions: International Monetary Fund	We reaffirm our commitment to maintaining a strong, quota-based and adequately resourced [International Monetary Fund]. (G20 Antalya Leaders' Communiqué)
5	Trade: Anti-protectionism	We further reaffirm our longstanding commitment to standstill and rollback on protectionist measures (G20 Antalya Leaders' Communiqué)
6	Terrorism: Financial Action Task Force Recommendations	We will continue to implement relevant [Financial Action Task Force] recommendations and instruments. (G20 Antalya Leaders' Communiqué)
7	Development: Aid for Trade	We emphasize the important role of trade in global development efforts and will continue to support mechanisms such as Aid for Trade in developing countries in need of capacity building assistance. (G20 Antalya Leaders' Communiqué)
8	Development: Remittances	Our G20 National Remittance Plans developed this year include concrete actions towards our commitment to reduce the global average cost of transferring remittances to five per cent with a view to align with the [Sustainable Development Goals] and Addis Ababa Action Agenda. (G20 Antalya Leaders' Communiqué)
9	Development: Tax Administration	We support the efforts for strengthening developing economies' engagement in the international tax agenda. (G20 Antalya Leaders' Communiqué)
10	Labour and Employment: Gender	We will continue monitoring the implementation of our Employment Plans as well as our goals to reduce gender participation gap. (G20 Antalya Leaders' Communiqué)
11	Terrorism: Information Exchange	We also remain committed to tackling the financing channels of terrorism, particularly by enhanced cooperation on exchange of information. (G20 Statement on the Fight Against Terrorism)

12	Financial Regulation: Information Exchange	[We are progressing towards enhancing the transparency of our tax systems and] we reaffirm our previous commitments to information exchange on-request as well as to automatic exchange of information by 2017 or end-2018 (G20 Antalya Leaders' Communiqué)
13	Information and Communication Technologies: Digital Divide	We commit ourselves to bridge the digital divide. (G20 Antalya Leaders' Communiqué)
14	Labour and Employment: Youth	Building on our previous commitments and taking into account our national circumstances, we agree to the G20 goal of reducing the share of young people who are most at risk of being permanently left behind in the labour market by 15% by 2025 in G20 countries (G20 Antalya Leaders' Communiqué)
15	Macroeconomics: Small and Medium-Sized Enterprises	We support policies that allow firms of all sizes, particularly [small and medium-sized enterprises], in countries at all levels of economic development to participate in and take full advantage of [global value chains] (G20 Antalya Leaders' Communiqué)
16	Trade: Multilateral Trade System	We will continue our efforts to ensure that our bilateral, regional and plurilateral trade agreements complement one another, are transparent and inclusive, are consistent with and contribute to a stronger multilateral trade system under [World Trade Organization] rules. (G20 Antalya Leaders' Communiqué)
17	Crime and Corruption: Asset Recovery	[We will further work to strengthen international cooperation, including where appropriate and consistent with domestic legal systems, on civil and administrative procedures, as an important tool] to support asset recovery (G20 Antalya Leaders' Communiqué)

Table 2: 2015 G20 Antalya Summit Final Compliance Scores

		Argentina	Australia	Brazil	Canada	China	France	Germany	India	Indonesia	Italy	Japan	Korea	Mexico	Russia	Saudi Arabia	South Africa	Turkey	United Kingdom	United States	European Union	Average		
1	Energy: Fossil Fuel Subsidies	+1	-1	-1	0	0	0	0	+1	-1	0	-1	0	-1	-1	0	-1	-1	-1	+1	-1	-0.35	33%	
2	Refugees	+1	+1	+1	+1	0	+1	+1	-1	0	+1	0	0	+1	+1	+1	-1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+0.60	80%
3	Macroeconomics: Fiscal Policy	+1	+1	+1	+1	0	0	+1	+1	0	+1	0	0	+1	0	0	+1	+1	+1	0	+1	+0.60	80%	
4	IFI Reform: IMF Reform	0	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	0	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	0	+1	+1	+1	+0.85	93%	
5	Trade: Anti-protectionism	0	+1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+1	+1	0	0	+1	0	0	+1	+1	0	+0.30	65%	
6	Terrorism: FATF Recommendations	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	-1	+1	+1	+1	0	0	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+0.80	90%
7	Development: Aid for Trade	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	0	+1	+1	0	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+0.90	95%
8	Development: Remittances	-1	0	0	-1	0	+1	0	+1	0	+1	0	0	0	-1	-1	+1	-1	0	0	+1	0.00	50%	
9	Development: Tax Administration	0	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	0	+1	0	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+0.85	93%
10	Labour and Employment: Gender	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	0	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+0.95	98%
11	Terrorism: Information Exchange	+1	0	0	0	+1	+1	+1	+1	0	+1	0	+1	+1	+1	+1	0	0	+1	+1	+1	+1	+0.65	83%
12	Financial Regulation: Information Exchange	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	0	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	0	+1	0	+1	0	n/a	+0.79	89%	
13	ICT: Digital Divide	0	0	0	+1	0	0	0	0	0	-1	-1	+1	0	0	+1	0	0	+1	-1	+1	+0.10	55%	
14	Labour and Employment: Youth	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	0	-1	+1	+1	0	+1	+1	+1	0	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+0.75	88%
15	Macroeconomics: SMEs	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	-1	+1	-1	+1	+1	+0.80	90%	
16	Trade: Multilateral Trade System	0	+1	0	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	0	+1	+1	-1	+1	0	-1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+0.60	80%	
17	Crime/Corruption: Asset Recovery	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+1	+1	+1	+0.15	58%	
		+0.53	+0.65	+0.53	+0.65	+0.59	+0.71	+0.71	+0.65	+0.18	+0.71	+0.35	+0.53	+0.53	+0.47	+0.35	+0.24	+0.41	+0.71	+0.71	+0.81	+0.55	77%	
		76%	82%	76%	82%	79%	85%	85%	82%	59%	85%	68%	76%	76%	74%	68%	62%	71%	85%	85%	91%	+0.77		

Note: FATF = Financial Action Task Force; ICT = information and communication technologies; IFI = international financial institutions; IMF = International Monetary Fund; SMEs = small and medium-sized enterprises. n/a = not applicable.

Table 3: 2015 G20 Antalya Summit Final Compliance by Member

Rank	Member	Average	
1	European Union	+0.81	91%
2	France	+0.71	85%
	Germany		
	Italy		
	United Kingdom		
	United States		
7	Australia	+0.65	82%
	Canada		
	India		
10	China	+0.59	79%
11	Argentina	+0.53	76%
	Brazil		
	Korea		
	Mexico		
15	Russia	+0.47	74%
16	Turkey	+0.41	71%
17	Japan	+0.35	68%
	Saudi Arabia		
19	South Africa	+0.24	62%
20	Indonesia	+0.18	59%

Table 4: 2015 G20 Antalya Summit Final Compliance by Commitment

Rank	Commitment	Average	
1	Labour and Employment: Gender	+0.95	98%
2	Development: Aid for Trade	+0.90	95%
3	IFI Reform: IMF Reform	+0.85	93%
	Development: Tax Administration		
5	Terrorism: FATF Recommendations	+0.80	90%
	Macroeconomics: SMEs		
7	Financial Regulation: Information Exchange	+0.79	89%
8	Labour and Employment: Youth	+0.75	88%
9	Terrorism: Information Exchange	+0.65	83%
10	Refugees	+0.60	80%
	Macroeconomics: Fiscal Strategies		
	Trade: Mutliateral Trade System		
13	Trade	+0.30	65%
14	Crime and Corruption: Asset Recovery	+0.15	58%
15	Information and Communication: Digital Divide	+0.10	55%
16	Development: Remittances	0	50%
17	Energy: Fossil Fuels	-0.35	33%

Note: FATF = Financial Action Task Force; ICT = information and communication technologies; IFI = international financial institutions; IMF = International Monetary Fund; SMEs = small and medium-sized enterprises.

Table 5: G20 Compliance by Member, 2008-2015

Member	Final		Final		Final		Final		Final		Final		Final		Final		Final		Interim		Final	
	Washington 2008		London 2009		Pittsburgh 2009		Toronto 2010		Seoul 2010		Cannes 2011		Los Cabos 2012		St. Petersburg 2013		Brisbane 2014		Antalya 2015			
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	50%	+0.53	76%
Australia	n/a	-	+0.60	80%	+0.50	75%	+0.56	78%	+0.85	93%	+0.67	84%	+0.94	97%	+0.63	81%	+0.59	79%	+0.60	80%	+0.65	82%
Brazil	+1.00	100%	+0.20	60%	-0.63	19%	+0.29	65%	+0.42	71%	+0.60	80%	+0.56	78%	+0.31	66%	+0.12	56%	-0.30	35%	+0.53	76%
Canada	+1.00	100%	+0.60	80%	+0.63	82%	+0.78	89%	+0.69	85%	+0.73	87%	+0.75	88%	+0.44	72%	+0.71	85%	+0.50	75%	+0.65	82%
China	0	50%	-0.40	30%	+0.13	57%	+0.38	69%	+0.42	71%	+0.53	77%	+0.38	69%	+0.19	59%	+0.59	79%	+0.50	75%	+0.59	79%
France	+1.00	100%	+0.80	90%	+0.63	82%	+0.56	78%	+0.77	89%	+0.60	80%	+0.69	85%	+0.69	84%	+0.63	81%	+0.30	65%	+0.71	85%
Germany	+1.00	100%	+0.80	90%	+0.63	82%	+0.56	78%	+0.54	77%	+0.67	84%	+0.56	78%	+0.75	88%	+0.69	84%	+0.60	80%	+0.71	85%
India	0	50%	-0.40	30%	-0.38	31%	-0.29	36%	+0.42	71%	+0.60	80%	+0.50	75%	+0.63	81%	+0.59	79%	+0.30	65%	+0.65	82%
Indonesia	n/a	-	-0.40	30%	-0.63	19%	-0.13	44%	+0.36	68%	+0.14	57%	+0.47	74%	+0.50	75%	+0.12	56%	0	50%	+0.18	59%
Italy	+1.00	100%	0	50%	+0.13	57%	+0.56	78%	+0.77	89%	+0.80	90%	+0.19	60%	+0.44	72%	+0.13	56%	+0.30	65%	+0.71	85%
Japan	+1.00	100%	+0.20	60%	+0.50	75%	+0.56	78%	+0.62	81%	+0.47	74%	+0.50	75%	+0.31	66%	+0.65	82%	+0.10	55%	+0.35	68%
Korea	n/a	-	0	50%	+0.75	88%	+0.56	78%	+0.46	73%	+0.60	80%	+0.63	82%	+0.38	69%	+0.65	82%	0	50%	+0.53	76%
Mexico	+1.00	100%	0	50%	+0.25	63%	-0.14	43%	+0.58	79%	+0.67	84%	+0.69	85%	+0.38	69%	+0.47	74%	-0.20	40%	+0.53	76%
Russia	0	50%	+0.40	70%	+0.38	69%	+0.13	57%	+0.59	80%	+0.60	80%	+0.63	82%	+0.44	72%	+0.47	74%	-0.20	40%	+0.47	74%
Saudi Arabia	n/a	-	+0.20	60%	-0.13	44%	-0.13	44%	+0.08	54%	+0.21	61%	+0.50	75%	+0.06	53%	-0.24	38%	+0.10	55%	+0.35	68%
South Africa	+1.00	100%	+0.40	70%	+0.63	82%	-0.14	43%	+0.33	67%	+0.47	74%	+0.47	74%	+0.25	63%	-0.12	44%	+0.10	55%	+0.24	62%
Turkey	n/a	-	+0.20	60%	-0.25	38%	-0.14	43%	+0.17	59%	+0.20	60%	+0.25	63%	+0.25	63%	0	50%	+0.30	65%	+0.41	71%
UK	+1.00	100%	+1.00	100%	+0.50	75%	+0.78	89%	+0.77	89%	+0.87	94%	+0.81	91%	+0.75	88%	+0.76	88%	+0.40	70%	+0.71	85%
US	0	50%	+0.40	70%	+1.00	100%	+0.33	67%	+0.38	69%	+0.53	77%	+0.81	91%	+0.69	84%	+0.76	88%	+0.80	90%	+0.71	85%
EU	+1.00	100%	+0.60	80%	+0.38	69%	+0.57	79%	+0.82	91%	+0.85	93%	+0.75	88%	+0.63	81%	+0.75	88%	+0.40	70%	+0.81	91%
Average	+0.67	83%	+0.23	62%	+0.24	62%	+0.28	64%	+0.50	75%	+0.54	77%	+0.57	79%	+0.44	72%	+0.42	71%	+0.23	62%	+0.55	77%

n/a = not available

Conclusions

G20 compliance performance for the chosen priority commitments, measured as a summit average, improved incrementally from the 2009 London Summit and 2009 Pittsburgh Summit (both at 62%) to the 2010 Toronto Summit (64%) and then rose with the 2010 Seoul Summit (75%), the 2011 Cannes Summit (77%) and the 2012 Los Cabos Summit (79%). With the 2013 St. Petersburg Summit, compliance dropped to 72% and the compliance with the 2014 Brisbane Summit commitments dropped to 71%. The interim average of 62% for the 2015 Antalya Summit is even lower. However, the final score for 2015 increased significantly to 77%, which is higher than the average of 72% for all 10 summits. 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 2015 Antalya 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 Antalya Summit. This report has been produced as an invitation for others to provide additional or more complete information on compliance during the period under study. Feedback should be sent to g20@utoronto.ca.

Considerations and Limitations

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

See also Appendix: General Considerations.

Appendix: General Considerations

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

Assessments contained in this report apply to commitment-related actions taken by G20 members only since the commitments were declared publicly at the last summit.

Compliance has been assessed against a selected set of priority commitments, rather than all commitments contained in the summit documents. The selection is intended to produce a representative subset of the total body of commitments. An ideal set of priority commitments represents proportionally the amount of attention paid to each policy area in summit documents, reflects the relative ambition of summit commitments, and holds as many G20 members to account for compliance as possible.

In addition to producing commitments, summits provide value by establishing new principles and norms, creating and highlighting issues and issue areas and altering the traditional discourse used to discuss priorities. Some of the most important decisions reached at summits may be done in private and not encoded in the public record of the summit documents.

Some commitments cover several years and thus compliance takes longer than the summit-to-summit timeframe applied in this report. For this reason, full compliance (denoted by a +1 score) might not require that G20 members carry out a given commitment completely, but might instead demand clear, visible progress commensurate with the overall timetable as well as public statements of support of commitment objectives.

In some cases, a G20 member might choose not to comply with a particular summit commitment for good reason, for example if global conditions have changed dramatically since the commitment was made or if new knowledge has become available about how a particular problem can best be solved.

As each G20 member has its own constitutional, legal and institutional processes for undertaking action at the national level (and in the case of the European Union at the supranational level), each member is free to act according to its own legislative schedule. Of particular importance here is the annual schedule for creating budgets, seeking legislative approval and appropriating funds.

Commitments in G20 summit documents might also be included, in whole or in part, in documents released by other international forums, as the decisions of other international organizations or even national statements such as the State of the Union Address in the US, the Queen's Speech in the UK and the Speech from the Throne in Canada. Merely repeating a G20 commitment in another forum does not count fully as compliant behaviour.

This report assesses G20 members' action in accordance with the text of actual, specific commitments made in G20 summit documents. Because commitments demand that policymakers and regulators act specifically to meet the identified objectives, this report holds policymakers accountable for pushing and passing recommended policies. Furthermore, compliance is assessed against the precise, particular commitment, rather than what might be regarded as a necessary or appropriate action to solve the problem being addressed.

As individual members can take different actions to comply with the same commitment, no standardized cross-national evaluative criterion can be universally applied. The interpretive guidelines attempt to provide an equitable method for assessing compliance.

Because the evaluative scale used in this compliance report runs from -1 to +1, any score in the positive range represents at least some degree of compliance.