



2020 G20 Riyadh Summit Final Compliance Report

Prepared by

Kaylin Dawe, Jae Yoon Mary Noh and the G20 Research Group

University of Toronto

Toronto

and

Alexander Ignatov and the Center for International Institutions Research

Russian Presidential Academy of National Economy and Public Administration,

Moscow

From 23 November 2020 to 27 September 2021

28 October 2021

Feedback, as always, is welcome and is kept anonymous.

We encourage readers to send comments to

G20@utoronto.ca

Contents

Preface	3
Research Teams	4
Toronto G20 Research Group Team.....	4
G20 Research Group Lead Analysts	4
G20 Research Group Analysts	4
CIIR G20 Research Team.....	5
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: 2020 G20 Riyadh Summit Commitments Selected for Compliance Monitoring.....	8
Table 2: 2020 G20 Riyadh Summit Final Compliance Scores.....	10
Table 3: 2020 G20 Riyadh Summit Final Compliance by Member	12
Table 4: 2020 G20 Riyadh Summit Final Compliance by Commitment	12
Table 5: G20 Compliance by Member, 2008-2020	13
Conclusions	13
Future Research and Reports	14
Considerations and Limitations.....	14
Appendix: General Considerations.....	15
1. Macroeconomic Policy: Inclusive Growth.....	16
2. Macroeconomics: Capital Markets.....	119
3. Trade: Investment	149
4. Trade: Open Markets.....	251
5. Digital Economy: Consumer Rights	272
6. International Taxation: Tax Systems.....	310
7. International Taxation: BEPS	364
8. Crime and Corruption: Threats.....	381
9. Labour and Employment: Job Protection.....	414
10. Gender: Inequalities.....	469
11. Gender: Economic Participation	599
12. Development: Debt Relief.....	688
13. Development: COVID-19.....	755
14. Health Preparedness and Response	787
15. Health: Information Sharing	981
16. Health: Vaccine Distribution.....	1034
17. Energy: Fossil Fuels.....	1064
18. Environment: Marine Plastic Litter.....	1096
19. Climate Change: Circular Carbon Economy	1125
20. Climate Change: Paris Agreement.....	1221

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), and 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, including those that leaders can change to improve compliance and the impact of this important informal international institution. Previous reports are available at the G20 Information Centre at <http://www.g20.utoronto.ca/analysis>.

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

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

Professor John Kirton
Director, G20 Research Group

Research Teams

Toronto G20 Research Group Team

Professor John Kirton,
Director
Kaylin Dawe, Co-chair,
Summit Studies
Jae Yoon Mary Noh, Co-
chair, Summit Studies
Sonja Dobson, Editor
Alyssa Atef, Compliance
Director
Joy Fan, Compliance
Director

Angela Min Yi Hou,
Compliance Director
Jenna Im, Compliance
Director
Wenny (Yiyao) Jin,
Compliance Director
Nammal Khan, Compliance
Director
Matthew Kieffer,
Compliance Director
Malhaar Moharir,
Compliance Director

Natasha Pirzada,
Compliance Director
Quinn Teague-Colfer,
Compliance Director
Diego Vásquez,
Compliance Director
Jennifer Miao Wang,
Compliance Director
Brandon Yih, Compliance
Director
Gabriella Shiyuan Zhao,
Compliance Director

G20 Research Group Lead Analysts

Omar S. Abdellatif
Miranda Bocci
Nour Ellassiuty
Chan Wai Suet Gi Gi
Ilan Hughes

Omar Kassam
Olivia Klasios
Samantha Moura Novais de
Quadros
Srijan Sahu

Quinn Teague-Colfer
Ingrid Wong
Charlie Lecheng Zeng
Meixi Zhang

G20 Research Group Analysts

Rana Al-Fayez
Meryem Althani
Diana Anton
Santiago Ardisson
Simran Arulraj
Nika Asgari
Yasmeen Atassi
Para Babuهران
Leena Badri
Yuchen Bai
Rawan Barakat
Matthew Barrett
Clémentine Benoit
Desbasmita Bhattacharya
Alisha Bhimji
Annabelle Bourzeix
Matthew Brubacher
Shanice Burton
Laura Bustos
Faadil Butt
Joy Chan
Haobin Chen
Tammy Cheng
Keerthi Chintapalli
Arees Chooljian
Luisa Cortat Simonetti
Goncalves
Dre Daley

Omar Danaf
Oya Darici
Ghazaleh Darini
Bubneet Dhillon
Ana Djordjijevic
Nouran El Atreby
Jad El Ghali
Arun Eswaran
Sahar Fatima
Sharif Fatourehchi
Julia Gavieta
Sydney Grad
Darwin Gumba
Kate Haberl
Xin Han
Phoebe Han
Neeharika Hemrajani
Azana Hyder
Minahil Iftikhar
Ujala Iqbal
Anna Ivanova
Janishan Jeyarajah
Jessica Johnson
Rebecca Jones
Shafna Kallil
Diya Kumar Katra
Burhan Anees Khan
Muhammad Hamza Khan

Saarah Khan
Olivia Klasios
Signe Kossmann
Jonathan Ku
Franscesca Kwon
Jennifer Lam
Elizabeth Lerman
Isabella Li
Andy Lin
Dong (Delia) Liu
Jenny Liu
Ziyi Liu
Ema Marcheska
Erica Matsui
Beatrice McLeod
Lougein Metwally
Dalia Michaud
Arina Mnatsakanyan
Samar Moghal
Amanda Morana
YanYui Mork
Sara Mostafa
Shereen Marouf Mourad
Tourang Movahedi
Mehr Mukhtar
Delaney Murphy
Ishita Nagar
Shalin Nayak

Aline Nayir
Veronique Nuqui
Rahul Pallan
Claire Parish
AnnaMaria Pavlopoulos
Thérèse Perucho
Bianca Piccone
Abigail Potter
Surabhi Pradhan
Zhuojia Qiu
Darya Rahbar
Warisa Rahman
Chan-Min Roh
Tamara Saadi
Amandeep Saini
Aisha Shafaqat

Keah Sharma
Simren Ravina Sharma
Aimaan Shergill
Hayley Spent
Hannah Story-Korman
Dimitris Symeonidis
Dorottya Szekely
Brett Szmul
Vlada Taitis
Derek Thiele
Aadi Thulasingam
Zhenyi Tsai
Alexander Trachsell
Wing Ka Tsang
Ethan Ullmann
Jeffrey Vandespyster

Karči Aldridge Végi
Veniamin Veselovsky
Amanda Wang
Tianhe Wang
Tianyang (Victoria) Wang
Sarah Weiner
Angelo Wijaya
Nathan Ye
June Young Lee
Rachel Zack
Aida Zarghami
Liva Zemitis
Jing sen Zhang
Shunjie Tony Zhao

CIIR G20 Research Team

Marina Larionova, Director
Alexander Ignatov
Irina Popova
Andrei Sakharov
Andrey Shelepov
Sergei Vasilkovsky
Pavel Doronin
Anastasiya Kirillova

Introduction and Summary

The G20 2020 Riyadh Final Compliance Report is prepared by the G20 Research Group based at the University of Toronto and its Russian partner at the Center for International Institutional Research of the Russian Presidential Academy of National Economy and Public Administration (RANEPA). The report analyzes compliance by G20 members with 20 priority commitments carefully selected from the total of 107 commitments made at the Riyadh Summit hosted by Saudi Arabia on 21–22 November 2020. This final report covers relevant actions taken by the G20 members between 23 November 2020 to 27 September 2021, which builds on the interim report that covered actions taken up to 22 May.

Methodology and Scoring System

This report draws on the methodology developed by the G7 Research Group, which has been monitoring G7/8 compliance since 1996. The International Organisations Research Institute at the Higher School of Economics joined this multi-year project in 2005, followed by RANEPA. The use of this methodology builds cross-institutional and cross-member consistency and also allows compatibility with compliance assessments of other institutions.

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

A compliance score of –1 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 continue to monitor developments, progress made by members can be recorded in future compliance reports.

The Compliance Coding Manual that describes the methodology in detail is available on the G20 Information Centre website at <http://www.g20.utoronto.ca/analysis/index.html#method>.

Commitment Breakdown

The G20 made a total of 107 commitments at the Riyadh Summit.² These commitments, as identified by the G20 Research Group and RANEPA, are drawn from the official Riyadh Leaders' Declaration.

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 G7 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,

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

² A commitment is defined as a discrete, specific, publicly expressed, collectively agreed statement of intent; a promise by summit members that they will undertake future action to move toward, meet or adjust to an identified target.

More details are contained in the Reference Manual for Summit Commitment and Compliance Coding).

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

For the 2020 G20 Riyadh Summit Final Compliance Report, 20 priority commitments were selected for assessment by the University of Toronto and the RANEPAs teams (see Table 1).

Final Compliance Scores

This assessment is based on relevant, publicly available information relating to actions taken from 23 November 2020 to 27 September 2021. The final compliance scores by commitment are contained in Table 2. Country rankings are listed in Table 3 and commitment rankings are listed in Table 4.

For the full compliance period, including all 20 commitments, G20 members achieved average compliance of +0.69 (85%).

Final Compliance by Member

For final compliance with the Riyadh Summit's priority commitments, Germany had the highest compliance at +1.00 (100%), followed Korea, the United Kingdom and the European Union at +0.95 (98%), and France at +0.89 (95%). Host Saudi Arabia tied for 10th with three other G20 members at +0.65 (83%). India had the lowest compliance score at +0.30 (65%). The difference between the highest and lowest G20 member compliance scores is 0.70. All the scores by G20 members are listed in Table 3.

Final Compliance by Commitment

The climate change commitment on the Paris Agreement ranked first at +0.95 (98%), followed by the international taxation commitment and both the macroeconomics commitments at +0.90 (95%). The trade commitment on open markets had the lowest compliance at +0.12 (56%). All the scores by commitment are listed in Table 4.

Table 1: 2020 G20 Riyadh Summit Commitments Selected for Compliance Monitoring

1	Macroeconomics: Inclusive Growth	“We will continue our efforts to reduce inequalities reaffirming our previous commitments to promote inclusive growth.” (G20 Riyadh Leaders’ Declaration)
2	Macroeconomics: Capital Markets	“We will strengthen long-term financial resilience and support growth, including through promoting sustainable capital flows and developing domestic capital markets.” (G20 Riyadh Leaders’ Declaration)
3	Trade: Investment	“We strive to realize the goal of a free, fair, inclusive, non-discriminatory, transparent, predictable, and stable trade and investment environment.” (G20 Riyadh Leaders’ Declaration)
4	Trade: Open Markets	“[We strive to]...keep our markets open.” (G20 Riyadh Leaders’ Declaration)
5	Digital Economy: Consumer Rights	“We support fostering an open, fair, and non-discriminatory environment, and protecting and empowering consumers, while addressing the challenges related to privacy, data protection, intellectual property rights, and security.” (G20 Riyadh Leaders’ Declaration)
6	International Taxation: Tax Systems	“We will continue our cooperation for a globally fair, sustainable, and modern international tax system.” (G20 Riyadh Leaders’ Declaration)
7	International Taxation: BEPS	“We remain committed to further progress on both pillars and urge the G20/OECD Inclusive Framework on BEPS to address the remaining issues with a view to reaching a global and consensus-based solution by mid-2021.” (G20 Riyadh Leaders’ Declaration)
8	Crime and Corruption: Threats	“We reiterate our strong commitment to tackle all sources, techniques and channels of these threats.” (G20 Riyadh Leaders’ Declaration)
9	Labour and Employment: Job Protection	“We will continue to support workers through training and reskilling policies.” (G20 Riyadh Leaders’ Declaration)
10	Gender: Inequalities	“As many women have been disproportionately affected by the crisis, we will work to ensure that the pandemic does not widen gender inequalities and undermine the progress made in recent decades.” (G20 Riyadh Leaders’ Declaration)
11	Gender: Economic Participation and Entrepreneurship	“We will take steps to remove the barriers to women’s economic participation and entrepreneurship.” (G20 Riyadh Leaders’ Declaration)
12	Development: Debt Relief	“We are committed to implementing the Debt Service Suspension Initiative (DSSI) including its extension through June 2021, allowing DSSI-eligible countries to suspend official bilateral debt service payments.” (G20 Riyadh Leaders’ Declaration)
13	Development: COVID-19	“We remain determined to support all developing and least developed countries as they face the intertwined health, economic, and social effects of COVID-19, recognizing the specific challenges in Africa and small island developing states.” (G20 Riyadh Leaders’ Declaration)
14	Health: Preparedness and Response	“We commit to advancing global pandemic preparedness, prevention, detection, and response.” (G20 Riyadh Leaders’ Declaration)

15	Health: Information Sharing	“[We reaffirm our commitment to] the continued sharing of timely, transparent, and standardized data and information [IHR].” (G20 Riyadh Leaders’ Declaration)
16	Health: Vaccine Distribution	“We will spare no effort to ensure their [vaccines] affordable and equitable access for all people, consistent with members’ commitments to incentivize innovation. In this regard, we fully support all collaborative efforts, especially the Access to COVID-19 Tools Accelerator (ACT-A) initiative and its COVAX facility, and the voluntary licensing of intellectual property.” (G20 Riyadh Leaders’ Declaration)
17	Energy: Fossil Fuels	“We reaffirm our joint commitment on medium term rationalization and phasing-out of inefficient fossil fuel subsidies that encourage wasteful consumption, while providing targeted support for the poorest.” (G20 Riyadh Leaders’ Declaration)
18	Environment: Marine Plastic Litter	“We reaffirm our commitment to reduce additional pollution by marine plastic litter, as articulated by the Osaka Blue Ocean Vision.” (G20 Riyadh Leaders’ Declaration)
19	Climate Change: Circular Carbon Economy	“We endorse the Circular Carbon Economy (CCE) Platform, with its 4Rs framework (Reduce, Reuse, Recycle and Remove), recognizing the key importance and ambition of reducing emissions, taking into account system efficiency and national circumstances.” (G20 Riyadh Leaders’ Declaration)
20	Climate Change: Paris Agreement	“Signatories to the Paris Agreement who confirmed at Osaka their determination to implement it, once again, reaffirm their commitment to its full implementation, reflecting common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities, in the light of different national circumstances.” (G20 Environment Ministers Meeting)

Table 2: 2020 G20 Riyadh 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	Macroeconomics: Inclusive Growth	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	0	+1	+1	+1	+1	0	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+0.90	95%
2	Macroeconomics: Capital Markets	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	0	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	0	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+0.90	95%
3	Trade: Investment	+1	+1	0	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	0	+1	0	0	+1	0	0	0	+1	+1	+1	+1	+0.65	83%
4	Trade: Open Markets	0	0	0	-1	0	n/a	n/a	0	+1	n/a	0	+1	0	+1	0	0	0	0	0	0	+0.12	56%
5	Digital Economy: Consumer Rights	+1	+1	+1	+1	0	+1	+1	0	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	0	+1	+1	0	+1	+1	+0.80	90%
6	International Taxation: Tax Systems	+1	+1	+1	0	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	0	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+0.90	95%
7	International Taxation: BEPS	0	-1	+1	+1	0	+1	+1	0	+1	+1	+1	0	0	+1	-1	0	+1	+1	+1	+1	+0.50	75%
8	Crime and Corruption: Threats	-1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	0	+1	0	0	+1	0	0	+1	0	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+0.60	80%
9	Labour and Employment: Job Protection	0	+1	0	+1	+1	+1	0	+1	+1	+1	+1	-1	0	+1	+1	0	+1	+1	+1	+1	+0.65	83%
10	Gender: Inequalities	+1	+1	+1	+1	0	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	0	+1	0	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+0.85	93%
11	Gender: Economic Participation	+1	+1	+1	+1	0	0	+1	0	+1	0	0	+1	+1	0	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+0.70	85%
12	Development: Debt Relief	0	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	0	0	+1	+1	+1	0	+1	0	0	0	+1	+1	+1	+1	+0.65	83%
13	Development: COVID-19	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	-1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	0	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+0.85	93%
14	Health: Preparedness and Response	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	0	+1	0	+1	+1	+1	0	+1	+1	0	+1	+1	+1	+1	+0.80	90%
15	Health: Information Sharing	+1	+1	+1	+1	0	+1	+1	0	+1	+1	+1	+1	0	0	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+0.80	90%
16	Health: Vaccine Distribution	0	+1	0	+1	0	+1	+1	0	0	+1	+1	0	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+0.70	85%
17	Energy: Fossil Fuels	-1	0	0	+1	+1	0	+1	0	+1	0	+1	-1	0	0	0	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+0.40	70%

2020 G20 Riyadh Summit Final Compliance Report

	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		
18	Environment: Marine Plastic Litter	+1	+1	0	+1	+1	+1	0	-1	-1	+1	+1	0	0	+1	0	0	+1	0	+1	+0.45	73%	
19	Climate Change: Circular Carbon Economy	+1	+1	0	+1	+1	+1	0	0	0	0	+1	0	0	0	0	+1	+1	+1	+1	+0.55	78%	
20	Climate Change: Paris Agreement	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	0	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+0.95	98%	
	Final Score	+0.55 78%	+0.80 90%	+0.65 83%	+0.85 93%	+0.65 83%	+0.89 95%	+1.00 100%	+0.30 65%	+0.55 78%	+0.63 82%	+0.75 88%	+0.95 98%	+0.35 68%	+0.50 75%	+0.65 83%	+0.35 68%	+0.65 83%	+0.95 98%	+0.85 93%	+0.95 98%	+0.69 85%	85%

Table 3: 2020 G20 Riyadh Summit Final Compliance by Member

Rank	Member	Average	
1	Germany	+1.00	100%
2	European Union	+0.95	98%
	Korea		
	United Kingdom		
5	France	+0.89	95%
6	Canada	+0.85	93%
	United States		
8	Australia	+0.80	90%
9	Japan	+0.75	88%
10	Brazil	+0.65	83%
	China		
	Saudi Arabia		
	Turkey		
14	Italy	+0.63	82%
15	Argentina	+0.55	78%
	Indonesia		
17	Russia	+0.50	75%
19	Mexico	+0.35	68%
	South Africa		
20	India	+0.30	65%

Table 4: 2020 G20 Riyadh Summit Final Compliance by Commitment

Rank	Commitment	Average	
1	Climate Change: Paris Agreement	+0.95	98%
2	International Taxation: Tax Systems	+0.90	95%
	Macroeconomics: Capital Markets		
	Macroeconomics: Inclusive Growth		
5	Development: COVID-19	+0.85	93%
	Gender: Inequalities		
7	Digital Economy: Consumer Rights	+0.80	90%
	Health: Information Sharing		
	Health: Preparedness and Response		
10	Gender: Economic Participation and Entrepreneurship	+0.70	85%
	Health: Vaccine Distribution		
12	Development: Debt Relief	+0.65	83%
	Labour and Employment: Job Protection		
	Trade: Investment		
15	Crime and Corruption: Threats	+0.60	80%
16	Climate Change: Circular Carbon Economy	+0.55	78%
17	International Taxation: BEPS	+0.50	75%
18	Environment: Marine Plastic Litter	+0.45	73%
19	Energy: Fossil Fuels	+0.40	70%
20	Trade: Open Markets	+0.12	56%

Table 5: G20 Compliance by Member, 2008-2020

Member	Final Washington 2008		Final London 2009		Final Pittsburgh 2009		Final Toronto 2010		Final Seoul 2010		Final Cannes 2011		Final Los Cabos 2012	
	Argentina	0	50%	-0.60	20%	-0.13	44%	0	50%	-0.08	46%	0	50%	+0.31
Australia	n/a	–	+0.60	80%	+0.50	75%	+0.56	78%	+0.85	93%	+0.67	84%	+0.94	97%
Brazil	+1.00	100%	+0.20	60%	-0.63	19%	+0.29	65%	+0.42	71%	+0.60	80%	+0.56	78%
Canada	+1.00	100%	+0.60	80%	+0.63	82%	+0.78	89%	+0.69	85%	+0.73	87%	+0.75	88%
China	0	50%	-0.40	30%	+0.13	57%	+0.38	69%	+0.42	71%	+0.53	77%	+0.38	69%
France	+1.00	100%	+0.80	90%	+0.63	82%	+0.56	78%	+0.77	89%	+0.60	80%	+0.69	85%
Germany	+1.00	100%	+0.80	90%	+0.63	82%	+0.56	78%	+0.54	77%	+0.67	84%	+0.56	78%
India	0	50%	-0.40	30%	-0.38	31%	-0.29	36%	+0.42	71%	+0.60	80%	+0.50	75%
Indonesia	n/a	–	-0.40	30%	-0.63	19%	-0.13	44%	+0.36	68%	+0.14	57%	+0.47	74%
Italy	+1.00	100%	0	50%	+0.13	57%	+0.56	78%	+0.77	89%	+0.80	90%	+0.19	60%
Japan	+1.00	100%	+0.20	60%	+0.50	75%	+0.56	78%	+0.62	81%	+0.47	74%	+0.50	75%
Korea	n/a	–	0	50%	+0.75	88%	+0.56	78%	+0.46	73%	+0.60	80%	+0.63	82%
Mexico	+1.00	100%	0	50%	+0.25	63%	-0.14	43%	+0.58	79%	+0.67	84%	+0.69	85%
Russia	0	50%	+0.40	70%	+0.38	69%	+0.13	57%	+0.59	80%	+0.60	80%	+0.63	82%
Saudi Arabia	n/a	–	+0.20	60%	-0.13	44%	-0.13	44%	+0.08	54%	+0.21	61%	+0.50	75%
South Africa	+1.00	100%	+0.40	70%	+0.63	82%	-0.14	43%	+0.33	67%	+0.47	74%	+0.47	74%
Turkey	n/a	–	+0.20	60%	-0.25	38%	-0.14	43%	+0.17	59%	+0.20	60%	+0.25	63%
United Kingdom	+1.00	100%	+1.00	100%	+0.50	75%	+0.78	89%	+0.77	89%	+0.87	94%	+0.81	91%
United States	0	50%	+0.40	70%	+1.00	100%	+0.33	67%	+0.38	69%	+0.53	77%	+0.81	91%
European Union	+1.00	100%	+0.60	80%	+0.38	69%	+0.57	79%	+0.82	91%	+0.85	93%	+0.75	88%
Average	+0.67	83%	+0.23	62%	+0.24	62%	+0.28	64%	+0.50	75%	+0.54	77%	+0.57	79%

n/a = not available

Member	Final St. Petersburg 2013		Final Brisbane 2014		Final Antalya 2015		Final Hangzhou 2016		Final Hamburg 2017		Final Buenos Aires 2018		Final Osaka 2019		Final Riyadh 2020	
	Argentina	+0.06	53%	+0.06	53%	+0.53	76%	+0.63	82%	+0.82	91%	+0.75	88%	+0.53	76%	+0.55
Australia	+0.63	81%	+0.59	79%	+0.65	82%	+0.79	89%	+0.71	85%	+0.80	90%	+0.74	87%	+0.70	85%
Brazil	+0.31	66%	+0.12	56%	+0.53	76%	+0.58	79%	+0.82	91%	+0.70	85%	+0.47	74%	+0.65	83%
Canada	+0.44	72%	+0.71	85%	+0.65	82%	+0.84	92%	+0.94	97%	+0.75	88%	+0.79	89%	+0.85	93%
China	+0.19	59%	+0.59	79%	+0.59	79%	+0.74	87%	+0.76	88%	+0.75	88%	+0.42	71%	+0.65	83%
France	+0.69	84%	+0.63	81%	+0.71	85%	+0.63	82%	+0.94	97%	+1.00	100%	+0.71	85%	+0.85	93%
Germany	+0.75	88%	+0.69	84%	+0.71	85%	+0.79	89%	+0.88	94%	+0.65	83%	+0.88	94%	+0.95	98%
India	+0.63	81%	+0.59	79%	+0.65	82%	+0.63	82%	+0.82	91%	+0.75	88%	+0.58	79%	+0.30	65%
Indonesia	+0.50	75%	+0.12	56%	+0.18	59%	+0.53	76%	+0.94	97%	+0.45	73%	+0.32	66%	+0.55	78%
Italy	+0.44	72%	+0.13	56%	+0.71	85%	+0.32	66%	+0.76	88%	+0.35	68%	+0.65	82%	+0.60	80%
Japan	+0.31	66%	+0.65	82%	+0.35	68%	+0.68	84%	+0.76	88%	+0.55	78%	+0.58	79%	+0.75	88%
Korea	+0.38	69%	+0.65	82%	+0.53	76%	+0.68	84%	+0.71	85%	+0.60	80%	+0.42	71%	+0.95	98%
Mexico	+0.38	69%	+0.47	74%	+0.53	76%	+0.53	76%	+0.65	82%	+0.60	80%	+0.53	76%	+0.35	68%
Russia	+0.44	72%	+0.47	74%	+0.47	74%	+0.68	84%	+0.65	82%	+0.35	68%	+0.47	74%	+0.45	73%
Saudi Arabia	+0.06	53%	-0.24	38%	+0.35	68%	+0.42	71%	+0.59	79%	+0.45	73%	+0.42	71%	+0.60	80%
South Africa	+0.25	63%	-0.12	44%	+0.24	62%	+0.37	68%	+0.65	82%	+0.45	73%	+0.37	68%	+0.30	65%
Turkey	+0.25	63%	0	50%	+0.41	71%	+0.37	68%	+0.29	65%	+0.05	53%	+0.42	71%	+0.60	80%
United Kingdom	+0.75	88%	+0.76	88%	+0.71	85%	+0.47	74%	+0.94	97%	+0.25	63%	+0.74	87%	+0.90	95%
United States	+0.69	84%	+0.76	88%	+0.71	85%	+0.42	71%	+0.35	68%	+0.75	88%	+0.42	71%	+0.90	95%
European Union	+0.63	81%	+0.75	88%	+0.81	91%	+0.84	92%	0.94	97%	+0.37	68%	+1.00	100%	+0.95	98%
Average	+0.44	72%	+0.42	71%	+0.55	77%	+0.60	80%	0.75	87%	+0.57	78%	+0.57	79%	+0.67	84%

Conclusions

Many of the commitments assessed in this report have timelines that extend beyond the next 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 period immediately following the Riyadh 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 often take different actions to comply with the same commitment, no standardized cross-national evaluative criterion produced by external parties can be universally applied. The interpretive guidelines attempt to provide a clear, consistent, 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.