

2019 G20 Osaka Summit Interim Compliance Report

Prepared by

Sofia Lopez and the G20 Research Group

University of Toronto

Toronto

and

Irina Popova and the Center for International Institutions Research

Russian Presidential Academy of National Economy and Public Administration,

Moscow

From 30 June 2019 to 10 May 2020

14 October 2020

“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
Commitment Breakdown.....	6
Selection of Commitments.....	6
Interim Compliance Scores.....	7
Interim Compliance by Member.....	7
Interim Compliance by Commitment.....	7
Table 1: 2019 G20 Osaka Summit Commitments Selected for Compliance Monitoring.....	8
Table 2: 2019 G20 Osaka Summit Interim Compliance Scores.....	10
Table 3: 2019 G20 Osaka Summit Interim Compliance by Member.....	11
Table 4: 2019 G20 Osaka Summit Interim Compliance by Commitment.....	11
Table 5: G20 Compliance by Member, 2008–2018.....	12
Conclusions.....	14
Future Research and Reports.....	14
Considerations and Limitations.....	14
Appendix: General Considerations.....	15
1. Macroeconomics: Inclusive Growth.....	16
2. Macroeconomics: Exchange Rates.....	83
3. Trade: Open Markets.....	92
4. Trade: Reform of the World Trade Organization.....	109
5. Infrastructure: Quality Infrastructure Investment.....	141
6. Digital Economy: Frameworks.....	183
7. International Taxation: Digitalization.....	201
8. Crime and Corruption: Cyber Resilience.....	215
9. Terrorism: Internet Security.....	237
10. Labour and Employment: Opportunities for Youth.....	268
11. Gender: Education and Training.....	289
12. Gender: Labour Market.....	315
13. Development: Energy.....	350
14. Development: Investment in Human Capital.....	370
15. Health: Ageing Populations.....	416
16. Health: Public Health Preparedness.....	458
17. Environment: Marine Plastic Litter and Microplastics.....	490
18. Climate Change: Financing for Sustainable Development.....	508
19. Climate Change: Innovation.....	528

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

Toronto Research Team

Professor John Kirton, Director, G20 Research Group
Sofia Lopez, Chair, Summit Studies
Alyssa Atef, Compliance Director
Kaylin Dawe, Compliance Director
Susha Guan, Compliance Director
Arshia Hassani, Compliance Director
Angela Hou, Compliance Director
Ramsha Naveed, Compliance Director
Jae Yoon Mary Noh, Compliance Director
Christopher Sims, Compliance Director
Ian Stansbury, Compliance Director
Nicole Vučemilo, Compliance Director

G20 Research Group Lead Analysts

Sophia Bai	Shamshir Malik	Jennifer Wang
Wayne George	Daniel Scarpitti	Gabriella Zhao
Yiyao (Wenny) Jin	Nicole Shi	
Vannie Kopalakrishnan	Diego Vásquez	

G20 Research Group Analysts

Omar Abdellatif	Jenna Im	Asahi Dania Ogie
Ishmam Ahsan	Zarlasht Jamal	Julia Orsini
Miranda Bocci	Mathuja Jeyakumar	Samantha Parker
Xavier Bornert	Harris Johnston	Dan Poliwoda
Isabelle Buchanan	Shafna Kallil	Evangeline Procopoudis
Geoffrey Burrows	Omar Kassam	Dimas Bimo Radhityo
Naomi Butterfield	Khalil Khalifa	Shubdeep Randhawa
Christina Caouette	Burhan Khan	Gabrielle Regimbal
Wai Suet Chan	Katharina Kuhn	Fiona Reuter
Meimenat Cheng	Anushka Kurian	Srijan Sahu
Fatima Chohan	Zeng Lecheng	Khurram Shamim
Raphaël Colombier	Eunbi Lee	Arjun Singh
Isabel Davis	Abby Lessard	Quinn Teague-Colfer
Margaret de Leon	Jolie Leung	Wing Ka Tsang
Nour Ellassiuty	Vanessa Li	Olga Tumurova
Chantal Elias	Scarlett Lin	Sebastian Vecerina
Joy Fan	Daisy Liu	Parul Wadhawan
Lucy Faria	Lucia Mabika	Alice Wang
Jared Forman	Talha Mahboob	Ingrid Wong
Dmitriy Frolovskiy	Areej Malik	Zhenyu Xu
Georgia Sydney Gibbings	Rachael Mannie	Tony Xun
Jessi Gilchrist	April Mu	Coco Yang
Layal Hallal	Christina Muia	Katherine Yarun
Miles Harrison	Varisha Naeem	Brandon Yih
Amira Higazy	Samantha Moura Novais de	Derron Yu
Andrea Ho	Quadros	Zimu Zhao
Ilan Hughes	Ivette Ordonez Nunez	Daisy Zhou

CIIR G20 Research Team

Marina Larionova, Director

Irina Popova, Moscow Team Director

Alexander Ignatov

Andrey Sakharov

Andrey Shelepov

Pavel Doronin

Introduction and Summary

The G20 2019 Osaka 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 Institutions Research of the Russian Presidential Academy of National Economy and Public Administration (RANEPA). The report analyzes compliance by G20 members with the 19 priority commitments carefully selected from the total of 128 commitments made at the Osaka Summit hosted by Japan on 28–29 June 2019. This interim report covers relevant actions taken by the G20 members between 30 June 2019 to 10 May 2020. The final report that covers the full period between the 2019 and the 2020 summits will be released on the eve of the Riyadh Summit scheduled for 21-22 November 2020.

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 (IORI HSE) joined this multi-year project in 2005. 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 128 commitments at the Osaka Summit.² These commitments, as identified by the G20 Research Group and RANEPA, are drawn from the official Osaka 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

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).

secondary criteria of performance measurability and ability to comply to some degree within a year, as well as the tertiary criterion of significance as identified by scientific teams and relevant stakeholders in the host country.

For this report, the research teams selected 19 commitments for analysis (see Table 1).

Interim Compliance Scores

This assessment is based on relevant, publicly available information relating to actions taken from 30 June 2019 to 10 May 2019. 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.

For the full interim period, including all 19 priority commitments, G20 members achieved average compliance of +0.38 (69%).

Interim Compliance by Member

For interim compliance with the Osaka Summit's priority commitments, the European Union had the highest compliance at +0.84 (92%), followed by Germany at +0.65 (82%), and then Australia and the United Kingdom both at +0.63 (82%). Host Japan ranked fourth, along with Canada and India, at +0.58 (79%). Five countries shared the lowest score at +0.16 (58%): Argentina, Brazil, China, Indonesia and South Africa. The difference between the highest and lowest G20 member compliance scores is 0.68. For more information about compliance by G20 members, see Table 3.

Interim Compliance by Commitment

The macroeconomic commitment on exchange rates ranked first at +0.88 (94%), followed by three commitments that each had compliance of +0.80 (90%): a climate change commitment on financing for sustainable, a development commitment on investment in human capital and a health commitment on public health preparedness. These were followed by a labour and employment commitment on opportunities for youth at +0.75 (88%). The lowest compliance was on marine plastic litter and microplastics at -0.40 (30%). For more information on scoring by commitment, see Table 4.

Table 1: 2019 G20 Osaka Summit Commitments Selected for Compliance Monitoring

1	Macroeconomics: Inclusive Growth	“We reaffirm our commitment to use all policy tools to achieve strong, sustainable, balanced and inclusive growth, and safeguard against downside risks, by stepping up our dialogue and actions to enhance confidence.” (G20 Osaka Leaders’ Declaration)
2	Macroeconomics: Exchange Rates	“We also reaffirm the exchange rate commitments made by our Finance Ministers and Central Bank Governors in March 2018.” (G20 Osaka Leaders’ Declaration)
3	Trade: Open Markets	“[We strive to] ... keep our markets open.” (G20 Osaka Leaders’ Declaration)
4	Trade: Reform of the World Trade Organization	“We reaffirm our support for the necessary reform of the World Trade Organization (WTO) to improve its functions.” (G20 Osaka Leaders’ Declaration)
5	Infrastructure: Quality Infrastructure Investment	“We endorse the G20 Principles for Quality Infrastructure Investment as our common strategic direction and high aspiration.” (G20 2019 Osaka Leaders’ Declaration)
6	Digital Economy: Frameworks	“We will cooperate to encourage the interoperability of different frameworks [for data free flow with trust]” (G20 Leaders’ Osaka Declaration)
7	International Taxation: Digitalization	“We will redouble our efforts for a consensus-based solution [on addressing the tax challenges arising from digitalization] with a final report by 2020.” (G20 Osaka Leaders’ Declaration)
8	Crime and Corruption: Cyber Resilience	“We also continue to step up efforts to enhance cyber resilience.” (G20 Osaka Leaders’ Declaration)
9	Terrorism: Internet Security	“For us all to reap the rewards of digitalisation, we are committed to realising an open, free and secure internet.” (G20 2019 Osaka Leaders’ Declaration)
10	Labour and Employment: Opportunities for Youth	“We will also continue to promote employment opportunities for and employability of the young population.” (G20 Osaka Leaders’ Declaration)
11	Gender: Education and Training	“[We commit to continue support for girls’ and women’s education and training, including...] improved access to STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics).” (G20 Osaka Leaders’ Declaration)
12	Gender: Labour Market	“We will also address the gender gap in unpaid care work which remains a major obstacle to women’s participation in the labour market.” (G20 Osaka Leaders Declaration)
13	Development: Energy	“[We support developing countries in their efforts to advance progress towards the timely implementation of the SDGs (Sustainable Development Goals) in such areas as] ... energy ... [using all means of implementation, such as the mobilization of private sector resources and capacity building assistance.]” (G20 Osaka Leaders’ Declaration)
14	Development: Investment in Human Capital	“We reaffirm our commitment to invest in human capital... [as emphasized in the G20 Initiative on Human Capital Investment for Sustainable Development.]” (G20 Osaka Leaders’ Declaration)
15	Health: Ageing Populations	“We will promote healthy and active ageing through policy measures to address health promotion.” (G20 Osaka Leaders’ Declaration)

16	Health: Public Health Preparedness	“We are committed to improving public health preparedness and response including strengthening our own core capacities” (G20 Osaka Leaders’ Declaration)
17	Environment: Marine Plastic Litter and Microplastics	“In this regard, we are determined to swiftly take appropriate national actions for the prevention and significant reduction of discharges of plastic litter and microplastics to the oceans.” (G20 Osaka Leaders’ Declaration)
18	Climate Change: Financing for Sustainable Development	“To this end, we strive to foster inclusive finance for sustainable development, including public and private financing mobilization and alignment between them.” (G20 Osaka Leaders’ Declaration)
19	Climate Change: Innovation	“[To this end, we strive to foster]... innovation in a wide range of areas for low emissions and resilient development.” (G20 Osaka Leaders’ Declaration)

Table 2: 2019 G20 Osaka Summit 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	Macroeconomics: Inclusive Growth	+1	0	-1	+1	+1	+1	0	+1	+1	+1	+1	0	+1	+1	+1	0	+1	0	+1	+0.65	83%	
2	Macroeconomics: Exchange Rates	+1	+1	+1	+1	-1	n/a	n/a	+1	+1	n/a	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+0.88	94%
3	Trade: Open Markets	0	0	0	0	0	n/a	n/a	0	0	n/a	-1	-1	0	0	0	0	0	0	-1	0	-0.18	41%
4	Trade: Reform of the World Trade Organization	0	+1	+1	+1	+1	0	+1	+1	+1	0	+1	+1	+1	+1	-1	+1	+1	0	+1	+1	+0.70	85%
5	Infrastructure: Quality Infrastructure Investment	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	-1	+1	+1	-1	+1	0	0	+1	0	+1	+1	0	0	+1	+1	+0.55	78%
6	Digital Economy: Frameworks	0	0	0	+1	0	+1	+1	+1	+1	-1	+1	+1	-1	0	-1	-1	+1	0	+1	+1	+0.30	65%
7	International Taxation: Digitalization	0	-1	0	-1	-1	0	0	+1	0	+1	+1	-1	0	0	-1	-1	0	+1	-1	+1	-0.10	45%
8	Crime and Corruption: Cyber Resilience	0	0	+1	-1	0	0	+1	0	+1	-1	+1	0	+1	+1	0	0	+1	+1	-1	+1	+0.30	65%
9	Terrorism: Internet Security	0	0	-1	+1	0	0	0	0	-1	0	0	+1	-1	0	0	0	-1	0	0	0	-0.10	45%
10	Labour and Employment: Opportunities for Youth	0	+1	+1	+1	0	0	+1	0	+1	+1	+1	0	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+0.75	88%
11	Gender: Education and Training	0	+1	-1	0	-1	0	+1	+1	-1	0	0	+1	0	0	+1	0	0	0	0	+1	+0.15	58%
12	Gender: Labour Market	-1	+1	0	+1	0	+1	0	+1	0	0	0	-1	0	0	+1	0	+1	+1	+1	0	+0.30	65%
13	Development: Energy	0	+1	+1	+1	+1	-1	+1	0	0	-1	+1	0	+1	+1	0	0	+1	+1	+1	+1	+0.50	75%
14	Development: Investment in Human Capital	+1	+1	0	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	0	+1	0	+1	0	+1	+1	+1	+1	+0.80	90%
15	Health: Ageing Populations	-1	+1	-1	+1	+1	0	0	0	-1	-1	+1	+1	0	0	-1	-1	-1	0	0	+1	-0.05	48%
16	Health: Public Health Preparedness	+1	+1	+1	+1	0	+1	+1	+1	0	+1	+1	+1	0	+1	+1	0	+1	+1	+1	+1	+0.80	90%
17	Environment: Marine Plastic Litter and Microplastics	-1	+1	-1	-1	-1	0	0	-1	-1	-1	0	+1	0	-1	-1	0	0	-1	-1	+1	-0.40	30%
18	Climate Change: Financing for Sustainable Development	0	+1	0	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	0	+1	+1	+1	+1	0	+1	+1	+1	+0.80	90%
19	Climate Change: Innovation	+1	+1	+1	+1	0	+1	+1	+1	0	+1	0	+1	0	0	0	0	+1	+1	0	+1	+0.60	80%
	Average	+0.16	+0.63	+0.16	+0.58	+0.16	+0.29	+0.65	+0.58	+0.16	+0.18	+0.58	+0.32	+0.47	+0.32	+0.26	+0.16	+0.32	+0.63	+0.21	+0.84	+0.38	69%
		58%	82%	58%	79%	58%	65%	82%	79%	58%	59%	79%	66%	74%	66%	63%	58%	66%	82%	61%	92%	69%	

n/a = not applicable

Table 3: 2019 G20 Osaka Summit Interim Compliance by Member

Rank	Member	Average	
1	European Union	+0.84	92%
2	Germany	+0.65	82%
3	Australia	+0.63	82%
	United Kingdom		
5	Canada	+0.58	79%
	India		
	Japan		
8	Mexico	+0.47	74%
9	Korea	+0.32	66%
	Russia		
	Turkey		
12	France	+0.29	65%
13	Saudi Arabia	+0.26	63%
14	United States	+0.21	61%
15	Italy	+0.18	59%
16	Argentina	+0.16	58%
	Brazil		
	China		
	Indonesia		
	South Africa		

Table 4: 2019 G20 Osaka Summit Interim Compliance by Commitment

Rank	Commitment	Average	
1	Macroeconomics: Exchange Rates	+0.88	94%
2	Climate Change: Financing for Sustainable Development	+0.80	90%
	Development: Investment in Human Capital		
	Health: Public Health Preparedness		
5	Labour and Employment: Opportunities for Youth	+0.75	88%
6	Trade: Reform of the World Trade Organization	+0.70	85%
7	Macroeconomics: Inclusive Growth	+0.65	83%
8	Climate Change: Innovation	+0.60	80%
9	Infrastructure: Quality Infrastructure Investment	+0.55	78%
10	Development: Energy	+0.50	75%
	Gender: Labour Market		
12	Crime and Corruption: Cyber Resilience	+0.30	65%
	Digital Economy: Frameworks		
14	Gender: Education and Training	+0.15	58%
15	Health: Ageing Populations	-0.05	48%
16	International Taxation: Digitalization	-0.10	45%
	Terrorism: Internet Security		
18	Trade: Open Markets	-0.18	41%
19	Environment: Marine Plastic Litter and Microplastics	-0.40	30%

Table 5: G20 Compliance by Member, 2008–2018

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

Table 5: G20 Compliance by Member, 2008–2018, continued

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

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 the first 10-month period following the Osaka 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 an 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.