



**The G8 Research Group  
LSE/Oxford**

**The G8 and  
Climate Change  
since Heiligendamm**

**Final Compliance Report for  
the G8 and Outreach Five Countries**

**3 July 2008**

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

**For the full report visit:**

**[www.g8.utoronto.ca/oxford/g8rg-oxford.html](http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/oxford/g8rg-oxford.html)**

---

The G8 Research Group - LSE/Oxford is a network of more than 50 postgraduate students from Oxford and LSE interested in climate change policy and the G8 process. Its mission is to provide independent information and analysis on whether the G8 and Outreach Five countries are abiding by the climate policy commitments they made at the previous G8 summit.

The views expressed in this report are those of the authors alone. They do not necessarily reflect the views of the associated institutions.

G8 Research Group - LSE/Oxford  
c/o Centre for Environmental Policy and Governance  
London School of Economics  
Houghton Street  
London WC2A 2AE

First published 3 July 2008

Suggested Citation

Niel Bowerman, Marie Karaisl, Joanna Langille, Christopher Wright, and Zinta Zommers (eds.)  
"The G8 and Climate Change since Heiligendamm - Final Compliance Report for  
the G8 and Outreach Five Countries, 2007-08", LSE: G8 Research Group – LSE/Oxford, 3 July 2008.

## **Media Inquiries**

**Christopher Wright, Executive Director,  
G8 Research Group – LSE/Oxford**

Research Fellow  
Centre for Environmental Policy and Governance  
London School of Economics and Political Science  
Houghton Street, London WC2A 2AE  
United Kingdom

Email: [c.m.wright@lse.ac.uk](mailto:c.m.wright@lse.ac.uk)

Phone: +47 98 43 10 47

## About the G8 Research Group – LSE/Oxford

Founded in 1987, the G8 Research Group is an organisation based at the University of Toronto with a mission to serve as the world's leading independent source of information, analysis, and research on the institutions, issues, and members of the G8. The Research Group consists of a global network of scholars, professionals in the media, business, government and research communities, and students interested in the ongoing activity of the G7 and G8. The group is assisted by a Professional Advisory Council and special advisors on specific issue areas.<sup>1</sup> Since 1996, the G8 Research Group has produced an annual compliance report on the progress made by the G8 member countries in meeting their summit commitments, which is offered to a global network of scholars, professionals in the media, business, government and research communities, and individual members of civil society.<sup>2</sup>

A separate branch of the G8 Research Group was established in 2004/05 at the University of Oxford. In 2007, its analyst base was expanded to include postgraduates from the London School of Economics (LSE), and the group now engages more than 50 postgraduates from both universities. Its primary mission is to provide information and analysis on whether the G8 and Outreach Five countries are abiding by the climate-related policy commitments they made at the previous G8 summit. In 2006, the group published a report that assessed whether these 13 countries and the European Union (EU) had abided by the commitments made at the 2006 St. Petersburg Summit, in areas such as promoting renewable energy and clean technologies, promoting sustainable transport, and obligations under the Kyoto Protocol.<sup>3</sup> In 2007-8, the group published similar compliance reports relative to the Heiligendamm Summit in June 2007, and thereby established itself as the source of the most comprehensive, independent information about the climate policy actions of the G8 and Outreach Five countries.

### G8 Research Group – LSE/Oxford The Executive Committee

Christopher Wright  
Executive Director

Niel Bowerman  
Marie Karaisl  
Joanna Langille  
Zinta Zommers

---

<sup>1</sup> About the G8 Research Group, G8 Information Centre, (Toronto), 9 February 2007. Date of Access: 18 February 2008. [http://www.g7.utoronto.ca/about/g8rg\\_about.htm](http://www.g7.utoronto.ca/about/g8rg_about.htm).

<sup>2</sup> Maria Banda and Joanna Langille, Eds. (2007). *Governing Global Climate Change: St Petersburg Compliance Report for the 'G8 Plus Five' Countries*. G8 Final Compliance Report 2007. Oxford, G8 Research Group Oxford.

<sup>3</sup> The report titled Maria Banda and Joanna Langille, Eds. (2007). *Governing Global Climate Change: St Petersburg Compliance Report for the 'G8 Plus Five' Countries*. G8 Final Compliance Report 2007. Oxford, G8 Research Group Oxford is available online at: <http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/oxford/2006compliance-ox.pdf>.



# **G8 Research Group – LSE/Oxford, 2007-08**

## **Team Members**

### **Executive Committee and Editors**

Christopher Wright, Executive Director

Niel Bowerman

Marie Karaisl

Joanna Langille

Nadia Siddiqui

Zinta Zommers

### **Analysts**

Zhao Ang

Martha Baxter

Emily Belgrade

Andy Benica

Simon Billett

Ruth Brandt

Stephen Brosha

Brendan Carey

Maria Christofili

John Donnelly

Carolina Elia

Jean-Benoît Fournier

Paul Ganga

Carmen Gayoso

Marianne Gillis

Mhairi Guild

Roberto Hanania

Dominique Henri

Aaron Holdway

Andrew Jones

Marie Karaisl

Carola Kennigott

Victoria Lennox

Tess Lorrman

Lorena Fonseca Mariz de

Medeiros

James Meers

Hilary Millar

Catherine Nadeau

Cynthia Owens

Vanessa Pena

Ottavia Pesce

Eduardo Plastino

Diana Poputoaia

Massimo Preziuso

Miriam Prys

Ana Francisca Ramirez

Takashi Sagara

Alexander Schroede

Nadia Siddiqui

Lauge Skovgaard Poulsen

Aparna Sridhar

Seren Tang Shun Ting

Jessica Toale

Christine Toczek

Diarmuid Torney

Cristiana Tosti

Luca Paolo Virgilio

Y. Andrea Wang

Kwok Hong Wong

Claire Woods

Karlin Younger

Fonger Ypma

Ina Zharkevich

Zinta Zommers

### **Interpretive Guidelines Committee**

Ruth Brandt

Marie Karaisl

Joanna Langille

Miriam Prys

Christopher Wright

Zinta Zommers

### **Senior Advisors**

Dr. Neil MacFarlane

Dr. Jennifer Welsh

## **Acknowledgements**

The G8 Research Group - LSE/Oxford operates on a voluntary basis, and depends entirely on the time and energy provided by analysts. The Executive Committee wishes to thank all of the analysts for their tremendous commitment.

The G8 Research Group - LSE/Oxford also wishes to acknowledge the generous support of LSE External Relations, in particular Robin Hoggard and Warwick Smith, for facilitating a group of our analysts to attend and report from the G8 Summit in Toyako, Japan 7-9 July 2008.

We would also like to give thanks to an anonymous donor who provided a generous financial gift in support our ongoing work.

And finally, Christopher Wright, the Executive Director, wishes to acknowledge the Alcoa Foundation for its support of his participation in the G8 Research Group – LSE/Oxford.

## Executive Summary

The G8 Research Group – LSE/Oxford is independent network of more than 50 postgraduate students affiliated with the London School of Economics and the University of Oxford. Its mission is to provide independent information and analysis on whether the G8 and Outreach Five countries are abiding by the climate policy commitments they made at the previous G8 summit. This comprehensive report considers whether the G8 and Outreach Five Countries (Brazil, India, China, Mexico, and South Africa) have complied with the climate change commitments they made at the G8 Heiligendamm Summit in June 2007. By implication, the report provides information and analysis that enable observers to hold governments to account for their policy commitments, as well as the G8 process as a whole.

The report, and the work of the G8 Research Group - LSE/Oxford more broadly, is premised on the principle that compliance of governments to commitments made in multilateral fora has a bearing on their accountability relative to their citizens, business, as well as other governments. Furthermore, the extent to which governments follow-up the public commitments they make is an important criteria for evaluating both the legitimacy and effectiveness of multilateral processes such as the G8. In turn, by carefully considering whether G8 governments act on their climate-related commitments, the report contributes to increasing public understanding of G8 as a decision-making forum, and the extent to which declarations endorsed by G8 governments are reflected in domestic policies.

The G8 Research Group - LSE/Oxford is affiliated with the G8 Research Group based at the University of Toronto, which has tracked G8 compliance with various climate change commitments, alongside commitments in other policy areas, including security, trade and energy since 1987. The methodology applied rates country performance in compliance cycles, or the one-year time period between annual G8 Summits. The reports have recently been evaluated by Kirton and Guebert (2007),<sup>4</sup> who find an overall positive performance of G8 countries with respect to compliance to their climate change commitments.<sup>5</sup> In general terms, compliance with climate and energy commitments is higher than with those in all other policy areas, except trade. As a result, the meta-analysis concludes that the G8 process has been an effective multilateral forum for negotiating and reaching consensus on policy issues related to climate change and energy.

Since 2004/05, the G8 Research Group – LSE/Oxford has published an in-depth compliance report that considered the extent to which the G8 and Outreach Five countries had abided by their climate-related commitments from the 2006 St. Petersburg Summit. Compared to the previous reporting from the G8 Research Group in Toronto, these reports have tracked fewer commitments, but more substantially. Each country's policy actions relative to the respective policy commitments are rated as either -1 (non-compliance), 0 (partial compliance), or +1 (full compliance). This quantitative methodology provides the basis for not only comparing compliance across G8 and Outreach Five governments, but also across different commitment areas.

Compliance reports produced since the establishment of the G8 Research Group – LSE/Oxford reveal that compliance with climate-change related commitments has been

---

<sup>4</sup> Kirton, J. and Guebert, J., *Compliance with Climate Change Commitments: The G8 Record, 1975–2007*. Toronto: G8 Research Group, 13 December 2007, (Toronto). Date of Access: 22 February 2007. <http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/evaluations/compliance-climate.html>.

<sup>5</sup> Kirton, J. and Guebert, J., *Compliance with Climate Change Commitments: The G8 Record, 1975–2007*. Toronto: G8 Research Group, 13 December 2007, (Toronto). Date of Access: 22 February 2007. <http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/evaluations/compliance-climate.html>.

mixed, and varied greatly across countries. For example, in the assessment conducted for last year's report, *Governing Global Climate Change: St. Petersburg Final Compliance Report for the G8 Plus Five Countries*, only the EU obtained full compliance on all selected issue areas.<sup>6</sup> In contrast, Canada and Russia achieved an average score of only -0.40, having achieved three scores of 'work in progress,' and two scores of 'non-compliance' in the five selected issue areas. Similar divergence in performance was found among the Outreach Five countries, where Mexico led with an average score of +0.20,<sup>7</sup> while China and India trailed behind with an average score of -0.20.<sup>8</sup>

The next section will briefly review the results for the 2007/08 compliance cycle.

### The G8 and the EU: Main Findings

Overall, the G8 and the EU have followed-up on their commitments made at the Heiligendamm Summit, and introduced numerous supportive strategies, plans, and programmes. Compared to the previous year, compliance scores generally increased, yet the prevalence of "partial compliance" scores suggests that ambitious targets and notable policy statements have not been adequately followed-up by concrete policy actions and budgetary allocations.

<b>G8 (+EU)</b>	<b>1A</b>	<b>1B</b>	<b>1C</b>	<b>1D</b>	<b>1E</b>	<b>Average</b>
<b>European Union</b>	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	<b>1.00</b>
<b>Germany</b>	0	+1	+1	+1	+1	<b>0.80</b>
<b>Japan</b>	0	+1	+1	0	+1	<b>0.60</b>
<b>France</b>	0	+1	0	+1	0	<b>0.40</b>
<b>Canada</b>	0	0	+1	0	0	<b>0.20</b>
<b>United Kingdom</b>	0	0	+1	0	0	<b>0.20</b>
<b>United States</b>	0	0	+1	0	0	<b>0.20</b>
<b>Italy</b>	0	0	0	0	0	<b>0.00</b>
<b>Russian Federation</b>	0	-1	0	-1	0	<b>-0.40</b>
<b>Average</b>	<b>0.11</b>	<b>0.33</b>	<b>0.67</b>	<b>0.22</b>	<b>0.33</b>	

<sup>6</sup> Maria Banda and Joanna Langille, Eds. (2007). *Governing Global Climate Change: St Petersburg Compliance Report for the 'G8 Plus Five' Countries*. G8 Final Compliance Report 2007. Oxford, G8 Research Group Oxford. <http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/oxford/2006compliance-ox.pdf>.

<sup>7</sup> Mexico achieved a score of 'work in progress' in four, and a score of 'full compliance' in one issue area.

<sup>8</sup> Both China and India achieved 'work in progress' in four, and was non-compliant in one issue area.

**Country Scores:** The final results above reveal that the EU has done the most to fulfill its Heiligendamm commitments, and has earned a perfect average compliance score of +1. Conversely, the Russian Federation was the only G8 country that attained a negative score, as it was assessed to be non-compliant with two commitments (1B and 1D). Germany, the host of the last G8 Heiligendamm Summit, received an overall compliance score of 0.80, suggesting that previous hosts may have additional incentives to follow-up summit commitments they themselves helped craft in order to ensure that the Summit receives a positive legacy. Japan received an overall score of 0.60, a relatively strong performance that can be explained by the roll-out of various policy actions aimed at demonstrating leadership ahead of the next G8 Summit in Japan. The United States and the United Kingdom both received overall scores of 0.20, and finally, Canada, France, and Italy were found to be in partial compliance with all the commitments, and therefore received an overall score of 0.00.

**Commitment Scores:** Across the G8 and the EU, compliance was the highest relative to the commitment to promote less emission-intensive energy consumption, as their overall score was 0.67 on a scale from -1 to +1. This observation suggests that industrialized countries are beginning to address how domestic markets and consumer behaviour are influencing trends in domestic GHG emissions, and how increasing the efficiency of energy consumption can be an important element in reducing domestic GHG emissions. Interestingly, both the United States and Japan, which have resisted the long-term global GHG emission targets proposed by the EU, were assessed to be in full compliance with the commitment to promote less emission-intensive energy consumption. More broadly, the growing prevalence of demand-side regulatory interventions suggests that countries are beginning to translate national policy targets into sector-level plans and programmes so as to enable a transition to a low-carbon economy.

Governments have not matched their commitment to introduce and implement demand-side interventions with similar actions to address domestic GHG emissions. Apart from the European Union, which has announced it will reduce the number of allowances in the second phase of the EU Emissions Trading Scheme (EU ETS), no G8 government received more than a 'partial' compliance score with the commitment to stabilize GHG emissions. Compliance was assessed against the respective government's commitments and actions to avert dangerous climate change. In general terms, the analysis revealed that while most governments have set long-term emissions reductions targets (typically for either 2020 or 2050), lack of full compliance resulted from either setting targets that do not reflect the urgency of the problem, or failing to identify how targets will be achieved. This may suggest that it is proving politically difficult for governments to confront emission-intensive sectors and to implement the structural reforms necessary to transition to a low-carbon economy.

With regards to the commitment to curb deforestation, the overall compliance score was 0.33, which reflects the prevalent position that forestry had on the agenda at the United Nations Climate Change Conference in Bali. Both the European Union and Japan were assessed to be in full compliance with this commitment, largely on the basis of initiating and implementing bilateral projects and programs with developing countries to help reduce deforestation. Compliance scores for the commitment to promote less emission-intensive energy production was driven by the proliferation of supportive regulation for renewables in Europe and Japan, in addition to the absence of such in Russia. And finally, the relatively low score associated with support for adaptation in developing countries reflects how several G8 governments have failed to follow-through on pledges made at Bali to make funds available.



## The Outreach Five Countries: Main Findings

Compared to the previous compliance cycle (2006-07), the Outreach Five countries have done well to follow-up on their commitments made at the Heiligendamm Summit, and introduced numerous supportive strategies, plans, and programmes. Compliance scores generally increased, yet as with the G8 and the EU, the prevalence of “partial compliance” scores suggests that ambitious targets and notable policy statements have not been adequately followed-up by concrete policy actions and budgetary allocations. But notably, none of the Outreach Five countries were found to be non-compliant with any of three commitments.

Outreach Five	2A	2B	2C	Average
China	+1	+1	0	<b>0.66</b>
Mexico	0	+1	0	<b>0.33</b>
Brazil	0	0	0	<b>0.00</b>
India	0	0	0	<b>0.00</b>
South Africa	0	0	0	<b>0.00</b>
<b>Average</b>	<b>0.20</b>	<b>0.40</b>	<b>0.00</b>	

**Country Scores:** The final results reveal that China has done the most among the Outreach Five countries to fulfill its Heiligendamm commitments, and has earned a compliance score of 0.66, including full compliance in all but one commitment (2C). This can be largely attributed to the release of its National Climate Change Programme, which identified policy goals and measures to reduce GHG emissions, and adapt to climate change. For example, it outlines a plan to raise the proportion of renewable energy in primary energy supply by 10%, by 2010, and includes specific recommendations for reducing emissions in key industrial sectors.<sup>9</sup> Meanwhile, Mexico received the second highest overall score – 0.33 – as a result of being assessed to be in full compliance with its commitment to reduce the emission-intensity of domestic energy production. The remaining three countries, India, Brazil, and South Africa, were found to be in partial compliance with all the commitments, and therefore each obtained an overall score of 0.00.

**Commitment Scores:** Across the Outreach Five countries, compliance was the highest relative to the commitment to promote less emission-intensive energy production, with an average score of 0.40 on a scale from -1 to +1. This was driven by policies and programs that facilitate inward investment in renewable energy and clean technologies, and the introduction of national targets for expanding the share of energy derived from renewable sources. For example, Mexico introduced an Energy Sector Programme (the *Programa*

<sup>9</sup> However, just recently, China announced its intention to expand emission-intensive coal-to-liquid production, including the construction of a CTL plant in Inner Mongolia, the biggest of its kind outside South Africa. See China builds plant to turn coal into barrels of oil, Reuters, (Beijing), 5 June 2008. Date of Access: 2 June 2008. <http://www.planetark.com/dailynewsstory.cfm?newsid=48644&newsdate=05-Jun-2008>.

*Nacional de Infraestructura*), which sets long-term targets for renewables, refinery efficiency, and forestations. More generally, the relatively high compliance score associated with this commitment suggests that large developing countries are beginning to realize how their growing domestic GHG emissions associated with rapid economic growth and industrialization (or deforestation in the case of Brazil) may be regulated in a post-2012 international climate regime. On the other hand, the current focus on renewable energy may not be driven by a concern for preventing climate change, but rather reflect a growing interest among governments in securing future energy supplies, as South Africa demonstrates clearly.

Relative to the commitment to stabilize GHG emissions, the overall score across the Outreach Five countries was 0.20. Only China received a score of full compliance, attributable to setting a domestic emission-intensity target for 2010, and outlining various sector-level programmes for achieving it, including the stimulation of inward investment for CDM projects. The prevalence of partial compliance scores relative to the other Outreach Five countries may suggest that governments are holding off on announcing long-term policy goals and strategies until a post-2012 framework has been signed.

Finally, all Outreach Five countries were found to be in partial compliance with the commitment to promote less emission-intensive energy consumption. While short of fully complying, this suggests governments presiding over large populations without adequate access to energy are announcing energy-efficiency programs as a means to broaden coverage and find feasible solutions to counter high energy prices. In fact, as increasing energy productivity is the cheapest source of additional energy, especially amidst rising oil prices, governments are paying more attention to existing domestic patterns of energy use.

## **Analysis of Compliance Scores**

As the G8 countries agree on different climate-related policy commitments at successive summits, it is difficult and somewhat distorting to do time-series analysis of compliance scores. Nevertheless, it is still justifiable to consider general patterns of compliance across time. In this regard, it is noticeable that the compliance scores for 2007/08 summarized in this report are noticeably higher than those found in 2006/07. Moreover, the compliance scores in this report are also higher than those made public in the Interim Compliance Report released in February 2008, which assessed whether the G8 and Outreach Five countries had complied with their climate-related commitment, at the half-way point of the 2007-08 compliance cycle.<sup>10</sup> In terms of the G8 and the EU, the interim report found that the average compliance score with the five selected Heiligendamm climate change commitments was 0.20 on a scale of -1 to +1. As for the Outreach Five countries, the analysis assessed their final average compliance score with the three selected Heiligendamm climate change commitments to be the same, 0.20 on a scale of -1 to +1. Overall, both groups scored higher in this compliance cycle than the previous one. This pattern of results continued through to the final compliance assessment, released in this report.

Two factors may account for relatively higher compliance scores in 2007/08 compared to 2006/07. First, Germany had made climate change an important item prior to and during

---

<sup>10</sup> Wright et al eds. (2008), *The G8 and Climate Change since Heiligendamm: Interim Compliance Report for the G8 and Outreach Five Countries*, G8 Research Group- LSE/Oxford. Date of Access: 3 July 2008. <http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/oxford/g8rg-ox-interim-2007.pdf>

the G8 Heiligendamm Summit, thereby raising expectations that the negotiations would produce an ambitious declaration on climate change, and among participating governments, renewed political will to translate commitments into concrete policy actions. In contrast, the Russian Federation, the host of the G8 St. Petersburg Summit in 2006, sought to integrate negotiations over climate change within broader political discussions of energy security and development. As a result, the climate agenda was less pronounced, and governments were less compelled to introduce ground-breaking and far-reaching policy initiatives.

Secondly, this compliance cycle featured the United Nations Climate Change Conference in Bali, 3-14 December 2007, which produced the “Bali Road Map,” a document that defines a negotiating process and a number of policy initiatives that provide a basis for a post-2012 climate regime. In response to this historic conference and the unprecedented media attention toward climate change, many governments planned to propose or introduce new climate policy initiatives just prior to or after the conference. As such, the fact that this conference took place in this compliance cycle may have augmented compliance scores. The heightened scrutiny of government climate policies generated by the conference may have created an additional incentive for countries to follow-up on their G8 commitments with new policy initiatives, thereby explaining higher levels of compliance compared to 2006/07. Yet, the prevalence of partial compliance scores may be explained by the fact conferences of this kind induce governments to make lofty and far-reaching policy statements that meet public expectations without implementing these into concrete policy actions.

Third, as a compliance score is both a function of policy actions and the commitments against which compliance is measured, higher average compliance scores compared to previous years may result if commitments are weaker and vaguer. In other words, even if government behaviour remains stable over compliance cycles, annual compliance rates may fluctuate if the nature of climate commitments across annual G8 Summits differs markedly. Yet, there is little evidence that the climate change commitments around which a consensus emerged at the G8 Heiligendamm Summit were any weaker than those listed in the G8 St. Petersburg Summit declaration. Instead, the analysis finds some support for the argument that both G8 and Outreach Five countries are in fact devoting more time and political will to the climate change issue, by introducing national climate plans, expanding supportive regulations for renewables, and setting long-term emissions reduction targets. In most cases, the reason that ‘partial’, as opposed to ‘full’, compliance scores are particularly prevalent is that the policy actions are often deemed to either be sufficiently ambitious or specific, or that past policies have not delivered expected results.

And finally, the current rise in energy prices has triggered a growing awareness among government in the energy security dividend associated with climate change interventions. The promotion of a domestic renewable energy sector does not only reduce domestic GHG emissions, but it also provides for an alternative supply of energy that can replace imports from less reliable sources. Thus, rising compliance scores may reflect a more urgent concern among governments for securing future energy supplies, rather than simply a growing commitment to help solve the climate change problem. This line of reasoning is becoming increasingly significant in the United States, and other countries that predominately rely on imported energy. In the long-run, a marriage of the climate change and energy security agenda may result in a broadening of political support for nuclear energy, as it provides a clean energy source that can deliver volumes comparable to coal-fired power plants. While the handling of radioactive waste is a risk that continues to drive opposition to nuclear energy, governments in several countries – including Italy and Germany – have announced their support.

## Commitments

### The G8 and the EU

The commitments below are the most important climate-related commitments made by the G8 and the EU at the G8 Summit in Heiligendamm, 7-9 June 2007. They are taken from the main summit document, “Growth and Responsibility in the World Economy.”<sup>11</sup>

#### 1A. Commitment to Stabilize GHG Concentrations (§49)

“We are therefore committed to taking strong and early action to tackle climate change in order to stabilize greenhouse gas concentrations at a level that would prevent dangerous anthropogenic interference with the climate system.”

#### 1B. Commitment to Promote Less Emission-Intensive Energy Production (§54)

“We have urgently to develop, deploy and foster the use of sustainable, less carbon intensive, clean energy and climate-friendly technologies in all areas of energy production...”

#### 1C. Commitment to Promote Less Emission-Intensive Energy Consumption (§65)

“We commit ourselves to a model of efficient energy systems and...will promote the appropriate policy approaches and instruments, including inter alia economic incentives and sound fiscal policies, minimum standards for energy efficiency, sound and ambitious energy performance labelling, information campaigns aimed at consumers and industry that enhance national awareness, sector-based voluntary commitments agreed with industry, investment in research and development and guidelines for public procurement.”

#### 1D. Commitment to Support Climate Adaptation in Developing Countries (§58)

“We emphasise our willingness to continue and enhance cooperation with and support for developing countries in adapting to climate change and enhancing their resilience to climate variability, in particular those most vulnerable to the negative impacts of climate change.”

#### 1E. Commitment to Reduce GHG Emissions by Curbing Deforestation (§56)

“We are determined to assist in reducing emissions from deforestation, especially in developing countries, by ...continu[ing] to support existing processes to combat illegal logging and ... remain[ing] engaged in supporting developing countries to achieve their self commitments for halting forest loss and to implement sustainable forest management.”

---

<sup>11</sup> Growth and Responsibility the World Economy, Summit Declaration, G8 Summit 1007 in Heiligendamm, 7 June 2008. [http://www.g-8.de/Content/EN/Artikel/\\_\\_\\_g8-summit/anlagen/2007-06-07-gipfeldokument-wirtschaft-eng.property=publicationFile.pdf](http://www.g-8.de/Content/EN/Artikel/___g8-summit/anlagen/2007-06-07-gipfeldokument-wirtschaft-eng.property=publicationFile.pdf).

## The Outreach Five Countries

The commitments below are the most important climate-related commitments made by the Outreach Five countries at the G8 Summit in Heiligendamm, 7-9 June 2007. They are taken from the “Joint Statement by the German G8 Presidency and Brazil, China, India, Mexico and South Africa.”<sup>12</sup>

### 2A. Commitment to Stabilize GHG Concentrations

“We reaffirm our commitment to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and to its objective through both mitigation and adaptation in accordance with our common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities.”

### 2B. Commitment to Promote Less Emission-Intensive Energy Production

“We confirm our commitment to promote energy efficiency, through cost-effective solutions, to advance the effective use of fossil fuels, such as the clean coal technology, and to increase the use of cleaner and renewable energy sources, such as biofuels and biomass, as an important step towards secure, stable and competitive energy supplies for achieving sustainable development.”

### 2C. Commitment to Promote Less Emission-Intensive Energy Consumption

“We recognise the need for closer, more practical and result-oriented regional and international cooperation in the energy sector, especially in ensuring secure and affordable supplies of energy as well as in improving energy efficiency and the access to advanced and affordable energy technologies.”

---

<sup>12</sup> Joint Statement by the German G8 Presidency and the Heads of State and/or Government of Brazil, China, India, Mexico and South Africa on the occasion of the G8 Summit in Heiligendamm, Germany, 8 June 2007. [http://www.g-8.de/nsc\\_true/Content/EN/Artikel/\\_\\_\\_g8-summit/anlagen/o5-erklaerung-en,templateId=raw,property=publicationFile.pdf/o5-erklaerung-en](http://www.g-8.de/nsc_true/Content/EN/Artikel/___g8-summit/anlagen/o5-erklaerung-en,templateId=raw,property=publicationFile.pdf/o5-erklaerung-en).

## Methodology

Policy commitments made by governments in multilateral negotiations do not commonly take the form of precise statements that clearly delineate between appropriate and inappropriate policy actions. This makes the task of assessing compliance particularly difficult. As governments bring different and often opposing policy positions to the table, declarations commonly take the form of consensus statements that reflect a compromise between the official policy positions and goals of the different parties. The outcome is often broad-sweeping statements that lend support to a wide range of policies and actions, particularly in policy areas where polarization between policy positions is strong. In such cases, we would expect parties to only endorse imprecise, vague commitments, as they are unwilling to accept language that seems to favour the other side.<sup>13</sup>

It cannot be assumed that a country's compliant behaviour is a direct consequence of its government's participation at the previous G8 summit. In many cases, commitments negotiated in a G8 Communiqué may coincide with, or echo, identical or similar pledges made in other international forums, international organizations, or national policy statements—just as they may precede such developments. However, establishing whether a direct causal link exists between a particular summit commitment and a subsequent policy action in a G8 or O5 country is beyond the scope of this analysis. In terms of holding countries accountable for the commitments made at the summit, and providing an overview of policy actions across different climate-related policy areas, providing this causal link is not relevant.

**The Commitments:** The Heiligendamm Summit produced numerous documents containing policy commitments and broader aspirational goals across many themes, including foreign investment, energy security, and international trade.<sup>14</sup> In line with the core objective of the G8 Research Group – LSE / Oxford, only the most important climate-related commitments were selected for this report.

The G8 countries will be assessed against five commitments selected from the main summit document, "Growth and Responsibility in the World Economy." This document was produced in consultations between G8 countries prior to and during the summit. The Outreach Five countries – India, China, Brazil, South Africa and Mexico – will be evaluated against three commitments contained in the "Joint Statement" which they endorsed alongside the German Presidency.

Both sets of countries will be assessed against the commitments to help stabilize global GHG concentrations, and to promote less emission-intensive energy production and consumption. These three policy commitments were included in both documents, and thus the report will offer a comparison of policy actions across governments within the same policy areas. In addition, the G8 countries will be assessed against their commitment to support climate adaptation in developing countries, and their commitment to help curb deforestation as a means to protect carbon sinks.

---

<sup>13</sup> As an example, the question of whether industrialized countries should be subjected to binding national GHG emission reduction targets has been a divisive issue in climate negotiations, and the discussion of climate mitigation and adaptation within the G8 process is no different in that regard.

<sup>14</sup> For an overview, see the G8 Information Centre:

<http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/summit/2007heiligendamm/index.html>.

**Selection of Commitments:** The eight commitments were not chosen at random, but through a systematic and careful selection process designed to produce a representative and multi-dimensional assessment of policy development in the climate change area. Each commitment, if taken in isolation, could at best provide only a partial appraisal of whether a single country is complying with its overall climate commitments made at the summit. But taken together the commitments give a comprehensive picture of individual governments' performance in addressing anthropocentric climate change; covering alternative and renewable energy production (supply-side policies); sustainable energy use (demand-side policies), such as building codes and product standards; and for the G8 countries, efforts to transfer finance and technology to developing countries in support of climate adaptation, and forest protection.

**Timeline:** To report compliance, the G8 Research Group operates in compliance cycles.

- For the **interim report**, any policy actions and initiatives that are included in the assessment of compliance should be announced or enacted between the Heiligendamm Summit (7-9 June 2007) and 4 January 2008.
- For this **final report**, any policy actions and initiatives that are included in the assessment of compliance should be announced or enacted between the Heiligendamm Summit (7-9 June 2007) and 6 June 2008.

However, the degree to which any such policies need to be operationalized (i.e. not merely proposed, but also implemented) depends on the type of policy: For example, a long-term strategy need not be entirely fulfilled in order to count as compliance.

**Scoring Methodology:** Individual compliance is graded on a three-point *scale* (-1, 0, +1), in which -1 denotes no compliance, +1 denotes full compliance, and 0 denotes some degree of compliance. Thus, a country assigned either 0 or +1 has at least some degree of compliance with the relevant summit commitments. In general terms, no compliance (-1) may be assigned if policy actions are limited to official reaffirmations or statements of intent or support, whereas strong compliance would require budget allocations and new programs of implementation. The criteria used to score each individual commitment are described in detail in the subsequent sections. All judgments should be based on exhaustive empirical data about government policy (footnoted throughout the report), which are cross-referenced with independent commentary to establish their expected and/or actual policy impact. The resultant scores therefore reflect both the governments' promises *and* the material results – where possible - of their policy actions.

**Assigning Scores:** Most commitments do not specify for countries which particular policies and initiatives they have to introduce and implement in order to secure full compliance. Therefore, given the lack of clarity and specificity that characterize multilateral consensus declarations, including the G8 Summit documents, assessing compliance and assigning compliance scores require analysts to use their professional judgment in cases where objective evaluation criteria cannot be used. Yet, notwithstanding this invariable element of subjectivity, a set of interpretative guidelines have been developed to maximize coherence in assessment methodology by standardizing the evaluation of specific commitments across countries to the extent possible.<sup>15</sup> Furthermore, the nature and implementation of particular policy actions often reflect a country's distinct constitutional, legal, and institutional processes. Given the diversity of government

<sup>15</sup> For further information on the Interpretative Guidelines, please visit the G8 Research Group – LSE / Oxford site: <http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/oxford/g8rg-oxford.html>, where the Interpretative Guidelines for the 2007/08 report will be published shortly.

systems, we should expect government actions, policy initiatives, and timeframes for meeting the Summit commitments to differ considerably.

Furthermore, contextual factors, such as elections, commodity prices or macroeconomic developments will impact the nature and pace of policy development. As such, there is no standardized cross-national evaluative criterion that can be used to rate compliance since countries are expected to take different steps to comply with the same commitment, particularly those focused on domestic policy actions. Therefore, analysts will bring their professional judgement to bear in order to assess whether a country has achieved compliance with a particular commitment. So even though the manner in which Summit commitments are reached are context-dependent, and will vary considerably, the extent to which each country has achieved the collectively-endorsed goals contained in each Summit commitment can be established across countries.

**Comparing Scores:** In terms of compliance with Summit commitments, each country departs from a different baseline. Therefore, all scores are judged relative to each country's current policy position. By implication, 'significant' progress for one country would not necessarily count as significant for another, given their different levels of emissions or support for renewable energy. In fact, the Summit commitments themselves implicitly endorse this interpretation, as they commonly focus on process rather than specific targets. Moreover, the time between one Summit and another may be insufficient to comply with certain (longer-term) commitments, which analysts should take into consideration. Lastly, dramatically altered international conditions or newly-available knowledge about resolving a particular problem may make compliance with a Summit commitment unwise or unfeasible. The new insights into the potentially negative impacts of first generation biofuels present such a case. Where applicable, this would be noted in the analysis.

**Effect of compliance:** Depending on the wording and the intent of the individual commitment negotiated at the Summit, it is possible that even full compliance may fail to address the deeper structural problems that the commitment seeks to solve. Indeed, given the aforementioned limitations with consensus declarations, it is entirely possible that the commitments themselves are too weak and narrow to achieve their stated aspirational goals. For example, a commitment that proposes to achieve deep cuts in GHG emissions by relying solely on voluntary regulation of the private sector may not achieve its objective. But while critiquing the commitments themselves, and identifying which policy commitments the G8 should make in order to reach their aspirational goals is valuable, it is beyond the scope of this analysis. Related, whereas one country's compliance with a commitment would represent progress towards a collectively-held policy goal, it may not materially affect the problem unless other countries comply as well. Indeed, some problems -and anthropocentric climate change may be the best example- require concerted collective action to be solved, and it is precisely this feature which induces countries to address them multilaterally. But since the implementation of Summit commitments is done nationally by the respective governments, compliance should be assessed against their own specific commitments, rather than whether their efforts contribute to solving the broader problem.



## Introduction

The global recession resulting from the oil crisis of 1973 prompted the leaders of the major industrialised countries to meet on an annual basis to tackle pressing economic and political challenges as members of the G7/G8. Since the first meeting of the then six largest industrialised nations in 1975 in Rambouillet (France), issues related to energy and energy security have been a critical element of negotiations.<sup>16</sup> In 1979, at the G7 Summit in Tokyo, the seven leading economies expressed the urgency to ‘...expand alternative sources of energy, especially those which help to prevent further pollution, particularly increases of carbon dioxide and sulfur oxides in the atmosphere.’<sup>17</sup> Over the years, the attention paid to environmental and climate change issues at G8 Summits has fluctuated, experienced an unprecedented peak at the past three summits (Gleneagles (2005), St Petersburg (2006), Heiligendamm (2007) ), and has been placed at the top of the agenda by this year’s hosts, Japan.<sup>18</sup>

More broadly, climate change as a policy problem that requires a multilateral response has been frequently addressed in summit declarations since 1975.<sup>19</sup> At the G8 Gleneagles Summit in 2005, the UK government announced the initiation of the G8 + 5 Climate Change Dialogue, a forum that brings together legislators from the G8 and Outreach Five countries (Brazil, China, India, Mexico, and South Africa) with respected international institutions to discuss and agree policy and actions that are both politically and practically robust. While not formally associated with the inter-ministerial meetings between G8 countries, this policy process nevertheless identifies and helps resolve conflicts over climate policy that exists within the G8.

At the G8 Heiligendamm Summit in June 2007, climate change again featured prominently, given the hosts desire to produce momentum ahead of the United Nations Conference on Climate Change in Bali later in the year.<sup>20</sup> German Chancellor Angela Merkel helped forge a new consensus among G8 leaders ‘to take strong and early action to tackle climate change.’<sup>21</sup> Moreover, participating countries agreed to “consider seriously (...) at least a halving of global emissions by 2050,”<sup>22</sup> which, according to Yvo de Boer, Executive Secretary of the UNFCCC, helped “reenergise” the UNFCCC process.<sup>23</sup> The G8

---

<sup>16</sup> Die Energiesackgasse, Greenpeace Gruppe Berlin, (Berlin), 17 October 2006. Date of Access: 30 January 2008. <http://www.greenpeace-berlin.de/themen/presse/newsarchiv/newsarchiv/artikel/die-g8-energiesackgasse/index.html>

<sup>17</sup> Kirton, J. and Guebert, J., Compliance with Climate Change Commitments: The G8 Record, 1975–2007. Toronto: G8 Research Group, 13 December 2007, (Toronto). 22 February 2007. <http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/evaluations/compliance-climate.html>

<sup>18</sup> Kirton, J. and Guebert, J., Compliance with Climate Change Commitments: The G8 Record, 1975–2007. Toronto: G8 Research Group, 13 December 2007, (Toronto). Date of Access: 22 February 2007. <http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/evaluations/compliance-climate.html>

<sup>19</sup> G8 Issues Catalogue – Climate Change, compiled by John Kirton, Laura Sunderland, Jenilee Guebert and Sarah Cale (G8 Research Group, Toronto). Last updated 5 June 2008. Date of Access : 2 July 2008. <http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/references/climatechange.pdf>

<sup>20</sup> Climate Change Tops Agenda at Opening of G-8, NPR, 6 June 2007. Date of Access: 10 February 2008. <http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=10758128>

<sup>21</sup> G8 Summit Declaration: Growth and Responsibility in the World Economy, (Heiligendamm), 7 June 2007. Date of Access: 10 February 2008. [http://www.g-8.de/nn\\_220074/Content/EN/Artikel/\\_\\_\\_g8-summit/anlagen/2007-06-07-gipfeldokument-wirtschaft-eng.html](http://www.g-8.de/nn_220074/Content/EN/Artikel/___g8-summit/anlagen/2007-06-07-gipfeldokument-wirtschaft-eng.html)

<sup>22</sup> G8 Summit Declaration: Growth and Responsibility in the World Economy, (Heiligendamm), 7 June 2007. Date of Access: 10 February 2008. [http://www.g-8.de/nn\\_220074/Content/EN/Artikel/\\_\\_\\_g8-summit/anlagen/2007-06-07-gipfeldokument-wirtschaft-eng.html](http://www.g-8.de/nn_220074/Content/EN/Artikel/___g8-summit/anlagen/2007-06-07-gipfeldokument-wirtschaft-eng.html)

<sup>23</sup> UNFCCC Executive Secretary: G8 document reenergises multilateral climate change process under the United Nations, (Bonn), 7 June 2007. Date of Access: 10 February 2007.

stated that a global emission reduction goal must be agreed, involving “all major emitters.”<sup>24</sup> Importantly, this sent a clear signal to Bali delegates to immediately launch talks on a post-Kyoto climate change framework.<sup>25</sup> Thus, as a UNFCCC press release claims, “the G8 Summit in Heiligendamm has paved the way for negotiations in Bali and given climate talks under the auspices of the UN a considerable boost.”<sup>26</sup>

On 3-14 December 2007, at the United Nations Conference on Climate Change in Bali, delegates negotiated and adopted the Bali Road Map, which charts the course of a new process to negotiate a successor to the Kyoto Protocol, once it expires in 2012. This process is expected to be concluded by 2009, at the COP-15 in Copenhagen, Denmark.<sup>27</sup> Apart from the post-2012 framework, the COP 13 reached important agreements on deforestation, adaptation, and technology transfer, which are discussed throughout this report.<sup>28</sup> Yet, major differences between negotiating parties on the future emissions reduction targets persisted, as the EU, Britain, and Germany were unable to persuade the United States, Russia, and Japan, among others, to commit to a 25-40% reduction in emissions by 2020 relative to 1990 levels.

Also at the G8 Heiligendamm Summit, the US, as the only G8 member not to have ratified the Kyoto Protocol, pledged to host a meeting of ‘major energy consuming and greenhouse gas emitting countries,’ intended to ‘support [and] report back to the UNFCCC process.’<sup>29</sup> G8 members pledged their support on the condition that the policy process served to reinforce, rather than undermine, the principles and outcomes of the UNFCCC process. Despite low expectations, the second of these talks was successfully held in Hawaii, in late January 2008,<sup>30</sup> and just recently, the US signaled its willingness to accept binding international obligations to cut its domestic GHG emissions.

Looking ahead, climate change is once again expected to be near the top of the agenda at this year’s G8 Summit in Hokkaido, Japan.<sup>31</sup> A key priority for the hosts will be to formulate a proposal endorsed by the G8 for the post-2012 framework.<sup>32</sup> On 27 May 2008, G8 environment ministers issued a joint statement which endorsed a target to cut GHG emissions by 50% by 2050, and cited the need for global emissions to peak within the next

---

[http://unfccc.int/files/press/news\\_room/press\\_releases\\_and\\_advisories/application/pdf/20070607\\_g8\\_press\\_release\\_english.pdf](http://unfccc.int/files/press/news_room/press_releases_and_advisories/application/pdf/20070607_g8_press_release_english.pdf)

<sup>24</sup> G8 Summit Declaration: Growth and Responsibility in the World Economy, (Heiligendamm), 7 June 2007. Date of Access: 10 February 2008. [http://www.g-8.de/nn\\_220074/Content/EN/Artikel/\\_\\_\\_g8-summit/anlagen/2007-06-07-gipfeldokument-wirtschaft-eng.html](http://www.g-8.de/nn_220074/Content/EN/Artikel/___g8-summit/anlagen/2007-06-07-gipfeldokument-wirtschaft-eng.html)

<sup>25</sup> International Action – The G8 and the Gleneagles Dialogue, DEFRA, (London), 7 November 2007. Date of Access: 10 February 2008. <http://www.defra.gov.uk/Environment/climatechange/internat/g8/index.htm>

<sup>26</sup> UNFCCC Executive Secretary: G8 document reenergises multilateral climate change process under the United Nations, (Bonn), 7 June 2007. Date of Access: 10 February 2007. [http://unfccc.int/files/press/news\\_room/press\\_releases\\_and\\_advisories/application/pdf/20070607\\_g8\\_press\\_release\\_english.pdf](http://unfccc.int/files/press/news_room/press_releases_and_advisories/application/pdf/20070607_g8_press_release_english.pdf)

<sup>27</sup> COP15 Copenhagen 2009, 8 February 2008. Date of Access: 10 February 2008. <http://www.cop15.dk/en/>

<sup>28</sup> At a glance: Bali climate deal, BBC, 15 December 2007. Date of Access: 10 February 2008. <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/sci/tech/7146132.stm>

<sup>29</sup> G8 Summit Declaration: Growth and Responsibility in the World Economy, (Heiligendamm), 7 June 2007. Date of Access: 10 February 2008. [http://www.g-8.de/nn\\_220074/Content/EN/Artikel/\\_\\_\\_g8-summit/anlagen/2007-06-07-gipfeldokument-wirtschaft-eng.html](http://www.g-8.de/nn_220074/Content/EN/Artikel/___g8-summit/anlagen/2007-06-07-gipfeldokument-wirtschaft-eng.html)

<sup>30</sup> Bush’s climate talks ‘engaging’, BBC, 1 February 2007. Date of Access: 10 February 2007. <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/sci/tech/7223222.stm>

<sup>31</sup> ‘Japan eyes 4 key issues for G8 summit, sherpas to begin talks Jan.’, Kyodo News, 5 December 2007. Date of Access: 10 February 2007.

<http://www.g7.utoronto.ca/evaluations/2008hokkaido/2008plan/2008plan.html#climate>

<sup>32</sup> ‘Japan eyes 4 key issues for G8 summit, sherpas to begin talks Jan.’, Kyodo News, 5 December 2007. Date of Access: 10 February 2007.

<http://www.g7.utoronto.ca/evaluations/2008hokkaido/2008plan/2008plan.html#climate>

10 to 20 years. However, the statement fell short of identifying the specific emissions reductions developed countries should make by 2020, and how they would assist developing countries to both mitigate their emissions and adapt to climate change. Therefore, it remains unclear whether the G8 Hokkaido Toyako Summit will meet the expectations of Yvo de Boer, Executive Secretary of the UNFCCC, by giving “a clearer understanding of what G8 countries are willing and able to do to help developing countries act on climate change.”<sup>33</sup>

Yet, the G8 process has over time become an important negotiating forum for the largest and fastest-growing economies to discuss issues related to climate, energy and development. Furthermore, given the growth of China and India as major emitters and the expectation that non-Annex I countries may be included in a future climate treaty, the outcomes of the G8+5 Climate Dialogue may set the agenda for future climate negotiations between and among industrial countries and large, developing countries. Indeed, on 29 June 2008, on the eve of the G8 Hokkaido Toyako Summit, the legislators announced an agreement on a post-2012 framework, but similar to the statement released by G8 environment ministers a month before, it lacks timetabled targets for emissions reductions.

Notwithstanding these shortcomings, the growing importance of the G8 process in global climate politics, and the recent inclusion of large developing countries in the negotiations, is precisely what provides a strong rationale for producing an in-depth report on whether participating states abide by their climate-related commitments.

---

<sup>33</sup> ‘Japan in key position to tackle climate change: U.N. official,’ Kyodo News, 23 August 2007. Date of Access: 10 February 2007.  
<http://www.g7.utoronto.ca/evaluations/2008hokkaido/2008plan/2008plan.html#climate>