

regard, G7 countries should increase the dissemination of information to the public regarding progress achieved on Summit commitments, not only in the lead-up to the Summit and in the period immediately thereafter, but on a year-round basis. The occasion of the G7 foreign ministers meeting at the end of September might be appropriate for conducting a mid-term review that could generate a publication.

4) G7 Summit members should also disseminate privately to their partners information about the progress of other countries in fulfilling their commitments and obligations. This would help to ensure parties that other members are aware of monitoring and are also sharing the burden of implementation, particularly where there are high economic costs associated with complying with certain commitments (ie, CO2 emissions reductions). Revealing this type of information would also serve to provide the basis for appropriate international public pressure, initially within the G7. This would assist in encouraging compliance behaviour. Dissemination through the EU to its members could expand the pool of pressure.

5) If Summit success is going to be based on the extent to which leaders follow-up on their Summit commitments, the leaders should ensure that the commitments themselves become more clearly specified so that the quantification and measurement of these commitments becomes less of an arduous exercise and more transparent to all. In cases where numeric targets and timetables are appropriate, leaders should ensure that they are clearly specified, at least in private, allowing for greater consistency in monitoring and implementation across Summit countries.

6) In cases where the communiqués have included prescriptions for implementing action, review, monitoring and accountability mechanisms, compliance has proven to be higher. As such, Summit leaders should continue to seek language in