

(81%) and developing country debt (73%), than for climate change (34%) and above all biodiversity (-13%).

These findings suggest a number of trends with respect to Summit compliance. First, during its third seven-year cycle, the G7 offered a larger number of specific and often ambitious environment and development commitments than was the overall norm for the earlier period. These findings thus suggest that the summit has become more active in generating agreements that are specific, identifiable and measurable, if not necessarily timely, well tailored and ambitious.

Second, Canadian and US compliance during this period has generally been positive, with a net score of 43%⁴. This suggests rising levels of compliance, compared to the von Furstenberg and Daniels figures of 31% for 1975 to 1989. Moreover, this substantial positive compliance during the third cycle is a widespread phenomena; both the most powerful, United States, and relatively less powerful, Canada, have positive compliance records. Positive compliance appears in virtually all eight issue areas (4 issue areas and 2 countries), with the lone exception being biodiversity commitments for the US.

Third, wide variations arise by country. Canada's overall score of 53% contrasts markedly with the US overall score of 34%. While the ranking is consistent with that found by von Furstenberg and Daniels (41% for Canada and 25% for the US), the figures for the third summit cycle suggest a widening of the compliance gap between Canada and the US.⁵

⁴ This pattern contradicts the argument of those who assert that a more limited or focused summit agenda rather than a diffuse or comprehensive one will by itself necessarily produce superior summit performance, as more numerous commitments are accompanied by higher compliance. See, for example, W.R. Smyser, "Goodbye, G7", *The Washington Quarterly*, Vol. 16, No. 1 (Winter 1993), pp. 15-28; Bergsten, C. Fred and C. Randall Henning, *Global Economic Leadership and the Group of Seven*. Washington, D.C.: Institute for International Economics, 1986.

⁵ Note that direct comparisons between the von Furstenberg and Daniels and Kokotsis, Kokotsis and