

## Appendix A: Methodological Approach to Compliance Measurement and Key Definitions

### *Key Definitions*

Assessing the degree and causes of national compliance with international commitments requires in the first instance a definition and a measurement device for specifying the commitments themselves. The texts of the final communiqués since the Summit's inception in 1975 provide a suitable referent for identifying the encoded commitments the Summit has produced.

A "commitment" is defined in this study as a discrete, specific, publicly expressed, collectively agreed statement of intent; a "promise" or "undertaking" by Summit members that they will take future action to move forward, meet, or adjust to an identified target.

"Compliance" with a Summit commitment is defined to mean national government action geared towards the domestic implementation of the necessary formal legislative and administrative regulations and budgetary, institutional or other action designed to execute summit commitments. In other words, compliance is measured according to governmental actions designed to modify existing instruments within the executive and legislative branch to accommodate the commitments reached. By identifying the introduction of new executive actions, an assessment is then made concerning whether or not the domestic political process within the G7 countries are in conformance with the instruments or direction of a target specified in the Summit communiqué.

### *Methodological Approach to Compliance Measurement*

Assessing compliance so conceived requires isolating and identifying commitments in the communiqué that are, for the most part, to be found in words rather than numbers. Given the analytical rather than statistical nature of this study, a three-level measurement scale is employed in this paper. This corresponds with the scale constructed by Kokotsis and used by Kokotsis and Kirton. This range includes: 1) full conformance with a commitment (measured by +1); 2) complete failure to implement a commitment (measured by -1); and 3) "work in progress", (measured by "0"), indicating that a resolution has been initiated, but not completed, within the specified time interval (in this case, one full year, from Summit to Summit).

Note that von Furstenberg and Daniels employ a similar metric, but with two notable exceptions. Although the authors consider "+1" to correspond with full conformance, they take "0" to mean failure to implement a commitment and assign a "-1" if the actual outcome is the *opposite* of that committed to.

The analysis in this study employs the Kokotsis-Kirton methodology which is also the methodology employed by the University of Toronto G7 Research Group in their 1996 Lyon compliance study.