



G8 Preliminary Accountability Report

L'Aquila G8 Summit (8-10 July 2009)

Table of contents

Introduction.....	3
G8 Global Food Security Experts Group Report “G8 Efforts towards Global Food Security”	4
G8 Water Experts Group Report “Progress Report on the implementation of the G8 Water Action Plan”	7
G8 Health Experts Group Report “Promoting Global Health”	10
G8 Education Experts Group Report “Sharing responsibilities to advance Education for All”	16

G8 Preliminary Accountability Report

Introduction

At the 2008 Hokkaido Toyako Summit, the G8 placed accountability firmly on its agenda by releasing the first reports on the implementation of past commitments and by requesting additional reports for the future. In view of the L'Aquila Summit, to improve transparency and effectiveness, G8 countries decided to strengthen their accountability with respect to G8 individual and collective commitments, starting from development and development-related goals. To this end, G8 experts have been asked to provide the present preliminary report as an annex to the Leaders Declaration.

This report aims at providing a synthesis of the main results emerged from the G8 Experts Groups on Food Security, Water, Health and Education. It is strictly based on contents and figures agreed by G8 experts in their respective reports. Each group followed a specific methodological approach, according to the particular features of the different sectors. All experts groups identified the most appropriate data and data sources to be used to monitor the commitments made in Hokkaido Toyako and previous G8 Summits, addressing problems related to differences in national strategies and modalities of financing, currencies and exchange rates, timeframe of commitments and disbursements, double counting.

Looking forward, and building on the experience of the G8 Experts Groups, G8 countries decided to set up a senior level working group on accountability to share best practices for accountability and develop, in cooperation with relevant international organizations, a comprehensive and consistent methodological approach for a G8 Accountability Framework, with a particular attention to results, broadening the Hokkaido Toyako legacy. The G8 Accountability Report will be delivered in 2010 at the Muskoka Summit in Canada.

G8 GLOBAL FOOD SECURITY EXPERTS GROUP REPORT

“G8 Efforts towards Global Food Security”

The soaring food prices and the intensification of food crisis in 2008 called for a more sustained, action-oriented and effective response to the current and future food insecurity. The G8 Leaders met in Hokkaido Toyako (July 2008) and responded to the appeal of the international community towards food security. Through the Leaders Statement on Global Food Security, Leaders committed to undertake all possible measures to ensure global food security and demonstrated their commitment of over US\$ 10 billion since January 2008. The G8 put emphasis on actions to foster sustainable agriculture, which would be the key to overcoming the global food crisis in the medium to long run. A G8 Experts Group on Global Food Security was tasked to monitor the implementation of G8 commitments, support the work of the UN High Level Task Force on the Global Food Security Crisis, cooperate with other interested parties to shape the Global Partnership for Agriculture and Food Security and report progress to the 2009 Summit.

Following this mandate, the G8 Experts Group developed a report aimed at collectively monitoring the status of G8 actions, as well as individual members' initiatives, undertaken since the onset of the food crisis up to L'Aquila G8 Summit (2009) to accomplish G8 commitments. In this regard, the commitments contained in the Hokkaido Toyako G8 Leaders Statement on Global Food Security were clustered in seven categories that include financial commitments and disbursements via multilateral and bilateral channels. The fulfilment of these commitments is reported on a collective basis, resulting from G8 individual actions, initiatives and interventions (annexed to the report).

Based on the report, G8 Partners have reinvigorated their response to address the global food crisis, adopting appropriate measures to implement Hokkaido Toyako commitments on food security. Resulting from the individual country annexes, US\$ 13,45 billion have been disbursed since January 2008 to July 2009, exceeding the US\$ 10 billion Hokkaido Toyako commitment. Furthermore, additional US\$ 13.14 billion have been pledged from July 2008 (Hokkaido Toyako Summit), of which US\$ 3.45 billion have already been disbursed up to now. This brings the total G8 commitment to food security, during the period January 2008-July 2009, to US\$ 23,14 billion.

Bearing in mind that the overall goal is maintaining and reinforcing high political attention on food security and considering that a deepening economic downturn is dramatically undermining the achievement of the MDG 1, G8 will, collectively and individually, refocus their policies (not only development) to respond to new challenges through coordinated and inclusive frameworks, such as the Global Partnership for Agriculture and Food Security.

G8 Commitment

“We are determined to take all possible measures in a coordinated manner, and since January 2008 have committed, for short, medium and long-term purposes, over US\$ 10 billion to support food aid, nutrition interventions, social protection activities and measures to increase agricultural output in affected countries. In the short-term, we are addressing urgent needs of the most vulnerable people.[...]” (para 2, G8 Leaders Statement on Global Food Security – Hokkaido Toyako 2008)

Financial commitments¹ (January 2008 – July 2009)	
	All G8 Partners
Total (US\$ millions)	23,137.5

Individual financial commitments (January 2008 – July 2009) (US\$ millions)	
Canada²	543.6
France	872
Germany³	1,747
Japan⁴	5,622
Russia	103
UK	1,538
USA⁵	6,240.6
Italy⁶	708.5
EC	5,762.8

¹ “Financial commitments” include all possible short, medium and long-term measures to address the urgent needs of the most vulnerable people, to support food aid, nutrition interventions, social protection activities and increase agricultural output. Among these measures, some Partner Countries have also considered their ODA Loan for agriculture development.

² Canadian figure is based on actual disbursements and not commitments.

Fiscal year 2008/2009 preliminary. Canada’s fiscal year run from April 1st to March 31st .

³ Commitments 2008 plus commitments (preliminary) January to December 2009.

⁴ Japan: Figure is based on announcements. It includes up to 4 billion US dollars announced in TICAD IV, that would be financed through Japanese ODA loan over five years for the development of Africa, with special focus on infrastructure and agricultural development.

⁵ USA: Financial Announcements (December 2007 – September 2009).

⁶ Italy: Figures do not include financing towards national and regional agricultural research institutes.

Financial disbursements¹ (January 2008 – July 2009)	
	All G8 Partners
Total (US\$ millions)	13,448.7
Financial disbursements per area² (US\$ millions)	
FAO Reform	7.98
Comprehensive Africa Agricultural Development Program (CAADP)	77.61
Research/ Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR)	922.34
Infrastructure	1,593.9
Early warning systems	70.32
IFIs (e.g. IFAD)	430.42
Climate change adaptation	714.9
Biofuels	229.45
Mainstream food security	721.60
Others ³	see country annexes in 2009 Food Security Experts report (pp 9-74)

Individual financial disbursements (January 2008 – July 2009) (US\$ millions)	
Canada⁴	543.6
France	754
Germany⁵	879
Japan	1,683
Russia	73
UK	482
USA⁶	4,720.6
Italy	597.3
EC	3,716.2

¹ Among “Financial disbursements” some Partner Countries have considered their ODA Loan for agriculture development.

² The disbursements per area do not include all the initiatives financed by G8 targeting food security.

³ This area clusters G8 individual actions/initiatives/interventions that are not matching the Hokkaido Toyako commitments but are contributing to food security.

⁴ Canada: Fiscal year 2008/2009 preliminary. Canada’s fiscal year run from April 1st to March 31st.

⁵ Germany: financial commitments for 2008.

⁶ USA: Financial Obligations (December 2007 – July 2009).

G8 WATER EXPERTS GROUP REPORT

“Progress Report on the implementation of the G8 Water Action Plan”

At Evian in 2003, the G8 adopted a Water Action Plan as a contribution to meet the Millennium Development Goals (MDG) and other internationally agreed targets on water and sanitation. At the Hokkaido Toyako G8 Summit in 2008, G8 Leaders requested that their water experts review progress on the Water Action Plan and report at the 2009 G8 Summit in Italy. The G8 Water Experts prepared the “Progress Report on the implementation of the G8 Water Action Plan” in response to that request.

The results presented below are based on the OECD-DAC Credit Reporting System database. While this data is representative of G8¹ support for water and sanitation activities², it does not reflect the entirety of G8 direct and indirect support for achieving progress on water and sanitation issues.

Overall G8 bilateral ODA allocated to the water sector




Fig.1. G8 disbursements³ allocated to the water sector (US \$ million, 2002-2007)
(WSS: Water Supply and Sanitation; IWRM: Integrated Water Resources Management; WP: Water Productivity)

¹ The “G8” here refers to Canada, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Russia, the UK, the USA and the European Commission. Russia is not a DAC member and therefore Russia’s financial contributions are not included. The analysis was restricted to bilateral disbursements from G8 countries and to the assistance provided by the EC, which is multilateral by nature. **Multilateral G8 contributions were not included because complete data are not available.**

² In this section, “the water sector” refers to ODA flows directly earmarked as, and reported to the appropriate categories of the DAC classification, namely: - Water Supply and Sanitation activities reported under Code 140 (Water Supply and Sanitation); - Integrated Water Resources Management activities reported under Codes 140 (idem) and 410 (General Environmental Protection); - Water Productivity activities reported under Code 230 (Energy Generation and Supply), Code 311 (Agriculture).

³ The analysis was restricted to *disbursements* representing the actual transfers from donors to recipient countries year by year. *Commitments* as provided by DAC are not reported here as they usually refer to multi-annual financial agreements, with no direct relationship with the level of disbursements made in a given year.

G8 individual bilateral disbursements (US\$ millions spending 2002-07)	
Canada	251.51
France	1,018.01
Germany	2,645.35
Japan	5,267.30
Russia	TBC
UK	471.86
USA	3,260.55
Italy	261.61
EC	1,288.09

Fig.2. G8 individual disbursements allocated to the water sector (US \$ million, 2002-2007)

Official Development Assistance disbursed by the G8 for the water sector has more than tripled between 2002 and 2007, with expenditure amounting to US \$ 14.5 billion over the period (an average of US \$ 2.4 billion p.a.). The launch of the Water Action Plan in 2003 appears to be an important milestone in this global trend.

The G8 contribution amounted to nearly 82% of the total share of US \$ 17.6 billion spent by all DAC donors over the same period. An average of 61% (US\$ 8.8 billion) out of total G8 disbursements to the water sector was allocated to water supply and sanitation activities (see lower bars in fig. 1), demonstrating that access to safe water and sanitation (WSS) was a priority for G8 investments.

In addition to their bilateral contributions, G8 countries provided significant support to multilateral initiatives, international financial institutions and international or regional organisations including UN agencies working in the water sector. Recent OECD analyses report that such flows substantially increased after 2002, but remain lower than those delivered through bilateral programmes for the G8 as a whole.

During the period 2002-2007, total G8 disbursements targeted to Africa amounted to US \$ 4.2 billion (on average US \$ 701 million, p.a.), out of which 60% went to Sub Saharan Africa, while Asia received US \$ 5.0 billion (on average US \$ 850 million, p.a.), including 62% to South and South East Asia; the Middle East region received US \$ 3.3 billion (US \$ 288 million, p.a.). Total financial support raised by the G8 increased in all geographical regions.




Fig.3 Distribution of aid from the G8, water supply and sanitation, 2002-2007
(Disbursements, value by region, US \$ million)

Collectively, the G8 is the largest donor in the water sector. Between 2002 and 2007, G8 support to regions with critical needs (Sub-Saharan Africa and South Asia) represented around 30% of the total G8 support for water and sanitation; while the amount of support has increased, the proportion has declined in recent years highlighting the need for a strengthened partnership with Sub-Saharan Africa.

Since Evian, the Water Action Plan has provided a strong political message and attention has been drawn to the need for increased access to safe drinking water and basic sanitation and improved water resources management. Each G8 country has developed its own specific commitments to address this issue. Progress has been made since 2003, but there is much to do. Almost one billion mostly poor people still lack safe drinking water and over two and half billion lack adequate sanitation facilities. Moreover, the world's freshwater resources are under increasing threat from demographic and climatic changes and many people, particularly in Asia, suffer from floods, typhoons and cyclones.

G8 HEALTH EXPERTS GROUP REPORT

“Promoting Global Health”

Preparation for the 2009 Summit takes place at a time of global financial and economic crisis, which presents not only challenges but opportunities to promote global health in a more effective and innovative way. Therefore protecting and possibly expanding health spending as well as delivering on existing commitments, using resources more efficiently and effectively, are key to maintain progress in the current unstable environment.

Recent G8 Summits, notably Saint Petersburg, Heiligendamm and Hokkaido Toyako, have confirmed and implemented specific commitments to support global health, and to work towards the goal of providing at least a projected US\$60 billion over 5 years to fight infectious diseases and strengthen health, as stated in the Hokkaido Toyako Leaders' Declaration. In respect to the Leaders' commitment to ensure accountability made in St. Petersburg and implemented in Hokkaido Toyako, the G8 Health Experts have developed a monitoring report, showing G8 implementation of past commitments.

G8 health experts undertake to continue the work of monitoring progress on G8 health-related commitments and building on and processing the work of previous Presidencies, have considered four themes as input to the 2009 Summit. These broad themes refer to the major challenges in global health and provide a structure to define priorities and focus within a broader agenda, to identify the main outcomes to be achieved, and potential G8 actions to be undertaken in support of developing countries.

The four themes are: (i) promoting a comprehensive and integrated approach to the achievement of the health-related Millennium Development Goals; (ii) strengthening health systems to advance the goal of universal access to health services; (iii) promoting health as an outcome of all policies, and (iv) increasing the quantity and quality of development aid in the context of existing G8 commitments and further advancing G8 accountability.

G8 Health Accountability Exercise

Progress in Global Health is a result of collective action involving manifold actors, and therefore difficult to attribute to any specific input of a subset of countries, such as the G8. However, G8 action can make a tremendous difference, and G8 countries are accountable against the commitments they have taken in the realm of Global Health. In this regard, with the Hokkaido Toyako Declaration, the G8 leaders agreed to establish a follow-up mechanism to monitor progress on meeting the G8 commitments (see paragraph 45 of the Leaders' Declaration) and tasked the G8 Health Experts' Group to develop such a mechanism.

This year, under the Italian Presidency, the G8 Health Experts revised the *Toyako Framework for Action* and produced a new template of matrices with the aim of highlighting collective G8 performance in Global Health against agreed targets (e.g. 60 USD billion). In addition to disease-specific and sector-specific tables which

assess progress against G8 commitments (see the full health experts' report), a new cumulative table to assess G8 contribution to Global Health was produced, resulting from the addition of new country tables, which apply the same methodology and resulting therefore comparable. The cumulative tables also include G8 contributions to the Polio Eradication Initiative and long-lasting insecticide treated nets

For purposes of transparency, the tables on global health investment are divided into two main sections: Aid to Health reported as ODA to DAC, and other specific inputs to Global Health for Developing Countries.

Differences in the methodology applied may create problems of comparability, when comparing the 2009 matrices to last year's. Other differences consist of the use of the US dollar as a common currency; the introduction of an agreed exchange rate; the use of current US dollars as opposed to 2006 base year; the identification of the nature of G8 "inputs" (commitments as defined by DAC¹).

A.1 Cumulative tables on Global Health Investment

G8 Commitment:

- *We will continue our efforts toward these goals (HIV/AIDS, malaria, TB, and health systems strengthening) to provide at least a projected US\$60 billion over the coming years, and invite other donors to contribute as well. (Heiligendamm, 48)*
- *We reiterate our commitment to continue efforts, to work towards the goals of providing at least a projected US\$60 billion over 5 years, to fight infectious diseases and strengthen health systems. (Hokkaido Toyako, 46)*

A.1.1 - Aid to Health, reported as ODA to DAC - sums individual Tables (see full health experts report for more detailed information on figures and methodology used)

US\$, millions

Commitment	Japan	Canada	France	Germany	Italy	Russia	UK	US	EC
2007	842.20	634.08	1,302.58	741.6	638.71	102.18	1,609.31	6,625	692
2008 ²	698.69	740.15	1,399.12	977.1	623.87	108.54	1,461.10	7,875	849
TOTAL G8	26,379.23								
TOTAL G8 + EC	27,920.23								

¹ According to DAC definition a commitment is: "A firm obligation, expressed in writing and backed by the necessary funds, undertaken by an official donor to provide specified assistance to a recipient country or a multilateral organization".

² 2008 figures are still provisional. Final data for 2008 will be provided in the second half of 2009 and the updated matrices published on the G8 Presidency website.

A.1.2 - Other specific inputs to Global Health - *sums individual Tables (see full health experts report for more detailed information on figures and methodology used)*

US\$, millions

Commitment	Japan	Canada	France	Germany	Italy	Russia	UK	US	EC
2007	16.03			12.5		15.78		7	
2008	18.60		39.8	10		43.78		57	
TOTAL G8	220.49								
TOTAL G8 + EC	220.49								

1 - G8 Global Health Investment – TOTAL - *sums A.1.1 with A.1.2 (see full health experts report for more detailed information on figures and methodology used)*

A. US \$, millions

Commitment	Japan	Canada	France	Germany	Italy	Russia	UK	US	EC
2007	858.23	634.08	1,302.58	754.1	638.71	117.95	1,609.31	6,632	692
2008	717.29	740.15	1,433.62	987.1	623.87	152.32	1,461.10	7,932	849
TOTAL G8	26,599.72								
TOTAL G8 + EC	28,140.72								

A - 2 Cumulative Tables on Specific G8 Commitments (contributions already included in Table A.1 amounts)

Polio eradication

G8 Commitment:

- *To maintain momentum towards the historical achievement of eradicating polio, we will meet our previous commitments to maintain or increase financial contributions to support the Global Polio Eradication Initiative, GPEI and encourage other public and private donors to do the same. (Hokkaido Toyako, Development and Africa, 46e)*

A 2.1 Table on Polio eradication (from G8 Contributions to the Polio Eradication Initiative)

US\$, millions current

Country	2006 contributions	2007 contributions	2008 contributions	2009 contributions
Canada*	42.46	9.07	32.56	13.91
France	12.55			
Italy*	5.85		12.62	2.11**
Germany	13.61	26.20	80.96	98*
Japan	14.09	20.32	21.49	*
Russia	3.0	3.0	9.0	5.0
UK	59.74	57.46	41.30	39.36
US	132.8	132.9	129.7	133
EC*	30			
Total G8 Contributions	1,182.06			

CANADA * Figures for 2009 reflect spending to date as of June 15 2009. Up to a further \$26 million CDN is planned for Canada's 2009-2010 fiscal year, ending March 31, 2010.

ITALY *The Italian contributions to the GPEI are included in the annual voluntary contributions to WHO. Contributions for 2009 are planned in millions euro.

**Italy has planned to commit 1.5 Mio € for the fight against Polio in 2009. Exchange rate: 1.4096 as of 2.7.2009 (OECD DAC exchange rate for 2009 not yet available).

JAPAN *The figure is not available as of 1st July 2009.

GERMANY *In January 2009, the German government pledged 100 Mio. € for the fight against Polio to be allocated in the upcoming five years. Out of the pledged 100 Mio. €, it is expected that 70 Mio. € will be committed in 2009. Exchange rate: 1.40 as of 25.6.2009 (OECD DAC exchange rate for 2009 not yet available).

EC *Contribution to Polio eradication in 2008 is made through a specific support to Nigeria in the framework of the cooperation agreement between EC and this country. 20 M€ have been programmed for this activities for the year 2009 to 2010.

Malaria

G8 Commitment:

- *As part of fulfilling our past commitments on malaria, we will continue to expand access to long-lasting insecticide treated nets (LLINs), with a view to providing 100 million nets through bilateral and multilateral assistance, in partnership with other stakeholders by the end of 2010. (Hokkaido Toyako, 46d)*

A 2.2 - Table on long-lasting insecticide treated nets (LLINs)

Number of LLINs, millions

Country	2008 Multilateral	2008 Bilateral	2009 Multilateral	2009 Bilateral
Canada*	2.24		2.19	0.03
France	17.29*			
Italy	1.62*		2.07**	
Germany	2.0*	1.36**	4.6***	n.a.
Japan	1.49*	1.38	**	**
Russia	0.51*		0.41**	
UK	2.75*	11.6		
US	6.56	7.28		11.05
EC*				
Total G8 Contributions	76.43			

CANADA * As reported by fiscal years, i.e. April 1st 2008 to March 31st 2009 for 2008. Figures do not include nets that may be provided through CIDA's emergency assistance programs. 2008 multilateral figure includes data provided by the Global Fund. Estimate used for Global Fund portion of nets in 2009.

FRANCE * Consolidated figures calculated from data provided by Global Fund (3,081,505) and UNITAID (65% of 109 MU\$D for LLINs) 1bednet : 5U\$

ITALY * The number of LLINs corresponds to the cumulative numbers of LLINs distributed at the end 2008 minus the cumulative number distributed at end 2007 and it refers to the cumulative Italian financial contributions 2001-2008 of 1,008,260,873 US\$. Source: Global Fund.

** Estimation is based on Italian contribution to GFATM of 130 Mio. \$ in 2009.

GERMANY *See Italy's footnote; number of bednets in 2007: 1.916.569.

** Estimations are based on contributions to special malaria/LLIN projects (Malawi, Rwanda), outputs achieved through larger bilateral programs - where malaria is a sub-component - are not included. Therefore, number of beneficiaries is actually much higher.

*** Estimation is based on German contribution to GFATM of 288 Mio. \$ in 2009.

JAPAN *The figure was calculated based on the cumulative data given by the Global Fund.

**The figures are not available as of 1st July 2009.

RUSSIA *Number of LLINs was calculated based on data provided by the GFATM and does not include number of LLINs procured through the Russian Federation contribution to the World Bank Malaria Booster Program. Under this program \$1,5 mln. were allocated for LLINs in Zambia.

**Figures for 2009 are estimated based on funding for GFATM.

UK *The figures for 2008 is for the financial year (April 2008 to March 2009). The multilateral figures are derived from data provided by the Global Fund (880,000) together with an attributed share of UNITAID bednet procurement (9.2% of 20 million nets).

EC* EC is not funding any specific project to procure and/or distribute LLINs to developing countries, and is not aware of any method to count the number of LLINs which have been purchased by/and supplied to developing countries thanks to EC general or sectoral budget support, or to EC contribution to the GFATM.

G8 EDUCATION EXPERTS GROUP REPORT

“Sharing responsibilities to advance Education for All”

The Hokkaido Toyako Summit Declaration called for the G8 to report on its progress to support FTI (Education for All-Fast Track Initiative).

The report accounts for the progress made towards the Education for All goals (EFA) and the Fast Track Initiative (FTI), highlighting the remaining challenges. It acknowledges the role of education as a contributor to the whole MDG agenda. In a time of crisis, education is a powerful tool, enabling communities to cope with major environmental and economic challenges and maintaining social cohesion and stability.

G8 donors have contributed to FTI, together with other major donors, through political, technical and financial inputs. Some G8 donors have taken the lead in promoting specific programmes and providing FTI with technical inputs to keep a balanced approach to such important aspects as capacity development, assessment of learning outcomes and data quality.

Financial support from G8 donors to the Education sector is provided through bilateral and multilateral channels and through the FTI Trust Funds.¹

The following table shows cross-G8 donors aggregate² direct support for education sector-wide³, for basic education⁴ and for basic education⁵ in the 37 FTI-endorsed countries⁶:

Aggregate G8 ODA commitments								
US\$ millions 2000-07								
	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Education	4,389.41	4,472.4	4,926.87	5,983.55	6,324.1	5,287.83	6,513.91	7,069.82
Basic Education	1,142.42	871.78	977.92	1,573.85	1,854.79	1,727.76	1,308.6	1,750.71
Basic Education to FTI-endorsed countries⁷			280.77	383.34	465.67	413.15	608.80	923.49

¹ Some G8 are also very active in General Budget Support (GBS) frameworks. GBS plays an important role in Education financing through the national budgets to which it is channeled. This is particularly relevant for EC, which committed the total of US\$ 5.6 billion in GBS in the period 2000-2007 in all developing countries and the total of US\$ 2.9 billion in FTI endorsed countries in the period 2002-2007.

The following table shows EC general budget support commitments in all developing countries and in FTI endorsed countries (US\$ millions):

Year	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	Total
All dev. Countries	722	286	579	761	721	1136	463	955	5623
FTI-endorsed countries			431	554	552	634	202	492	2867

² These figures relate to ODA by all G8 countries plus EC.

³ Source: OECD/DAC.

⁴ Source: OECD/DAC.

⁵ Source: Figures provided by each G8 member.

⁶ The 37 FTI-endorsed countries are: Albania, Benin, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Djibouti, Ethiopia, Gambia, Georgia, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Kenya, Kyrgyz Republic, Lao PDR, Lesotho, Liberia, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Moldova, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Tajikistan, Timor Leste, Vietnam, Yemen, Zambia.

⁷ The data start from 2002, year of inception of the FTI.

The following tables show the disaggregate data:

Disaggregate ODA commitments to Education (US\$ millions 2000-07)	
Canada	2,440.63
France	13,234.96
Germany	8,813.11
Japan	6,722.7
Russia	759.51
UK	3,524.96
USA	3,942.21
Italy	530.09
EC	4,999.72
TOTAL	44,967.89

Disaggregate ODA commitments to Basic Education (US\$ millions 2000-07)	
Canada	1083.88
France	1838.33
Germany	921.94
Japan	892.02
Russia	4.2
UK	1997.25
USA	2806.32
Italy	33.18
EC	1630.71
TOTAL	11,207.83

Disaggregate ODA commitments to Basic Education in FTI-endorsed countries (US\$ millions 2002-07)	
Canada	422.06
France	331.28
Germany	231.04
Japan	463.78
Russia	0
UK	832.07
USA	571.96
Italy	6.28
EC	216.75
TOTAL	3,075.22

The following tables show aggregate and disaggregate G8 support to the FTI Trust Funds from 2004 to 2009¹:

Aggregate G8 commitments to FTI Trust Funds (US\$ millions 2004-09)						
	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Catalytic Fund²	2.4	2.4	188.7	20	203.4	72.1
Education Program Development Fund³		0.94	10.1	9.36	4.8	4.36

¹ Source: FTI Secretariat.

² Contributions to the Catalytic Fund (CF) include signed G8 commitments as of May 28, 2009.

³ Contributions to the Education Program Development Fund (EPDF) include signed G8 pledges.

Disaggregate Commitments to FTI Trust Funds (Catalytic Fund and Education Program Development Fund) (US\$ millions 2004-09)	
Canada	30.02
France	29.38
Germany	9.9
Japan	3.6
Russia	10.2
UK	291.16
USA	0
Italy	27.6
EC	116.7
TOTAL	518.56

The Group agreed on recognising that a future mechanism to monitor progress on meeting G8 commitments to EFA should move from a focus on financial inputs to a broader focus on aid effectiveness and development results. Future directions for the FTI will be informed by the findings of two exercises: the external evaluation of FTI and the design of a coherent replenishment mechanism.

An immediate step of the replenishment strategy aims at covering financial needs of the FTI Trust funds in the next 18 months, estimated by the FTI Secretariat at US\$ 1.2 billion.

The G8 will continue efforts to mobilize bilateral and multilateral resources to meet the needs of FTI endorsed education sector plans and to close gaps in education data, policy and capacity to accelerate action on EFA.