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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The purpose of this report is to determine how the Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC) and the Pacific Islands Forum (PIF but known more commonly as the Forum) interact with the Responsibility to Protect (R2P) principle. That is, what their involvement with the principle of R2P is, and whether they have incorporated it into their frameworks and projects. If they haven’t, this report identifies whether they hold potential for incorporating R2P into their future operations. In order to address this issue, background research was conducted into both organisations, to investigate how they operated and what the nature of their projects and day-to-day operations were. Key individuals and key funders of both organisations were also identified where possible, to create a clearer picture of the main drivers of each organisation.

Overall, research revealed that of the two organisations, PIF had a more direct relationship with the principle of R2P. It has made direct reference to the R2P principle in the past few years – such as during the 2018 United Nations Debate on R2P – as well as indirectly drawing upon the principle. For example, it acknowledged the links between climate change and triggering factors of conflict and included the concept of human security in its most recent security declaration, the Boe Declaration. Likewise, although SPC has never directly invoked the principle of R2P, its Regional Resource Rights Team (RRRT) and its Climate Change and Environmental Sustainability (CCES) divisions both hold potential for incorporating the R2P principle into their projects, with links between their goals and the goals of the R2P principle.

Based on these findings, three different sets of recommendations – to the SPC, PIF, and the Asia Pacific Centre for the Responsibility to Protect (AP R2P) – have been made. Key recommendations for the two Pacific organisations include: incorporating the R2P principle into key SPC division projects, encouraging the discussion of R2P at the next Forum Leaders Meeting, and the creation of a crisis intervention plan. Recommendations for the AP R2P include: holding an R2P workshop with SPC Divisions, gaining access to the next Forum Annual Leaders Meeting as an Observer, meeting with key individuals within both organisations, and targeting key funding partners.
Both the SPC and the Forum play a vital role in advancing the development of the Pacific Islands, albeit in different ways. The SPC, founded in 1947, is an international development organisation that is owned and governed by 26 different country and territory members, all of whom are equal members and owners of the organisation. Members of interest include Australia, France, the United Kingdom, and the United States of America. The SPC’s mission is “to work for the well-being of Pacific people through the effective and innovative application of science and knowledge, guided by a deep understanding of Pacific Islands contexts and cultures.”

The SPC has always had a strong focus on knowledge and innovation, transforming over the years into an agency that provides technical advice, training, research and assistance in addressing economic, medical, educational, biological and social issues of importance. The organisation has nine different divisions (with a tenth known as ‘special projects’) that all work together to achieve the SPC’s mission, vision and goals for the region. These vary from divisions such as the ‘Climate Change and Environmental Sustainability’ to the ‘Public Health Division’ and – of particular importance for this report – the ‘Regional Rights Resource Team’ (RRRT). The RRRT was founded in Fiji in 1995 with funding from the United Kingdom’s Department for International Development, joining SPC in July of 2008.

SPC identifies three key development goals they contribute most to:

- That Pacific people benefit from sustainable economic development
- That Pacific communities are empowered and resilient
- That Pacific people reach their potential and live long and healthy lives

(SP, 2015)

In comparison, the Forum primarily focuses on political and economic policies in the region, often considered vital in maintaining peace and security in the region. Founded in 1971 and based in Suva, Fiji, the Forum comprises of 18 members including Australia. Leaders from each member nation, in addition to a number of dialogue partners from 18 nations (such as China, Canada, Japan, and the United States) meet annually to discuss key issues, with decisions subsequently outlined in a Forum Communiqué from which policies are then developed and implemented. The Forum’s vision is to build a region of “peace, harmony, security, social inclusion and prosperity, so that all Pacific people can lead free, healthy, and productive lives.” It aims to achieve this vision by helping to foster cooperation between governments, collaborating with key international agencies, and representing the interests of its members. Its creation of a “Blue Pacific” mantra and concept of Pacific Regionalism helps guide its principles and is a reminder to Forum leaders of the importance of collective action. In 2014 the Pacific leaders of the Forum developed the ‘Framework for Pacific Regionalism’ to help formalise a commitment to working together through political dialogue and decision-making to address the challenges and opportunities facing the Pacific. The Forum works to make sure that its decisions are properly implemented, whether by supporting Forum advocacy in other regional and international discussions, cultivating relationships with partner nations and organisations, coordinating assistance, or strengthening sub-regional efforts.

### 1.1 SPC Recent Key Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Location &amp; Time</th>
<th>Topic/SPC Involvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Regional MPs Dialogue</td>
<td>Vanuatu: November 2019</td>
<td>This dialogue, organised by the RRRT and supported by SPC funding partners, resulted in the Port Vila Declaration on Human Rights, Good Governance and Sustainable Development. This Declaration concerns human rights in the context of climate change and Pacific cultures, traditions and faith.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Global Planning Meeting for UN Decade of Ocean Science</td>
<td>Denmark: May 2019</td>
<td>A Forum to gather over 200 key stakeholders for interdisciplinary discussions on ocean policy. SPC co-hosted this meeting with IOC/UNESCO, engaging participants from the Pacific Small Island Developing States (PSIDS) and Peter Thompson, the UN Secretary General’s Special Envoy for the Ocean.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Citizenship Workshop</td>
<td>Kiribati: March 2019</td>
<td>Lecturers from Kiribati Teachers College shared their ideas, strategies, and experiences for addressing social and human rights issues.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.2 PIF Recent Key Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Location &amp; Time</th>
<th>Topic/PIF Involvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50th Pacific Islands Leaders Meeting</td>
<td>Tuvalu: August 2019</td>
<td>Leaders of the Pacific met under the theme Securing our future in the Pacific and built on agreements of the Foreign Ministers Meeting in July. Topics included increased partnerships and governance, geostrategic concerns and action on climate change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Nations Secretary General visit to the Pacific</td>
<td>Fiji: May 2019</td>
<td>PIF leaders converged in Suva to hold a Talanoa session with the Secretary General, discussing climate change issues and national priorities, as well as seeking cooperating in advancing development interests.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islands Forum Economic Ministers Meeting: Panel Discussion</td>
<td>Fiji: May 2019</td>
<td>Seminar on infrastructure finance, with a focus on strengthening commitment to collective priorities and building resilience against disasters and climate change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52nd Annual Asia Development Bank Meeting</td>
<td>Nadi: May 2019</td>
<td>The Forum member Fiji hosted the event, with many other members and their representatives involved. They helped highlight the importance of building support for the Pacific’s economic and social development goals and enhancing climate/disaster resilience.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.0 Who’s Who Within the Organisations

Listed below are a number of individuals in both organisations currently holding positions of note, and a short summary about each member. Within the SPC, many of the individuals of note with regards to R2P are a part of the RRRT division, as this division is concerned with human rights issues.

2.1 Key Individuals of the SPC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Current holder of position</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Director General (Senior Executive)</td>
<td>Dr Colin Tukitonga</td>
<td>Former Director of SPC Public Health Division, former CEO of the New Zealand Government’s Ministry of Pacific island Affairs, former Director of Public Health at the New Zealand Ministry of Health. Served since 2014.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Director-General (Senior Executive)</td>
<td>Dr Audrey Aumua</td>
<td>Dr Aumua oversees the operations of SPC staff, division work, and activities, working in close coordination with the SPC’s Director-General. Dr Aumua has expansive knowledge in research, management, and policy development in education and health sectors in Australia, New Zealand and the Pacific region. Served since 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Director-General (Senior Executive)</td>
<td>Cameron Diver</td>
<td>Cameron Diver has over 18 years of experience in sustainable development and international cooperation. He oversees SPC’s scientific and technical programmes in CCES, fisheries, aquaculture and marine ecosystems, public health and statistics for development divisions. Served since 2013.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Biography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director, Regional Rights Resource Team</td>
<td>Dr Miles Young</td>
<td>An Australian qualified lawyer with over 20 years of professional experience as a legal development practitioner and a private legal practitioner across the Pacific, Asia and Africa. Mr. Young has worked on a wide range of substantive areas including access to justice and legal aid, legal and economic empowerment of communities, women’s rights and gender equality, constitution-making, judicial administration, human rights, international trade law, education, and agriculture. Served since 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director, Climate Change and Environmental Sustainability</td>
<td>Sylvie Goyet</td>
<td>French and Swiss citizen, Ms Goyet has held previous positions as Regional Coordinator of the UNOPS/UNDP/GEF MedWetCoast project and has a master’s degree in environmental management from the University of London. Served since 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director, Statistics for Development Division</td>
<td>Dr Ofa Ketu’u</td>
<td>Significant technical expertise in economic and social statistics. She has more than 20 years of experience in leadership positions within the Pacific region. Served since 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Advisory Board Member of RRRT</td>
<td>Rosslyn Noonan</td>
<td>Current Director at the Faculty of Law of Auckland University’s Centre for Human Rights Law, Policy and Practice. Former Chief Commissioner of the New Zealand Human Rights Commission. Former Chair for the International Coordinating Committee of National Institutions for the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights (ICC) from 2010-2012.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Advisory Board Member of RRRT</td>
<td>Romulo Nayacalevu</td>
<td>A Human Rights Lawyer who has worked in the Pacific for over ten years. He serves in the board of Save the Children, and in 2017 took an appointment as the program manager for Governance and Legal Affairs at the Melanesian Spearhead Group Secretariat in Vanuatu. Previously worked as a senior trainer at RRRT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Advisory Board Member of RRRT</td>
<td>Andie Fong Toy</td>
<td>Current Deputy Secretary General of the Forum Secretariat’s Economic Governance and Security programme. In 2016 she was Deputy Secretary General of the PIF.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Advisory Board Member of RRRT</td>
<td>Ethel Sigimanu</td>
<td>Currently the Permanent Secretary of the Ministry of Women, Youth, Children and Family Affairs. Previously served in the Solomon Islands government as the Permanent Secretary of the Ministry of Fisheries and Marine Resources, Department of National Unity, Reconciliation and Peace, Department of Home Affairs, and Chairlady of the National Disaster Council and Ministry of Women, Youth and Sports.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.2 Key Individuals of the Pacific Islands Forum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Current holder of position</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Forum Chair (who is the Head of Government of the Host Country). This person chairs the annual forum meetings.</td>
<td>The most recent Forum Chair was Enele Sopoaga, (now former) Prime Minister of Tuvalu.</td>
<td>Position held for one year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary General</td>
<td>Dame Meg Taylor</td>
<td>Dame Meg Taylor has established a rich body of work. Thanks to her, the Compliance Advisor Ombudsman of the World Bank Group has become internationally recognised for having cutting edge capability that addresses corporate-community conflict around the world. She concluded her term at CAO in 2014. Dame Taylor was appointed to the High-Level Steering Committee on “Every Woman Every Child” by the Secretary General of the United Nations in January of 2016. Served since 2014.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIF Secretariat Deputy Secretary General</td>
<td>Cristelle Pratt</td>
<td>Pratt has worked in both the public and private sectors and has previously worked for the Fijian government. She has provided policy and strategic advice on areas like ocean governance and climate change risk resilience development to the World Bank Group, AusAid, and the Council of Regional Organisations in the Pacific (CROP). Served since 2014.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Policy</td>
<td>Paki Ormsby</td>
<td>Paki is responsible for the development and implementation of PIF policy initiatives. He studied Defence and Strategic Studies at ANU. Served since 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director, Governance and Engagement</td>
<td>Sione Tekiteki</td>
<td>Sione is responsible for engaging with stakeholders in the region to better inform the policy debate and agenda of the Forum. Served since 2018.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional and International Partnerships Advisor</td>
<td>Bethany Sargent</td>
<td>Sargent is the team leader to external engagement between the Forum and regional/international organisations. Served since 2018.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.0 Who funds SPC and PIF?

The tables below demonstrate key funding partners for both the SPC and PIF. SPC has five primary funders, and 28 other main funding and knowledge partners. Of the main funding/knowledge partners, this report will address key organisations that are of most importance to AP R2P.

Note: The Forum notes funding by “development cooperation” – that is, by how much Forum dialogue partners contribute to Forum Islands Countries (FiCs). As such, it is unclear past these dialogue partners how much private sector or civil society non-state actors contribute.
### 3.1 Key Funders of SPC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country/Organisation</th>
<th>About</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>European Union (EU)</td>
<td>The Connecting Europe Facility of the European Union is the main branch funding the SPC and their divisions. They promote development primarily through infrastructure investment, particularly in transport, energy and digital projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Australian Government (Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade)</td>
<td>Australia is no longer the SPC’s largest donor but is however the lead donor in the provision of flexible and core funding. “In this regard Australia has helped set the agenda for a stronger, more effective SPC. SPC sees the relationship with DFAT in very favourable terms but notes that there is some distance to travel before the Partnership reaches its full potential, particularly in regard to collaboration at a strategic level.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The French Republic (France)</td>
<td>The French Development Agency is the agency spearheading France’s investment into the Pacific. It “…funds, supports and accelerates the transitions to a fairer and more sustainable world. With a focus on climate, biodiversity, peace, education, urban development, health and governance, their organisation runs over four thousand projects.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The United States of America</td>
<td>USAID investments help implement environmental and disaster migration strategies. Its focus is on climate change, natural disaster, governance issues, and infectious diseases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand (Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade)</td>
<td>New Zealand sends almost 60% of its aid funding to the Pacific region, to help facilitate the prosperity and stability of the region. They have a particular focus on climate change, health and education issues, as well as good governance, human rights, and women’s empowerment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.2 Other SPC Funding and Knowledge Partners of Note for AP R2P

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country/Organisation</th>
<th>About</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>German Corporation for International Cooperation (GIZ Germany)</td>
<td>GIZ funding focuses on sustainable development and international education, as well as interest areas such as “economic development and employment promotion, energy and the environment, and peace and security.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Fund for Agricultural Development</td>
<td>They believe that by investing in rural people and empowering them to increase their food security, improve the nutrition of their families and increase their incomes, they can help counteract some of the world’s most pressing problems like hunger, poverty, migration, climate change, and conflict. It is a specialised United Nations agency based in Rome.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIDA</td>
<td>A Swedish government agency whose mission is to reduce poverty in the world and increase human security, primarily through the distribution of aid and other funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN Women</td>
<td>The global champion for gender equality, with a goal to ensure every woman and girl is able to exercise her human rights and live up to her full potential.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)</td>
<td>His goal is to eradicate poverty, accelerate structural transformations, and build resilience to shocks and crises.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.3 Key Funders of PIF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country/Organisation</th>
<th>About</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia (Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade)</td>
<td>Total Australian ODA estimated funding (2018-19): $278.6 million. Despite not being the largest donor to the region, Australia has had a long history of involvement in the region and is a member of the Pacific Islands Forum. Thus, its funding plays an important role.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>An active donor in the region, Germany donates through the European Development Fund, GIZ Germany and the KfW Development Bank. Its net contributions to the Oceania region were reported as $11.8 billion USD in 2014.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People’s Republic of China</td>
<td>Reported to have contributed 1.4 billion USD to the Pacific since 2006, through a combination of loans and grant-based financing.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>Combined net funding of $700 million EUR between 2008-2013, 23% of which comes from regional organisations and the rest on a bilateral basis.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>The third largest aid donor to the region, between 2012 and 2015 Japan donated approximately $554 million USD.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The United States of America</td>
<td>Contributed $127.17 million USD total by 2015. They engage with 14 FICs through 15 government departments and agencies.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Climate Fund</td>
<td>This organisation has funding earmarked primarily for the Pacific, and receives donations from multiple nation-states, including the United Kingdom.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.0 SPC and the Responsibility to Protect

As mentioned in the introduction, the SPC primarily focuses on innovation and technology, which at first glance leaves little room for R2P concepts to be incorporated into their projects. However, the RRRT (the human rights programme of the SPC) provides potential as a division that could benefit from the incorporation of R2P concepts. Although the RRRT has never invoked the concept of R2P in its work directly, it pioneers Pacific human rights capacity development, and works with key states and civil society in order to build a deep culture of human rights.64 The RRRT’s vision is to have a “socially just and equitable Pacific built on a foundation of human rights (civil, political, social and economic), inclusivity, democracy and good governance, as the basis of development for Pacific peoples”.65 The RRRT believes that the most effective way to achieve this vision is by providing quality, results-focused technical assistance, research, policy and legal services, and capacity development, which it has been doing for the past 20 years.66

One particular goal of the RRRT is to end violence against women. This issue is related to the R2P principle in that:

“The protection of minority rights is a key factor in the prevention of conflicts and atrocity crimes as well as in peace-building... Minority women and girls are often particularly targeted, including for sexual violence in detention or in armed conflicts. Available and known experience shows that tensions rising to the level of conflict are less likely to occur in societies where minorities can use their own language, practice their own culture and religion and participate effectively in economic and political life.”67

According to the RRRT, violence against women is the most common violation of human rights occurring in the Pacific.68 As a result, one of the RRRT’s major projects is the Pacific Partnership to End Violence Against Women and Girls. In order to facilitate this project, it has partnered with other SPC divisions (the Educational Quality and Assessment Programme, and Social Development Programme) as well as the PIF, and UN Women.69 The aim of this project is to achieve three outcomes: First, to improve education on gender equality and the prevention of violence against women and girls. Second, to promote gender equitable norms at both an individual and community level, to help ensure survivors have necessary quality responses services. Third, to encourage and empower national and regional civil society organisations to “…advocate, monitor and report on regional institutions and governments commitments to enhance gender equality and prevent violence against women and girls”67,70
4.0 SPC and the Responsibility to Protect

Under another of its projects – the Pacific Commonwealth Equality Project (PCEP) – the RRRT has also helped develop National Human Rights Institutions (NHRIs). Currently in effect in three Pacific Island Nations (of Samoa, Fiji, and Tuvalu), the goal of NHRIs is to facilitate conversations about human rights, as well as to promote the protection of political, social, economic, cultural, and civil rights.71

NHRIs can be defined as “state bodies with a constitutional and/or legislative mandate to protect and promote human rights. However, they operate and function independently from government... the general role of NHRIs is to address discrimination in all its forms.”

(Pacific Community, 2019)

Another ‘output’ of the PCEP is a National Implementation of Human Rights. This aims to strengthen states’ capacity for effective implementation by establishing a National Implementation and Reporting Committee (NIRC), developing a National Action Plan, and using technology to support implementation and monitoring of the outcomes.72 The NIRC is a mechanism established by the state to plan, monitor, coordinate, and report on the progress of the state’s human rights obligations, Sustainable Development Goals, and other development priorities, while the National Action Plan details how human rights obligations can be met.73 Additionally, the third output of the PCEP is to empower actors of change, which the RRRT sees as vital to creating lasting societal change.74 This output involves increasing awareness among young stakeholders on the importance of human rights within the Pacific context and the role they play as future leaders.75

Furthermore, as the 2008 Oxfam International Report on climate change argues, human security and human rights are at great risk due to the failure to effectively tackle climate change.76 The increasing effects of climate change is “...depriving millions of people of the very water, food, soil, and land on which they subsist”.77 As Axworthy and Rock argue, ecological crises arising from climate change can lead to conflicts.78 Communities who once cooperated with each other can easily turn to competition and conflict due to resource scarcity, exacerbated by global-warming induced droughts and floods. However, at this stage the SPC’s Climate Change and Environmental Sustainability (CCES) Division has not made any direct reference to contribution of climate change to conflicts or mass atrocities. Instead, it focuses on the need to counteract climate change to prevent “extreme meteorological events, climate variability and accelerated sea-level rise... malnutrition, malaria, diarrhoea, and heat stress.”79 The CCES is currently carrying out the Restoration of Ecosystem Services and Adaptation to Climate Change (RESCCUE) project to help mitigate and build resilient institutions that can withstand these effects.80 Measures include their integrated coastal management plan, economic analysis, and economic and financial mechanisms.81 Thus, while CCES recognises the importance of mitigating climate change in order to maintain the human security and human rights of those in the region, it will likely be up to AP R2P to educate SPC on the importance of linking R2P with climate change.

5.0 PIF and the Responsibility to Protect

5.1 Direct Involvement with R2P

The Pacific Islands Forum has made direct reference to the concept of R2P on more than one occasion. In 2014, the Forum held a workshop on implementing R2P commitments, co-organised by AP R2P.82 Senior government officials from Kiribati, the Solomon Islands, Papua New Guinea, Vanuatu, and Samoa came together to discuss R2P in the context of the Pacific Islands, drawing upon the expanding concept of non-traditional security. A highlight of this discussion was Kiribati’s suggestion of establishing a national human security framework that would “…mainstream human security principles into government programmes and activities”.83 Although there is little information on whether nations took this suggestion on board, the recently announced Boe Declaration (discussed below) makes moves in this direction and holds a great deal of potential in getting member nations to agree with a broader coverage of human security issues.

In 2016, Deputy Secretary Andie Fong Toy reminded members at a workshop on Mapping of Private Security in the Pacific that “…although the Security Governance Framework focused primarily on State institutions, all security institutions have the responsibility to support human rights.”84 The Pacific Security Sector Governance Project (PSSG) is a project that aims to ensure a peaceful and inclusive society within the Pacific, in order to help build effective, inclusive, and accountable institutions at all levels.85 UNDP has been involved in this project, supporting early access to justice initiatives that justice sector stakeholders have undertaken.86 It is important to note that although this is called the Pacific Security Sector Governance Project, there has been a particular focus on Fiji, due to troubles it has recently faced concerning law and justice. Fong Toy’s remarks, however, demonstrate how the PIF aims to put a spotlight on the importance on incorporating R2P concepts into all aspects of security discussions.

Furthermore, in the 2018 UN General Assembly Opening of Debate on R2P, Teburoro Tito of Kiribati spoke on behalf of the Forum to demonstrate how PIF had helped facilitate R2P by recognising and enshrining early warning and early action in the Biketawa Declaration. This Declaration set the framework for the Pacific’s crisis management and conflict resolution initiatives.87 Tito argued that the Biketawa Declaration “…recognized the vulnerability of its members to civil unrest and other security threats, having committed to resolve conflict through regional cooperation.”88 According to Tito, PIF members believe early dialogue, action, and partnership (especially at the regional level) are critical to delivering solid outcomes on R2P.
5.0 PIF AND THE RESPONSIBILITY TO PROTECT

The Biketawa Declaration and R2P

“The Biketawa Declaration articulated a common commitment to resolve conflict through regional cooperation. It had also served as the springboard for a number of regional assistance missions, including the Regional Assistance Mission to Solomon Islands, which commenced in 2003 and concluded in 2017. That Mission was a partnership between the people and the Government of the Solomon Islands and 15 contributing countries from the Pacific region. Its mandate was to help lay the foundations for long-term stability and prosperity in the Solomon Islands, by restoring civil order, rebuilding the machinery of government, and helping to rebuild the economy. The consent of the Solomon Islands was a prerequisite for the Mission and an essential element of its success. Another critical reason for the Mission’s success was that assistance was requested and provided in the early stages of unrest. It was an example of the responsibility to protect in action.”

(United Nations, 2018)

5.2 Peripheral Involvement with R2P

In this section of the report, a discussion of PIF’s operations that can be linked to R2P or demonstrate potential for further application of the R2P principle will be identified and discussed.

In the 2018 Forum Leaders Meeting, leaders signed the Boe Declaration (known informally as ‘Biketawa Plus’). The aim of the Boe Declaration is to update the 2000 Biketawa Declaration on regional security to include an “…expanded concept of security inclusive of human security, humanitarian assistance, prioritising environmental security, and regional cooperation in building resilience to disasters and climate change”. In recognising this expanded concept of security, the Forum helps build an immunity against triggers for atrocity crimes, which are never spontaneous or isolated, but rather built from processes, histories, precursors and other triggering factors. Indeed, much of the Forum’s language in events it holds or attends centres around the importance of building resilience. For instance, in the latest Forum Economic Ministers Meeting held in May 2019, the Honourable David Adeang (the Minister of Finance for the Republic of Nauru) stated in his opening remarks:

“Given that climate change and disasters remain the greatest threat to our economies, it is crucial that such infrastructure investment prioritise resilience, including at the community level. To that end, I look forward to the robust panel discussion on resilient infrastructure development”.

Although Adeang – and much of the Forum rhetoric – highlights the need for resilience as necessary for climate change and disasters, a resilience strategy is also vital in the prevention of atrocity crimes. The UN Framework of Analysis for Atrocity Crimes posits that prevention of atrocity crimes requires a sustained effort to build a society’s resilience to such crimes. Such resilience is initiated by ensuring “…the rule of law is respected and that all human rights are protected; by establishing legitimate and accountable national institutions; by eliminating corruption; by managing diversity constructively; and by supporting a strong and diverse civil society and a pluralistic media”. The Forum’s hard work in the region reflects their desire to ensure these measures are enacted. For instance, the Forum supports and coordinates election observer missions for its member countries, facilitates independent analyses and reports on elections, and offers expert recommendations on how to improve electoral processes. The Forum also provides coordination and support to members on the legislative implementation of Forum policy priorities, making sure members undertake compliance reviews and assisting members where there is a need for legislative reform. Members must also commit to Principles of Good Leadership and Accountability, including the expectation that they uphold a just, fair and honest government through disclosure of fraud, corruption, and maladministration, refraining from using any legal immunity or privilege as a shield, and respecting enforcement of the decisions of the courts.

Furthermore, as mentioned above it is becoming increasingly clearer that climate change can have a direct relationship with R2P. In contrast with SPC, the Forum has acknowledged in the past that direct links between climate change and the potential for conflict exist. In the 8307th Security Council in 2018, President Waqa of Nauru, who was also the current Forum Chair, drew attention to the importance of linking the two issues together. He argued that nations must pay attention to how climate change impacts the drivers of conflict, and how best to respond to this challenge, in order to maintain human security.

“Since acknowledging that the adverse effects of climate change may aggravate certain existing threats to international peace and security, the Security Council has begun to consider the issue according to specific geopolitical contexts. In our view, it is essential that we begin examining the ways that climate change interacts with the drivers of conflict and how the United Nations system can respond appropriately…

“Some of the greatest threats posed by climate change may be not the actual biophysical impacts, but rather the deficiencies in our response to them. Greater competition for scarce resources, the destruction of critical infrastructure, the interruption of public services and human displacement will all test the resilience of our institutions and governance structures” – President Waqa of Nauru, 2018

6.1 Recommendations for SPC

1. Incorporate R2P Principle into RRRT Projects
As this report has revealed, the goals of the RRRT — such as to prevent violence against women and girls and create equality for all across the Pacific — can be linked to the R2P principle. The SPC should aim to ensure that all projects consider the importance of R2P, to help build up resilience of member nation’s institutions. Expanding the National Human Rights Institutions, National Implementation and Reporting Committee, and National Action Plan to include measures that plan, monitor, report, and assess how nations are meeting the R2P principle will help in the prevention of atrocity crimes.

2. R2P’s direct relationship with climate change, adding conflict analysis to RESCCUE Project
With the SPC’s focus on technology and innovation, they provide a great deal of assistance in providing solutions for minimising the effects of climate change on Pacific peoples. However, by acknowledging how climate change can have a direct cause on conflict, (for example, by creating a scarcity of resources) the SPC can incorporate measures that take this into consideration. Monitoring key resources of local populations, the resilience of institutions (particularly against climate change) and identifying areas most likely to fall into conflict due to the effects of climate change, will help ensure that the potential for atrocity crimes is minimised.

6.2 Recommendations for PIF

1. Encourage Forum Leaders to commit to the principle of R2P at the next Annual Forum Leaders Meeting.
Drawing attention to the issue of R2P and its importance in ensuring human security will help Forum Leaders understand the threats and triggers of atrocity crimes and how best to mitigate them. This meeting can also be utilised to draw upon past activities by the PIF with regards to R2P (i.e. the effective management of the Solomon Islands utilising the Biketawa Declaration) and thus help celebrate member’s commitment to protecting their citizens, encouraging further action.

2. Encourage member states to implement a National Human Security Framework.
In their recent declaration, the Boe Declaration, Forum leaders acknowledged the expanded concept of security and the importance of strengthening existing regional security architecture to help build resilient security institutions.99 Creating a National Human Security Framework, as first recommended by Kiribati in the 2014 workshop on R2P, would help in cementing the commitments of Forum Leaders to security in the region. Most member nations likely already understand the importance of human security, with those in the Pacific facing security threats that are primarily non-traditional (such as from climate change and transnational crime). However, encouraging those who do not already have a framework to implement one will enable members to build a comprehensive analysis on their current state of affairs through a human security perspective.100 This will help to safeguard against people falling below an acceptable threshold where they can no longer be helped.101 The advantage of a national human security framework is that each can be tailored to the individual member state, and in turn will help the Forum identify where the most help is needed.

3. Create an intervention plan in case of conflict
The Forum should take steps to ensure that all potential security issues or conflict triggers are monitored and assessed at all times, so as to be aware of any situation before it escalates. This may involve taking steps to prepare for resettlement of populations as climate change worsens (to minimise conflict over resources) and creating a sustained humanitarian assistance plan. As the Forum emphasises its commitment to respecting the rights of members to conduct their national affairs without external interference or coercion, the Forum may find it difficult to uphold the second and third pillars of R2P, concerning the international community’s and United Nations’ obligation to step in and protect populations at risk.102 However, if the Forum ensures it engages with member states every step of the way, invoking the “Blue Pacific” regionalism goal, it may be able to minimise reluctance to such assistance.

6.3 Recommendations for AP R2P

1. Hold an R2P workshop with SPC Divisions: RRRT and CCES
Both divisions of SPC are related to the R2P principle, the former because of its human rights focus, and the latter due to its focus on climate change. By educating these divisions on the importance of R2P, and how acknowledging it is useful in addressing all aspects of issues that nations may face, they can be better aligned to tackle potential problems regarding atrocity crimes that may arise. A key focus should be on identifying the links between atrocity crimes and violence against women and girls, and risk factors caused by climate change.
2. Meet with Dr Miles Young and Sylvie Goyet, respective heads of RRRT and CCES.
Create an open dialogue on the R2P principle and provide information on what R2P is. This will help them understand why RRRT and CCES projects might benefit from incorporating R2P principles into their measures.

3. Meet with Dame Meg Taylor to facilitate discussion on R2P and its incorporation in the next Annual Leaders Meeting.
As mentioned above in key individuals of PIF, Dame Taylor is the Secretary General of the Pacific Islands Forum. As such, she is a key driver in the direction of the Forum. In order to create awareness among the Forum Leaders about the importance of committing to the R2P principle, it will be essential to first raise the possibility with Dame Meg.

4. Gain access to the next Forum Annual Leaders Meeting as an observer.
This would be a fantastic opportunity to learn about how Forum meetings operate, as well as ensure that R2P principle will be addressed and discussed. This may be something that can also be raised with Dame Taylor first, in order to better understand how to go about the process of becoming an observer.

5. Target key funding partners of the SPC and PIF for funding of R2P projects and/or workshops.
The Connecting Europe Facility of the EU, New Zealand, The French Republic, GIZ Germany, SIDA, and the International Fund for Agricultural Development, are all key organisations that hold potential for further funding of the SPC. GIZ Germany and the French Development Agency in particular hold a great deal of potential, as both proactively support projects which will enable development, in order to build peace and security. In comparison, for PIF the key countries to target are Germany, China, Japan, and the US, as they are the largest donors to the Pacific Region, in addition to being Forum Dialogue Partners.

6.0 Conclusion

Overall, the purpose of this report is to determine how the SPC and PIF interact with the principle of R2P. The research reveals that, of the two organisations, PIF has a more direct relationship with the principle of R2P. It has made direct reference to the R2P principle in the past few years, as well as having indirectly drawn upon the principle. Furthermore, although SPC has never directly invoked the principle of R2P, its RRRT and CCES divisions both hold potential for incorporating R2P into their projects.

Based on these findings, three different sets of recommendations – to the SPC, PIF, and AP R2P – have been made. The recommendations made to these organisations will help ensure that R2P becomes a key consideration for those acting in the Pacific region. It will also help facilitate the prevention of atrocity crimes by minimising conflict and encouraging the protection of human rights.
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