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Executive Summary

The Third International Conference on Small Island Developing States (SIDS Conference) was held from 1 to 4 September 2014 in Apia, Samoa under the overarching theme of “The sustainable development of small island developing States through genuine and durable partnerships”. The Conference resulted in an intergovernmental agreed outcome document – the SAMOA Pathway - and the announcement of 300 multi-stakeholder partnerships devoted to the sustainable development of SIDS.

A key outcome of the SIDS Conference was also the establishment of a SIDS Partnership Framework, which were designed to monitor progress of existing, and stimulate the launch of new, genuine and durable partnerships for the sustainable development of SIDS.

The present report contains an in-depth analysis of the status and trends of partnerships for Small Island Developing States (SIDS), as well as a set of case studies that provides a basis for the description of best practices in developing durable and genuine partnerships for SIDS.

The report, which has been made possible through generous funding support provided by the Government of Italy, aims to support Member States in preparing for the SAMOA Pathway High-level Review that will take place on 27 September 2019 at United Nations (UN) headquarters, New York.

Since 2015, a series of partnership dialogues have been organized by the UN Secretariat in close collaboration with the Steering Committee, and other partners, to support the objectives of the SIDS Partnership Framework. A total of 104 partnerships have been featured in the various dialogues since the 2014 Conference.

The in-depth analysis of partnerships, contained in this report, has been informed by a range of stakeholders, partners, regional reports, interviews, and through a series of partnership dialogues organized in the margins of the preparatory process of the SAMOA Pathway High-level Mid-term Review.

The analysis set out to answer the following questions:

- What is the status and trends of SIDS partnerships globally, regionally and nationally?
- How have these partnerships addressed the SAMOA Pathway priority areas?
- Are there under-represented areas of the SAMOA Pathway that may need to be addressed further through partnerships?
- Have the partnerships had an impact on their beneficiaries and on the sustainable development of SIDS?
- What challenges have the partnerships faced?
- What lessons can be learned that could help stakeholders develop the next generation of genuine and durable multi-stakeholder partnerships for SIDS?
What do the numbers say?

A total of 555 partnerships for SIDS, announced and registered with the UN Secretariat through various conferences and processes, are the basis for this analysis. Around 300 of these partnerships were announced during the SIDS Conference in 2014. A total 261 new partnerships and commitments have been registered ever since.

The analysis shows that the Pacific region includes the most number of partnerships, followed by the Caribbean region and the region of Atlantic, Indian Ocean and South China Sea (AIS).

It is worth noting that a large number of partnerships have to date (March 2019) completed their activities, and more are coming to an end shortly. These partnerships offer invaluable experiences and lessons learned in the design of SIDS partnerships.

Governments, regional organizations and UN entities lead most of these partnerships. At the global level, a majority (52%) are led by the UN, while regional organizations and governments lead the majority of partnerships with a regional focus.

In the Caribbean and the Pacific, a large number of partnerships are led by regional organizations. In the AIS region, most likely due to the lack of a regional coordinating body, there are very few regional partnerships - most partnerships are either national or sub-regional in scope.

Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) and civil society participate broadly in partnerships throughout all regions, but lead very of them. NGOs and civil society has the highest participation (16%) in partnerships in the Pacific region. In addition, participation by the private sector and academia is generally lower than other entity types.

Overall, the analysis found that all SAMOA Pathway priority areas are addressed by partnerships, but with a higher focus on oceans and seas, climate change, sustainable economic growth, renewable energy and disaster risk reduction.

Out of 147 global partnerships, 117 are still active. Global partnerships play a crucial role in providing dialogue and knowledge sharing and learning between regions. Climate change and resilience is by far the largest priority area of such partnerships. Other common priority areas include biodiversity and oceans, access to education, particularly higher education, access to technologies, data and information, as well renewable energy. Sustainable economic development includes partnerships designed to assist national transitions to green and blue economies, including components such as sustainable tourism and fisheries. Priority areas under-represented by global partnerships include social development, poverty, gender equality, sustainable consumption and production, health and NCDs, and sustainable transportation.

In the AIS region, the analysis reviewed 82 partnerships, 57 which are active, and 23 having completed their activities. Recently, there has been an increase of partnerships in the
region, from only 20 partnerships announced in 2014. Most are undertaken on the national level, with only one regional partnership.

Oceans and seas, including marine and coastal conservation, spatial planning, species conservation, sustainable aquaculture, marine pollution prevention, and blue economies is the largest priority area in the AIS region (28% of total partnerships), followed by social development and sustainable economic growth. None of the priority areas is particularly under-represented, but a primary focus on health and NCDs, as well as gender is lacking in partnerships.

Climate change and disaster risk priority areas are less prominently addressed by partnerships in this region than in other regions. Food security has a strong focus on fisheries, with agriculture less prominently featured, while the few sustainable transportation partnerships focused on shipping. With some of the water, wastewater, sanitation and watershed management partnerships now having completed their work, this area may also require further focus.

In the Pacific region, the analysis looked at 285 partnerships, with 223 being currently active. With 134 partnerships registered in 2014, there has thus been significant increase overall. The majority (89) are regional-level partnerships, but a large number of national driven partnerships also exist. All Pacific island countries and territories are represented through the partnerships.

The partnerships in the Pacific are broadly aligned with oceans (50%), followed by climate change, disaster risk reduction and economic development. The ocean partnerships touch upon marine protected areas, locally managed marine areas, coral reef, mangrove conservation, marine spatial planning, climate resilience and ocean acidification, scientific research and fisheries. Sustainable economic growth was a component of approximately 30% of the partnerships and ranged from green and blue economies to sustainable financial services and initiatives relating to tourism, agriculture and aquaculture.

Several partnerships in the Pacific incorporate aspects of traditional knowledge and culture. Sustainable and renewable energy, energy efficiency, gender, wastewater and sanitation, health and NCDs, and sustainable transportation is also well represented. Under-represented areas include poverty, inequality, and sustainable consumption and production.

In the Caribbean region, a total of 178 partnerships were reviewed, of which 141 are active. This is a significant increase from the 42 partnerships that were registered at in 2014. Most of these partnerships (125) were undertaken on the regional level, including several, and often all, Caribbean countries.

Partnerships in the Caribbean address all of the SAMOA Pathway priority areas, with a focus on oceans and seas (16%), sustainable economic growth (15%), climate change (13%), and sustainable energy (12%). Ocean-related partnerships incorporated similar issues to the partnerships in the Pacific, as described. In the area of economic growth, the development
of national green and blue economies, sustainable tourism and fisheries, fostering private investment in nations around the region, rural economic development, and improving capacity in public finance is a focus. Partnerships with a focus on sustainable energy are centered on energy efficiency and development of clean and renewable energy technologies.

Partnerships with a social development focus in the Caribbean included youth programmes, protection of the rights of children, gender issues, strengthening of civil society participation in development, protection of traditional knowledge and cultural heritage, and a variety of educational initiatives. Priority areas with fewer partnerships included terrestrial biodiversity, sustainable consumption and production, trade, sustainable transportation, recycling, hazardous wastes and wastewater.

**Impacts of partnerships**

Overall, the analysis shows that partnerships have a positive impact for the sustainable development of SIDS. Examples of this include:

- **Direct impacts on beneficiaries** (e.g. increased resilience of communities, customers enrolled in financial services, improved access to safe water and sanitation for communities)
- **Direct impacts on the environment** (e.g. protection of marine and terrestrial environments)
- **Knowledge, information, data and indicators** (e.g. platforms for disaster management, nutrient management and water and sanitation; knowledge sharing between drought-affected SIDS)
- **Improved coordination between agencies and organizations**, leading to a more effective and comprehensive delivery of programs and outcomes
- **Improved capacity** (e.g. training programs on topics ranging from disaster resilience to wastewater management, cultural heritage and comprehensive sexual education; delivery of university programs and virtual education)
- **Positive policy environment** (e.g. training parliamentarians on gender issues and empowerment of women, strengthening youth engagement in policy, and developing an agreed-upon comprehensive sustainability vision).

**Gaps in partnerships**

The results of the analysis, including considering data from the Human Development Index (HDI) compiled for SIDS countries by UNDP, highlight some under-represented SAMOA Pathway priority areas, which may require further attention, including through partnerships. These areas include:

- **Aspects of social and economic development, in particular addressing inequality and ensuring that no one is left behind**. Such partnerships may include actions relating to income inequality, poverty, education, and health, and provide for the inclusion of marginalized groups.
• **Multiple dimensions of poverty**, particularly in countries and areas with a high number of poor and vulnerable households. These partnerships may require sustained investments in human capital, such as education and health, and food and nutrition security, and may include agriculture, small-scale fisheries, rural development, market development, trade and other activities.

• **Sustainable transportation**, particularly in terms of low-carbon, low cost options for communities on remote islands.

• **Water, wastewater and sanitation** in many areas where these services are still inadequate.

• **Health and NCDs**, particularly in assisting countries implement their NCD-related activities.

• **Gender considerations**, particularly in regards to income equality, women’s participation in the workforce, and women’s leadership.

• **Integrated ecosystem management focusing on whole islands**, particularly on terrestrial and watershed areas, and their connection to the sea, as well as human livelihoods.

• **Sustainable consumption and production**, including addressing this topic holistically in the context of small islands.

• **Sourcing development finance for SIDS**, which is an area that has not seen previous partnerships. One proposal was to engage in partnerships with the insurance industry to mobilize innovative financing.

**Partnership challenges**

Common partnership challenges across the three regions included sustainable financing; capacity (human and institutional); an enabling national environment for fostering new generation of partnerships; enabling conditions for the participation of all stakeholders in partnerships; ensuring that the right people with the right expertise are involved in each partnership; lack of trust between partners; and weak institutional, legal and governance structures.

In addition, internal monitoring of partnerships and their impacts present challenges. There is a lack of baseline data for partnerships, as well as limited monitoring and evaluation frameworks to assess progress. Access to information and statistics, managing data, and knowledge transfer were issues in many countries.

**SIDS Partnerships Criteria and Norms**

In a response to discussions from the 2018 regional partnership dialogues, the co-chairs of the Steering Committee developed the *SIDS Partnership Criteria and Norms*, which articulates what constitutes a genuine and durable partnership for SIDS, through outlining elements of the SMART criteria - a partnership that is:

- SIDS Specific
- Measurable & Monitorable
- Achievable & Accountable
• Resource-based and Results-focused, with
• Timelines for implementation & transparency by all parties.

**Partnership case studies**

In an effort to understand how the SIDS Partnership Criteria and Norms is translated to the work of partnerships, a select number of in-depth case studies of partnerships where developed, around the SMART elements.

The regional dialogues also highlighted a number of best practices in developing and running partnerships, including:

• *Different organizational structures can serve different purposes* – even within the same partnership. A partnership may have several goals or objectives, and reaching them may require setting up different structures of governance and organizational systems.

• *Support from ‘Champions’ and ‘Unusual Suspects’ can be of great help.* Having a few Champions that are committed to the partnership can provide important assistance in developing a partnership by providing good examples to other partners. Support can also come from ‘Unusual Suspects’ that unexpectedly take on leading roles.

• *Being part of a partnership can stimulate individual partners to establish new functions within their own systems,* as well as initiatives that take on a ‘life of their own’ by growing into new networks for knowledge-sharing or support.

• *It is important to provide for capacity building among partners* and working ‘from within’ existing systems can be a valuable approach to strengthen the sense of ownership by different partners.
Introduction

The Third International Conference on Small Island Developing States (SIDS Conference) was held from 1 to 4 September 2014 in Apia, Samoa under the overarching theme of “The sustainable development of small island developing States through genuine and durable partnerships”. The Conference resulted in an intergovernmental agreed outcome document – the SAMOA Pathway - and the announcement of 300 multi-stakeholder partnerships devoted to the sustainable development of SIDS.

A key outcome of the SIDS Conference was also the establishment of a SIDS Partnership Framework which is designed to monitor progress of existing, and stimulate the launch of new, genuine and durable partnerships for the sustainable development of SIDS. Guided by an intergovernmental Steering Committee, the framework has ensured that SIDS partnerships have remained high on the UN’s agenda, providing a multi-stakeholder platform for reviewing progress made by SIDS partnerships, and for sharing of good practices and lessons learned among all stakeholders, on an annual basis.

On 27 September 2019, Member States will convene a one-day high-level meeting at United Nations to review progress made in addressing the priorities of SIDS through the implementation of the SAMOA Pathway. A robust preparatory process is currently underway, which has featured three regional meetings of SIDS in their respective regions, as well as an interregional meeting for all SIDS to be held in Apia, Samoa, from 30 October to 2 November 2019.

Member states have also called upon UN DESA and the Office of the High Representative for the Least Developed Countries, Landlocked Developing Countries and Small Island Developing States (OHRLLS) to enhance the necessary analytical and advocacy support for the work of the Steering Committee, and, in particular, to ensure an annual action-oriented, results-focused Global Multi-Stakeholder Small Island Developing States Partnership Dialogue.

In support of the SAMOA Pathway mid-term review, a series of regional partnership dialogues, and one inter-regional partnerships, has been organized in the margins of the preparatory meetings.

The partnership dialogues, made possible through generous funding support provided by the government of Italy, have provided an opportunity to bring together relevant stakeholders from the different SIDS regions to:

- Assess the status of partnerships for each SIDS region, identifying best practices and gaps around which new partnerships could be forged to further drive implementation of SAMOA Pathway priority areas and SDGs in SIDS;
- Raise the capacity of diverse stakeholders to develop genuine and durable partnerships for SIDS;
- Strengthen the review and monitoring process of SIDS partnerships.
The present document includes three main chapters.

The first chapter provides an in-depth analysis of the status and trends of 555 partnerships for SIDS, as registered with the UN Secretariat through the 2014 SIDS Conference, and beyond.

The second chapter attempts to look within a partnership, the advantages of choosing a partnership approach, lessons learned on how to develop, and maintain, a genuine, durable, and effective partnership. The chapter also draws best practices around the SMART Criteria.

The third chapter is devoted to a selected number of in-depth case studies, that has been conducted with focal points of a number of selected partnerships. These case studies have provided much of the lessons learned found in chapter two.

The material collected for this publication has provided the basis for a SIDS Partnership Toolbox - a set of online, and policy, tools for enhancing capacity around development and design of partnerships for SIDS, and for improving monitoring and review of partnerships.

The online version of this report, the SIDS Partnership Toolbox, and information on all partnerships, can be found on the SIDS Action Platform at sidspartnerships.un.org.

Analysis of Partnerships for Small Island Developing States

Overview

Monitoring and review of partnerships for SIDS is crucial on many levels. On the level of individual partnerships, it is needed to assess whether a partnership is meeting its goals, what impacts it has on its intended beneficiaries, and how it advances the implementation of the SAMOA Pathway priority areas.

On a national, regional and global level, monitoring and review of partnerships serve as a crucial means for making sure commitments are fulfilled, priorities are aligned, and for showcasing best practices and lessons learned.

The regional partnership dialogues organized in 2018 in support of the SAMOA Pathway midterm review stressed the need to improve the quality and quantifiable data that serves as the basis for undertaking monitoring and review of partnerships. It was also emphasized that monitoring and review should be an integral component of the design phase of any partnership and include an evaluation of its impact, as well as an assessment of how the partnership relates to SAMOA Pathway priority areas, both within and outside of its main
area of focus. The in-depth analysis has shown, however, that many partnerships lack the capacity and resources to conduct extensive regular monitoring and review.

Overall, there has been a steady rise in the number of partnerships for SIDS since the 2014 Conference. The 2017 UN Ocean Conference resulted in over 1,400 voluntary commitments for implementation of Sustainable Development Goal 14 (Oceans), which included many SIDS specific partnerships. Collectively, as this analysis shows, these partnerships make considerable contributions to the sustainable development of SIDS.

The analysis has been undertaken for the purpose of helping countries prepare for the mid-term review of the SAMOA Pathway, with a view to assist Member States in better understanding the landscape of the many SIDS partnerships that have been undertaken to implement the SAMOA pathway, and how these partnerships have addressed its priority areas. Specifically, the in-depth review aims to answer the following questions:

- What is the status and trends of SIDS partnerships globally, regionally and nationally?
- How have these partnerships addressed the SAMOA Pathway priority areas?
- Are there under-represented areas of the SAMOA Pathway that may need to be addressed through further partnerships?
- Have the partnerships had an impact on their beneficiaries and on sustainable development of SIDS?
- What challenges have the partnerships faced?
- What lessons have been learned that could help in developing the next generation of genuine and durable multi-stakeholder partnerships?

The results of this analysis rely on many different sources of information, as detailed in the next section, and yet information on certain topics, such as the impacts of partnerships, is often difficult to come by.

**Materials and methods**

**Sources of information**

There were many different sources of information that contributed to the present in-depth analysis. The SIDS Action Platform is the primary source of information on partnerships and their progress, through the detailed information provided upon registration of partnerships, and subsequent reporting.

Other sources include partnership dialogues, work undertaken by regional organizations to analyze partnerships, reports of the Secretary-General relating to SIDS, external websites and other publicly published information relating to specific partnerships, including final evaluations of selected partnerships, as well as other sources.

Thus, the analysis relied on the following information:
• **SIDS Action Platform** – partnerships announced in the lead-up, during and beyond the 2014 SIDS Conference
• **Relevant partnerships for SIDS** - announced as voluntary commitments for the 2017 UN Ocean Conference as partnerships for SIDS
• **Information received from regional organizations and from partnership dialogues**, including information from partnerships participating in regional and inter-regional partnership dialogues. Additional information was also provided by regional organizations, including the Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat (PIFS) and the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC). Each of these sources is referenced in the appropriate section.
• **Regional reports submitted to the inter-regional preparatory meeting for the Mid-Term Review of the Samoa Pathway**, held in Apia, Samoa, from 29 October to 1 November 2018. Regional reports of the Caribbean, Pacific and AIMS region were reviewed for information relating to partnerships. Each of these sources is referenced in the appropriate section.
• **Information from an analysis of SIDS Human Development indices** undertaken by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP).
• **Other relevant information**, such as reports of the Secretary-General, published reports, websites, etc. Each of these sources if referenced as appropriate.

**Uncertainties**

While efforts have been made to locate detailed information about SIDS partnerships, it should be kept in mind that this information is still likely to be incomplete. Many partnerships may not report to global or even regional processes, and governments may not be aware of all active partnerships on the ground. Therefore, it is very likely that the information in this report may under-estimate the number of partnerships, and that many other partnerships, particularly at the local level, are operating in the regions, and outside the scope of this analysis. Partnerships are also dynamic, with new partnerships being formed and old ones being completed. The numbers and trends in this analysis should therefore be interpreted more as an indication of status and trends, rather than absolute values.

**SIDS Partnership Framework**

The SIDS Partnership Framework consist of several elements:

- a Steering Committee on Partnerships for SIDS;

---

1 The regional reports are available at the inter-regional preparatory meeting website at https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/sids/samoareview/inter
an annual action-oriented and results-focused Global Multi stakeholder SIDS Partnership Dialogue;
• a standardized partnership reporting template and process;
• encouragement to organize regional and national SIDS multi-stakeholder partnership dialogues with support from the UN system and the international community.

Steering Committee

The Steering Committee, which is open to all States Members of the UN or members of the specialized agencies, meets regularly both on Ambassadorial level and on expert level to support the follow-up work for promoting and advocating the launch of new partnerships, and plan for upcoming activities.

The Committee, supported by the UN Secretariat through UN DESA and OHRLLS, is co-chaired by a SIDS and non SIDS member State, appointed by President of the General Assembly.

In the first two years, 2016-2017, the Committee was chaired by His Excellency (H.E.) Mr. Ahmed Sareer, Permanent Representative of the Republic of Maldives to the United Nations and H.E. Mr. Sebastiano Cardi, Permanent Representative of Italy to the United Nations.

As of 2018, Her Excellency (H.E.) Ms. Lois M. Young, Permanent Representative of Belize to the United Nations and H.E. Mrs. Geraldine Patricia Byrne Nason, Permanent Representative of Ireland to the United Nations, serve as its co-chairs.

SIDS Partnership Dialogues

Since 2015, a series of partnership dialogues have been organized by the Secretariat in close collaboration with the Steering Committee, and other partners, to support the objectives of the Partnership Framework of monitoring existing and stimulate launch of new partnerships for SIDS.

In 2015, an informal partnership dialogue was organized by Maldives and UN DESA in the margins of the HLPF. At the meeting, a first draft of the recommendations for the SIDS Partnership Framework was introduced by the Secretariat, followed by several partnership presentations from the floor, including interactive and focused discussions on key priorities related to SIDS, including on how SIDS partnerships can advance the priority areas identified in the SAMOA Pathway.

The first mandated Global Multi-stakeholder SIDS Partnership Dialogue was held in 2016 during the high-level week of the General Assembly. The Dialogue was attended by over 100 participants from governments, UN entities, civil society representatives, and focal points of SIDS partnerships from all regions of SIDS, which provided both updates to existing partnerships, and launched several new partnerships for SIDS.

In 2017, the Steering Committee decided to focus the annual Dialogue on Ocean partnerships for SIDS, as a concrete contribution to the 2017 UN Ocean Conference and SDG 14 for SIDS. This was a timely theme, since roughly two thirds of all the 300 partnerships
that were announced in the lead up to, and during, the SIDS Conference in 2014, are related to oceans, seas and marine resources. At the end of the UN Ocean Conference, there were close to 1,400 voluntary commitments from all stakeholders announced. Many of these commitments were coming from SIDS, and many others were directly benefitting SIDS. This was a true testament that the partnership approach adopted in 2014 in Samoa works, and is really the only pathway to future sustainability – across SIDS regions and indeed across the world.

In 2018, the Dialogue was organized in the margins of the High-level Political Forum on Sustainable Development (HLPF), with a focus on how partnerships can drive sustainable and resilient societies in SIDS, which was in line with the theme of the 2018 HLPF.

Also in 2018, as part of the support for the SAMOA Pathway midterm review, a series of partnership dialogues were organized in the margins of the midterm review preparatory meetings, in Mauritius, Tonga, Belize (regional), and Samoa (inter-regional).

The fourth (2019) Global Multi-stakeholder SIDS Partnership Dialogue is tentatively scheduled for 10 July 2019, to be held in the margins of the HLPF.

A total of 104 partnerships have been featured in the various dialogues organized as part of the follow-up of the SIDS Partnership Framework activities since the 2014 Conference (see Figure 3 - Partnerships represented in dialogues).

**Partnership reporting**

In addition to participation in the various partnership dialogues, an online partnership reporting template was launched in May 2016, after consultations with member States and other partners.

Reporting form: sidspartnerships.un.org/partnerships/progress

Focal points of partnerships are asked to use the reporting template as way of providing update on the progress of their partnerships, once a year, until completion of the activities of the partnership. As part of the reporting process, a traffic light system was introduced, which indicates status of submitted reports.

The template seeks information from individual partnerships on:

1. implementation status of the partnership;
2. recent achievement of the partnership;
3. any challenges faced in implementation;
4. next steps for the partnership;
5. description of who the beneficiaries of the partnership are; and
6. specific actions taken to positively impact beneficiaries.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traffic light</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
<th>Partnership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Light Status</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green (report received the past year)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow (due for reporting – 1 year passed since registration)</td>
<td>206</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red (no report received for 2 years)</td>
<td>161</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not due yet (date of registration less than 1 year)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities completed (no further reporting expected)</td>
<td>124</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1 - Traffic light reporting status (as of October 2018)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New partnerships</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>261 (since 2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress reports</td>
<td>N/a</td>
<td>N/a</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>114 (since May 2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active (accumulated)</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>460</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2 - Status & reporting of partnerships

New partnerships, participation and reporting

Overall, since the SIDS Conference in 2014, around **218 partnerships have reported on their progress**, either through the online standardized reporting template or by participating in the several partnership dialogues organized.

Since 2014, a total of **261 new partnerships and commitments** for SIDS have been announced through various processes.

**Participation in dialogues**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Global Partnership Dialogues</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoa inter-regional Partnership Dialogues</td>
<td>N/a</td>
<td>N/a</td>
<td>N/a</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Partnership Dialogues</td>
<td>N/a</td>
<td>N/a</td>
<td>N/a</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As demonstrated in table 31, a substantial number of partnerships have participated in the various partnership dialogues from 2015 to 2018, with a significant increase in participation in 2018 due to the processes related to the 2019 SAMOA Pathway midterm review.

Overall, the numbers show that partnerships have increased in all regions since the 2014 SIDS Conference.

The Pacific region has the most partnerships, followed by the Caribbean, and AIS. In addition, SIDS in all regions participate in global and multi-regional partnerships that are included in this analysis. The numbers of SIDS partnerships regionally and globally are summarized in the table below.

The term “active partnerships” refers to those partnerships that are currently operating, leaving out partnerships that have already completed their work. A relatively large number of partnerships have to date been completed, and many more will come to an end shortly. These partnerships have valuable experience and lessons learned to offer, providing an opportunity to apply them in the design of the next generation of genuine and durable SIDS partnerships.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIDS Regions</th>
<th>Partnerships</th>
<th>Completed</th>
<th>Active</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AIMS</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caribbean</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (including Global)</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Monitoring and reporting in individual partnerships**

Internal partnership monitoring and reporting methodologies can be divided into “home-grown” approaches developed by certain partnerships to measure and report on their impact (see examples below); approaches used by various United Nations organizations, which coordinate a substantial number of partnerships, or to which many partnerships report to; and monitoring and evaluation undertaken by partnerships funded by the Global Environment Facility (GEF).

In addition, partnerships receiving donor funding from country donors or organizations are likely to report to those donors using specific methods or processes mandated by the donor.
Regional organizations also coordinate a substantial number of partnerships, and this coordination process generally involves compiling reports from partner countries and organizations and forwarding them to global processes and to donors. Some regional organizations also host databases of regional projects.

National governments generally report on their activities both to donors, if applicable, and to relevant international conventions.

Information about monitoring and review undertaken by some partnerships, particularly local partnerships that do not have significant international donor funding is generally difficult to find.

Figure 5 below summarizes current information about monitoring and review methodologies used by specific partnerships. As can be seen, UN organization methodologies are the most prominent, followed by regional organizations coordinating the monitoring process. It should also be noted that even though the monitoring and review methodologies for over half of the partnerships listed in the SIDS Action Platform are not known, this does not necessarily mean that those partnerships do not undertake any monitoring at all.

![Pie chart showing monitoring, evaluation and reporting methods used in partnerships]

There are numerous reporting arrangements between organizations, governments, conventions and donors. It should be noted that many partnerships have multiple partners, including donor partners, and that better understanding and utilizing the existing reporting
and communication pathways that exist between different types of partnerships may also help capture improved information about partnership impacts. For example, reports to donor organizations, to the GEF, and to international conventions contain a wealth of information about partnership impacts, and could be linked to from the SIDS Action Platform.

Some partnerships use innovative mechanisms to monitoring their impacts, and demonstrate these impacts on their websites. The box below provides examples used by selected partnerships.

**Examples of partnership monitoring and reporting**

The Sustainable Coastlines Charitable Trust published detailed information about their impact and results on their website, with results illustrated through easy to understand graphics ([http://sustainablecoastlines.org/about/impact/](http://sustainablecoastlines.org/about/impact/)).
Comunidad y Biodiversidad (COBI) makes available on their website (https://cobi.org.mx/en/) results at a glance from each of their projects. Additional information, as well as reports, are also available.

Global Island Partnership (GLISPA) has created an Impact Dashboard (https://impact.glispa.org) to better understand the collective impact of all GLISPA partners.

The Aloha+ challenge uses “Collective Impact” framework in assessing progress. Collective impact is the commitment of a group of important actors from different sectors to a common agenda for solving a specific social problem. Collective impact is organized around
five conditions of collective success, which include common agenda; shared measurement systems; mutually reinforcing activities; continuous communication; and backbone support organizations. (https://ssir.org/articles/entry/collective_impact)

The Coral Triangle Initiative has a Monitoring and Evaluation Working Group (MEWG) that has worked to develop a Monitoring and Evaluation System and provide technical inputs and recommendations to the Regional Secretariat and the National Coordinating Committee. The M&E System is embedded in the five goals of the Regional Plan of Action (RPOA) and will measure against baselines on the status quo for each goal the outputs and outcomes using indicators developed and endorsed by the Technical Working Groups (TWGs) and the MEWG.

**Entity types in partnerships**

The main entities leading partnerships include governments, regional organizations and United Nations organizations. At the global level, the majority (52%) of partnerships are led by United Nations organizations, while regional organizations and/or governments generally lead the majority of partnerships in the regions.

In the Caribbean and the Pacific, a larger number of partnerships were led by regional organizations than by governments. In the AIS region, most likely due to the lack of a regional coordinating body, there are very few regional partnerships - most partnerships are either national or sub-regional in scope.

NGOs and civil society participate in partnerships throughout all regions, but lead a minority of them. Their participation was the highest in the Pacific region, where 16% of partnerships were led by NGOs and civil society, likely due to the many partnerships in that region that work with local communities. Participation by the private sector and by academia was generally lower than that of NGOs and civil society.

All three Regional Partnerships Dialogues agreed that genuine and durable partnerships include the participation of, and ownership by, all stakeholders. Thus there is need to strengthen the participation of under-represented stakeholders in partnerships, including the private sector, civil society and academic/research organizations.

**Addressing SAMOA Pathway priority areas, and impacts of activities**

The analysis assessed how existing partnerships have addressed SAMOA Pathway priority areas, including the numbers of partnerships in each priority area, their focus, and, in some cases, their content. It is generally agreed that numbers cannot tell the full story, and that a few good and comprehensive partnerships may be more effective than a larger number of poorly executed partnerships. However, partnership numbers still provide an indication of interest and priority given to specific issues by donors, governments and intergovernmental organizations. A larger number of partnerships may also indicate that many different
aspects of a priority area are being addressed on levels ranging from local, national, regional to global.

Overall, the existing partnerships address all SAMOA Pathway priority areas, but in an uneven way. In most regions, oceans and seas and climate change are well addressed, with many partnerships also focusing on sustainable economic growth, renewable energy and disaster risk reduction. However, there are also some regional differences, as discussed below.

**Integration in partnerships**

Most partnerships included in the analysis addressed multiple SAMOA Pathway priority areas, demonstrating a high degree of integration in their design. For example, partnerships relating to fisheries also often promote economic and social development, sustainable consumption and production, food security and nutrition, as well as gender equality. Partnerships relating to water and sanitation also recognize a contribution to human and environmental health and economic development. Many climate change-related partnerships also incorporate issues related to renewable energy, environmental sustainability, resilience, disaster risk reduction, livelihoods and marine transportation.

Perhaps the most well-integrated partnerships are those relating to green and blue economies, which place themselves in the nexus of economic development, social inclusion and environmental protection. These partnerships often seek to advance innovation, new technologies, and capacities, and provide employment opportunities in sectors including sustainable tourism, fisheries, aquaculture, renewable energy, transportation, blue carbon, etc.

**Impacts of partnerships**

Partnerships do not always report on their impacts on the global level, and thus there is no consistent and comparable source of information about their impacts on beneficiaries. Some information on this respect is available from individual partnerships and from donor-conducted evaluations.

Based on a subset of partnerships for which information is available, the impacts of partnerships include the following:

- **Direct impacts on beneficiaries** (e.g. increased resilience of communities, customers enrolled in financial services, improved access to safe water and sanitation for communities)
- **Direct impacts on the environment** (e.g. protection of marine and terrestrial environments)
- **Knowledge, information, data and indicators** (e.g. platforms for disaster management, nutrient management and water and sanitation; knowledge sharing between drought-affected SIDS)
• **Improved coordination between agencies and organizations**, leading to a more effective and comprehensive delivery of programs and outcomes
• **Improved capacity** (e.g. training programs on topics ranging from disaster resilience to wastewater management, cultural heritage and comprehensive sexual education; delivery of university programs and virtual education)
• **Positive policy environment** (e.g. training parliamentarians on gender issues and empowerment of women, strengthening youth engagement in policy, and developing an agreed-upon comprehensive sustainability vision).

Where figures are available, they can be added up to provide an indication of the scale of impact. For example, the subset of partnerships in the table below that provided quantitative data (a minority of the partnerships), directly benefited approximately 1.2 million people and 1025 communities. 9.6 million km² of marine and terrestrial area was protected or managed, with 60 new protected areas established. 6 new funds or financial mechanisms were established to provide funding for activities including renewable energy, wastewater management, climate adaptation, critical ecosystems, biodiversity and environmental protection. In regards to renewable energy, 2.75GW of capacity was installed. In actuality, these figures will be larger, given that very few partnerships provide exact figures of their impact.

Another tangible impact of partnerships has been the scaling up of successful approaches. One example is the Locally Managed Marine Areas Network, which has expanded from a single village in Fiji to incorporating 600 villages and covering an area of more than 12,000 km² in 15 Pacific Island States and some Indian Ocean countries, providing benefits on fisheries and community livelihoods. Another example is the Micronesia challenge to effectively conserve at least 30% of the near-shore marine resources and 20% of the terrestrial resources across Micronesia by 2020, which has inspired the Caribbean Challenge and the Western Indian Ocean Coastal Challenge.

Many primary impacts of partnerships also have positive spillover effects. For example, partnerships that improved the access of communities to water, also serve to reduce poverty, improve health outcomes, facilitate climate change adaptation, and mitigate the threat of natural and man-made hazards. Providing opportunities for marginalized women to access finance will incorporate their economic potential into the wider economy, thus resulting in economic growth.

A majority of partnerships provide some degree of capacity building and, in some cases, technology transfer. Thus, their impacts may include long-lasting skill-building on the individual level, as well as strengthening institutions in the region.

The partnership dialogues organized between 2015 and 2018 have also increased the capacity of participants in understanding what makes partnerships genuine and durable, as demonstrated by the development of SIDS Partnership Criteria and Norms (see annex to this document). The partnership dialogues have generated opportunities for peer-to-peer learning from challenges and bright spots, and contributed towards development of good partnership practices. The sharing of information has also generated a renewed interest in,
and momentum towards, the implementation of the SAMOA Pathway, including pledges for new partnerships.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Samoa Pathway priority area</th>
<th>Impacts recorded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Sustained and Sustainable, Inclusive and Equitable Economic Growth with Decent Work for All | - Over 1 million customers enrolled in appropriate financial services in Pacific (as of 2016), helping them achieve their full economic potential (*Pacific Financial Inclusion Programme*)
- Cultural producers in the Pacific have benefited from enhanced business skills and market access opportunities through the cultural industries entrepreneurship training programme (*EU-ACP Enhancing the Pacific Cultural Industries*)
- More than 150 Solomon Island market vendors opened bank accounts, most for the first time, incorporating their economic potential into the wider economy (*Markets for Change*)
- Sustainable tourism activities in all SIDS regions exposed over 5,000 people each year to various local community contexts and initiatives (*Peace Boat*)
- Pacific governments have mainstreamed sustainable tourism policies in their national planning strategies and donors/development partners have assisted the implementation of sustainable tourism development projects (*Pacific Regional Tourism Capacity Building Programme*)
- A practical and accessible sustainability management toolkit was developed to build the awareness and participation of tourism enterprises in two pilot destinations (*Pacific Regional Tourism Capacity Building Programme*)
- Toolkit for Parliamentarians on implementing UN Convention Against Corruption (UNCAC) has been developed (*Parliamentarians Advancing Anti-Corruption through UNCAC*)
- Entrepreneurship Portal for economic developments and microfinancing for youth in all SIDS was developed (*ICT4SIDS*)
- Reviews of the patenting activity in specific areas of technology were produced (*WIPO Patent Landscape Reports*) |
| Climate Change                                                         | - 142 community-led projects increased the resilience of over 300 SIDS communities to the impacts of climate change and its variability (*Corporate Programme of the GEF implemented by UNDP*)
- Establishment of the Pacific Climate Change Centre (PCCC), a regional hub for collaboration and coordination to support climate-resilient development and responses to climate change (*SPREP, Governments of Japan and Samoa*)
- Empirical knowledge was produced to inform government climate migration policies in Dominican Republic, Haiti, |
Mauritius, Papua New Guinea, contributing to a greater likelihood of success and livelihood quality *(Migration, Environment and Climate Change: Evidence for Policy)*

- **Climate awareness was provided through hands-on learning** for children and youth in all SIDS regions *(Sandwatch)*
- Actions to **reduce short-lived climate pollutants** were undertaken in all SIDS regions *(Climate Change and Clean Air Coalition)*
- **21 Pacific states and territories were brought together** around the theme of sustainable development and the impact of climate change *(Oceania 21)*
- A **community Climate Change Adaptation Fund** was established in Grenada, with 29 community projects approved *(Government of Grenada)*
- Community members in 9 islands in Vanuatu were supported to **increase their understanding of climate variability and change**, and plan and implement activities to strengthen DRR, water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH), Natural Resource Management (NRM), agriculture, nutrition, traditional knowledge, women's leadership and education *(Vanuatu NGO Climate Change Adaptation Program)*
- **Vanuatu Climate Adaptation Network (VCAN)** established to facilitate the sharing of lessons and good practice approaches among over 20 civil society organisations and with the Government of Vanuatu *(Vanuatu NGO Climate Change Adaptation Program)*
- **Capacity building on low carbon development and climate change adaptation in twelve SIDS** *(Denmark, SIDS)*

**Sustainable Energy**

- **2.75 GW of total RE installed capacity** globally through SIDS Lighthouses Initiative was added, with more than 400 MW of RE capacity installed from 2014 to 2017
- **25 million USD was mobilized over ten years for increasing access to low cost energy in remote areas of Pacific SIDS**, and **22 renewable energy projects were completed in 14 Pacific SIDS** that are ready to be replicated. *(Partnership between Pacific SIDS, Italy, Luxembourg, Austria, Spain, IUCN)*
- **Caribbean Centre for Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency (CCREEE)** was established
- **Pacific Centre for Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency (PCREEE)** was established
- **ECOWAS Centre for Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency (ECREEE)** was established
- **Network of regional sustainable energy centers for Small Island Developing States (SIDS)** is fully operational, with an aim to accelerate the energy and climate transformation by creating economies of scales, equal progress and spill-over effects between countries
- **UAE-Caribbean Renewable Energy Fund** provides two cycles of funding, covering 12 countries
- The Pacific Energy Advisory Group created a platform for
### Disaster Risk Reduction

- **New government posts** relating to risk resilience were created in Solomon Islands, Vanuatu, Tonga and Fiji (*Pacific Risk Resilience Programme*)
- Increased **implementation of ‘risk-informed’ development undertaken** in Solomon Islands, Vanuatu, Tonga and Fiji, and increased ownership of the approach perceived in participants (*Pacific Risk Resilience Programme*)
- **Platform on Disaster Displacement established**, and a toolbox developed to better prevent and prepare Pacific SIDS for displacement and to respond to situations when people are forced to find refuge, within their own country or across the border (*Nansen Initiative*)
- **Disaster Loss Databases** built for the SIDS from all regions included in the initiative to provide evidence-based understanding of the true extent of damages and losses, identifying specific hazards and providing a new view on the magnitude of Extensive Risk losses (*Building Capacities for Increased Public Investment in Integrated Climate Change Adaptation and Disaster Risk Reduction*)
- **The multi-hazard, probabilistic global disaster risk model** developed by UNISDR has for the first time provided many of SIDS countries with rough but realistic measures of catastrophic risk (such as Average Annual Loss and Probable Maximum Loss) (*UNISDR*)
- **Substantial increases in Risk Reduction budgets** (e.g. Comoros), and the creation of **risk transfer facilities** in the Indian Ocean Commission countries. (*Integrated Climate Change Adaptation and Disaster Risk Reduction*)
- **Pacific Training Course on Disaster Risk Management of Cultural Heritage** in Small Island Developing States (Vanuatu, October 2015) (*Heritage Strengthening in the Pacific*)
- Through PIEMA (UN Partnership for SDGs), Pacific Island Countries have received resources (vehicles & equipment) to support the strengthening of capability for Fire Services, Police and disaster management. Training has also been provided to several Pacific Island Countries with focus on common incident management systems, emergency operations center functions and operations as well as specialist training such as Fire Investigation, etc. (*PIEMA*)
- Utilising the strengths of Digicel's business networks and products and the technical expertise of UNISDR, **Pacific business awareness of disaster risk reduction and access to recovery products has been increased** (*Digicel Pacific and*...
| **Oceans and Seas** | • More than 420 Indo-Pacific sites in the locally managed marine area (LMMA) network involve around 600 villages and LMMAs cover more than 12,000 km² in 15 Pacific Island States. Villages have seen direct benefits in increased fisheries catches (LMMA Network).
• Marae Moana multiple use marine park in Cook Islands, covers an area of 1.9 million square kilometers, and was legally designated in 2017.
• 96 villages participated in the Samoa Community-Based Fisheries Management Program, strengthening stewardship of coastal fisheries management (Samoa Community-Based Fisheries Management Program).
• Coral nurseries have been established in both Grenada and the sister island of Carriacou, with training for community members (Grenada Government).
• Community co-managed mangrove restoration pilot project is underway in Grenada (Grenada Government).
• A coastal zone management policy has been developed for Grenada, Carriacou and Petite Martinique (Grenada Government).
• Improved information on key fisheries management and monitoring, control and surveillance (MCS) issues was provided for Forum Fisheries Agency (Pacific) members and stakeholders (Pacific Islands Oceanic Fisheries Management).
• Regional nodes of the Global Partnership on Marine Litter have so far been established in the Wider Caribbean Region and the Northwest Pacific.
• Coral Triangle Initiative achievements Asia-Pacific include more than 3 million hectares of MPAs declared, thousands of small-scale fishers benefiting from Fisheries and Aquaculture Improvement Projects, and hundreds of women engaged in financial inclusion and empowerment projects with increased recognition and engagement in marine resource management.
• Caribbean Challenge Initiative participating countries have designated 50 new protected areas: The Bahamas established three marine protected areas, including the largest one in the region. The Dominican Republic established 30 new protected areas, surpassing their goal of conserving at least 20% of nearshore and coastal environments, and Jamaica has set up eight no-take marine zones.
• Launch of the Young Ocean Professionals network and the Ocean Investment Platform for harnessing the power of finance and innovation in support of ocean and island sustainable development (World Ocean Council).
• Establishment of the Palau National Marine Sanctuary, covering 500,000km². |
<p>| <strong>Food Security and</strong> | • Global Action Programme on Food Security and Nutrition in Small Island Developing States (GAP) promotes food security. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nutrition in SIDS (FAO)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Water and Sanitation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Demonstration projects in 6 Atlantic and Indian Ocean SIDS resulted in <strong>nearly 100,000 community members having benefitted from improved water quality</strong>, which reduces poverty, improves health outcomes, facilitates climate change adaptation, and mitigates the threat of natural and man-made hazards (<em>Atlantic and Indian Ocean SIDS Integrated Water Resources Management Project</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>3 pilot financing mechanisms for wastewater management</strong> in Belize, Guyana, and Jamaica were established; <strong>national action plans, regulations and policies</strong> were developed in participating countries; and <strong>wastewater management training programmes</strong> were delivered to more than 600 persons across the region (<em>Caribbean Regional Fund for Wastewater Management - CReW</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>Knowledge sharing and advocacy between drought-affected Pacific SIDS</strong>, relevant development partners and regional and international organisations was improved (<em>Pacific Partnership for Atoll Water Security</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>Capacity of National Water and Sanitation Officers in Pacific SIDS</strong> was increased (<em>Pacific Partnership for Water Security</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>Water security initiatives</strong> undertaken in Pacific SIDS (<em>Pacific Partnership for Water Security</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>Platform for knowledge sharing and advocacy on water and sanitation</strong> established among Pacific SIDS, supporting the <strong>development of regional synthesis reports and progress snapshots</strong> (<em>Pacific Partnership for Action on Safe Water and Sanitation</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Grants for <strong>toilets were provided to 5 communities</strong> in South Tarawa lagoon, as well as sustainable land management training (<em>GEF Small Grants</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>Road maps for waste management</strong> were developed for Antigua (<em>A Series of SIDS In-country Technical Assistance for Sustainable Development Roadmaps</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Application of multi-focal solutions to address holistic and site-specific challenges (droughts, floods, unpredictable rainfall patterns as well as anthropogenic pressures) have <strong>increased Participating SIDS communities’ capacities in ecosystem restoration/protection and improvement of water schemes</strong>. As such, access to potable water as well as agricultural and fisheries reliability increased (<em>A corporate programme of the GEF implemented by UNDP</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>Improved waste management facilities</strong> and strengthened regulatory and enforcement environment developed in Cook Islands (<em>Waste Management and Sanitation Improvement Programme</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sustainable Transport</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Peace Boat Ecoship &quot;Green Technology package&quot; is exportable to other vessels, including smaller cruise ferries operating between islands in SIDS (<em>Peace Boat</em>)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- **Sustainable sea transport** boats were built for use in the Pacific based on traditional canoe designs, including sailing canoes and a solar catamaran (*Okeanos*).
- **Black carbon footprint** from heavy-duty diesel vehicles and engines reduced on several islands in all SIDS regions was reduced (CCAC).
- First **Canoe Summit** was held in Guam in 2016 (*Heritage Strengthening in the Pacific*).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Sustainable Consumption and Production</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- A set of indicators were identified and <strong>data collected on sustainable consumption and production in Pacific's tourism enterprises</strong> (<em>Tourism Development</em>).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Management of Chemicals and Waste, including Hazardous Waste</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- <strong>A waste minimization demonstration project</strong> was supported in Samoa to demonstrate best practice measures for effective waste management and minimisation of marine debris (<em>Global Partnership on Marine Litter</em>).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- <strong>Caribbean platform on Nutrient Management</strong> was established to improve nutrient pollution (<em>Global Partnership on Nutrient Management</em>).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- <strong>Pilot projects on disaster waste management</strong> were implemented (<em>Japanese Technical Cooperation Project for Promotion of Regional Initiative on Solid Waste Management in Pacific Island Countries - J-PRISM</em>).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- <strong>Pacific Island Database of Capacity Development Activities (PIDOC)</strong> system was established as a database of regional experts in solid waste management. (<em>J-PRISM</em>).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The <strong>Cleaner Pacific 2025</strong> (regional strategy) was developed and the <strong>Clean Pacific Roundtable</strong> (regional committee) established (<em>J-PRISM</em>).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- <strong>Improved waste management undertaken through a community garbage collection system</strong> in Vava'u, Tonga; Horn collection system in Chuuk State, FSM; <strong>Subsidy programs on home composting</strong>, Clean School Program, <strong>Expanded market composting</strong>, <em>Eco-Bag initiative</em>, and <strong>Semi-aerobic landfill system</strong> in Fiji; as well as weighbridge system and <strong>container Deposit legislation</strong> programme (<em>J-PRISM</em>).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Health and NCDs</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- <strong>National and regional capacities to develop, implement and monitor HIV responses</strong> were strengthened, utilizing a combination prevention approach to meet the needs of young people and key populations (<em>HIV and STI Prevention in the Caribbean</em>).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Regional systems for the delivery of <strong>comprehensive sexuality education (CSE)</strong> in 6 Caribbean countries were improved (<em>HIV and STI Prevention in the Caribbean</em>).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- South-South cooperation for <strong>Health and Family Life Education (HFLE)</strong> Master training was established (<em>HIV and STI Prevention in the Caribbean</em>).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Greater <strong>collaboration and coordination among UN agencies</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>was achieved for efforts to prevent and control NCDs in the Pacific (UN Pacific Interagency Task Force on Noncommunicable Disease Prevention and Control - UN PIATF)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comprehensive Sexuality Education (CSE) developed as part of national programs and activities within schools in the Pacific, including training of teachers (Supporting Comprehensive Sexuality Education in the Pacific)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Development</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Biodiversity</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| - The **Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund (CEPF)** implemented a **US$6.9 million investment in eight Caribbean SIDS** and at the regional level through 77 grants to 68 CSOs, with 78% of the funds going to local and regional Caribbean CSOs. **Demonstrable improvements in management were achieved in 25 Key Biodiversity Areas covering a total of 593,967 hectares. Eight new protected areas** were created covering 111,496 hectares in The Bahamas, the Dominican Republic and Haiti, including terrestrial and marine national parks, municipal reserves and a private protected area.  
- Establishment of the **Caribbean Biodiversity Fund for biodiversity conservation**, which is currently supported by the German Development Bank, Global Environment Facility, and The Nature Conservancy  
- Launch of the **Pacific Environment Community (PEC) Fund** to promote the development and implementation of practical Pacific-tailored approaches to combating the impacts of climate change, with approximately USD 4M allocated for each of the 14 participants  
- Completed projects in 2016 (Pacific) **promoted sustainable land restoration, mangrove reforestation and water resource management**, increasing effectiveness of ecosystem services, and resulting in agricultural and fisheries reliability, food and water security, improved nutrition and well-being as well diversified income-generation activities (**A corporate programme of the GEF implemented by UNDP**)  
- **Networking between Pacific Biopshere reserves** undertaken (**Pacific Biosphere Reserves Network**)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Invasive Alien Species</strong></th>
<th><strong>Means of Implementation,</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| - **Increased political and technical support for invasive species management**, with capacity development to Pacific island countries and territories and development of best practice resources (**Pacific Invasive Partnership**)  
- **Increased action-on-the ground** including successful eradication of invasive plants, rodents, cats, rabbits and goats on islands and on-going control of rats, invasive plants and invasive birds (**Pacific Invasive Partnership**)  
- **Increased cooperation and coordination** at the national and regional levels such as the establishment of French Polynesia Invasive Species Archipelagic Network and the Micronesia Regional Invasive Species Council (**Pacific Invasive Partnership**)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Means of Implementation,</strong></th>
<th><strong>Invasive Alien Species</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| - A unified statewide **sustainability vision** for 2030 for Hawaii developed, with indicators, capacity building, inspiration and coordinated action (**Aloha+ Challenge**)  

- **Capacity of over 100 heritage managers, government officials and other stakeholders involved in heritage management in Pacific SIDS enhanced** through a series of capacity building activities (**Pacific Heritage Hub**)
| including Partnerships | • A Centre of Excellence COE for Sustainable Development of SIDS created in Aruba, as a contribution to knowledge sharing and capacity building, with the first training session attended by policy-makers from close to 30 SIDS (Centre of Excellence for the Sustainable Development of SIDS – UNDP and Government of Aruba)  
• Global, regional and national data and knowledge for environmental assessment and reporting made accessible; transforming data and information into indicators (UNEP Live)  
• Innovation and diffusion of green technologies promoted through an online platform (WIPO Green)  
• Digital innovations applied: 1. A Computer Aided SDG Advisor that can help the SIDS assess their status and launch the needed services 2. A powerful computer aided planner that allows rapid implementation of over 150 services that support 12 SDG goals 3. An implementation methodology that combines the aforementioned tools with capacity building for the youth (ICT4SIDS)  
• Development of a Virtual University for Small States of the Commonwealth (VUSSC), with ability to deliver courses using new technologies  
• Development of a Pacific Islands Universities Research Network to generate knowledge through research and publication on priority challenges in the Pacific region. |

**Identifying under-represented areas that could be addressed through new or enhanced partnerships**

The results of the in-depth analysis, as well as data from the Human Development Index (HDI) compiled for SIDS countries by UNDP, highlight some under-represented Samoa Pathway priority areas, which may require further attention, including through partnerships. These areas include:

- **Aspects of social and economic development, in particular addressing inequality and ensuring that no one is left behind.** Such partnerships may include actions relating to income inequality, poverty, education, and health, and provide for the inclusion of marginalized groups.
- **Multiple dimensions of poverty,** particularly in countries and areas with a high number of poor and vulnerable households. These partnerships may require sustained investments in human capital, such as education and health, and food and nutrition security, and may include agriculture, small-scale fisheries, rural development, market development, trade and other activities.
- **Sustainable transportation,** particularly in terms of low-carbon, low cost options for communities on remote islands.
- **Water, wastewater and sanitation** in many areas where these services are still inadequate.
- **Health and NCDs**, particularly in assisting countries implement their NCD-related activities.
- **Gender considerations**, particularly in regards to income equality, women's participation in the workforce, and women's leadership.
- **Integrated ecosystem management focusing on whole islands**, particularly on terrestrial and watershed areas, and their connection to the sea, as well as human livelihoods.
- **Sustainable consumption and production**, including addressing this topic holistically in the context of small islands.
- **Sourcing development finance for SIDS**, which is an area that has not seen previous partnerships. One proposal was to engage in partnerships with the insurance industry to mobilize innovative financing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Identified gap areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AIS</td>
<td>- Sustainable, equitable and inclusive economic growth, health and NCDs, and gender equality and women's empowerment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Climate change resilience and disaster risk reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Fresh water, waste management, WASH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Reducing dependence on imported fuels and expensive transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Involving more women and youth in decision-making processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Innovation and the transfer of technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>- Poverty, social protections, equality, sustainable consumption and production, water and sanitation, sustainable transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Technology transfer for surveillance and monitoring of EEZs, including as it relates to illegal fishing and piracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Technology as a driver of sustainable development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Participation of women in parliament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Youth, marginalized groups, including people with disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caribbean</td>
<td>- NCDs, terrestrial biodiversity, trade, wastewater and sanitation, trade, and sustainable transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Building resilient health systems, including physical and mental well-being</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Development of an integrated regional emergency response including in relation to pests and animal diseases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Fostering innovation in the maritime domain, and maximizing socio-economic benefits of open science and open data towards developing blue economies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In addition, each region put forward\(^2\) a number of specific gap areas, which broadly overlap with the general gaps presented above. However, the combination of the present review and the regional partnership dialogues and preparatory workshops also articulated additional and more specific issues shown in this table that may require further attention.

**Understanding and defining a genuine and durable partnership**

The partnerships included in this analysis are heterogeneous in nature. This is not surprising since different partnership types and structures and approaches may be required to address different issues in different countries on levels ranging from local to global. At the same time, the partnerships registered in the SIDS Action Platform also include single events such as conferences, implementing and developing government policy and regulations, and projects related to overseas development funding, some of which are unlikely to be true multi-stakeholder partnerships. All three regional partnership dialogues noted that there is a need to better define and understand what constitutes a genuine and durable partnership, and to build capacity on this issue among those coordinating partnerships. The SIDS Partnership Criteria and Norms, based on the SMART criteria, as well as capacity building, was developed to address this issue.

**Partnership challenges**

Common partnership challenges across the three regions included sustainable financing; capacity (human and institutional); an enabling environment dictated by the national social and political context; enabling conditions for the participation of all stakeholders in partnerships; ensuring that the right people with the right expertise are involved in each partnership; lack of trust between partners; and weak institutional, legal and governance structures.

In addition, the monitoring of partnerships and their impacts presented many challenges. There is a lack of baseline data for partnerships, as well as limited monitoring and evaluation frameworks to assess progress. Access to information and statistics, managing data, and knowledge transfer were issues in many countries.

**Global partnerships**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2014 SIDS</th>
<th>Current number</th>
<th>Complete</th>
<th>Active</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

\(^2\) These gap areas were outlined in reports of the preparatory meetings for the Mid-Term Review of the SAMOA Pathway, as well as the Samoa Partnership Dialogues.
Global partnerships have the important function of providing for dialogue and learning between regions, while allowing countries to make collective progress on issues and policies of common concern.

Climate change and resilience is by far the largest priority area of global SIDS partnerships, approximately half of which address this topic in some way. Other common priority areas of partnerships on the global level include biodiversity and oceans; access to education, particularly higher education; access to technologies, data and information; as well as renewable energy.

The priority area of sustainable economic development includes partnerships designed to assist national transitions to green and blue economies, including its components such as sustainable tourism and fisheries. Priority areas with far fewer partnerships include social development, poverty, gender equality, sustainable consumption and production, health and NCDs, and sustainable transportation.

There are currently 147 global and inter-regional SIDS-relevant partnerships registered. These are either partnerships specifically designed for SIDS to collaborate across regions and share experiences, or global partnerships involving SIDS and other countries. South-South cooperation, in particular, offers opportunities for SIDS to advance knowledge and implementation of the SAMOA Pathway.

Out of the 147 partnerships, the overwhelming majority, a total of 76 partnerships, are led by United Nations organizations. 21 are led by NGOs, 17 by IGOs, 11 by governments, 9 by coalitions of organizations, 7 by academia/research organizations, 5 by the private sector, and one by several regional organizations working together. A relatively high number (48%) are reporting.
At the 2014 SIDS Conference, 113 global/inter-regional partnerships were registered, and the current number of 147 is a slight increase on the 2014 total. However, 30 of the registered partnerships have now been completed or are presumed completed, making the total number of current active global partnerships 117. Several partnerships are set to expire in 2018, and this may present an opportunity for new global partnerships to be registered in response to priority and underrepresented areas.

One important function of global SIDS partnerships is to provide for dialogue and learning between regions, and at the same time, to allow countries to make collective progress on issues and policies of common concern. The Global Island Partnership (see box below) is an example of a global high-level islands partnership that aims to build resilient and sustainable island communities by inspiring leadership, catalyzing commitments and facilitating collaboration for all islands.
Global Island Partnership (GLISPA)

Led by the Presidents of Palau and Seychelles, the Prime Minister of Grenada and the Premier of the British Virgin Islands, the Global Island Partnership promotes action to build resilient and sustainable island communities by inspiring leadership, catalyzing commitments and facilitating collaboration. It is a partnership for all islands, regardless of size or political status, to take greater action to conserve and sustainably utilize invaluable island natural resources that support people, culture and livelihoods around the world.

GLISPA realizes its mission by undertaking the following actions:

- Mobilizing high level political will for island commitments and action on resilience and sustainability.
- Building and strengthening partnerships that implement global resilience, conservation & sustainability goals on islands, especially the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).
- Helping members strategize to bring global attention to and support for island solutions and initiatives, especially through major international meetings & conferences.

Since launch in 2006, the Partnership has engaged high-level leaders to catalyze US$150 million for island action and assisted 35+ countries to launch or strengthen major sustainable island commitments. GLISPA now has more than 30 members and 37 friends as part of the island movement.


Figure 6 Global Island Partnership

While GLISPA provides an overarching platform for collaboration on island issues, most of the global partnerships are focused on one or several SAMOA Pathway priority areas. Climate change and renewable energy are addressed through many global partnerships, while other priority areas, particularly those relating to poverty, health and social sustainability, are less represented overall.

Climate change is by far the largest priority area of global partnerships, and approximately half of the registered global partnerships address climate change or climate resilience in some way. These partnerships cover resilience-building, adaptation, climate finance, climate data, migration, climate change and health, and other relevant topics. Many of the partnerships provide opportunities for South-South collaboration, and for learning from a community of climate practitioners.
Some examples of climate change-related partnerships include the SIDS Blue Guardians Partnership for Protecting Oceans and Climate-resilient Blue Economies; South-South Cooperation between Pacific and Caribbean SIDS on Climate Change Adaptation and Disaster Risk Management (DRM); German Strategic Cooperation with SIDS on Climate Change Adaptation & Disaster Risk Management; World Bank’s Small Island States Resilience Initiative (SISRI); The Commonwealth’s Climate Finance Access Hub; the Global Adaptation Network (GAN) to help build climate resilience of vulnerable communities, ecosystems and economies through the mobilization of knowledge for adaptation; and Climate Resilient Islands Partnership: An Inter-Regional Partnership on Climate Change Planning and Finance in Small Island Developing States.

Renewable energy and energy efficiency is the focus of more than 15 of the global SIDS partnerships. Some examples of these partnerships include the Lighthouses Initiative led by IRENA (see box below); SIDS-SIDS Partnership on Sustainable Energy for Blue Island Economies; German Strategic Cooperation with SIDS on Sustainable Energy; Global Efficient Lighting Partnership Programme; The En.lighten Initiative, which promotes efficient lighting technologies; and IRENA’s Global Renewable Energy Islands Network (GREIN).

**Lighthouses Initiative**

IRENA has developed the SIDS Lighthouses Initiative to support the strategic deployment of renewable energy in SIDS, to bring clarity to policy makers regarding the required steps, and to enable targeted action. As a joint effort of SIDS and development partners, this framework for action will assist in transforming SIDS energy systems through the establishment of the enabling conditions for a renewable energy-based future, by moving away from developing projects in isolation to a holistic approach that considers all relevant elements spanning from policy and market frameworks, through technology options to capacity building.

The Lighthouses Initiative has five main objectives:

1. Develop and implement a structured approach to island power sector transitions to high shares of renewable energy through a set of guidelines, tools and support mechanisms, thus enabling more efficient use of resources
2. Accelerate renewable energy transitions through identification of needs and gaps, and learning from experiences on other islands.
3. Strengthen knowledge base and building of institutional capacity that can handle a rapid and profound transition
4. Facilitate development of enabling frameworks for investment
5. Identify funding opportunities and facilitate matchmaking between project developers and funding organizations


While disaster risk reduction is often featured in climate change partnerships, it is not as prominent as adaptation. Other disaster risk reduction topics for partnerships include global tsunami warning and mitigation systems.
Biodiversity and the oceans are, either directly or indirectly, part of more than half of the registered partnerships.

Oceans-related initiatives are more common than terrestrial ones, and include many large global collaborations on topics such as marine protected areas, prevention of marine pollution, blue carbon, coral reefs, ocean acidification, and improved governance of fisheries and other ocean resources.

Some examples include UNEP's Blue Carbon Initiative; the Global Programme of Action for Prevention of Marine Pollution from Land-based sources (UNEP-GPA), and its partnerships on marine litter, wastewater, nutrients, and waste; International Coral Reef Initiative, Global Coral Reef Monitoring Network; Global Ocean Acidification Observing Network (GOA-ON); and SANDWATCH, a Global Observatory of Changing Environments in SIDS based on citizen science.

Many global partnerships focus on improving access to education, particularly higher education in SIDS, and on improving the available data for ecosystem management. The educational initiatives include the University Consortium of Small Island States (UCSIS) and its efforts at SIDS-related curriculum development, including an online higher degree on sustainable development (see box below).

Other educational programmes include the Global Universities Partnership on Environment and Sustainability (GUPES), which is UNEP's flagship program on environmental education, aiming to increase mainstreaming of environment and sustainability practices to curricula in universities; and the Virtual University for Small States of the Commonwealth (VUSSC), which is a university training network of small countries committed to the collaborative development of free content resources for use in an educational context.

The United Nations' Division for Ocean Affairs and the Law of the Sea, Office of Legal Affairs (DOALOS) collaborates with the International Seabed Authority and other intergovernmental organizations to promote and facilitate the development and conduct of marine scientific research (MSR) in accordance with the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS). The partnership will include demand-driven online training courses, and providing an ongoing opportunity for MSR Professionals to reinforce their knowledge and share experiences within a community of practice, which will be networked through an Internet Portal. The Nippon Foundation and DOALOS collaborate on building capacities on ocean governance for the implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals.

**University Consortium of Small Island States (UCSIS)**

The UCSIS, with the support of UNDESA and the Government of Spain developed an online Master of Science course on Sustainable Development, which launched in 2014. The degree is targeted for students from UCSIS member universities and is supported by an IT platform developed for the universities under the project. Building on this success, the UCSIS will design a joint research programme to develop solutions to key development issues affecting Small Island States. The
There were also many partnerships that sought to improve access to technologies and information for sustainable development in SIDS.

A number of organizations, including the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO), Climate Technology Centre and Network (CTCN) and UN Environment support access to technologies. Among this is WIPO's Access to Research for Development and Innovation (ARDI), which provides research institutions in developing countries free or low-cost access to over 20,000 journals, books and reference works across numerous scientific and technical disciplines; and WIPO GREEN, which promotes innovation and diffusion of green technologies by promoting skill and technology sharing.

UNEP Live provides support to integrated environmental assessment processes by making accessible global, regional and national data and knowledge flows. The ICT4SIDS Partnership provides assistance to the implementation of SDGs through latest digital innovations. The private sector was involved in partnerships to provide better telecommunications and broadband access to SIDS.

In addition to technologies, a number of partnerships support SIDS through better access to environmental data. They include the International Hydrographic Organization, which provides fundamental mapping of seas and oceans, as well as hydrographic data, and the Global Ocean Biodiversity Initiative (GOBI), which compiles data on marine biodiversity, including ecosystems and species, for better understanding and management of the ocean.

The priority area of economic development is also relatively well covered, although topics such as trade are under-represented. Partnerships relating to economic development incorporate national transitions to green and blue economies, sustainable tourism, microfinance, repurposing plastic litter in the ocean, rebuilding fisheries, combatting illegal, unreported and unregulated (IUU) fishing, and trade in fisheries.

Some examples of partnerships include UNEP’s Partnership for Action on Green Economy (PAGE); Global Partnership for Sustainable Tourism; Microlead, a local microfinance programme led by UNCDF; the Commonwealth Marine Economies (CME) Programme; FAO’s programmes on blue growth, strengthening fisheries and implementing the Port State Measures Agreement; and UNCTAD’s Trade in Fisheries initiative. An innovative economic initiative undertaken by Parley for the Oceans, in collaboration with the private sector and governments, seeks to repurpose plastic waste found on beaches.

**Parley for the Oceans – repurposing plastic waste**
Parley for the Oceans has initiated a global movement with a proven approach to solutions: the Parley AIR Strategy: Avoid. Intercept. Redesign. Led by the principles of AIR, the organization aims to tackle the global marine plastic pollution crisis through creativity, collaboration, and eco-innovation, providing a space and network where creators, thinkers, and leaders come together to raise awareness for the beauty and fragility of our oceans and collaborate on projects that can end their destruction.

Since its inception in 2012, Parley for the Oceans has partnered with progressive private sector partners, notably Adidas to change industry and consumer behavior around use of plastics. Through its Corporate AIR guidelines, Adidas has phased out their use of plastics and microplastics in their consumer products and focused on integrating Parley Ocean PlasticTM as a replacement for virgin plastic. Parley Ocean Plastic is made from upcycled plastic waste material recovered from coastal areas through Parley cleanup operations implemented in partnership with governments under its Remote Island Coastal Interception Program. Parley through its partnership with UN SIDS focuses on a Call To Action to scale up the implementation of Parley AIR in vulnerable countries. The Republic of the Maldives and the Government of Grenada have already implemented Parley AIR with others on board to implement AIR before the end of 2017.

More information is available at http://www.sids2014.org/partnerships/?p=15581

Figure 9 Parley for the Oceans

The area of social development is under-represented in global partnerships, and there was no partnership found that specifically focused on poverty reduction.

While there were several partnerships relating to youth, such as the SIDS Youth Network, only one global partnership directly address gender equality; a partnership to enhance the role of women in marine scientific research through capacity building led by the International Seabed Authority.

One partnership, a corporate programme of the GEF implemented by United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), sought to reduce the vulnerability and increase adaptive capacity of communities and disabled persons to manage the additional risks of climate change.

Sustainable Consumption and Production was similarly under-represented, only with one partnership titled the “Sustainable Consumption and Production for SIDS Initiative”, which aims to undertake the development of national SCP Plans and sub-regional coordination planning frameworks for SIDS, including the promotion of lifecycle based and integrated planning methods.

The SAMOA Pathway priority area of health was represented by two registered global partnerships: the Joint United Nations Team on AIDS (JUNTA) initiative on HIV/AIDS prevention, and the NCD Alliance; with 2,000 civil society organizations in more than 170 countries, dedicated to improving NCD prevention and control worldwide. Considering the prevalence of NCDs in SIDS, this area could be enhanced through improved support to SIDS on their national NCD actions.
Finally, transportation was represented by two International Maritime Organization (IMO) projects: the IMO’s Global Maritime Technology Cooperation Centres’ Network Project (GMN), which conducts training on energy efficiency and GHG in shipping; and a project to reduce hull fouling in ships.

Figure 10 Percentage of global partnerships addressing Samoa Pathway priority areas. Climate change, oceans and biodiversity dominate.

Atlantic, Indian Ocean, and South China Sea (AIS)

The nine AIS-region SIDS are spread across the Atlantic Ocean (Cape Verde, Guinea-Bissau, São Tomé and Principe), the Indian Ocean (Comoros, the Maldives, Mauritius, the Seychelles), the Persian Gulf (Bahrain), and the South China Sea (Singapore).

While the region is geographically dispersed and culturally diverse, the SIDS in this region share many common features and challenges. They range in size from the Maldives with an area of 298 km² to Guinea-Bissau with an area of 36,120 km², and with arable land ranging from 2% in Singapore to 49% in Mauritius. While they vary in the level of human and

---

economic development patterns, all rely heavily upon natural resources for livelihoods (with fish being the common resource), and some face significant challenges regarding economic development, social justice, and environmental preservation.

The geographic dispersion of the region represents a special challenge in terms of coordination and intra-regional cooperation. There is currently no regional body to address cooperation on sustainable development for the entire AIMS region, and the urgent need to develop further and strengthen regional support mechanisms for intra-regional cooperation, partnerships and exchange has been noted by the United Nations.

The Indian Ocean Commission brings together five countries in the region [Comoros, France (Reunion), Madagascar, Mauritius and Seychelles], and has taken an active role in facilitating partnerships.

The lack of a regional framework has been cited as a reason for infrequent knowledge integration and lack of policy coherence on topics such as food security and ecosystem-based adaptation, and likely contributes to the shortage of partnerships encompassing the entire AIMS region. Despite these challenges, many sub-regional and national partnerships exist in the region, greatly contributing to its sustainable development.

**Status and trends of partnerships**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2014 SIDS Conference</th>
<th>Current number of partnerships</th>
<th>Number of completed partnerships</th>
<th>Active partnerships</th>
<th>Number reporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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8 This figure only includes partnerships registered in the SIDS Action Platform.
A total of 72 registered partnerships pertaining to the AIS region are registered in the SIDS Action Platform. An additional 10 partnerships were reported on in the AIMS Regional Report of the Mid-Term Review of the Samoa Pathway\(^9\), bringing the total up to 82. Of these partnerships, a majority, or 60, are undertaken on the national level, while 22 are sub-regional or regional, involving two or more countries. Thus, the majority of AIS region partnerships are undertaken through collaborative arrangements between national agencies and other entities on the local, national or global levels, including with United Nations agencies.

Oceans and seas is the largest priority area in the AIS region (28% of total partnerships), followed by social development and sustainable economic growth. The oceans and seas priority area includes partnerships on marine and coastal conservation, spatial planning, species conservation, sustainable aquaculture, marine pollution prevention, and blue economies. None of the priority areas is particularly under-represented, but health, NCDs, and gender, are lacking in partnerships.

Climate change and disaster risk are less prominently addressed by partnerships in this region, compared to other regions. Food security has a strong focus on fisheries, with agriculture less prominently featured, while the few sustainable transportation partnerships focuses on shipping. With some of the water, wastewater, sanitation and watershed management partnerships having completed their work, this area may also require further focus.

Countries in the AIS region also frequently participated in partnerships that are global or encompass multiple SIDS regions. A total of 144 global and multi-regional partnerships include AIS region countries. Singapore, Mauritius, Seychelles and the Maldives registered the most partnerships, and many of these were commitments for the UN Ocean Conference. On the opposite extreme, Bahrain did not participate in any registered partnerships, and Guinea Bissau was involved in five partnerships.

There has been an increasing trend in partnerships in the AIS region, which had only 20 partnerships registered at the 2014 SIDS Conference. The UN Ocean Conference provided a catalyst for a large number of new ocean-related partnerships, particularly in regards to national-level commitments for ocean action, and as a result, the number of national and regional AIS partnerships registered in the SIDS Action Platform rose from 20 to 72 between 2014 and 2018.

---

\(^9\) AIMS Regional Report 2018 – Mid-term review of the Samoa Pathway in the Atlantic, Indian Ocean, Mediterranean and South China Sea Region
Only one partnership, the SIDS Youth AIMS Hub expressly includes all the AIS countries. More common are partnerships that include either the Indian Ocean SIDS countries or some sub-set of them (9 partnerships), or the Eastern Atlantic SIDS of the AIS region (3 partnerships). Collaborations between two or three countries are also common.

One partnership, the Atlantic and Indian Ocean SIDS Integrated Water Resources Management Project, brought together both the Indian Ocean and Atlantic SIDS, with Cabo Verde, Comoros, Maldives, Mauritius, São Tomé and Príncipe and Seychelles participating. This project, which was funded by the Global Environment Facility and implemented by UNEP and UNDP, was completed in 2017.

Some AIS countries also partner with African countries, for example the participation of Mauritius in the Switch Africa Green programme, a partnership between 7 pilot African countries including Mauritius and the European Union to achieve sustainable development through the adoption of sustainable consumption and production practices.

**SIDS Youth AIMS Hub (SYAH) – an example of a collaborative partnership involving the entire AIMS region**

SYAH focuses on advancing and implementing youth-led sustainable development in Small Island Developing States (SIDS) found in the Atlantic, Indian Ocean, Mediterranean, and South China Sea (AIMS) region. Owing to the geographical dispersion of SIDS within the AIMS region, lack of access to youth funding, and the common need to set up an entity that will enable SIDS youth within the AIMS region to collaborate on addressing common needs, the youth participants of the My World, My SIDS AIMS Region Youth Meeting organized by UNESCO, UNICEF and other UN agencies and partners in Seychelles during July 2013, committed to set up a dynamic network of young people within the AIMS region. The creation of such a youth network was also endorsed by Governments in the AIMS region in the Outcome Document of the SIDS AIMS Regional High-Level Preparatory Meeting.

The areas of collaboration will involve empowerment of vulnerable/marginalised youth, the environment and community development, amongst others.

More information is available at: http://www.sids2014.org/partnerships/?p=7402

*Figure 11 SIDS Youth AIMS Hub.*

The majority, or 50, of the 82 regional and national partnerships are led by government entities, with two or more governments collaborating in some cases. This demonstrates a high degree of government leadership and involvement in partnerships.
The region demonstrates some interesting private sector collaborations, with private sector partners taking the lead in sustainable tourism initiatives, including reducing single-use plastics, and participating in risk mapping using drone technology, getting airports ready for disasters, and contributing to youth and education programs.

A total of 16 of the 72 national and regional partnerships registered in the SIDS Action Platform fulfill the SMART criteria as currently reported, while the rest (56) do not. In some cases, this may reflect lack of reporting about certain project components rather than an actual lack of SMART design in the partnerships. Thus the lack of adherence to SMART criteria likely indicates both a need for improved reporting on all aspects of a partnership, and the need to further define and understand the relationship between genuine and durable partnerships and the SMART criteria.

ECOWAS Centre for Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency (ECREEE)

In 2010, the ECOWAS Centre for Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency (ECREEE) was established in Cape Verde with support of the ECOWAS Commission, UNIDO and the Austrian and Spanish Governments. The regional centre of excellence works in fifteen West African countries including the two small island developing states Cape Verde and Guinea Bissau. ECREEE aims at the establishment of an enabling environment for renewable energy and energy efficiency investments and markets. ECREEE coordinates and executes regional programs, projects and activities in the areas of capacity and policy development, information and data sharing, as well as investment and business promotion. In close partnership with SIDS DOCK it is intended to establish the centre as the coordinative hub and think-tank for regional sustainable energy cooperation between all African islands.

In providing for capacity building and technology transfer, ECREE has established regional train-the-trainer networks and south-south/north-south partnerships for knowledge and technology transfer.
More information is available at http://www.sids2014.org/partnerships/?p=7510

Figure 13 ECOWAS Centre for Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency

Figure 14 Percentage of AIMS/AIS partnerships addressing Samoa Pathway priority areas. While all areas are addressed, oceans have the most partnerships.

Expansion of sea cucumber grow-out operations to support coastal community livelihoods

A couple of years since the start of the sea cucumber fishery in the Maldives in mid-1980s, the fishery experienced a drastic decline. A fishery that exclusively targeted high-valued sea cucumber species changed quickly to include mid- and lower-valued varieties. The export-oriented sea cucumber trade generates close to USD 1 million annually. The fishery is usually carried out as a small-scale operation in rural island communities. The Ministry of Fisheries and Agriculture, with assistance from the International Fund for Agricultural Development launched the Mariculture Enterprise Development Project in 2013, with the objective of developing mariculture as an income and employment opportunity for the rural islands, with emphasis on creating opportunities for women and youth. Sea cucumber grow out is being piloted in two island communities, providing beneficiaries small loans in the form of material and seed required to start grow-out operations, since October 2016. The project targets supplementing incomes of households through the sea cucumber grow-out operation. The project collaborates with the only hatchery facility in operation in
the Maldives for the provision of seed and training for the beneficiaries. The hatchery operation is committed to providing the pilot communities with seed required for future cycles.

More information is available at http://www.sids2014.org/partnerships/?p=18028

Figure 15 Expansion of sea cucumber grow-out operations to support coastal community livelihoods

**Measuring impacts of partnerships**

While there is no consistent source of information about the impacts of partnerships on beneficiaries and on sustainable development in the region, some information is available from individual partnerships. Where impacts have been reported, they have often been real and tangible. This is the case, for example, for the Atlantic and Indian Ocean SIDS Integrated Water Resources Management Project as described in the box below.

**The Atlantic and Indian Ocean SIDS Integrated Water Resources Management Project**

The Atlantic and Indian Ocean SIDS Integrated Water Resources Management Project addresses issues related to the management of water resources, both freshwater and coastal marine areas in an integrated manner, in six participating SIDS of which 2 are located in the Atlantic Ocean (Cape Verde and Sao Tome & Principe) and 4 are located in the Indian Ocean (Comoros, Maldives, Mauritius and Seychelles). The project sought to accelerate progress on Integrated Water Resources Management and improved Water Use Efficiency plans, and water supply and sanitation development goals for the protection and utilization of groundwater and surface water in the participating countries. Demonstration projects were undertaken in all participating countries and, depending on national priorities, related to water use, management, sanitation and access to drinking water.

Through the combined efforts of these six SIDS, nearly 100,000 community members have benefitted from improved water quality, which reduces poverty, improves health outcomes, facilitates climate change adaptation, and mitigates the threat of natural and man-made hazards. Demonstration projects in each country have also contributed to gender equality by acknowledging and reinforcing the role that women play in managing water, and mainstreaming gender dimensions into wider project outputs.


Figure 16 The Atlantic and Indian Ocean SIDS Integrated Water Resources Management Project

In addition, many SIDS in the region have experienced increased access to renewable energy and electricity as a result of partnerships. For example, in São Tomé and Príncipe, renewable energy partnerships allowed for the increase in capacity of renewable energy and the improvement in the reliability of the electricity supply that has been demonstrated
by an increase of 2.2 MW of the capacity of generating hydroelectric energy; and reduction of energy losses on the intervention area up to 33 per cent\textsuperscript{10}.

Some partners in the region have also provided important capacity building for other SIDS. For example, the Singapore Cooperation Programme (SPC), which is Singapore’s flagship flagship technical assistance programme, has offered training to SIDS in a wide variety of Samoa Pathway priority areas. Since its beginning in 1992, over 119,000 officials from more than 170 developing countries have joined SCP programmes in areas such as education, transport, economic development and trade promotion, judiciary and public administration\textsuperscript{11}.

Going forward there is a need to improve monitoring of partnerships, and to make information about their impacts available through a central location. Some suggestions towards this end are made in the final section.

**Integration of priority areas and spillover effects**

The majority of the national and regional partnerships help achieve the goals of more than one of the SAMOA Pathway priority areas. Out of the 66 national and regional partnerships, 48 address at least two SAMOA Pathway priority areas, and many address multiple ones. Even the 18 partnerships and projects that indicate only one priority area (generally this was oceans and seas or sustainable transport) likely contribute to building human and institutional capacity, transfer of technology and improving information sharing and/or infrastructure, thus building skills, providing employment, improving the informational basis for decision-making, and impacting economic activities (for example, where shipping infrastructure was improved). Without monitoring and evaluation built into each partnership, however, it is difficult to measure these on-the-ground impacts.

Those partnerships that contributed to multiple SAMOA Pathway priority areas were often clustered together. For example, partnerships relating to fisheries, also often promote sustainable consumption and production, and food security and nutrition. Partnerships relating to water and sanitation also recognized a contribution to human health. Partnerships relating to oceans or climate change also often included disaster risk reduction, biodiversity, and renewable energy. In some cases they also included social goals related to livelihoods, social development, human health and gender equality. One concrete example of this cluster is the Western Indian Ocean Coastal Challenge (WIOCC), which promotes actions for climate resilient development that achieves effective conservation of

\textsuperscript{10} AIMS Regional Report 2018 – Mid-term review of the Samoa Pathway in the Atlantic, Indian Ocean, Mediterranean and South China Sea Region

\textsuperscript{11} AIMS Regional Report 2018 – Mid-term review of the Samoa Pathway in the Atlantic, Indian Ocean, Mediterranean and South China Sea Region
biodiversity, enhanced livelihoods and economies for greater social security among coastal communities. Similarly, the partnerships relating to sustainable “blue” ocean economies placed themselves in the nexus of environmental protection and social and economic development, which require integrated approaches for governance, as demonstrated by the Northern Mozambique Channel partnership in the box below.

**Northern Mozambique Channel Partnership – an example of an integrated approach**

The Northern Mozambique Channel (NMC) region is one of the world’s outstanding marine biodiversity areas and a biological reservoir for all East African coastal areas and the Indian Ocean at large. The natural and economic assets of the NMC will emerge as drivers of national and regional development on a scale not previously realized in East Africa, from living assets, hydrocarbons and human resources, and place unprecedented strain on ecosystems and natural resources. The Northern Mozambique Channel partnership is emerging, and will involve countries, civil society and the private sector with the goal to deliver a sustainable blue economy that preserves and builds the wealth of the region across the natural, social, and economic capitals. Its long term vision is that “the people, countries and economies of the Northern Mozambique Channel prosper in a sustainable future founded on the natural and cultural assets and diversity of the region”.

The themes emerging from this work include regional collaboration on combating pollution and contingency planning; sustainable management of shared fish resources; oceans and climate change; transition to a low carbon pathway; integrated ocean governance; as well as the cross-cutting theme of harmonization of policy, sharing research and knowledge, and developing innovative financing mechanisms.


**Potential gaps**

The potential gap areas in partnerships in this region could be classified into geographic and thematic gaps, and gaps related to stakeholder involvement.

In regards to geographic gaps, there is only one partnership that covers the entire AIMS region, thus highlighting the need for collaboration and cooperation amongst all the SIDS in the region. While there are many excellent sub-regional and national partnerships, working across the entire region would allow for joint learning, capacity development and an exchange of information and experiences. It is likely that the lack of a regional coordinating mechanism for AIMS is one of the main reasons for the absence of partnerships covering the entire region.

In regards to thematic gaps, there seems to be a need for partnerships addressing certain SAMOA Pathway priority areas as their primary topics. These priority areas include sustainable, equitable and inclusive economic growth, health and NCDs and gender equality and women's empowerment. Partnerships targeting sustainable consumption and production were also lacking, but were made up for (at least for some countries) by a global
partnership on this topic. On partnerships relating to the environment, there were few dealing with terrestrial issues, agriculture, and invasive alien species.

The partnerships in the AIS region were mainly partnerships that were led by government agencies, while very few were led by other entities. The heavy emphasis on government action may be due to the fact that governments are more likely to report on their activities in United Nations databases. However, there is a need to further involve civil society, NGOs, the private sector, and academia in the work of the partnerships in this region.

Finally, many of the AIMS partnerships have either been completed or are soon coming to an end. Out of the 66 national and regional partnerships, a high percentage (32%) have now been completed. The mid-term review may thus provide a good opportunity to initiate and build new partnerships in accordance with regional, sub-regional and national priorities.

**Challenges**

Participants at the SIDS Regional Partnership Dialogue for AIMS (Mauritius 22-23 May, 2018) identified a number of challenges around partnerships, which included capacity (human and institutional); sustainable financing; the monitoring and review of partnerships to understand their impact in driving sustainable development; enabling conditions for the participation of all stakeholders in partnerships; the national social and political context within which the partnership operates; and digital information infrastructure to enable communication among partners and beneficiaries.

Challenges reported by other sources\(^{12}\) indicate that weak legal, institutional and human capacities for effective governance are a problem in some countries in the region. Similarly, inadequate data and statistics for monitoring and evaluation, lack of baseline data and indicators, and inadequate links between data collection and planning and monitoring were challenges shared by many countries.

The participants at the regional dialogues also felt that there is a clear need to raise the capacity of SIDS and stakeholders in how to develop genuine and durable partnerships, and enhance their competency in partnering, by developing learning material based on best practices, case studies and lessons learned from existing durable and genuine partnerships.

**Lessons learned and best practices**

Lessons learned discussed at the SIDS Regional Partnership Dialogue for AIMS including the following:

Building stronger partnerships

- Genuine and durable partnerships for SIDS are those based on mutual collaboration, ownership, trust, respect, accountability, and transparency, where SIDS and partners are equal.
- Ownership of partnerships needs to be country-driven, with a shared vision between SIDS and partners.
- Projects on the ground need to be stakeholder-driven, with strong ownership by the community.
- Strong leadership and partnership champions are important, as well as political support for partnerships.
- The national enabling environment (political and social context) is important for the success of the partnership.

Engaging stakeholders locally, nationally, regionally and globally

- There is a need for SIDS to create a set of interrelated local and national conditions that allow stakeholders to fully engage in national development issues and in partnerships.
- There is a need to develop innovative multi-stakeholder partnership engagement strategies, including the private sector, with focus on implementation, knowledge sharing and match-making on partnerships.
- Youth engagement should be done meaningfully and professionally, both in implementation programmes and advocacy.
- There is a need to engage and promote the work of partnerships through regional organizations.

Reporting

- Partnership reporting should be based on accountability, effectiveness and impact of the partnership, evaluating outcomes, learning, knowledge sharing, with value added to those reporting.
- Reporting should be kept light and easy to use on local, national, regional and global levels, include input from implementing partners and beneficiaries, and other stakeholders, keeping in mind that there is no one-size-fits-all approach to reporting of partnerships.
- There is a need to move away from “reporting”, which seems to focus on one-way communication, to exchange of knowledge.

Other

- Data produced at the citizen level must be done through simple protocols which are acceptable at the scientific level.
Pacific

The Pacific is a diverse region of 19 island countries and territories\textsuperscript{13}. The Pacific SIDS include the countries of Fiji, Federated States of Micronesia, Papua New Guinea, Timor-Leste, Vanuatu, Kiribati, Nauru, Samoa, Tonga, Marshall Islands, Palau, Solomon Islands and Tuvalu. The region also includes the territories of American Samoa, Commonwealth of Northern Marianas, Guam, New Caledonia, Cook Islands, French Polynesia, and Niue.

Pacific Island countries have a collective population of about 11.5 million people, spread across a unique and diverse region made up of hundreds of islands, and scattered over an area equivalent to 15\% of the globe’s surface. There is great diversity within the region from Fiji, which is the largest country of the group with a population of around 880,000, to Tuvalu and Nauru, with estimated populations around 10,000 each. Kiribati is one of the most remote and geographically-dispersed countries in the world, consisting of 33 coral atolls spread over 3.5 million square kilometers of ocean\textsuperscript{14}.

Each of these countries share similar challenges and opportunities as small and remote island economies. They are small in size with limited natural resources, narrowly-based economies, large distances away from major markets, and vulnerable to external shocks; all of which can affect growth and have often led to a high degree of economic volatility\textsuperscript{15}.

Pacific Island countries are also some of the most vulnerable in the world to the effects of climate change and natural disasters\textsuperscript{16}. According to the World Risk Report, five Pacific countries are among the top 20 most at risk countries in the world, with the highest average annual disaster losses scaled by gross domestic product. Evidence of the adverse effects of climate change is increasing in the region, particularly in atolls, where sea-level rise and wave-driven flooding are having grave impacts on ground water resources.

The Council of Regional Organisations in the Pacific (CROP) brings together several regional inter-governmental agencies, which play an important role in providing regional coordination and support for Pacific Island countries and territories. They include the Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC), the Forum Fisheries Agency (FFA), the South Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP), the Pacific Islands Development Programme (PIDP), the South Pacific Travel Organization (SPTO), the University of the

\begin{itemize}
  \item Draft Pacific Regional Report 2018 - Mid-term review of the Samoa Pathway in the Pacific
  \item World Bank: https://www.worldbank.org/en/country/pacificislands/overview
  \item Ibid
  \item Draft Pacific Regional Report 2018 - Mid-term review of the Samoa Pathway in the Pacific
\end{itemize}
South Pacific (USP), the Pacific Aviation Safety Organisation, and the Pacific Power Association.

The Pacific Islands Forum (PIF) Secretariat acts as CROP’s permanent chair and provides secretariat support. In addition, the South Pacific Applied Geoscience Commission (SOPAC) and other regional organizations feature in partnerships. United Nations organizations are also active in the region.

### Status and trends of partnerships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of partnerships at 2014 SIDS Conference</th>
<th>Current number of partnerships</th>
<th>Number of completed partnerships</th>
<th>Active partnerships</th>
<th>Number reporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the Pacific region, the analysis looked at 285 partnerships, with 223 being currently active. With 134 partnerships registered in 2014, there has thus been significant increase overall. The majority (89) are regional-level partnerships, but a large number of national driven partnerships also exist. All Pacific island countries and territories are represented through the partnerships.

The partnerships in the Pacific are broadly aligned with oceans (50%), followed by climate change, disaster risk reduction and economic development. The ocean partnerships touch upon marine protected areas, locally managed marine areas, coral reef, mangrove conservation, marine spatial planning, climate resilience and ocean acidification, scientific research and fisheries. Sustainable economic growth was a component of approximately 30% of the partnerships, and ranged from green and blue economies to sustainable financial services and initiatives relating to tourism, agriculture and aquaculture.

Several partnerships in the Pacific incorporate aspects of traditional knowledge and culture. Sustainable and renewable energy, energy efficiency, gender, wastewater and sanitation, health and NCDs, and sustainable transportation is also well represented. Under-represented areas include poverty, inequality, and sustainable consumption and production.
An analysis conducted by the Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat (PIFS)\textsuperscript{17} shows a total of 285 Pacific partnerships, out of which 62 (22\%) have been completed. Out of the 223 active partnerships, a majority, or 89, are regional level partnerships, which include two or more countries. A total of 78 partnerships are national, and only delivered in one country. The rest are global partnerships involving several SIDS regions. In addition, Pacific SIDS participate in many of the other global partnerships detailed in this study.

There has been an increasing trend in registered partnerships following the 2014 SIDS conference, where a total of 134 Pacific partnerships were registered. Many of the more recent partnerships were those registered for the 2017 United Nations Ocean Conference.

Regional agencies are active participants and lead agencies in partnerships. According to data from PIFS, CROP agencies are partners in 87 of the 223 active partnerships, and lead 31 of them. United Nations agencies are included in 77 partnerships and lead in 33 of them. UNDP, UNEP, UNESCO, FAO and UNICEF were most involved in the region, but a total of 17 UN agencies were involved in partnerships in the region.

All Pacific island countries and territories are engaged in partnerships. According to data from PIFS, out of the 78 national-level partnerships, 68 are country-led. Fiji has the largest number at 20 partnerships, Samoa and Tonga have 10 partnerships each, while the Cook Islands has 6 partnerships. The other PSIDS, French Polynesia, Nauru, New Caledonia, Niue, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Republic of the Marshall Islands, Solomon Islands, Tuvalu and Vanuatu all average between 1 to 5 partnerships, with Kiribati and the Federated States of Micronesia being the only PSIDS without country-led partnerships. Most of the country specific and led partnerships were registered after the UN Oceans Meeting in 2017, and include national efforts for coastal fisheries, oceans management, addressing ocean acidification, pollution and conservation.

\textsuperscript{17} First Quadrennial Pacific Sustainable Development: Executive Summary 2018. Prepared by Pacific Islands Forum Countries with support from CROP and UN Agencies in the Pacific; and presentation by Sione Tekiteki, Director, Political Governance, Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat at the SIDS Regional Partnership meeting in Tonga
Overall, countries are engaging well with other stakeholders from the private sector, NGOs, and regional and international development partners to plan and implement partnerships. There is a relatively larger number of partnerships led by civil society and NGOs in the Pacific (a combined 16% of national partnerships in the SIDS Action Platform are led by these entities), and the inclusion of communities and local governments in partnerships is also relatively higher. Private sector leads 6% of the partnerships on the national level, but is involved as a partner in many more. Academic institutions are also involved in many partnerships, and lead 3% of them.

Reporting was initially found to be low. According to PIFS, only 17% of the national partnerships and 44% of the regional partnerships had reported to the SIDS Action Platform as of June 2018\textsuperscript{18}. The figure was higher in October 2018, with 38% of all Pacific partnerships having reported.

According to the PIFS study, an estimated 186 partnerships have resource allocations, while 37 have no information provided. Only 75 of the 186 have specified the allocation of financial resources, the amount of which totals USD 4.2 billion. The rest of the resource allocations relate to in-kind contributions. Of the USD 4.2 billion that has been committed, more than 50% comes from 30 global partnerships. 28 regional partnerships allocated a total of USD 1.6 billion, while a total of 17 national partnerships allocated USD 120.6 million.

\textsuperscript{18} First Quadrennial Pacific Sustainable Development: Executive Summary 2018. Prepared by Pacific Islands Forum Countries with support from CROP and UN Agencies in the Pacific
As with all regions, the Pacific partnerships incorporated a broad set of activities from multi-sectoral partnerships to further goals from health to marine protection, to government policies and single events. There is a need to categorize these partnerships further.

**Pacific Financial Inclusion Programme (PFIF)**

The Pacific Financial Inclusion Programme (PFIP) is a Pacific-wide programme helping to provide sustainable financial services to low income households. By 2019 PFIP aims to have:

- One million low-income people in the Pacific, with at least 50 per cent women, gain access to appropriate/affordable financial services; (600,000 achieved by 2014)
- Additional 150,000 previously unbanked people, with at least 50 per cent women, gain access to a formal savings account;
- Four additional Pacific Islands Countries (PICs) have national financial inclusion strategies that reflect gender differences, and which are based on sound and comprehensive diagnostics. Countries with strategies that are three or more years old review and update their strategies;
- Three additional PICs offer financial education through core curricula and;
- Three additional PICs have national financial literacy strategies in place.

PFIP currently covers Fiji, Papua New Guinea (PNG), Samoa, Solomon Islands (SOI), Tonga and Vanuatu, with Kiribati and Tuvalu potentially covered before the end of July 2019. The aim of the second phase of PFIP (PFIP 2), which will start in July 2014 and end in July 2019 is to respond to the current and emerging challenges that have been identified both from the first phase of PFIP, as well as a four-country onsite consultative process.

More information is available at https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/partnership/?p=7348

**PacSIDS Ridge to Reef Programme Partnership**

The goal of the Pacific Islands National Priorities Multi-Priority area ‘Ridge-to-Reef’ (R2R) program is to maintain and enhance Pacific Island countries’ ecosystem goods and services (provisioning, regulating, supporting and cultural) through integrated approaches to land, water, forest, biodiversity and coastal resource management that contribute to poverty reduction, sustainable livelihoods and climate resilience.

The Pacific Islands R2R program has been designed by the Pacific Island countries to strategically use their GEF STAR allocations to meet both their national priorities and adhere to relevant GEF priority area objectives, outcomes, indicators and outputs.

Given the close inter-connections between land, water and coastal systems in PacSIDS, the planning and management of freshwater use, sanitation, wastewater treatment and pollution control, sustainable land use and forestry practices, balancing coastal livelihoods and biodiversity
conservation, hazard risk reduction, and climate variability and change is best achieved through integrated and coordinated efforts.

GEF funding is directly focused on developing demonstration sites with the latest, but small-scale, technology that will be appropriate for Pacific island communities by promoting the use of appropriate technology, traditional knowledge and practices and strengthen linkages with nationally available expertise and through the development of key knowledge tools in the form of synthesis reports on: (i) climate variability in coastal systems; (ii) hazards and coastal area planning; (iii) ‘blue forests’ and livelihoods; (iv) spatial planning in coastal fisheries; (v) water security and wastewater management; and (vi) land and marine tenure and use designation, including implications for coastal and marine spatial planning.

These will be disseminated online and supporting multi-media products will be developed and syndicated regionally to stimulate national and regional level uptake and use in policy-making and planning. To further support the uptake of regionally accumulated scientific knowledge in policy-making and planning, the project will facilitate exchanges between government and the scientific community via meetings of the Regional Steering Committee and national Inter-Ministry Committees. Linkages will also be established with the community leaders and local government round-table meetings to support broad dissemination of regionally consolidated knowledge and science at the community level.

https://www.pacific-r2r.org/

Figure 20 PacSIDS Ridge to Reef Programme Partnership

Figure 21 Percentage of Pacific partnerships addressing Samoa Pathway priority areas. While most areas are addressed, oceans, climate change, and sustainable economic growth have most partnerships.
**Measuring impacts of partnerships**

Consistent data on the impacts of partnerships on their beneficiaries and on sustainable development as a whole is lacking. However, it is possible to point to individual partnerships, which have measured their impacts, and which demonstrate the potential of the partnership approach to advance sustainable development, providing economic, social and environmental benefits.

The analysis by PIFS\(^{19}\) also indicates that there are some good examples of successful partnerships that have been institutionalized or have delivered tangible outcomes at country and regional level. These partnerships are in the areas of climate change, resilience, oceans management and conservation, disaster risk reduction, NCDs action, culture, education research, capacity building and development effectiveness.

The Locally Managed Marine Areas (LMMA) Network, which started in Fiji and expanded to other parts of the Pacific and beyond, demonstrates direct benefits to sustainable development of villages. In a broader sense, it, along with the Micronesia Challenge (which inspired the Caribbean Challenge and the Western Indian Ocean Coastal Challenge), demonstrates the ability of Pacific home-grown approaches to be scaled up, both nationally and globally.

---

**Locally Managed Marine Areas (LMMA) Network**

Locally Managed Marine Areas (LMMA's) are protected areas that are largely or wholly managed by coastal communities and/or land-owning groups, with the support of government and partner representatives. The communities impose restrictions on areas such as 'no-take zones' and on certain equipment, practices, species or sizes of catches. These zones or restrictions allow resource and habitat recovery in over exploited areas, enabling a return to more sustainable harvest of marine resources for the community.

First recognized in Fiji, LMMA's are being replicated across coastal communities world-wide. More than 420 Indo-Pacific sites in the LMMA network involve around 600 villages and LMMAs cover more than 12,000 km\(^2\) in 15 Pacific Island States. LMMAs are now in Madagascar and Indian Ocean. The LMMA Network is a global initiative founded in 2000 to advance LMMA practices around the world. It consists of communities, dedicated practitioners and government officials all focused on community-based marine resource management projects, providing capacity building, awareness and monitoring support. The Network is about sharing ideas and experiences to improve the performance of LMMAs while empowering greater numbers of communities to manage their marine resources in a sustainable way.

Villages have seen direct benefits in increased fisheries catches. For example, by imposing a closed, "tabu" area around a mangrove island, Sawa villagers found that the numbers of the mangrove lobster *Thalassina anomala* increased by roughly 250 percent annually, with a spillover effect of

---

\(^{19}\) PIFS 2018 based on analysis of PSIDS partnerships information on the SIDS Action Platform
roughly 120 percent outside the tabu area.

A successful LMMA is, in effect, an alternative income source. The increase in fishery resources not only improves nutrition but also raises household income from market sales. Marine resources, on average, make up more than 50 percent of the household income for these villages, and raise these households far above the median income level of F$4000 a year in Fiji.

More information at: https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/partnership/?p=7987


Village by village: recovering Fiji’s coastal fisheries:
http://www.glispa.org/images/Papers/FijiCaseStudy.pdf

Figure 22 Locally Managed Marine Areas (LMMA) Network

A partnership relating to women’s economic empowerment (see box below) also demonstrates tangible impacts. By providing opportunities for marginalized women to access finance and incorporating their economic potential into the wider economy, the partnership has had positive impacts both on the beneficiaries, and on sustainable development as a whole.

Women’s Economic Empowerment Driving Sustainable Development in SIDS – demonstrating impacts on beneficiaries

The partnership began with the Port Moresby (Papua New Guinea) Safe City for Women and Girls Programme. This programme is part of a global initiative aimed at making public spaces safe for women and girls. In Papua New Guinea (PNG) the programme focuses on urban marketplaces, the most populated public spaces in the capital city, where women and girls often experience intense and varied forms of discrimination, particularly gender-based violence. The Safe City programme aims at making markets safe, clean and inclusive.

Since its launch, the programme has had major achievements including helping market vendors open special mobile phone accessible bank accounts with Nationwide Micro-bank, which allow bank their daily earnings, reducing the risk of robbery and assault. In Gerehu market, changes to security contracts and the refurbishment of the toilet block, including separation of male and female toilets, installation of running water and heightened visibility for those entering the facilities, has led to women and girls feeling safer and less vulnerable to sexual and gender-based violence. Additionally, UN Women has used better practices and lessons learned from the Safe City programme to develop a regional initiative in Fiji, Solomon Islands and Vanuatu called the Markets for Change (M4C).

Since its establishment M4C has resulted in more than 150 Solomon Island market vendors opening bank accounts, most for the first time. This is a significant step in expanding marginalised women’s access to finance and incorporating their economic potential into the wider economy. In Fiji, the M4C programme partnership resulted in the construction of 42 new market stalls and construction of a fence around the market infrastructure in Sigatoka. This provided market vendors with protection from weather conditions and has increased security for over 700 market vendors, who were previously vulnerable to theft. Additionally, installation of water storage tanks in Tavua, Fiji, along with improvements to drainage systems, has helped to provide vendors with water reserves and sanitation facilities for use during flooding and regular water disruptions.
In the Pacific region between 75 and 90% of market vendors are women. UN Women's strategy for women's economic empowerment, has a specific focus on market women, and recognizes that economic growth in SIDS is often uneven and particularly vulnerable to disaster-related shocks. There are also insufficient formal sector job opportunities to absorb the emergent labour market. The partnership, represented in these two programmes, demonstrates how government, the private sector and international community can work together to address these issues and improve the lives of women and their families in SIDS.


Figure 23 Women's Economic Empowerment Driving Sustainable Development in SIDS

Integration of priority areas and spillover effects

Many of the Pacific partnerships undertake integrated management of activities in different sectors in a sustainable way. The several blue and green economy partnerships integrate economic development, social inclusion and environmental protection, while providing for innovation, capacity development and employment opportunities. Similarly, partnerships related to marine spatial planning integrate environmental conservation with economic activities of several ocean sectors.

There are examples of partnerships that integrate a particularly large number of Samoa Pathway priority areas, demonstrating connections between areas such as climate resilience, renewable energy, food security, nutrition, and environmental protection. Hawaii's Aloha+ Challenge addresses six interconnected goals relevant to both the Samoa Pathway and the SDGs.

Aloha+ Challenge: A Culture of Sustainability – He Nohona 'Ae'oa

The Aloha+ Challenge is a joint commitment by Hawai'i's six elected Chief Executives to 2030 targets for six interconnected goals: clean energy, local food production, natural resource management, waste reduction, smart growth, climate resilience, green jobs creation and education.

The specific aims of the challenge are:

1. Clean Energy: 70 percent clean energy – 40 percent from renewables and 30 percent from efficiency.
2. Local Food: At least double local food production – 20 to 30 percent of food consumed is grown locally.
3. Natural Resource Management: Reverse the trend of natural resource loss mauka to makai by increasing freshwater security, watershed protection, community-based marine management, invasive species control and native species restoration.
4. Waste Reduction: Reduce the solid waste stream prior to disposal by 70 percent through source reduction, recycling, bioconversion, and landfill diversion methods.
5. Smart Sustainable Communities: Increase livability and resilience in the built environment through planning and implementation at state and county levels.
6. Green Workforce & Education: Increase local green jobs and education to implement these targets.

The partnership currently uses dynamic multi-sector teams with representatives from islands across
the state to share expertise while planning and implementing priority projects. It is working on the
design of a statewide sustainability action network to expand engagement and facilitate collaborative
action learning in the future.


http://www.glispa.org/glispa-bright-spots/30-thematic-bright-spots/building-resilient-sustainable-
island-communities/145-aloha-challenge

**Figure 24  Aloha+ Challenge**

Sustainable tourism cuts across all the priority areas of the SAMOA Pathway and it was
proposed at the SIDS Regional Preparatory Meeting for the Pacific that integrated
implementation could be addressed through a sustainable tourism lens\(^{20}\). A policy
framework and best practice guidelines for a resilient and sustainable tourism sector in the
Pacific is being developed through a regional partnership with South Pacific Tourism
Organization, SPREP and other partners.

Finally, most of the Pacific partnerships incorporate some degree of capacity development,
thus contributing to enhanced human and institutional capacity relating to sustainable
development.

**Potential gaps**

The existing partnerships are broadly aligned with regional priorities on oceans, with
climate change and economic development also well represented. On oceans, partnerships
in technology transfer for surveillance and monitoring of EEZs are needed to ensure proper
implementation, including as it relates to illegal fishing and piracy\(^{21}\).

There is less focus on topics such as poverty, equality, peace and human rights. Sustainable
consumption and production, water and sanitation (particularly WASH facilities), and
sustainable transportation may also require further attention. The region is still poorly
connected, particularly in regard to remote islands, and there is a need to increase the cost-
effectiveness and sustainability of transport and reduce the carbon emissions of the
transportation sector.

On poverty, the SIDS Regional Preparatory Meeting for the Pacific noted that across the
region one in four people lives below the poverty line, with children being
disproportionately vulnerable. Social protection only covers a certain part of the

Tonga, 19-21 June 2018

\(^{21}\) Report of the Pacific Preparatory Meeting for the Midterm Review of the SAMOA Pathway.
Tonga, 19-21 June 2018
population, and urbanization and migration have come with weakened community ties, leaving an increasing part of the population without adequate protection\textsuperscript{22}.

Technology remains an area of priority in the region, particularly in driving progress in sustainable development.

In the area of social development and inclusion, significant development challenges remain in the region. On gender equality and empowering women and girls, a growing level of awareness is observed in the region and is reflected in the many partnerships addressing gender equality. However, challenges remain in several areas, including as it relates to the participation of women in parliament; and the high prevalence of violence against women\textsuperscript{23}. Other marginalized groups include people with disabilities.

With regard to underrepresented partners, there is a need for meaningful private sector engagement and for building business networks and coalitions. In the Pacific, the private sector tends to consist mostly of small and medium-sized enterprises rather than large private sector bodies, and the private sector has promoted social inclusion through women in leadership positions, and by being a provider of jobs for people with disabilities. Going forward, there is a need to strengthen national private sector bodies, data and statistics; undertake collaborations with universities to articulate private sector research needs; and engage with non-traditional investment, such as impact investment.

Civil society has been a strong partner in the Pacific, particularly in terms of engaging with communities, and both civil society and universities have made a significant contribution to sustainable development in the region. Further engagement with these partners will be required going forward.

\textit{Challenges}

The SIDS Regional Partnership Dialogue for the Pacific (20-21 June 2018, Tonga) noted a number of challenges to partnerships. They include resources and funding; ensuring that the right people with the right expertise are involved in each partnership; and following through so that commitments filter to communities. Challenges also include practical working arrangements and scheduling issues, particularly where there are multiple partners from different entities and islands.

Lack of financing, human resources/turnover of staff, changes in organisational priorities are also common partnership challenges.

-------------------------------------

\textsuperscript{22} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{23} Ibid.
The study by PIFS\textsuperscript{24} reports challenges with capacity to implement due to competing national work commitments, sustainability of financing, as well as financing the engagement of stakeholders particularly those in outer islands. In response to communication and transportation difficulties, some countries have reported that technical support from regional organizations helped greatly in negotiations and outreach. Peer-to-Peer learning has been identified as a mechanism to foster better planning and implementation, particularly in the partnerships that involve developing Marine Protected Areas and National Ocean Policy and Institutions.

In addition, there is a need to better understand what makes an impactful partnership, including capacity for developing such partnerships, and to improve the information flow relating to partnerships between the national, regional and global levels.

\textit{Lessons learned and best practices}

The SIDS Regional Partnership Dialogue for the Pacific identified lessons learned from partnerships in the region as follows:

- **Success of partnerships depends on national ownership, mutual trust, transparency and accountability** – in other words open and honest relationships. Without ownership by all partners, a partnership is not sustainable.

- **Successful partnerships have a clear mandate and focused objectives.** Funding also needs to be clarified and tailored to meet the objectives and will need to be long-term and sustained.

- **Inclusion and innovation need to be part of a successful partnership,** and partnerships need to ensure that no one is left behind.

- **A good system of governance is important for partnership success,** as is a strong sense of ownership of the project by partners and member countries. Support from the highest political levels, mainstreaming partnership work to that of government departments, and basing work on science and quantitative goals are also important.

- **Universities are important development partners** and play a critical role in promoting local wisdom and producing new knowledge to address regional challenges.

There are also many lessons to be learned from those partnerships that have been completed, and that have had a chance to reflect on their experiences. For example, in reference to the Pacific Adaptation for Climate Change (PACC) Project, which has now closed, it was noted that there was a still need to maintain access to the extensive number of studies, documentation and publications that were collected. This is likely the case with many closed projects, which can offer important information and lessons learned. In

\textsuperscript{24} PIFS 2018 based on analysis of PSIDS partnerships information on the SIDS Action Platform
addition, while this project was successful, its implementation was limited to a few sites. Thus, there is a general need to expand successful pilot projects and develop full projects for implementation.

The Vanuatu NGO Climate Change Adaptation Program, which ran between 2012 and 2014, also offered a number of lessons on the methodology of partnerships working with communities and with multiple partners. These lessons are summarized in the box below.

Lessons learned from the Vanuatu NGO Climate Change Adaptation Program

The Vanuatu NGO Climate Change Adaptation Program (2012-2014), funded by the Australian Government, was implemented by a consortium of six organisations: Save the Children, CARE International in Vanuatu, Vanuatu Red Cross Society, Vanuatu Rural Development Training Centres Association, SPC/GIZ and coordinated by Oxfam. The program's goal was to increase the resilience of women, men and young people in Vanuatu to the impacts of climate change. The program worked with communities in nine islands across four provinces. It took a broad view on resilience as the ability of women, men and children to realise their rights and improve their wellbeing despite shocks, stresses and uncertainty. Community members were supported to increase their understanding of climate variability and change, and plan and implement activities to strengthen DRR, water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH), Natural Resource Management (NRM), agriculture, nutrition, traditional knowledge, women's leadership and education. This program also established the Vanuatu Climate Adaptation Network (VCAN), which facilitates the sharing of lessons and good practice approaches among over 20 civil society organisations and with the Government of Vanuatu.

In adopting the central concept of “resilience” as a framework for action, the partnership was able to accommodate the different operating processes of its partners. While all consortium agencies have different approaches to resilience programming, the framework provides coherence in working towards a common definition of impact. This approach has increased the program's focus on community participation, voice and access to information, which helps communities to become more resilient.

The final report of the partnership outlined nine areas that need to be prioritized when replicating this model in different sectors or in different countries:

1. Building inclusive, meaningful partnerships
2. Working with communities and engaging the most vulnerable
3. Promoting civil society input to government policy making
4. Bridging the gap between levels: community, national, regional, global
5. Allocating resources for a co-ordination hub
6. Strengthening the role of leadership, champions and relationships
7. Developing accountability and an innovative cycle of learning
8. Sharing information and knowledge
9. Promoting sustainability, results and value for money

More information at: https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/partnership/?p=8029


Figure 25 Lessons learned from Vanuatu Climate Adaptation Program
Caribbean

The Caribbean is home to many Small Island Developing States, which include Antigua and Barbuda, Belize, Dominican Republic, Haiti, Saint Lucia, Trinidad and Tobago, Bahamas, Cuba, Grenada, Jamaica, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Barbados, Dominica, Guyana, Saint Kitts and Nevis and Suriname. In addition, the SIDS in the region include the dependent territories of Bermuda, Sint Maarten, Anguilla, British Virgin Islands, Martinique, Turks and Caicos Islands, Aruba, Cayman Islands, Curacao, Guadeloupe, Montserrat, Puerto Rico and U.S. Virgin Islands. Like other SIDS, countries in the region share many common development challenges, including geographic and economic isolation, limited resources, environmental fragility, high costs of transportation and energy, and vulnerability to climate change and natural disasters.

In its resolution 71/224, the General Assembly recognized that the Caribbean Sea was an area with unique biodiversity and highly fragile ecosystems and that, when compared with all other marine ecosystems, was surrounded by the largest number of countries in the world, many of which rely heavily on the marine environment for economic growth and sustainable development.

The Caribbean SIDS have made some progress in meeting their sustainable development priorities, but continue to face major challenges that include the lack of economies of scale in production, high vulnerability to environmental stresses, acute exposure to external shocks, excessive reliance on external financial inflows and on few export and import markets, limited transport and communications, reduced scope for economic diversification and limited human resources, compounded by high levels of migration of skilled individuals, and high unemployment of youth and women. This has resulted in stalled progress in some areas and reversal of development gains in others25.

There are many regional organizations in the Caribbean facilitating collaboration between governments in their areas of competence. These organizations, which are well represented in regional partnerships, include the Caribbean Community (CARICOM), the Organisation of Eastern Caribbean States (OECS), the Association of Caribbean States (ACS), the UN Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean, (ECLAC), the UNEP Caribbean Environmental Programme (CEP), the Western Central Atlantic Fishery Commission of the FAO, Caribbean Tourism Organisation (CTO), Caribbean Development Bank (CDB), Caribbean Natural Resources Institute (CANARI), Caribbean Agricultural Research and Development Institute (CARDI), Caribbean Community Climate Change Centre (CCCC), Secretariat for Central American Economic Integration, Latin American and Caribbean Economic System, Central American Integration System (SICA), Caribbean Disaster

______________________________

25 San Pedro Declaration. Caribbean SIDS Regional Preparatory Meeting, San Pedro, Belize, 7-9 August 2018
Emergency Management Agency (CDEMA), Caribbean Catastrophe Risk Insurance Facility Segregated Portfolio Company (CCRIF SPC), and many others.

**Status and trends of partnerships**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of partnerships at 2014 SIDS Conference</th>
<th>Current number of partnerships</th>
<th>Number of completed partnerships</th>
<th>Active partnerships</th>
<th>Number reporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>29%26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The in-depth review noted 178 national and regional partnerships within the Caribbean. In addition, the countries in the Caribbean region participated in an additional 146 global and inter-regional partnerships.

Out of the 178 national and regional partnerships, 75 were registered in the SIDS Action Platform, and include both Samoa Pathway partnerships and commitments made in response to the UN Ocean Conference.

The remaining 103 partnerships included in this analysis were sourced from a Samoa Pathway Mid-term review undertaken by ECLAC27, which increased considerably the available information on partnerships in the Caribbean. Out of the 146 global partnerships that have Caribbean participation, 143 were registered in the SIDS Action Platform, with the remaining ones sourced from the ECLAC review.

There has been a rising trend in partnerships since the 2014 SIDS Conference, where 42 Caribbean partnerships were registered. As with other regions, the UN Ocean Conference provided a boost in ocean-related partnerships.

Most of the partnerships included in this review are regional partnerships that include several, and often all, Caribbean countries. Out of the 178 partnerships that pertained to Caribbean countries, 125 were regional, while 53 were national. Most of the national partnerships were government-led, and governments led 24% of the partnerships overall. Regional organizations led the majority, or 8% of the partnerships. This demonstrates

---

26 This figure only includes partnerships registered in the SIDS Action Platform

strong regional collaboration across many different Samoa Pathway priority areas. Most partnerships also include partners from outside the region in the form of United Nations agencies (21% of the partnerships), donor agencies and countries, and universities or other organizations providing technical expertise on specific issues. NGO and civil society led 7% of the partnerships, while the private sector led 3%. All countries and territories in the Caribbean region participated in partnerships, although the participation rate of some dependent territories was relatively lower.

The partnerships are heterogeneous in nature, and range from large regional projects relating to climate change adaption and mitigation, sustainable energy and marine and coastal management to initiatives relating to advancing social and livelihoods causes on specific SIDS and developing national policy and legislation.

**Figure 26** Entities leading partnerships in the Caribbean region. Partnerships by regional organizations and governments dominate. There are also many United Nations – led partnerships.

**Resource Efficient Low Carbon and Circular Industrial Partnership Platform for Catalysing Eco-Innovation and Entrepreneurship in Barbados** (RECIPPEE-Barbados)

Announced in Samoa in 2014, the partnership between the Government of Barbados and the United Nations Industrial Development Organisation (UNIDO) aimed to build the island’s green economy through development of sustainable industries. Entitled the “Resource Efficient Low Carbon and Circular Industrial Partnership Platform for Catalysing Eco-Innovation and Entrepreneurship in Barbados”, (RECIPPEE-Barbados)” this partnership has given rise to the 2018-approved GEF “Strategic platform to promote sustainable energy technology innovation, industrial development and entrepreneurship in Barbados” to the amount of US$14.67M. This initiative is also closely aligned with Barbados’ new development priorities in the areas of youth entrepreneurship, business and export development, innovation, and education for development.
The Japan-Caribbean Climate Change Partnership

The Japan-Caribbean Climate Change Partnership (J-CCCP) is designed to strengthen the capacity of countries in the Caribbean to invest in climate change mitigation and adaptation technologies, as prioritised in their Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Actions (NAMAs) and National Adaptation Plans (NAPs). These technologies will help reduce the dependence on fossil fuel imports, setting the region on a low-emission development path; as well as improve the region’s ability to respond to climate risks and opportunities in the long-run, through resilient development approaches that go beyond disaster response to extreme events.

The partnership brings together policy makers, experts and representatives of communities to encourage policy innovation for climate technology incubation and diffusion. By doing so, the Partnership aims to ensure that barriers to the implementation of climate-resilient technologies are addressed and overcome in a participatory and efficient manner. As a result, concrete mitigation and adaption will be implemented on the ground, in line with the countries’ long-term strategies. Building upon and supported by the NAMAs and NAPs, the Partnership also supports the incubation of climate technology into targeted public sectors, private industries, and community groups and enterprises so that green, low-emission climate-resilient technologies can be tested, refined, adopted, and sustained as practical measures to enhance national, sub-national and community level resilience.

More information is available at http://www.sids2014.org/partnerships/?p=12369
Figure 29 Percentage of Caribbean partnerships addressing Samoa Pathway priority areas. While most areas are addressed, oceans, economic development, climate change and sustainable energy have the most partnerships.

**Measuring impacts of partnerships**

While there is not enough available data to measure the collective impacts of these partnerships on sustainable development in the Caribbean, individual initiatives have had measurable impacts on beneficiaries, have enhanced environmental protection, and put in place new policies and activities.

Most partnerships included in this review also provide some degree of capacity building and, in some cases, technology transfer. Thus, their impacts may include long-lasting skill-building on the individual level, as well as strengthening institutions in the region.

For example, two funds, the Caribbean Regional Fund for Wastewater Management and the Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund (CEPF) have provided tangible benefits on the ground. While the CReW is a regional fund, the CEPF is a global fund that operates in the Caribbean, providing grants to civil society to protect critical ecosystems. The two case studies below describe impacts from projects undertaken by these funds.

**Caribbean Regional Fund for Wastewater Management (CReW)**

The GEF CReW Project has made significant headway in progressing wastewater management in the region. Launched in 2011 and completed in 2017, it aimed at (i) providing sustainable financing for the wastewater sector; (ii) supporting policy and legislative reforms; and (iii) fostering regional dialogue and knowledge exchange (UN-DESA, 2018). Several significant achievements were
accomplished during its implementation including the establishment of 3 pilot financing mechanisms for wastewater management in Belize, Guyana, and Jamaica; the development of national action plans, regulations and policies in participating countries; and the delivery of wastewater management training programmes to more than 600 persons across the region. Based on the widespread success of this project, UNEP CEP is currently in development of a GEF CReW+ Project Proposal for further funding consideration by the GEF.


The Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund (CEPF)

The Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund (CEPF) is a global programme that provides grants to civil society to protect critical ecosystems. CEPF’s first investment in the Caribbean Islands Biodiversity Hotspot between October 2010 and July 2016 responded to these threats and produced a broad range of conservation results in eight countries and at the regional level focused on terrestrial biodiversity. Specific priorities for funding and targeted results were identified in the CEPF Caribbean Islands Ecosystem Profile and the final evaluation recognised the significant results that had been achieved. The CEPF implemented a US$6.9 million investment in eight Caribbean SIDS and at the regional level through 77 grants to 68 CSOs, with 78% of the funds going to local and regional Caribbean CSOs. The CEPF is currently finalising the design and programming of a second phase of investment.

With this focused support, the CSOs were able to achieve significant results for conservation and livelihoods. Demonstrable improvements in management were achieved in 25 Key Biodiversity Areas covering a total of 593,967 hectares, as guided by management and operational plans. Eight new protected areas were created covering 111,496 hectares in The Bahamas, the Dominican Republic and Haiti, including terrestrial and marine national parks, municipal reserves and a private protected area. The Dominican Republic’s first private protected area was declared, and the procedures required to implement the existing legal framework for the declaration of private protected areas were developed and disseminated.

Under the CEPF, climate change adaptation was integrated in protected area planning and implementation actions for the first time in Jamaica and the Dominican Republic. A climate change risk assessment was prepared for the Portland Bight and Hellshire Hills sub-area management plans in Jamaica. Similarly, a climate change adaptation action plan and strategy was included in the management plan for Dominican Republic’s La Humeadora National Park. CSOs in the Dominican Republic also developed a capacity building action plan to access climate finance in order to conserve critical ecosystems in the context of climate change.


In regards to ecosystem management, the Caribbean Challenge (CCI) has been able to demonstrate tangible results in the protection of marine environments in several countries around the Caribbean.
Caribbean Challenge (CCI)

The participating CCI countries have already designated 50 new protected areas. The Bahamas established three marine protected areas, including the largest one in the region. The Dominican Republic established 30 new protected areas, surpassing their goal of conserving at least 20% of nearshore and coastal environments, and Jamaica too has set up eight no-take marine zones.

Two marine zoning plans are completed (for the Dominican Republic’s Samana Bay and for St. Kitts and Nevis’ entire Exclusive Economic Zone) to support establishment of protected areas and to improve management.

The Caribbean Biodiversity Fund is currently supported by the German Development Bank, Global Environment Facility, and The Nature Conservancy. It will disburse funding to participating nations to support protected area management beginning as early as 2014.

The Inaugural Caribbean Summit of Business and Political Leaders took place in May 2013 on Necker Island, at the home of Sir Richard Branson, Founder of The Virgin Group. The Summit brought together 15 governments, 17 corporations and several partner organizations. Individual governments made specific conservation commitments and corporations and partners pledged to support marine and coastal conservation in the Caribbean.


Integration of priority areas and spillover effects

With most partnerships in the Caribbean addressing multiple SAMOA Pathway priority areas, integration is part of many partnerships. This is particularly the case with partnerships seeking to advance green and blue economies in the Caribbean, which incorporate the work of several sectors (often sustainable tourism, fisheries, renewable ocean energy, blue carbon etc.). These partnerships generally incorporate the spillover effects of building capacity for innovation and providing skilled employment in ocean sectors. Many also seek to provide employment and training for women and youth.

In addition, many climate change-related partnerships also incorporate issues related to renewable energy, environmental sustainability, disaster risk reduction, livelihoods and marine transportation. Partnerships relating to food security and nutrition may also consider climate change, agriculture and fisheries. Such clustering of Samoa Pathway priority areas demonstrates the high degree of connectivity between those areas, and by extension in the partnerships that seek to implement them.

The case study below, the Grenada Sustainable Farmers’ Night Market Network, demonstrates how a relatively simple activity, such as a night market, can provide spillover effects in many different areas.

Grenada Sustainable Farmers’ Night Market Network
This partnership that promotes sustainability has been on-going since 2003. It went into dormancy for some time but has been revived in 2014 and has been expanded with new partners. The principal goal is to assist participating rural business, organizations and groups, with ways and means to earn income and increase wealth (assets) through expanding overall sustainability in and for Grenada. We believe we can be part of the global movement to increase the national economic pie while reducing poverty, destruction and ignorance and enhancing the environment. Grenada is small enough (110,000 persons and 344 square miles and 8 small islands) that we think this can be achieved in the not too distant future. In hosting the monthly Night Market, so far, the network of rural economic and social actors, draws a few hundred persons who seek out a novel, fun, interactive event, at which they encounter new ideas, products and persons focused on Grenada’s sustainable development. In practical terms, many seek out healthy and traditional foods, fruits, plants, cultural items and artifacts and information.

Extracted from http://www.sids2014.org/partnerships/?p=7420

Figure 33 Grenada Sustainable Farmer’s Night Market Network

**Potential gaps**

In reviewing the partnerships in this study, there were several Samoa Pathway priority areas that seem under-represented. These areas include non-communicable diseases (NCDs), poverty, terrestrial biodiversity, trade, wastewater and sanitation, and sustainable transportation, particularly beyond shipping. It is possible that these issues are being addressed through means other than partnerships, including national-level policies and regulations. However, it may be worthwhile to consider whether their further inclusion in regional partnerships would help their implementation.

Participants at the SIDS Regional Partnership Dialogue for the Caribbean also brought up other gap areas. These included the following:

- **Sourcing development finance for SIDS**, which is an area that has not seen previous partnerships. One possible approach could be to engage in partnerships with the insurance industry, which could also be a way to mobilize innovative financing for the region for sustainable development. In addition, SIDS are highly dependent on fossil fuels, and the use of electric vehicles and development of Ocean Thermal Energy Conversion (OTEC) would reduce the amount of petroleum that needs to be imported.
- **Development of an integrated regional emergency response**, including in relation to pests and animal diseases. Diseases and pests move quickly and there is a need for a regional action plan in this regard. In addition, there is a need to ensure the safety of the food supply in an emergency situation.
- **Building resilient health systems**, including physical and mental well-being is important for the achievement of the SAMOA Pathway. Non-communicable diseases (NCDs – cancer, heart attack, stroke, physical inactivity) are more significant than communicable diseases in the Caribbean. Climate change is also a significant threat to human health, and something that SIDS are vulnerable to.
- **Fostering innovation in the maritime domain**, and maximizing socio-economic benefits of open science and open data towards developing blue economies are
important for SIDS. In addition, and fostering small and medium enterprise relating to ocean innovation can help develop ocean economies.

In regards to participation, there was strong participation by regional agencies and organizations in partnerships, as well as by governments. Civil society, the private sector and academia were less prominent, and their inclusion in partnerships may require further consideration.

**Challenges**

The SIDS Regional Partnership Dialogue for the Caribbean, held in San Pedro, Belize, on 6 August 2018, identified financing as one major challenge for partnerships. Partnerships often require internal resource mobilization on the part of Governments. This could be a challenge for governments where there is limited fiscal space for investment in sustainable development.

In such cases priorities have to be carefully defined as to where limited resources are to be spent. Some innovative solutions for financing involved the creation of the Caribbean Biodiversity Fund as part of the Caribbean Challenge Initiative.

Each country participating in the Caribbean Challenge is encouraged to create its own trust fund (National Conservation Trust Fund), and will additionally be able to access funding from the Caribbean Biodiversity Fund. Other partnerships have involved the private sector, chambers of commerce, as well as received funding from UNDP, GEF, donor countries and other funding entities.

The workshop also noted other challenges, which included overlap and duplication between partnerships and projects, lack of trust between partners, difficulties in engaging with the private sector, and capacity challenges.

On capacity building, it was noted that there are limited monitoring and evaluation frameworks to assess progress. Access to information, managing data, and knowledge transfer are issues both within the region and nationally.

It was further noted that there is a need to define what is meant by durable and genuine partnerships, and to develop an ability to measure, monitor and evaluate them. In this regard, it was noted that there is a need for more rigorous evidence-based criteria for how to establish partnerships, and more concrete baselines for measuring progress. Some challenges in this regard for the Caribbean include:

- The lack of baseline data for partnerships
- Lack of appropriate data for monitoring and evaluation, which does not allow for measuring impact of partnerships
- SMART criteria in partnerships
- Evidence-based criteria for evaluating partnerships
Lessons learned and best practices

The SIDS Regional Partnership Dialogue for the Caribbean also brought up several good practices on developing partnerships, which include the following:

- **A genuine and durable partnership requires buy-in from all partners. All partners will need to agree on a common goals and objectives**, and understand what the partnership is trying to achieve. This is sometimes difficult, particularly in the beginning, as partners may not fully understand each other. It is important to get an agreement, such as a MoU or declaration, down on paper, so that everyone understands and agrees on partnership objectives. A regular collaborative review of progress will also help keep the partnership on track towards its goals and objectives.

- **Trust is a critical ingredient of a successful partnership** and needs to be fostered and built through joint action and shared responsibilities.

- **Successful partnerships are often highly participatory.** They will involve government entities and work across ministries and with civil servants to build political will and leadership. They will also engage other partners, including academia, civil society, private sector, women and youth.

- **Partnerships will have to be durable and be able to withstand shock.** They should find a way to be consistent, and remain a priority even when the government changes.

- **Effective partnerships have shared benefits and commitments, as well as a sense of ownership by all partners.** Collaboration is essential for partnerships. While there is already capacity in Caribbean SIDS, strengthening that capacity is important, and international partnerships can provide for this. In international partnership there needs to be a focus on issues that are most critical for the country, rather than donor priorities.

- There is a need to strengthen the review and monitoring of partnerships. **Monitoring and evaluating of partnerships should be mandatory** and should be built into partnerships from the outset. In this way the cost of monitoring becomes part of project costs. A serious challenge to monitoring and evaluating partnerships in the Caribbean is the lack of baseline data as well as indicators. Capacity strengthening may be needed both for collecting and using evidence-based data.

- **Partnerships must be inclusive of all stakeholders,** and an effort must be made to include marginalized groups. They should be based on a common understanding of objectives, collaboration, trust and accountability. Successful partnerships bring together all stakeholders from the very beginning, ensuring ownership in the process. In order to have buy-in from communities, NGOs and civil society need to be involved. Partnerships must work and cooperate with government and government entities. Successful partnerships should be replicated, so as not to reinvent the wheel.
The Human Development Index and potential future directions for SIDS partnerships

UNDP has calculated the 2017 Human Development Index (HDI) for 36 out of 38 SIDS countries. The results of these calculations may help in determining priority areas for new SIDS partnerships. The HDI was created to emphasize that people and their capabilities should be the ultimate criteria for assessing the development of a country, not economic growth alone. The HDI is a summary measure of average achievement in key dimensions of human development: a long and healthy life, being knowledgeable and having a decent standard of living.

The average HDI value for the SIDS (without Singapore) is 0.684 and is above the average HDI for developing countries (0.681), but below the world average of 0.728.

Between 1990 and 2017, the SIDS registered the increase in HDI value over 18 percent, which is equivalent to an average annual growth of 0.63%. Looking at individual SIDS, Papua New Guinea achieved the fastest growth – growing at an average annual rate of 1.34%, followed by Sao Tome and Principe (0.98%) and then Mauritius (0.91%). The lowest growth was observed in Belize (0.35%).

Inequality

Losses in HDI when inequality is taken into account (the Inequality-adjusted HDI, or IHDI) are higher for SIDS (an average loss of 24.8 percent) than the world average loss (20.0 percent) and the average loss for developing countries (22.0 percent). The income component is where the loss due to inequality is the highest (34.9 percent) followed by inequality in education (20.8 percent) and in life expectancy at birth (17.4 percent).

The relatively high IHDI indicates that there may be a need to further develop partnerships that address aspects of inequality, including ensuring that no one is left behind. Such partnerships might need to address income inequality and poverty, education, health and life expectancy. Marginalized groups and people will also need to be included. There are currently relatively few partnerships addressing aspects of inequality.

Gender

28 The HDI was not calculated for Nauru and Tuvalu as data were not available for 2 or more necessary indicators.

29 http://hdr.undp.org/en/content/human-development-index-hdi

30 Value of Singapore’s HDI is 0.932.
The Gender Development Index (GDI) is a measure of gender disparities in human development achievements. On average the GDI value of SIDS is 0.948 compared to a world average of 0.941 and the average for developing countries of 0.917. It means that the female HDI value is, on average, only 94.8% of the HDI for males. The differences in values are greatest for estimated income per capita, which is 2.1 times higher for men ($11,487) than for women ($5,598).

The Gender Inequality Index (GII) reflects loss to potential achievements due to inequality between women and men in three aspects of human development — (i) the freedom to control own life, autonomy of the body, and the right to have and determine health-related choices; (ii) the right to have and to expand the sense of self-worth and the ability to influence the direction of social change towards a just social and economic order, and (iii) to have equal access to opportunities and resources. The average GII value for the SIDS is 0.458. The average for developing countries is 0.468 and the global average is 0.441. Because the GII is an inequality measure, the higher value indicates the higher inequality.

In terms of components, what appears to be driving the GII value is the relatively low labor force participation rate for females (53.7%) compared to labor force participation rate for men (73.0%), a difference of over 19 percentage points.

Thus it seems that gender inequality could best be addressed in partnerships through focusing efforts on women's participation in the labor force, and in achieving income equality.

**Poverty**

The Multidimensional Poverty Index (MPI) is a composite measure designed to capture overlapping deprivations that people suffer at the same time. It builds on recent advances in theory and offers a valuable complement to traditional money metric measures of poverty. The MPI has been calculated for 16 out of 37 SIDS, covering 56.5 million population or 68.3 percent of the total population of SIDS (82.8 million).

The results show that many households in SIDS countries are vulnerable to multidimensional poverty, meaning that they are not multidimensionally poor but are on the brink of poverty. In Vanuatu, based on the 2007 MICS, 32.3 percent of the population is vulnerable to poverty and about 38.8 percent is multidimensionally poor. In Timor-Leste, based on the 2016 DHS, about 46 percent of population is multidimensionally poor and an additional 26 percent are vulnerable to poverty.

Deprivations in standard of living tend to contribute more to multidimensional deprivation (46.0 percent) of SIDS than deprivations in other two dimensions, health (23.9 percent) and education (30.1).

There are currently few SIDS partnerships that address multiple dimensions of poverty. Tackling poverty is a complex undertaking, requiring a wide range of community partners collaborating towards a common goal. While economic growth will help alleviate poverty, it
does not necessarily benefit all people equally. Thus, inequality and poverty are closely linked. Sustained investments in human capital, such as education and health, and food and nutrition security will contribute to poverty reduction. Pro-poor growth strategies may include agriculture, small-scale fisheries, rural development, market development and trade. Thus, for countries with a high MPI indexes, there may be a need for partnerships engaging communities in addressing multiple aspects of poverty, in particular with a view to raising the standard of living.

**Environmental sustainability**

In assessing a selection of 10 indicators relating to environmental sustainability, SIDS were placed in the middle third in 4 indicators and in the bottom third in 2 indicators (CO2 emissions per unit of GDP and mortality rate due to unsafe water, sanitation and hygiene services.)

These results highlight the importance of further work and partnerships on water, wastewater, and sanitation, including through WASH facilities. Further work on transitioning towards energy efficiency and renewable energy also remain priorities.

**Regional commonalities**

There are many similarities in the regional experiences with partnerships thus far. All regions have seen a growing trend in partnerships since the 2014 SIDS Conference. For all regions, partnerships in certain Samoa Pathway priority areas are under-represented. When taken together with the 2017 Human Development Index for SIDS calculated by UNDP, they highlight potential areas for new partnerships. These areas include:

- **Aspects of social and economic development, in particular addressing inequality and ensuring that no one is left behind.** Such partnerships may include actions relating to income inequality, poverty, education, and health, and provide for the inclusion of marginalized groups.

- **Multiple dimensions of poverty,** particularly in countries and areas with a high number of poor and vulnerable households. These partnerships may require sustained investments in human capital, such as education and health, and food and nutrition security, and may include agriculture, small-scale fisheries, rural development, market development, trade and other activities.

- **Sustainable transportation,** particularly in terms of low-carbon, low cost options for communities on remote islands.

- **Water, wastewater and sanitation** in many areas where these services are still inadequate.

- **Health and NCDs,** particularly in assisting countries implement their NCD-related activities.

- **Gender considerations,** particularly in regards to income equality, women’s participation in the workforce, and women’s leadership.

- **Integrated ecosystem management focusing on whole islands,** particularly on terrestrial and watershed areas, and their connection to the sea, as well as human livelihoods.
• **Sustainable consumption and production**, including addressing this topic holistically in the context of small islands.

• **Sourcing development finance for SIDS**, which is an area that has not seen previous partnerships. One proposal was to engage in partnerships with the insurance industry to mobilize innovative financing.

In addition, each region put forward a number of specific gap areas, which broadly overlap with the general gaps presented above. However, the combination of the present review and the regional partnership dialogues and preparatory workshops also articulated additional and more specific issues that may require further attention.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Identified gap areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AIMS/AIS</td>
<td>- Sustainable, equitable and inclusive economic growth, health and NCDs, and gender equality and women's empowerment&lt;br&gt;- Climate change resilience and disaster risk reduction&lt;br&gt;- Fresh water, waste management, WASH&lt;br&gt;- Reducing dependence on imported fuels and expensive transport&lt;br&gt;- Involving more women and youth in decision-making processes&lt;br&gt;- Innovation and the transfer of technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>- Poverty, social protections, equality, sustainable consumption and production, water and sanitation, sustainable transportation&lt;br&gt;- Technology transfer for surveillance and monitoring of EEZs, including as it relates to illegal fishing and piracy&lt;br&gt;- Technology as a driver of sustainable development&lt;br&gt;- Participation of women in parliament&lt;br&gt;- Youth, marginalized groups, including people with disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caribbean</td>
<td>- NCDs, terrestrial biodiversity, trade, wastewater and sanitation, trade, and sustainable transportation&lt;br&gt;- Building resilient health systems, including physical and mental well-being&lt;br&gt;- Development of an integrated regional emergency response including in relation to pests and animal diseases&lt;br&gt;- Fostering innovation in the maritime domain, and maximizing socio-economic benefits of open science and open data towards developing blue economies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Under-represented partners included actors other than national governments and regional and UN organizations. The private sector, civil society, local governments and academia/research institutions were involved in relatively fewer partnerships overall.

Partnerships in all regions have a poor rate of progress reporting to the SIDS Action Platform. The lack of reporting impedes assessment of the impact of partnerships on their
beneficiaries and on sustainable development in SIDS overall. Suggestions for improving reporting include involvement of regional focal points in the reporting process; improved communication channels between the national and regional levels, and regional and global levels; a greater degree of dialogue between partnership leads regionally and globally; and using existing mechanisms and structures for reporting to multiple entities.

A relatively large number of partnerships have either already been completed, or will be completed shortly. These partnerships have valuable experience and lessons learned to offer, as well as proposals for future work. Successful partnerships that have been completed might be extended or scaled up if future funding becomes available. Therefore, it is important to ensure that completed projects are evaluated, that their lessons learned are collected and made available, and that any suggestions for future work are recorded. These materials should be incorporated into the SIDS Action Platform; as completed projects are archived.

It is also evident from the diverse nature of partnerships that there is a need to better understand, and define, what is meant by a durable and genuine partnership, including developing criteria or norms towards this end. Many regions also expressed a desire for capacity building on partnerships development, and on what consists a durable and genuine partnership. This could be achieved through developing learning materials based on best practices, case studies, and lessons learned from existing durable and genuine partnerships.

All of the regional partnership dialogues highlighted the importance of partnerships as a means for supporting sustainable development of SIDS, and as part of a new and more meaningful development paradigm for SIDS.

Common partnership challenges across the three regions included sustainable financing; capacity (human and institutional); an enabling environment dictated by the national social and political context; enabling conditions for the participation of all stakeholders in partnerships; ensuring that the right people with the right expertise are involved in each partnership; lack of trust between partners; and weak institutional, legal and governance structures.

All regions agreed that successful partnerships depend on ownership, mutual trust, respect, transparency and accountability.

The importance of the following were also acknowledged: (i) a clear, agreed-upon mandate with focused science-based goals and objectives; (ii) a robust governance structure; (iii) strong leadership; (iv) a high degree of participation with shared commitments and benefits; (v) a review and monitoring process; (vi) sustainable funding; (vii) partnership champions; (viii) the ability to withstand shock; and (ix) support from the highest political levels.

All regional dialogues also agreed that partnerships must be inclusive of all stakeholders, and an effort must be made to include marginalized groups so as to leave no one behind.
Genuine and effective partnerships are those that bring together all stakeholders from the very beginning, ensuring ownership in the process.

Partnerships need to be accountable to their beneficiaries and maintain dialogue with all partners, including communities, throughout the lifetime of the partnership. In order to have buy-in from communities, NGOs and civil society need to be involved.

The involvement of academia can improve the scientific (including social science) basis of partnerships, as well as their design and monitoring. Partnerships must also work and cooperate with government and government entities. There is also a need to enhance the involvement of the private sector in all regions, including through the use of evidence-based information and data.

**Durable and genuine partnerships for SIDS**

In the lead-up to the 2014 SIDS conference it was agreed that a genuine and durable partnership for Small Island Developing States (SIDS) is one that follows the SIDS Partnership SMART criteria – a partnership that is:

- SIDS-Specific
- Measurable and monitorable
- Achievable & Accountable
- Resource-based & results focused
- Timeline for implementation & transparency by all parties

Participants at the partnership dialogues held throughout 2018 stressed that there is a need to define what is meant by *durable and genuine* partnerships.

In response, the co-chairs of the Steering Committee on Partnership for SIDS developed the *SIDS Partnership Criteria and Norms* which articulates what constitutes a genuine and durable partnership for SIDS, through outlining elements of the SMART criteria.

In order to provide further clarity to what makes up the elements of the SIDS Partnership Criteria and Norms, a set of in-depth case studies of selected partnerships were conducted,

The case studies furthermore provide an in-depth understanding of how to apply the elements of the Criteria and Norms – the SMART - in forming partnerships for SIDS.

**Be SMART**

The in-depth case studies provide insight into elements required for a partnership to be effective, genuine and durable. These elements are summarized below, and are further elaborated on in the context of the case studies.

*Genuine partnership*
• A partnership that started from an initiative of a group of partners challenging each other to achieve a common goal
• A partnership that involves all actors
• A partnership that is open for each partner to assume different roles and leads
• A partnership outcome that also strengthens existing systems
• A partnership that includes different kinds of entities
• A partnership that is led by the partners themselves, while building their own individual and collective capacity

**Durable partnership**

• A partnership that has established a durable concept and will continue working even after the set end date has been reached
• A partnership that encourages partners to invest in their own resources
• A partnership that is based on good governance, and that takes into account all aspects of it (including people, mechanisms, and processes)
• A partnership that works across layers of governance (vertical and horizontal pathways)

**Effective partnership**

• A partnership that is easy to understand and straight forward
• A partnership that makes use of existing practices (e.g. reporting mechanisms) in order to make it easier for partners to participate
• A partnership that makes sure that the capacities and perspectives of a range of different partners are heard and taken seriously
• A partnership that in its approach reflects its objective(s)
• A partnership that shows results and that can stimulate continued initiatives among existing and new partners

The 2018 partnership dialogues also highlighted a number of best practices for developing and running effective partnerships, which include:

• *Different organizational structures can serve different purposes* – even within the same partnership. A partnership may have several goals or objectives, and reaching them may require setting up different structures of governance and organizational systems.

• *Support from 'Champions' and 'Unusual Suspects' can be of great help*. Having a few Champions that are committed to the partnership can provide important assistance in developing a partnership by providing good examples to other partners. Support can also come from ‘Unusual Suspects’ that unexpectedly take on leading roles.

• Being part of a partnership can stimulate individual partners to establish new functions within their own systems, as well as initiatives that take on a ‘life of their own’ by growing into new networks for knowledge-sharing or support.

• It is important to provide for capacity building among partners and working ‘from within’ existing systems can be a valuable approach to strengthen the sense of ownership by different partners.
**SIDSSpecific**

The Criteria and Norms state that SIDS-Specific partnerships are those that advance the implementation of priority areas of the SAMOA Pathway and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) for SIDS, the Sendai Framework and other SIDS specific mandates, are aligned with national development priorities, brings positive impact and benefits to SIDS while being globally accepted, and recognize the vulnerabilities and opportunities that are unique to SIDS.

In order to ensure a partnership fulfils this part, studying the relevant SIDS specific mandates might be necessary, in order to identify concrete and realistic outcomes that are aligned with such goals and targets. Doing such overall assessment in the early stages of the development of the partnership will also help identifying other positive – and sometimes negative – spillover effects, and maximize synergies with existing processes and stakeholders.

**Measurable and Monitorable**

The Criteria and Norms state that partnerships need to have clear set of goals, objectives, outputs and outcomes, have a clearly built in and defined monitoring and evaluation framework with the purpose of assessing progress of implementation and its intended impact on beneficiaries, is knowledge and research-based, have clear baselines, targets and indicators of achievement linked to Samoa Pathway priority areas and the SDGs, and generate appropriate data for monitoring and evaluation.

As recalled, monitoring and review of partnerships for SIDS is crucial on many levels. On the level of individual partnerships, it is needed to assess whether a partnership is meeting its goals, what impacts it has on its intended beneficiaries, and how it advances the implementation of the SAMOA Pathway priority areas.

Setting up a monitoring and evaluation of a partnership in its early development phase, with clear understanding on required data for measure progress further down the line, has been stressed as key to achieving this element. Having a way of measure potential success and other spillover effects provides valuable data for ensuring continued partner engagement, as well for all relevant stakeholders and potential donors.

**Achievable & Accountable**

The Criteria and Norms state that a partnership should be realistically designed to fulfil their objectives, includes a governance structure that is inclusive and participatory of all partners, relevant stakeholders and beneficiaries, has support, ownership and buy in of all partners.

It further states that a partnership should be based on mutual trust from all its stakeholders; and provides to partners and relevant stakeholders, on a regular basis, as
appropriate, through the SIDS Action Platform, the SIDS Global Business Network platform, or other means, effective communication of plans, results from monitoring and evaluation of impact, lessons learned.

Finally, a partnership should also provide opportunities to enhance peer learning, sharing of experiences and lessons learned between partners, beneficiaries and other stakeholders, and provide for evaluation to allow for the replication of successful partnerships.

There is not one-fit-all approach to how to successfully govern a partnership, as partnership structures are a result of what the partnership is set out to achieve, different level of partner engagement, and even national and regional context. It is clear however that openness, clear communication and broad engagement of both partners and intended beneficiaries are all key elements of achieving accountability and sustainability of partnerships. There are several good examples of how this can be achieved. The SIDS Partnership Toolbox provides some useful tools and examples to draw good practices from.

**Resource-based & results focused**

The Criteria and Norms state that a partnerships should be based on predictable and sustained resources for their implementation, include the mobilization of new resources and, where relevant, result in the transfer of technology to, and capacity-building in, SIDS, have the appropriate and effective human resources capacity, have demonstrable and, if where relevant, tangible, results that are verified by relevant stakeholders, and identifies the beneficiaries of, and evaluate impact from, the partnership.

For many partnerships, there are challenges related to obtaining adequate financial resources and securing sufficient human resources capacities. Focal points may be overworked and the partnership sometimes does not have the necessary overhead finances to maintain a sustainability over time. It is noted that ways to overcome such challenges include building the partnership slowly over time, with a clear and realistic strategy that takes into account sufficient capacity and resource mobilization in the long term.

Another key aspect of this element is to have a clear understanding of the role of partners in communicating and sharing of information, to manage expectations. Making sure that the partnership is transparent, shows results, and is inclusive, can also attract more funding resources to the partnership.

There are different ways of tracking impact and results. The impact of some partnerships may be associated with systemic changes, and the results of such partnerships are demonstrated through changes in practices and in the mindset of partners.

Other partnerships have more tangible impacts that are visible through measurable results.

The growing participation of partners and positive feedback from its beneficiaries is indicators of positive impact. Having the support of leaders and partnership champions is very helpful in communicating results. A sense of healthy competition among partners in
achieving common goals can also be helpful in pushing the overall progress of a partnership.

**Timeline for implementation & transparency by all parties**

The Criteria and Norms state that partnerships should have clear start and end dates, set timelines for its deliverables, have clearly defined roles for its partners and stakeholders; and have publicly available, such as through a website, information on its governance structure, procedures, partner composition, and results.

Furthermore, partnerships should engage, as appropriate, with the Steering Committee on Partnerships for SIDS, and the annual Global Multi-Stakeholder SIDS Partnership Dialogue, for the sharing of good practices, lessons learned and challenges and solutions from SIDS partnerships, and launch, and register in the SIDS Action Platform, new partnerships for SIDS, in line with their priorities.

Finally, partnerships maybe submit a progress report, using the established partnership reporting template, through the SIDS Action Platform once a year until completion of its activities, to include information on overall status, achievements, challenges, best practices, impact for its beneficiaries.

Having publicly available information about the governance structure, procedures, partner composition, and results, is crucial and may attract partners and resources, while ensuring greater level of transparency and openness.

Partnerships also benefit greatly from having a clear plan for its stakeholder engagement, for regular feedback, finding expertise, building capacity, and ensuring the principle of leaving no one behind is met.

**Internal monitoring and review of individual partnerships**

It is important to include a monitoring and reporting mechanism into partnerships from the outset. This may be either an internal process or contracted to an external independent reviewer.

Elements from the SIDS Partnership Criteria and Norms provide a solid basis for articulating what constitutes a genuine and durable partnership for SIDS, through the SMART criteria – a partnership that is SIDS Specific, Measurable & Monitorable, Achievable & Accountable, Resource-based on Results-focused with Timelines for implementation & transparency by all parties.

Partnerships will need to ensure that baseline data is available, so that monitoring of impacts is possible against this baseline. Data on progress against partnership goals needs to be collected regularly, and all partners should contribute to data collection. The use of indicators can be considered to evaluate progress in a systematic way. Data should be stored in either a database or an appropriate data management system. Input from
implementing partners, beneficiaries and other stakeholders should be incorporated. In particular, involving beneficiaries and stakeholders in the reporting process is important for assessing the impacts of a partnership on its intended beneficiaries. There is a need to develop a strong digital information infrastructure to allow communication among partners and beneficiaries.

Some SIDS partnerships use a Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning Plan (MEL), and this is the case, for example, for the UNDP Pacific Risk Reliance Programme that is included in the partnership case studies. The MEL approach is summarized in the box below.

**Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning Plan (MEL)**

*MEL planning* is the process for identifying which methods to adopt for *monitoring, evaluation and learning* on activities, outputs and outcomes.

| What is it? | 
|---|---|
| **Monitoring** | Monitoring refers to the routine monitoring of project resources, activities and results, and analysis of the information to guide project implementation. |
| **Evaluation** | Evaluation refers to the periodic (mid-term, final) assessment and analysis of an on-going or completed project. |
| **Learning** | Learning is the process through which information generated from M&E is reflected upon and intentionally used to continuously improve a project’s ability to achieve results. |

Monitoring and evaluation can help the partnership to assess what difference it makes through its activities. Partnership leads and stakeholders can then learn from this to improve performance in the future.

MEL is an integral part of project design, implementation and completion; MEL is done at all stages within the project cycle. The MEL cycle helps a partnership to position MEL in the life of their activities, as shown on the diagram below.
Information resources relating to MEL are available at:

- [https://www.seforall.org/sites/default/files/SEforALL_MEL_0.PDF](https://www.seforall.org/sites/default/files/SEforALL_MEL_0.PDF)

This section is adapted from the Scotland’s International Development Alliance MEL Guide (see first reference in list)
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The monitoring and review process will need to collect information about how the partnership impacts the Samoa Pathway priority area (or areas) that is its primary focus. In addition, information about spillover effects, or impacts on Samoa Pathway priority areas outside of the partnerships main focus areas should be collected.

The results of monitoring and review should be made available to all partners, stakeholders and beneficiaries. The results may also be shared more widely, for example on the partnership website, the SIDS Action Platform and beyond. Challenges, lessons learned and
best practices provide important information for others involved in partnerships, and their sharing should also be encouraged.

Capacity building may be required to help partnerships set up an effective monitoring and review mechanism, including regarding baseline data and metrics for assessment.