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INTRODUCTION

1. Official figures place the population of Pacific young people (aged 15-24 years)\(^1\) at approximately two million, although this figure is widely considered to be a gross underestimate. At two million, the youth population constitutes about one fifth of the total population and one third of the working age population. It is growing fast, placing huge and increasing - demographic pressures on basic resources and core services such as education, health and justice.

2. In addition to the population pressures, the Pacific faces other significant economic, environmental, social and political challenges. At the transitional stage of their lives, young people tend to bear the brunt of these challenges which can manifest in a range of negative outcomes such as teenage pregnancy, unemployment, crime, violence, and serious mental health problems.

3. In particular, the “youth bulge” is not being accommodated by the labour market so youth unemployment is high, equating to loss of potential, and negative impacts that endure across generations, and have wider implications for Pacific society. Estimates of lost output due to unemployment have been placed at approximately USD $828 million in 2011, increasing to USD $2.049 billion by 2015 and USD $3.18 billion by 2020.\(^2\) The wider social and political consequences can be also devastating as unemployed young people inevitably find ways to express their frustration. This frustration has occurred throughout the Pacific including in Kiribati, Papua New Guinea, the Solomon Islands and Tonga. The broad array of concerns are not new, but the size of the challenge is unprecedented, and increasingly urgent.

4. The importance of improving outcomes for young people as a critical part of the solutions to all of these challenges has long been recognised. Indeed, young people themselves share these concerns and have clearly signalled their desire to be more involved. Despite the challenges, young people in Pacific exhibit significant strengths including their positive energy, quick adaption to technology, effectiveness and forming social networks, resilience and connection to their culture, churches, communities and families. The lack of a co-ordinated structure to advance outcomes for young people risks loosing the enormous opportunity to benefit from Pacific young people’s strengths and resources, and to support their meaningful contribution to Pacific communities.

5. Over many years, a range of strategic and programme delivery initiatives at regional, national and local levels have aimed to address youth issues and to engage with the region’s young people. This work has largely struggled to gain traction and to achieve clear improvements in outcomes. Most recently efforts culminated in Pacific Island Forum Leaders recognising the need for more action to mainstream youth issues nationally and regionally. The communiqué from the Leaders was followed by a recommendation that a strategic youth development framework should be developed, from the Commonwealth Youth Programme (CYP) Pacific Young Leaders’ Conference, held in October 2011. One month later, representatives at the Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC) and United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) Adolescent Health Division and Directors of Youth meeting also supported this recommendation.

---

\(^1\) Note that the age range is defined differently throughout the Pacific.

6. This paper has been commissioned by SPC on behalf of the Pacific Youth Development Framework (PYDF) Steering Group. It is the first step in responding to this recommendation. The full Purpose, Background, Scope and Objectives for Phase One, is attached as Appendix D. Full development of the Framework (Phases 1-3) is likely to take 18 months.

7. The work completed in the broad Pacific youth development policy area over the past five years is significant and is summarised in Appendix B. Many of the current PYDF Steering Group have been involved in these projects and have a significant and often specialised understanding of Pacific youth development. Accordingly, this paper does not summarise these policy developments, nor the issues affecting Pacific young people. These matters are widely documented and assumed to be well understood by the Steering Group.

8. This paper aims to provide concise advice to the PYDF Steering Group to facilitate decision-making regarding the development and implementation of a new Framework. The proposed approach differs from previous approaches in three key ways:
   - the content of the PYDF is shaped by a positive youth development model
   - it involves more robust development, implementation and accountability processes, and
   - it identifies the foundations required for effective, sustainable youth development, and includes these as implementation projects.
Relevant issues are discussed and options for different strategic models are presented.

BACKGROUND

Methodology

9. This paper is based on a desk review of relevant documentation and targeted consultation with key stakeholders conducted between June and August 2012. It draws on previous work, particularly the recent review of the Pacific Youth Strategy 2010. A summary of the consultation (including a list of the stakeholders consulted) is included in Appendix C. All key themes raised in the consultation process have been incorporated in this summary. Readers are encouraged to review the consultation summary to get a comprehensive understanding of stakeholders’ views. Earlier drafts of the paper were peer reviewed by Dr Colin Tukuitonga, Vanessa Barlow-Schuster, and Dr Patrick Vakaotii. Their feedback has been incorporated wherever possible.

Complexity

10. The task of developing an effective regional youth development framework for 22 Pacific Island countries and territories is very challenging. Many stakeholders raised the risk of getting lost in the quagmire of United Nations agencies, governments, and other regional agencies. Further, the Pacific is not a homogenous population living in the same

---

circumstances. There is great variability within and between Pacific Island Countries and Territories (PICTs) in terms of demographics, history and cultural traditions, and the social, economic and environmental challenges that are faced.

11. There are many genuine issues, and the ‘task’ of Pacific youth development seems so vast, resulting in a tendency to develop strategies that present extensive menus of activities, without corresponding attention to governance, implementation or accountability. It is important we find ways to ‘get beyond’ the complexity by not reacting to every youth issue in the Pacific.

12. Reports of other regional initiatives struggling to get traction indicate that these difficulties are not limited to youth issues. Further, while there appears to be little evidence of progress, it is likely that the impact of the global financial crisis (GFC)\(^5\) (particularly reducing aid and tax revenue) has offset, or at least confounded, any progress that has been made.

**Recent Chronology of Regional Strategic Responses to/from Pacific Young People**

13. There have been many reports, policies, and declarations in recent years that acknowledge the issues facing young people in the Pacific and propose solutions to achieve better outcomes. Most of these initiatives have been the result of collaboration between governments, development agencies, NGOs, donors and youth organisations across a number of sectors. The recent history set out in Appendix B indicates that momentum has increased since the beginning of 2011.

14. There is general agreement that the status and well-being of young people is increasingly significant in relation to the prosperity of the region. For example, it is well understood that realising SPC’s vision of “a secure and prosperous Pacific community, whose people are healthy and manage their resources in an economically, environmentally and socially sustainable way” depends on youth empowerment and positive youth development.

15. The various strategies and statements recognise that young people are disproportionately affected by the challenges the region faces, and also, that they are an integral part of the solution. Young people have sought greater participation in decision-making, and this has been widely recognised among the stakeholders for some time, for example the Review of the Pacific Youth Bureau (SPC) in 2004.

16. Many of the previous documents are characterised by a shorter-term focus on fixing youth problems in a ‘standalone manner’, rather than investing in longer-term preventive strategies that address underlying causes. More recently, others (such as the *Urban Youth*\(^6\) report’s recommendations) have adopted a more macro or systemic approach. Additionally, contemporary work has begun to draw linkages between youth

---


strategies (e.g. the draft Pacific Youth Employment Strategy\textsuperscript{7} and Pacific Youth in Agriculture Strategy\textsuperscript{8}).

17. There has been a series of ‘calls to action’ where governments and other organisations have typically been requested to ‘make a concerted effort’.\textsuperscript{9} Despite strong evidence of goodwill and collaboration, real ownership for taking action has been elusive. Of greatest concern is that better outcomes for young people have not been achieved, as The State of Pacific Youth Report 2011 concluded.\textsuperscript{10}

18. The plethora of strategies and statements has not been matched with implementation plans or work programmes that outline roles and responsibilities, collaboration mechanisms, costings or funding plans. The PYS2010\textsuperscript{11} review highlighted the latter in relation to National Youth Plans. There is also little evidence of any accountability requirements, including systematic monitoring and evaluation. There were reports of low levels of awareness of key youth policy documents among potential partners, and consequently, highly variable integration into national policies and implementation.

**POSITIVE YOUTH DEVELOPMENT APPROACH**

Conventional Approaches to Youth Issues

19. Youth strategies usually focus on young peoples’ problems – dropping out of school, unemployment, teenage pregnancy, substance abuse and crime. These strategies reflect and reinforce enduring negative attitudes and stereotypes that become embedded in structures and institutions. Adults, who often have limited understanding of the realities of young people, can be swayed by these stereotypes. This perspective is reflected in their decisions that impact on young people – processes in which young people are typically not involved. In addition, responses to a problem tend to be ad hoc and isolated from the broader context of a young person’s life. This way of planning and working is referred to as a deficit model, and can result in policy, funding and interventions that fail to improve outcomes and may even cause harm.

20. Evidence from the documentation and stakeholder feedback indicates that this problematic approach towards young people is commonplace in the Pacific. The focus of youth initiatives has tended to be on provision of intervention services for young people already experiencing difficulties, such as second-chance education programmes or youth-friendly health services. Similarly, awareness-raising activities are a consistent theme. On their own, these kinds of interventions are unlikely to be effective and need to be accompanied by a range of integrated activities, such as skill development, incentives and environmental changes.

21. Despite the commitments set out in various policy documents, stakeholders highlighted the lack of genuine interest in young people’s voices as a central reason for the

---


implementation shortcomings. The challenges in the region are compounded by traditional beliefs and attitudes which give young people low status, leaving them ineligible to participate in the decisions that affect them. Those with responsibilities for youth outcomes appear to be afforded the same status. The result is that the well-being of young people is not adequately mainstreamed or prioritised in policy, funding and interventions.

22. Most of the problems young people experience are preventable, but issues-based responses are typically provided by the time a problem is entrenched and possibly severe. If there is an intervention, a young person might receive a short-term fix (such as diagnosis and treatment for a health problem), before returning to the environment where the same challenges remain. Often a young person is forced to rely on their family or community, and instead of being a positive contributor, the young person is a burden on systems often already under significant pressure. This further compounds the problems in a vicious cycle. This effect is replicated at a population level, where short term reactive responses prove ineffective in the longer term.

23. All young people have strengths and untapped potential, and their outcomes are shaped by a set of underlying social, cultural, environmental and economic determinants. The conventional approach tends to overlook these factors. Ultimately, this approach can perpetuate the underlying problems and may produce an ever-increasing array of negative outcomes. The young person loses motivation, and can easily be distracted from a path towards positive youth development. This amounts to a lot of avoidable misery and frustration, lost potential, and a waste of limited public and development resources on ineffective and unsustainable interventions.

24. Stakeholders did provide examples of conventional approaches that are considered to have had some success, such as the Tutu Training Centre on Taveuni in Fiji, and the Talavao Programme in Samoa. Overall however, the conventional deficit model has significant limitations. In particular, the perpetuation of stubborn, negative outcomes, and the growing level of concern for young people indicate that conventional approaches to youth issues are not working. A sea-change is indicated.

Positive Youth Development12 13

25. This paper proposes that the PYDF should align with the key components of a positive youth development approach as set out below (refer Recommendation 1). A positive youth development approach addresses these concerns and focuses on how young people can be supported to develop the skills and attitudes necessary to take part positively in society. This is a move away from thinking about young people from a problem-based position, to understanding young people as key partners and valid contributors to the social and economic fabric of the Pacific. Ensuring young people are valued in this way depends on all communities and sectors taking responsibility. The key differences between a conventional youth services approach and the positive youth development approach are summarised in the table below.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conventional Youth Services Approach</th>
<th>Positive Youth Development Approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focus on problems</td>
<td>Focus on positive outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reactive</td>
<td>Proactive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targeted youth</td>
<td>All youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth as recipients</td>
<td>Youth as active participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programmes and issue-specific responses</td>
<td>Community responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional providers</td>
<td>Community members</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. The transition into adulthood is a process of growth from dependence, to independence and interdependence (helping others). Positive connections with the core social environments are central to this process. This is based on strong evidence from the psychological, education and youth development literature that the strength of the relationships is the most significant factor for healthy outcomes.  

27. Young people’s connectedness to their social environments is integral to positive youth development. Positive connections to four particular social environments are critical, building protective factors and resilience to a range of risk factors. The four key social environments are family, friends/peers, community and school/work. Ensuring these connections should form the basis of positive youth development.

28. The core outcomes of positive youth development include:  
- young people enjoy positive physical, mental, emotional, spiritual, intellectual, and social wellbeing  
- young people have positive relationships with their key social environments  
- young people have a sense of direction and a positive vision for their future  
- young people have the capability to fulfil their potential  
- young people have sufficient resiliency to withstand, learn and grow from inevitable challenges and setbacks.

29. Positive youth development is founded on the following principles:  
- **Strengths-based** – shift the collective thinking away from problem- or deficit-based approaches to a strengths-based approach that builds resiliency  
- **Positive connections** - between young people and people in their key social environments (family, friends/peers, school/work, community) based on respect, challenge and support  
- **Quality relationships** – within and between communities, to facilitate integrated multi-sectoral and multi-level approaches  
- **Determinants** – a universal approach to enhance protective factors that increase resiliency, and to reduce risk factors that limit the likelihood of difficulties  
- **Participation** – where young people have status and engage in the activities that affect them

---

17 Note that these principles incorporate the eight principles outlined in *Urban Youth in the Pacific*. 

---
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- Diversity – acknowledging and recognising the diverse needs and circumstances of young Pacific people, and the need to provide targeted responses for young people facing extra challenges
- Evidence-based – providing information young people need; developing and applying the evidence base to inform best practice policy, funding, interventions, monitoring and evaluation
- Ownership and empowerment – by young people, institutions and communities.

30. Effective youth participation is integral to positive youth development. Effective youth participation involves young people in governance, management, design and delivery of initiatives in a way that genuinely gives young people decision-making power. It is based around an agenda that is jointly set between young people and adults, and avoids tokenism. Effective youth participation is about a partnership where all parties have the mandate to express their views and make decisions. The quality and effectiveness of the participation activities are at least as important as the amount of activity. Effective youth participation takes time, resource, and skill.

DISCUSSION

31. At regional, national and organisational levels, there appears to be good consensus about the issues facing young people. They broadly sit in the education, health and employment sectors and include:
- poor participation and achievement in education
- poor sexual and reproductive health
- substance misuse issues
- non-communicable diseases
- poor mental health and suicide prevention issues
- poor linkages between education and the labour market, and
- high unemployment.

There is also a high level of agreement at all levels that more needs to be done, but as noted previously, despite the commitment and efforts to date, the outcomes for young people are not improving. As demographic, economic and environmental pressures mount, outcomes are likely to worsen without the right kind of interventions.

32. There is a significant opportunity cost of inaction, and these costs will grow exponentially as the youth population grows. The PYS2010 review undertook linear forecasts for ten economically stagnant, non-resource rich PICTs. From a base of 385,000 in 2011, the number of unemployed people in the Pacific will increase to 530,000 in 2015 and to 700,000 in 2020. Estimates of lost output due to unemployment have been placed at approximately USD $828 million in 2011, increasing to USD $2.049 billion by 2015 and USD $3.18 billion by 2020.19

33. Urgency is required, but in setting the youth agenda there are risks that overly ambitious targets will lack credibility, while conservative targets will fail to attract the commitment required to achieve them. Stakeholders clearly reported that a challenge with previous and current youth policy has been that they are too complex and broad, leading to no

---

18 Note that employment issues are often managed in the labour and/or economic development sectors.
practical implementation. The objective will be to achieve a balance between realistic yet challenging actions, and a simple, yet inspirational, Framework.

34. There are significant contextual issues to be considered, and barriers that may take generations to overcome. There are significant tensions between a positive youth development approach based on empowerment, and traditional cultural and religious attitudes which see young people as subordinate. Similarly, there are tensions between collective, customary rights and individual human rights. This limits meaningful youth participation and can be a barrier to young people accessing services.

35. Off-setting the challenges however, there are opportunities to advance the youth development agenda. In addition to the consistent statements of commitment and calls-to-action, there are some good foundations on which to build, including:

- the education system is generally well established across the Pacific, even though participation and achievement data indicate that the system needs to do a lot better
- there is a reasonably well established youth network structure with the Pacific Youth Council (PYC), National Youth Councils (NYC’s) and church-based youth organisations
- a broader range of stakeholders who have the potential to make significant contributions (such as the Oceania Football Confederation), is signalling interest and is already active in promoting the positive development of young people
- work to promote human rights is increasing (e.g. the establishment of the Human Rights Commission and the review of the Village Fono Act 1990 in Samoa) and could bring opportunities to promote youth development and participation
- some youth development programmes have been established across the Pacific with varying degrees of success
- importantly, Pacific culture has proud traditions of strong families and communities – such values are integral to youth development, and
- many stakeholders noted that there are ‘lots of articulate and gifted young people in the Pacific with the capability to step up to leadership roles’.

Key Considerations

36. The ideas for the new PYDF set out in this paper and the aspirations of the PYDF Steering Group suggest a strategic, long-term approach is required to achieve real, sustainable change for Pacific young people. Both the entrenched challenges, and emerging issues such as the growing influence of technology, need to be addressed. In light of this, the paper recommends the new PYDF is set for a ten year timeframe (refer Recommendation 3).

37. Previous youth development policies highlighted the additional challenges facing young women, young people with disabilities, young people with diverse gender and sexuality identities, and rural young people. In particular, the need to promote engagement of these marginalised groups was identified. It is apparent that the rapidly expanding

---

20 Gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgender, takatāpui, mahu, vakasalewalewa, palopa, fa’aafafine, akava’ine, fakaleiti, and fakafifine.
21 Note that significant, but distinctive challenges have been identified for rural and urban young people. The PYDF could prioritise distinctive responses for both groups.
group of NEET (Not in Education, Employment or Training) young people is also a growing concern. The principles of the proposed PYDF make provision for both universal and targeted approaches for these priority groups. The Steering Group will need to determine how the appropriate focus is given to these young people in subsequent phases of this project (refer Recommendation 2).

38. There are many regional organisations, governments and in-country organisations with youth development or youth issues on their work programmes. Aligning this work with the PYDF will be critical. Current national youth plans and strategies could be aligned to operate as PYDF action plans. It is intended that governments would be able to access support to do this through the PYDF regional Foundation Projects to enhance their planning and implementation. For example, planning templates and policy analysis tools developed within the Foundation Projects outlined below (refer paragraph 62) are intended to make this process simple, consistent and useful for governments. The regional Foundation Projects are described in detail in paragraphs 55 to 78.

39. Stronger mainstreaming of the PYDF into the national policies of related sectors, such as education, health, labour and economic development\(^\text{22}\) will also be important. This has occurred to some extent, and continues to be relevant. Organisational structures, funding mechanisms, and citizen help-seeking behaviours are often organised around these primary sectors, and so a continued focus on sector-specific interventions, supported by the proposed Foundation Projects, is appropriate. The outcomes in each sector are highly correlated, and so integration across sectors will lead to better overall outcomes. For example, a high labour market participation rate will depend on better participation and achievement in education and a healthy workforce.

40. Providing for a continued sector-specific focus also recognises, and builds on recent work in these sectors, such as the development of the draft Pacific Youth Employment Strategy (PacificYES)\(^\text{23}\) led by the International Labour Organisation (ILO).

41. It is apparent that there are different views about the relationship between the draft PacificYES and the PYDF, particularly in relation to the expectations of the Forum Leaders. This relationship will need to be clarified (refer Recommendation 4). Regardless of the option favoured\(^\text{24}\) it is suggested that SPC and Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat (PIFS) representatives report back to Forum Leaders (refer Recommendation 5). The report back could note that the PYDF development is progressing and the new Framework will seek to address all of the main issues agreed by them at the Auckland 2011 meeting, including:

- the need for greater action in mainstreaming youth issues nationally and regionally
- the need for increasing employment and other meaningful opportunities for youth, including the voice of youth in decision-making\(^\text{25}\)
- the Key Guiding Principles in Urban Youth in the Pacific (refer paragraph 29)
- the need for the development of a regional framework for youth employment (including acknowledgement of the important role of government, the private sector and technical and vocational training institutions and the importance of

---

\(^{22}\) Including employment.


\(^{24}\) Note that the proposed Pillars Model would potentially allow this strategy to comprise one of the pillars.

\(^{25}\) In response to the Youth Employment Advocacy Initiative.
having annual labour and employment statistics that are disaggregated by gender and age)

- the importance of sport in assisting young people to stay healthy, contribute to society and develop into leaders of their communities.

**Foundations for an Effective Pacific Youth Development Framework**

42. Stakeholder interviews attributed the poor progress in improving outcomes for young people to a range of factors including undervaluing youth voices, a lack of buy-in from key stakeholders, ineffective governance, evaluation, monitoring, co-ordination, accountability and funding. These problems need to be addressed. It is clear that the new PYDF needs to be developed and implemented differently in order to achieve positive development of young people in the Pacific.

43. A robust governance structure and increased co-ordination capacity are key components of a new PYDF, regardless of the preferred model. They are discussed in detail below (refer paragraphs 45-54).

44. In addition, four Foundation Projects as part of the implementation are also recommended, regardless of the preferred model. In these projects will establish and strengthen the primary enablers of PYDF development and implementation in the Pacific. It is intended that these Projects are developed and tested in the pilot countries during the implementation phase. The intention is that the approach and resources developed would subsequently be adapted and applied regionally. The four projects are discussed in detail below and include Funding and Policy, Strengthening the Evidence, Youth Participation and Capacity Building (refer paragraphs 55-78 and Recommendations 12 and 13).

**Governance**

45. Youth issues need to be more visible on policy agendas across the Pacific, and they need to attract multi-level, and multi-sectoral support, including resources. This will require leadership (preferably with a strong and influential champion/s), endorsement, and decision-making at the highest level. Careful consideration should be given to a structure that can provide the highest level of governance for the PYDF. This structure should have significant regional and international credibility. It would be responsible not only for signing off the PYDF, but also monitoring its implementation and holding the PYDF Steering Group and co-ordination agency accountable.

46. There are four options for the high level governance of the PYDF (refer Recommendation 7):

1. Forum Leaders (Heads of State)

   The Forum Leaders have the highest status. Their high level statement and commitments in September 2011 (Auckland) could be a powerful platform for the PYDF. However, their membership does not include a number of the PICTs, and so consideration would have to be given to a mechanism that would include the non-represented PICTs.

---

Note that Option 3 includes only two of the proposed Foundation Projects.
2. SPC Committee of Representatives of Governments and Administrations (CRGA) (Foreign Ministers)
   The SPC membership does not have the same seniority, but is representative of all the PICTs. If the PYDF coordination function continues to be located within SPC, provision of secretariat support for the governance body would be more streamlined.

3. Youth Ministers
   This group of Ministers have direct responsibility for youth issues, but it is evident that they have limited resources and influence across their respective governments. They do not have a regular meeting cycle (although ad hoc meetings occur such as the Commonwealth Youth Ministers), and they do not appear to have a regional work programme. This option does not appear to meet the requirements outlined previously.

4. An alternative structure to be determined by the Steering Group.

47. The high level governance body needs to be supported by a Steering Group (refer Recommendation 8). The PYDF Steering Group would be responsible for operational oversight, including the co-ordination, development, implementation and monitoring of all aspects of the PYDF. They would make decisions regarding the progress and priorities of the PYDF, and would escalate appropriate decisions to the governance group. Representation should be considered from regional organisations (UN, SPC, PIFS, Pacific Youth Council), governments, non-government organisations, young people, faith-based organisations, traditional leaders, donors and expert advisors. Criteria for the PYDF Steering Group should include the ability to:
   - represent or work with the widest group of PICTs
   - make binding decisions on their respective organisations
   - place the PYDF on agendas at the highest level, such as that of Forum Ministers
   - effectively engage young people, and
   - engage with donors at the highest level.

48. The PYDF Steering Group would receive secretariat support as part of the co-ordination mechanism detailed below (refer paragraph 53).

49. Terms of Reference will be required to describe the structure, processes, membership and linkages for the two governance groups. Analysis on the extent to which the current PYDF Steering Group meets the proposed criteria is required. Based on this analysis, appropriate changes to the membership and function of the group would be made.

50. It is essential the participation of young people in the PYDF Steering Group is considered and addressed in the Terms of Reference. A goal to ensure that at least half of this group is made up of Pacific young people within a certain timeframe could be included. This would require a development plan and capacity building activities to reach this target, and to achieve meaningful participation. Young Steering Group members could be employees of the partner organisations. Whatever model is chosen, youth participation within the PYDF governance structures is critically important.

Co-ordination

51. It is apparent that the structures and processes to support effective development and implementation of previous youth policy have been inadequate. This is in part due to the small size of the youth development desk within SPC. The location of the proposed
coordination agency needs to be considered. This agency should have significant co-
ordination and implementation experience, and must be adequately resourced.

52. The choice of location appears to be either the Forum Leaders or SPC. Many
stakeholders suggested that SPC has Forum Leaders’ endorsement as the lead for youth
issues. In addition, its 22 PICT membership positions it well as the continued regional
youth development lead agency. The recent review of the SPC included controversial
recommendations about the future role of SPC as a co-ordination body for youth
development. Since then however, at a Special Session of the SPC Committee of
Representatives of Governments and Administrations (CRGA), it was agreed that SPC
would remain a lead agency for youth development, and would work to mainstream
youth issues across SPC divisions and oversee the co-ordination and development of the
PYDF.

53. Design of the co-ordination mechanism, including resource requirements, should be part
of Phase Two of the development of the PYDF (refer Recommendations 10 and 17). The
core functions of the co-ordination mechanism should include (refer Recommendation
11):
- providing secretariat support and co-ordination for the PYDF governance groups
- leading the development, implementation and monitoring of the PYDF
- facilitating regional collaboration
- managing the delivery of Foundation Projects, and
- communication and engagement with stakeholders.

54. The roles of the Commonwealth Youth Programme (CYP) and the Pacific Youth Council
(PYC) as the two regional organisations with an exclusive youth development focus
should also be considered in the discussions related to co-ordination of the PYDF.

Funding and Policy Foundation Project

55. A lack of funding is often cited as one of the primary reasons why broad policy
commitments have not translated into tangible actions. There is a lot of pressure on
governments in particular to step up to youth challenges, but they operate in an
environment of tight and volatile budgets. One stakeholder commented “You cannot
turn around the Titanic with a vaka paddle.”

56. Conversely, there are other signs of significant funds in the system which are not being
prioritised to benefit young people, or are being targeted at the wrong things. Larger
budgets tend to sit within domains such as health, education, labour and economic
development but the portion tagged for youth initiatives is often negligible in the
absence of adequately mainstreamed youth policy. Further, sizeable investments are
not producing the outcomes that are sought. Stakeholder feedback for example
suggested that up to 25 percent of Pacific governments’ budgets is spent on education,
but this investment is not delivering the skills needed by the labour market.

57. With the exception of one or two countries, national youth policies have not included
funding plans to support implementation. Funding from any source is unlikely to be
secured without robust data or projected costs. Accordingly, planning and securing

27 Including employment.
adequate funding will be critical for effective implementation of the PYDF. This will depend on three key factors:

- integrating (or mainstreaming) the PYDF into larger government departments, such as education, health, labour and economic development (particularly focused on employment)
- developing costings and funding plans to support implementation of the PYDF
- working constructively with major donors to align their funding policies with the PYDF, and possibly merging budgets through sector funding plans.

58. Funding mechanisms can be established to incentivise implementation of the PYDF, and to strengthen governance and accountability. Funders (including government and donors) could:

- include alignment with the PYDF as criteria for funding initiatives with a broader focus
- fund PYDF initiatives (foundation and sector-based) directly, through competitive regional funding streams
- directly incentivise key activities, such as attending school or work transition programmes, and/or
- implement contractual obligations that require providers to report against shared youth development outcomes, thereby strengthening accountability and the evidence base.

59. There are several established regional plans (e.g. The Pacific Plan), international human rights conventions (e.g. UNCRC and the Millennium Development Goals), and other strategies that are relevant to young people. They can drive policy settings, funding commitments, interventions, monitoring and reporting activities. These obligations are important policy levers, but overall the needs of young people are poorly reflected in these documents. Further policy work to ensure alignment of the PYDF with such documents is included in the recommendations for Phase Two of this project (refer Recommendation 17). There will be ongoing work to embed youth issues into new regional and international policies.

60. The PYS2010 review reported that the level of integration of this strategy into national youth policies was highly variable, and even when clear commitments were made, they rarely translated into action. Stakeholders reported that youth departments with responsibility for national youth policies struggled to influence significant government policy like health and education. Mainstreaming of youth development into broader sector policy is essential, and those leading this work will need support to be more effective in the future. It will require tools (such as policy impact assessment tools), training, guidance and support at a country level.

61. It is also apparent that the focus on structural policy development, such as legislative and regulatory changes, has been light. These are powerful tools. Opportunities to protect and promote the wellbeing of young people through these mechanisms should be given more consideration, particularly in relation to promoting participation in education, limiting access to harmful products, and establishing more conducive conditions for the employment of young people.

62. The Funding and Policy Foundation Project would focus on:

- working with donors to incorporate the PYDF into their priorities and to secure funding contributions
• establishing funding management mechanisms for delivery of initiatives
• supporting the integration of the PYDF into relevant national and regional strategies and work programmes
• developing and supporting the use of policy tools like templates for national youth policies and funding plans for national policy, and policy impact assessment tools
• assessing the impact of proposed new policies on youth development outcomes and the implementation of the PYDF, and
• identifying potential legislative/regulatory solutions.

A project plan should be developed as a part of the development phase (refer Recommendation 17).

**Strengthening the Evidence Foundation Project**

63. The shortage of data is also often cited as an underlying reason for the lack of progress on youth issues. The lack of evidence spans all sources: routinely collected data (via censuses, other population surveys, and administrative sources), research (particularly on risk and protective factors and outcomes for young people), and evaluation (of the effectiveness of interventions). Further, there is a particular need for data disaggregated by gender, ethnicity, sexual orientation, and disability, in order to identify disparities that may otherwise go unnoticed.

64. The shortage of data was a key factor in the lack of monitoring and evaluation of *PYS2010*. It is apparent that linking *PYS2010* to outcomes was particularly problematic. High quality data will be essential for the ongoing monitoring and evaluation of the PYDF.

65. In the first instance, it is imperative that high level decision-makers and leaders are presented with evidence that sets out the size and nature of current youth issues with projections about the consequences, including costs of inaction. Compelling arguments supported by high quality data will keep youth issues on high level agendas, and mobilise other stakeholders. Despite the gaps, there is enough data currently available to present such an argument, although more analysis is required. This work will be critical for the development and implementation of the PYDF and is included in Phase 2 of this project (refer Recommendation 17).

66. The SPC has signalled its intention to expand the capability of the PRISM database so that it becomes the central repository of youth development information. The *PYS2010* review recommended that SPC collaborates with other agencies such as the World Bank to develop PRISM as the main repository of youth development information.

67. There are limited signs that youth initiatives in the Pacific are founded on an evidence-based approach. This carries risks as there is potential for some well-intended youth development interventions to have unintended harmful consequences, particularly when issues such as substance abuse and suicide prevention are involved. An evidence-based approach maximises positive outcomes, ensures investment is made in programmes and projects that will have the highest impact, and limits any potential harmful impacts. Partnerships with tertiary education institutions (such as the University of the South Pacific) could help to progress this Foundation Project.
68. A Monitoring and Evaluation Framework will be a core component of the roll-out of the PYDF as part of the Strengthening Evidence Foundation Project. While such a framework was developed for the PYS2010, there was no evidence of any reporting against it. Evaluation and monitoring should be based on measuring impact and progress against outcomes identified and agreed in the development phase. Regional and country-level data should be used as indicators, and countries should be supported through capacity building and the provision of reporting tools.

69. The Strengthening the Evidence Foundation Project would focus on:
- developing and implementing a Monitoring and Evaluation Plan
- developing a core indicator set to measure progress of the PYDF (this could include standard indexes such as the World Bank Development Indicators, and the Oxford Poverty and Human Development Index),
- establishing baseline measures against which progress would be tracked
- developing mechanisms to collect data
- developing partnerships to support data collection and evaluation (e.g. World Bank, SPC PRISM)
- ensuring that PYDF initiatives are evidence-based.

A project plan should be developed as a part of the development phase (refer Recommendation 17).

**Youth Participation Foundation Project**

70. Formal youth participation in the Pacific is relatively new and while there are good intentions set out in the relevant strategies, there are few examples of real commitment and good practice. Stakeholders acknowledge the importance, but appear to have divergent understandings of what effective participation involves.

71. The special challenges with youth participation in a Pacific context have been identified in the documentation and by stakeholders (refer paragraph 34). Young people have very limited involvement in decision-making systems dominated by older people. The prevailing attitude is that young people will ‘come into their own eventually’ and ‘should be seen and not heard’. Challenging entrenched cultural and institutional attitudes that do not support participation will take significant and sustained effort over many years to create societies that value young people as equal with valid views. Recent political changes resulting from youth action in Egypt point to the significant change that has arisen from youth participation, activism and passion in many societies.

72. A number of stakeholders suggested that the central focus of the new PYDF should be on youth participation. They suggested that if the Framework achieves nothing else but increasing participation, it will have achieved a lot. Effective youth participation will depend on reducing the barriers between young people and adults, particularly those who work directly with young people. It will require awareness, compromise and power-sharing that Pacific communities have yet to come to terms with.

73. Formal structures such as NYCs and the PYC have had some investment and support, however many national youth policies do not identify how NYCs or other forms of participation will be supported. While support should be ensured for these

---

representative groups of young people, additional youth participation initiatives will also be required to ensure young people not connected to these structures are engaged.

74. It is suggested that the development phase of the PYDF is a youth participation exercise in itself. This would involve a significant proportion of young people in the PYDF Steering Group (refer paragraph 50), and design and implementation of the PYDF initiatives that involves and/or are led by young people (refer Recommendation 19).

75. Strengthening the participation of young people will have significant positive impacts on accountability, governance and organisational effectiveness across the Pacific. While the PYDF should involve varied forms of youth participation, the proposed Youth Participation Foundation Project will:

- ensure that effective participation happens across all aspects of the PYDF development and implementation, including the PYDF governance, coordination, and regional Foundation Projects
- ensure youth-led initiatives and projects are a core part of the PYDF implementation and receive adequate funding and support
- develop models of good practice, as well as more explicitly build capacity and collective understanding of effective participation, and
- provide advice and support to regional and country-level organisations to lead youth participation initiatives.

A project plan should be developed as a part of the development phase (refer Recommendation 17).

**Capacity Building Foundation Project**

76. The *PYS2010* identified organisational weakness as the biggest constraint to development, and a contributor to greater inequalities and social breakdown. Indicators of institutional strength (e.g. political stability, control of corruption, transparency and accountability) tend to be weak in the Pacific. The PYDF will not be effective if its delivery is reliant upon weak organisations. The need for greater organisational capability applies at all levels, from government agencies through to community groups in the informal sector.

77. Organisational capability depends on good governance and leadership, an appropriate structure, a supportive employment environment, a stronger evidence base and accountability, and a workforce with the relevant competencies. These can include policy analysis, funding and contract management, service delivery, and research skills.

78. The Capacity Building Foundation Project will include the provision of technical advice and capacity building services to support organisations implementing the PYDF, including government agencies. Developing the capacity of youth-led organisations should be a priority. A project plan should be developed as a part of the development phase (refer Recommendation 17).

**Options for a Pacific Youth Development Framework**

79. As noted previously the *PYS2010* translated into very little implementation. The review described *PYS2010* as “overly ambitious”, suggesting that a clear set of priority initiatives may have been more realistic and engaging when it came to implementation.
Stakeholders have asked for the new PYDF to be practical, simple and focused on implementation.

80. This paper sets out three models for consideration as options for the development and implementation of the new PYDF. All of the proposed models would be grounded in a positive youth development model as described in paragraphs 25-30.

81. All of the proposed models would include the Foundation Projects, except for Option Three which would only include two of the four Foundation Projects. A summary table for the three options is included in Appendix A to highlight the consistent and differentiating components of each model. The Foundation Projects would take account of the need for flexibility to respond to national, sector, or organisational issues. Implementation of national initiatives over and above the Foundation Projects would be directly responsive to local issues.

**Option One: Programmatic Model**

82. This option would develop a clear overarching framework for youth development in the Pacific, including purpose, principles, objectives and outcomes. The outcomes would be focused on key areas such as education, health, employment, sport, etc. In addition to the Foundation Projects, a small number of programmes would developed to address a range of inter-related objectives (refer Recommendation 20).

83. Three or four specific programmes would then be prioritised within the PYDF and developed through a programme design process in Phase Two. Implementation would be piloted in one or two countries in Phase Three. Regional stakeholders including donors, and stakeholders from one or both of the pilot countries would be engaged in the programme design process.

84. An example of a specific programme in the Pacific is the Oceania Football Confederation’s *Just Play* programme. Like *Just Play*, the programmes would need to:

- include outcomes that are based on a positive youth development approach. For examples, outcomes could include: young people’s connections with their communities are enhanced; young people’s participation in local village leadership structures is increased; the capacity of youth-led organisations responding to employment issues is developed; and young people take leadership of the development and delivery of health services for themselves.
- have specific activities (for *Just Play*, this is sport)
- address clear outcomes linked to the overarching outcomes of the Framework, including intermediate (e.g. young people’s involvement in regular sport activity is increased) and ultimate outcomes (e.g. the incidence of non-communicable diseases (NCDs) with young people is reduced, or new employment opportunities are created for young people)
- be youth-led or have significant and meaningful participation of young people in the management and delivery of the programme
- be clearly branded with high quality communications and key messages
- have a full programme delivery and implementation manual, and
- have a full budget for country-level delivery and regional support.

85. Programmes could focus on policy, funding, service delivery, or strengthening the evidence base depending on the agreed priorities. For example, there could be a project
working on mainstreaming youth issues across key areas of government policy.\textsuperscript{29} Other examples of specific programmes include the establishment and provision of youth health clinics; a scheme to encourage young people’s productive involvement in agriculture; a youth internship scheme that increases opportunities for young people to work. They could be delivered by, or in partnership with, a local provider organisation (which could be a youth-led organisation).

86. These initiatives should be integrated with, and help to operationalise the Foundation Projects to maximise the overall impact. For example, they should have components that strengthen the evidence base (e.g. evaluation); increase capacity development; incorporate funding and policy models; and they should include a youth participation component.

87. Following the programme piloting (Phase Three), the programmes would be adjusted to take account of the evaluation of the pilot programmes, and then scaled for implementation in all of the PICTs.

88. Over and above the Foundation Projects, this model would see the PYDF focus its implementation on the three of four programmes, meaning that some areas may not be addressed in the earlier stages of implementation. This is a very different approach to a strategy that seeks to concurrently address a wide range of areas with many pre-identified activities. The model will see the most important outcomes addressed first through focused activity that produces tangible results. It would enhance the credibility of the PYDF, increase the visibility of youth issues, build momentum, and motivate wider engagement and commitment among stakeholders. In this way, the model responds well to stakeholder views that a simple and pragmatic approach to the implementation of the PYDF is important.

Option Two: Pillars Model

89. Three of four key priority sectors (e.g. education, health, and employment\textsuperscript{30}) would be identified and specific plans or strategies would be developed as core pillars sitting under the overarching framework (refer Recommendations 21 and 22). The Pacific Youth Employment Strategy (PacificYES) and the Pacific Youth in Agriculture Strategy are current examples of regional sector strategies.

90. A stock take of existing policy, funding, interventions and evaluation in the priority areas will help to shape these plans. Rather than an extensive menu of actions, it would be more useful to focus plans on a small set of priority initiatives. As outlined above, these initiatives would align with, and operationalise, the Foundation Projects.

91. As with the Programmatic Model, the plans would be developed as part of the PYDF development phase, consulted on, and then piloted (Phase Three). The plans could be regionally led by the co-ordination agency or a regional development partner, and implemented nationally by, or in partnership with, a local provider organisation (which could be a youth-led organisation) or government department.

\textsuperscript{29} Note that this would need to align with, and/or extend the Foundation Project on Strengthening the Evidence Base.

\textsuperscript{30} Including labour and economic development.
92. In each sector, one or two initiatives could be set up as ‘flagship’ projects in the pilot countries, adapted to reflect local needs and circumstances. They could be piloted and evaluated, revised as required, and then scaled up and expanded into other PICTs as part of the full PYDF implementation.

**Option Three: Broad Framework Model**

93. Like the models described previously, this model would go through the same process to develop an overarching framework for youth development, including purpose, principles, objectives and outcomes. There would be no further specific plans or programmes stemming from the overarching Framework. It is proposed that the Foundation Projects would be limited to Strengthening the Evidence and Capacity Building, but the Steering Committee could consider including all of the proposed Foundation Projects.

94. This model is most similar to the PYS2010 and the Youth Development Strategy Aotearoa. Like this, and earlier Pacific strategies, implementation of the PYDF would be focused on encouraging regional agencies, governments and non-state actors to use the Framework as the basis for planning and actions relating to young people. As noted previously, this model has struggled to gain traction and to achieve the desired outcomes. Under the proposed approach, it could be problematic to secure commitment to the proposed regional Foundation Projects. This model could however be the least costly to implement, and would allow for greater flexibility to respond to the diverse local issues across the 22 PICTs.

**Comparing the Models**

95. The table in Appendix A provides a useful summary of the three models, and highlights the shared features and differences between the proposed models. The shared features of all the models include:

- Firstly, the development of an overarching framework, including purpose, principles, objectives and outcomes, that would firmly ground the development and implementation of the PYDF in the positive youth development approach.
- The Foundation Projects to be designed during Phase Two, and piloted in Phase Three.
- Governance structure and Co-ordination mechanism to be designed and piloted in Phase Three.
- Design of the Foundation Projects, Governance and Coordination components with a regional focus, but piloted in the two identified countries during Phase Three, before being scaled up and progressively expanded regionally. For example, outputs of the Foundation Projects would be developed with the expectation that they could be applied in any of the PICTs. It is expected that regional stakeholders would be engaged throughout Phases Two and Three.
- Regional oversight and support would be provided to the pilot countries during Phases Two and Three. This would allow for flexibility in the regional initiatives to ensure appropriate responses to national or local issues.

96. The differences between the models include:

---

• The Programmatic Model moves from the Framework to development of a programme of selected initiatives. These would be developed in Phase Two and piloted in Phase Three in close collaboration with the two pilot countries.
• The Pillars Model includes development of sector-specific strategies, with associated action or implementation. These would be developed in Phase Two and piloted in Phase Three in close collaboration with the two pilot countries.
• The Broad Framework Model does not include a programme of initiatives or sector-specific strategies, other than any agreed Foundation Projects. Regional support would be provided to assist PICTs and other organisations to adopt and implement the Framework.

PYDF Development Phase

97. During the development of this Options Paper, changes have occurred which may affect the timeframes for the next phases of the PYDF. Initially, the development phase (Phase Two) was to be completed in time for a Youth Ministers’ meeting in December 2012. This left just over three months to complete the second phase. It is anticipated that effective execution of the development phase will require more than three months, which may now be possible in light of the recent changes. The deliverables suggested for the development phase are based on the assumption that they will feed into Phase Three, where the PYDF will be piloted for a year in two countries (refer Recommendations 15, 16, 17 and 23).

Consultation and Development of the Draft PYDF

98. Stakeholder views about consultation varied, with most suggesting that effective consultation with organisations and groups including regional organisations, young people, traditional leaders, Civil Society Organisations, Non-Government Organisations, Governments, and Faith-Based Organisations was ideal. However, there was reluctance from many to resource in-country consultation in all 22 PICTs. There was no support for regional meetings of key youth officials as an effective consultation tool, except for consultation with those government departments for whom the officials work.

99. There was also no support for broad consultation on youth issues that would inform the development of the PYDF. All stakeholders preferred that consultation focuses on a draft PYDF with all of its components: purpose, principles, objectives and outcomes; and an implementation plan including Foundation Projects, governance Terms of Reference, and the co-ordination mechanism design (refer Recommendations 14 and 16).

100. Where possible, collaboration should occur with NYCs and other youth leaders to enable youth-led consultation with all stakeholders. Consultation should be split between Phases Two and Three, and would focus initially on the two pilot countries. Suggestions of how consultation could be undertaken are outlined below.

101. Phase Two (development phase) development and consultation could include:
• partnerships developed with local youth-led organisations, governments, and NYCs in the pilot countries to decide how consultation and PYDF development should be undertaken
• in-country consultation with all stakeholders in the two pilot countries, including engagement with the young people with disabilities, diverse sexual and gender identities, rural young people and young people not in education, training or employment (NEETs)
• engagement with stakeholders, particularly youth organisations and young people through social media/online survey engagement, and key informant interviews (The PYDF Steering Group may also identify other methods. Refer to Appendix C for stakeholders’ ideas within the Consultation Summary.)
• engagement via the PYDF Steering Group with all 22 PICT member governments and youth councils to ensure they are informed on progress and have opportunities to participate
• involvement of key regional organisations in the design workshops to develop the draft overarching framework, and
• programme/strategy/action plan design workshops for the Programmatic Model/Pillars Model co-led by the PYDF development team and local youth-led organisations.

102. Phase Three (pilot phase) consultation would be based on the draft PYDF developed in phase two, and could include:
• in-country consultation with all stakeholders in the remaining 20 PICTs, at the same time the PYDF is piloted, and timed so that initial learnings from the pilots could be shared, and
• methods similar to those proposed for Phase Two (design workshops, focus groups, social media/online survey engagement, and key informant interviews).

**Key Deliverables**

103. The deliverables for the PYDF development phase will depend on which option is favoured as detailed in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programmatic Model</th>
<th>Pillars Model</th>
<th>Broad Framework Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development of overarching framework for youth development in the Pacific</td>
<td>Development of 3-4 specific plans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme design for 3-4 specific programmes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terms of Reference for project governance groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-ordination mechanism design, budget and associated work programme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Design and Plan for Foundation Projects: Capacity Building</td>
<td>Project Design and Plan for Foundation Projects: Capacity Building</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening the Evidence (including the PYDF Monitoring and Evaluation Plan)</td>
<td>Strengthening the Evidence (including the PYDF Monitoring and Evaluation Plan)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding and Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of a draft PYDF for consultation</td>
<td>Consultation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of a final draft PYDF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONCLUSION

The following recommendations draw on the previous discussion and outline the key decisions required from the Steering Committee to proceed with the next phase in developing the PYDF.

Recommendations

1. **Agree in principle** that the focus of the PYDF should be in line with the vision, outcomes, objectives and principles of a positive youth development approach as outlined in paragraphs (refer to paragraphs 25-30).

2. **Agree in principle** whether or not the following groups of young people should be prioritised within the PYDF:
   a. rural young people
   b. young people with disabilities
   c. young people not in education, training or employment
   d. lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender young people, and
   e. young women.

3. **Agree** that the PYDF has a minimum ten year timeframe to enable full development of the foundations and achievement of tangible outcomes.

4. **Determine** the relationship between the drafted Pacific Youth Employment Strategy and the PYDF.

5. **Report back** to Forum Leaders that:
   a. PYDF development is progressing and the new Framework will seek to address all of the main issues agreed by them at the Auckland 2011 meeting, and
   b. Other decisions arising from this Steering Group meeting.

6. **Choose** one of the following models for the development and implementation of the PYDF (refer to paragraphs 79-96); either:
   a. “Programmatic”, or
   b. “Pillars”, or
   c. “Broad Framework”.

**Governance of PYDF**

7. **Choose** a high level governance group for the PYDF that will sign off the PYDF and act as the highest level of accountability for the Framework. The options are either:
   a. Forum Leaders, or
   b. The SPC Committee of Representatives of Governments and Administrations, or
   c. Youth Ministers, or
   d. An alternative structure to be determined by the Steering Group.

8. **Agree** on the membership of the PYDF Steering Group.

32 Note that significant, but distinctive challenges have been identified for rural and urban young people. The PYDF could prioritise distinctive responses for both groups.
Co-ordination of PYDF

9. Choose which agency is most suitable to lead the development and implementation of the PYDF, either:
   a. Forum Leaders, or
   b. SPC.

10. Agree to include in the development phase (Phase Two) a requirement to design the co-ordination mechanism and a work programme, including financial and staffing implications.

11. Agree that the co-ordination mechanism includes the capacity to:
   a. provide secretariat support and co-ordination for the PYDF governance groups
   b. lead the development, implementation and monitoring of the PYDF
   c. facilitate regional collaboration
   d. manage the delivery of foundation projects, and
   e. communicate and engage with stakeholders.

PYDF Foundation Projects

12. Note that the proposed Programmatic and Pillars Models include the establishment of four regional Foundation Projects. The proposed Foundation Projects are: Funding and Policy, Strengthening Evidence, Youth Participation and Capacity Building. The Broad Framework Model includes two of these Foundation Projects (Strengthening Evidence and Capacity Building).

13. Agree that project planning and design of the four (or two for Option 3) Foundation Projects is completed during the development phase (Phase Two).

Development Phase (PYDF Phase 2)

14. Subject to agreement on Recommendation 1, agree that a draft PYDF will be developed in collaboration with the PYDF Steering Group and then consulted on.

15. Agree the countries where the final draft PYDF is to be piloted.

16. Agree that consultation in the development phase should be focussed on wide engagement within the two pilot countries, including young people, traditional leaders, governments, donors, aid agencies, and non-government organisations including civil society organisations, and faith-based organisations.

17. Agree that the deliverables of PYDF development Phase Two will include:
   a. Further policy work to (i) analyse and collate relevant statistics that will constitute a clear evidence-base for prioritising youth development; and (ii) identify policy levers, including relevant accountability arrangements such as commitments to human rights conventions.
   b. Development of a first draft PYDF for consultation
   c. Development of a final draft PYDF
   d. Co-ordination mechanism design, and associated work programme with a proposed budget
e. Terms of Reference for project governance groups
f. Project planning and project design of the four (or two for Option 3) Foundation Projects (including a Monitoring and Evaluation Plan, which will be developed as part of the Strengthening Evidence Foundation Project).

18. **Agree** that in addition to the four Foundation Projects, implementation of the final draft PYDF is piloted and evaluated in two countries.

19. **Agree** that Pacific young people from the pilot countries must be a part of the development team.

**Specific Recommendations for Programmatic Model**

20. **Agree** that the second phase will design 3-4 specific programmes ready to be piloted, and that where possible, this process should be youth-led.

**Specific Recommendations for Pillars Model**

21. **Agree** that the second phase will develop 3-4 specific plans or strategies on key priority areas.

22. **Identify** priority areas of focus for the 3-4 specific plans or strategies.

**Pilot Implementation Phase (PYDF Phase Three)**

23. **Agree in principle** that Phase Three will focus on:
   a. Implementing the Foundation Projects, and piloting implementation of the PYDF in two countries
   b. Wide, regional consultation across Pacific countries
   c. Revising and finalising the PYDF based on evaluation feedback from the implementation initiatives and consultation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Programmatic Model</th>
<th>Pillars Model</th>
<th>Broad Framework Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Overarching framework for youth development in the Pacific, including purpose, principles and outcomes.</td>
<td>- Overarching framework for youth development in the Pacific, including purpose, principles and outcomes.</td>
<td>- Overarching framework for youth development in the Pacific, including purpose, principles and outcomes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 3-4 specific programmes would be designed as core parts of the PYDF.</td>
<td>- 3-4 key areas of focus identified.</td>
<td>- Implementation of the PYDF would be focused on encouraging regional agencies, governments and non-state actors to use the framework as the basis for their planning for young people.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Programmes would aim to have an impact on the PYDF outcomes.</td>
<td>- Specific plans or strategies (e.g., education, employment, health) would then be developed as core pillars of the PYDF.</td>
<td>- Specific plans or strategies would have specific activities that feed into the achievement of the PYDF outcomes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Programmes youth-led if possible</td>
<td>- Specific plans or strategies would have specific activities that feed into the achievement of the PYDF outcomes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Phase (Phase 2)</th>
<th>Programmatic Model</th>
<th>Pillars Model</th>
<th>Broad Framework Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Design co-ordination mechanism</td>
<td>- Design co-ordination mechanism</td>
<td>- Design co-ordination mechanism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ToR for governance groups</td>
<td>- ToR for governance groups</td>
<td>- ToR for governance groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Design and project planning for four foundation projects</td>
<td>- Design and project planning for four foundation projects</td>
<td>- Design and project planning for two foundation projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Programme design process to design the 3-4 programmes</td>
<td>- Strategic planning for 3-4 specific plans/strategies</td>
<td>- Draft PYDF (includes all of above)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Identification of providers for the programmes in pilot countries</td>
<td>- Identification of lead agencies for each of the plans</td>
<td>- Targeted Consultation – focused on regional agencies, and young people, CSOs, FBOs, NGOs in the pilot countries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Draft PYDF (includes all of above, including the 3-4 programmes)</td>
<td>- Draft PYDF (includes all of above, including the 3-4 plans)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Targeted Consultation – focused on regional agencies, and young people, CSOs, FBOs, NGOs in the pilot countries</td>
<td>- Targeted Consultation – focused on regional agencies, and young people, CSOs, FBOs, NGOs in the pilot countries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pilot Phase (Phase 3)</th>
<th>Programmatic Model</th>
<th>Pillars Model</th>
<th>Broad Framework Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Set up co-ordination mechanism</td>
<td>- Set up co-ordination mechanism</td>
<td>- Set up co-ordination mechanism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Commence all four foundation projects</td>
<td>- Commence all four foundation projects</td>
<td>- Commence two foundation projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Pilot the 3-4 programmes in 2 PICTs</td>
<td>- Begin implementation of the 3-4 specific plans/strategies in 2 PICTs</td>
<td>- Pilot the PYDF in 2 countries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Broad consultation across the PICTs</td>
<td>- Broad consultation across the PICTs</td>
<td>- Broad consultation across the PICTs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Evaluation of pilot delivery and programme changes to respond to evaluation</td>
<td>- Evaluation of pilot delivery and plan/strategy changes to respond to evaluation</td>
<td>- Evaluation of pilot and changes to respond to evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation</th>
<th>Programmatic Model</th>
<th>Pillars Model</th>
<th>Broad Framework Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Scale up the 3-4 programmes across the 22 PICTs</td>
<td>- Scale up the specific plans or strategies to work across the 22 PICTs</td>
<td>- PYDF rolled out to all 22 PICTs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Governance</th>
<th>Programmatic Model</th>
<th>Pillars Model</th>
<th>Broad Framework Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Level Governance Group and PYDF Steering Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Foundation Projects</th>
<th>Programmatic Model</th>
<th>Pillars Model</th>
<th>Broad Framework Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funding and Policy Foundation Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening the Evidence Foundation Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation Foundation Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity Building Foundation Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Co-ordination</th>
<th>Programmatic Model</th>
<th>Pillars Model</th>
<th>Broad Framework Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lead the implementation of the PYDF, engage with key stakeholders, co-ordinate and support the governance structure/s for the PYDF, manage delivery of the foundation projects.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B: HISTORY OF KEY STRATEGIES, STATEMENTS AND REPORTS ON PACIFIC YOUTH ISSUES.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Key document/statement</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2004     | Review of the Pacific Youth Bureau, SPC.                                               | Identified the need for:  
  - More synergy and a greater focus on National Youth Plans as the central focus  
  - Clearer identification regional and national functions, including SPC’s role  
  - Leadership, coordination and advocacy of youth issues |
| 2004     | Auckland Declaration 2004                                                               | Amongst their recommendations, Pacific leaders agreed to “listen to the needs and aspirations of the burgeoning population of young people in the region, and recognise the impact of bigger and more youthful populations on the resources required for education and vocational training, health care, and job opportunities”. |
|          | Mauritius Declaration                                                                   | Youth Visioning for Island Living Declaration adopted in Mauritius 2005.                                                                                                                              |
| May 2005 | Pacific Tofamamao 2015: Declaration of the Pacific Youth Summit for MDGs                 | Guide to how Pacific young people can play an active role in achieving the MDGs  
  - Concerns included limited resources to meet basic necessities, gender equality, environmental sustainability, limited ICT development, political conflicts and civil unrest, and rising youth suicide.  
  - Identify challenges and options for action for each MDG. |
|          | Pacific Youth MDG Summit                                                                 | Youth for a Sustainable Future (YSFP) was a major partner in the Pacific Youth MDG Summit, which was convened for the first time in collaboration with UN agencies and the Government of Samoa. |
| 2005     | Pacific Plan for Strengthening Regional Cooperation and Integration                      | Guides the implementation of the Plan towards economic growth, sustainable development, good governance and security in the Pacific region.  
  - Vision: “The Pacific region can, should and will be a region of peace, harmony, security and economic prosperity, so that all of its people can lead free and worthwhile lives.”  
  - Under “Sustainable Development”, there are two youth-specific strategic objectives with indicators: |
| 9. Enhanced involvement of youth: | 9.1 Enhance advocacy for and coordination of youth programmes and monitor the status of youth. |
| | 10. Increased levels of participation and achievement in sport |
| | 10.1 Enhance regional sporting networks to support the developmental role of sport. |
| | 10.2 Create a regional sporting institute. |

| Pacific Tofamamo 2015: Youth Statement on the Pacific Plan | Identifies key issues for young people in relation to the Pacific Plan goals: |
| | - Economic growth |
| | - Sustainable development |
| | - Good governance |
| | - Security |

| | - A tool for understanding the situation of youth in the Pacific region and guiding decision-making on measures to address youth issues. |
| | - Youth issues often treated in standalone manner, focus on high-profile youth problems rather than identifying and addressing underlying causes, not enough prevention. |
| | - Expenditure addresses symptoms only and avoids larger investment needed to implement long-term preventative strategies. |
| | - Underlying causes of youth issues – poverty and hardship, education systems focused on white-collar employment skills, scarcity of employment opportunities, rural/urban inequalities, conflict between traditional and modern cultures, authoritarian parenting methods, and discrimination on the basis of gender, sexual orientation, disability, etc. |

| 2005 Pacific Youth Strategy 2005 - 2010 | - Major theme “youth empowerment for a secure, prosperous and sustainable future” |
| | - 7 issues for action: |
| | - accessing integrated education, |
| | - nurturing sustainable livelihoods, |
| | - promoting healthy lifestyles |
| | - building stronger communities |
| | - strengthening institutional capacity |
| | - youth and identities |
| | - research information and data |
Developed with input from eight young representatives of the Pacific, who were established as the first Pacific Youth Council – lead by SPC, and endorsed by Pacific Youth Ministers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>November 2005</th>
<th><em>Koror Statement on Youth Empowerment for a Secure, Prosperous and Sustainable Future</em></th>
<th>This statement set the tone for the deliberations of the 2nd Conference of Youth Ministers of the Pacific Community convened in Port Moresby, Papua New Guinea from 5 to 7 December 2005, which resulted in the adoption of the <em>Pacific Youth Strategy 2010</em> (PYS2010) as the regional framework for youth development in the Pacific region to the year 2010 and beyond.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>December 2005</td>
<td>Pacific Youth Ministers endorsement.</td>
<td>Of the <em>State of Pacific Youth Report</em> and the <em>PYS2010</em>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2006          | *Pacific Youth Charter from the 1st Pacific Youth Festival* | - Good governance - establishment of youth assemblies/parliaments in all countries  
- Active citizenship - full youth participation in democratic processes  
- Education and training for all - integration of cultural knowledge and sustainable development into the curriculum, equipping teachers/parents to support youth development  
- Social and professional integration - better transition into the workforce with support for enterprise and volunteering  
- Sustainable development - resource management to offset climate change, poverty and inequality  
- Cultural diversity – strengthening young people’s efforts to preserve traditional knowledge and customs  
- Health – a stronger preventive approach and promotion of healthy lifestyles, better access to information, and more youth-responsive services  
- Equality – protecting and upholding human rights in an inclusive and caring society  
- Peace promotion – to minimise the impact of conflict/violence on young people |
- Review of PAYE 2005-2010 found it to be an excellent document, but there was not enough awareness of it, and therefore it was not adequately utilised. It also needed to set targets and measure
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Suva Declaration from the 2nd Pacific Youth Festival</td>
<td>Proposed action under five broad headings:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>▪ promoting healthy lifestyles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>▪ supporting Pacific identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>▪ improving climate change adaptation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>▪ fostering good governance, peace and security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>▪ more opportunities to gain skills for life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Pacific Youth in Agriculture Strategy (2011-2015): Echoing the Voices of Pacific Youth. SPC</td>
<td>▪ Responds to a call from Ministers of Agriculture in 2008 to explore ways to support more young people to take up careers in agriculture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Also addresses food security, employment, rural-urban migration, economic opportunities in rural communities, sustainable economic growth overall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Purpose: To support young people to see agriculture as a career option by (1) encouraging active engagement in agriculture, and (2) developing young entrepreneurs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Focuses on: (1) enabling environment; (2) youth oriented agricultural extension; (3) education and learning; (4) youth enterprise and entrepreneurship; (5) showcasing Pacific youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Mainstreaming and youth participation are key recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Intended to be adapted and implemented nationally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2010</td>
<td>Pacific Regional Youth Leadership Forum</td>
<td>▪ Lead by PYC with technical assistance from Pacific Leadership Programme (PLP) and UNICEF Pacific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Instigated the notion of targeting the Forum Leaders to make commitments to address youth employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Advocacy strategy was devised and resourced by PLP and a Steering Committee established (ILO, UNICEF, PYC).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2011</td>
<td>Pacific Declaration on “Investing in Youth Employment” from PYC, ILO and CYP.</td>
<td>▪ Recognised and reaffirmed youth employment as a key concern for PICTs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Called for the development of a Pacific Youth Employment Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>▪ PacificYES drafted in 2012 to feature as a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event/Document Title</td>
<td>Highlights/Actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2011</td>
<td><strong>Wansolwara Youth Statement on Peace Building</strong></td>
<td>▪ Young people from 14 PICTs with support from the CYP, UNESCO, UNDP and PIFS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Highlighted potential for young people to work with governments and other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>organisations to contribute positively to peace-building initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Called on Forum Leaders to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Strengthen capacity building and partnerships through education and training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(e.g. leadership programmes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Support safe places for dialogue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Enable easier and more affordable access to ICT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Encourage young people to be part of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>national decision- and policy-making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2011</td>
<td><strong>Urban Youth in the Pacific: Increasing Resilience and Reducing Risk for Involvement in Crime and Violence.</strong></td>
<td>▪ Responded to the call from Forum Regional Security Council (PRSC) leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>to understand why young people are disproportionately represented in prisons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>in the Pacific.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Applies a Risk and Resiliency Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>to assess their impact on the involvement of young people in crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and violence across eight countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Includes summary of key actions in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>National Youth Policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Principles – endorsed in Leaders’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Communique in September 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Outlines eight key issues and regional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>principles/recommendations:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Mainstream youth issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Whole-of-government approaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Participation of young people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Improve justice responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Improve education outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Employment opportunities and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>meaningful activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Reduce risk factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Partnerships with CSOs and FBOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Notes “the high return on investment in youth in the long term in terms of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>development gains and cost savings has been proven time and time again”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development Cooperation**</td>
<td>implemented and relevance for future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PYS2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Highlighted low level of awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(particularly outside of government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>departments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(and highly variable)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
integration into national policies, lack of baseline data and difficulty measuring progress

- Key themes:
  - Accessing integrated education
  - Nurturing sustainable livelihoods
  - Promoting healthy lifestyles
  - Building stronger communities
  - Strengthening institutional capacity
  - Youth and identities
  - Research information and data
- Each theme includes an analysis of achievements, challenges, lessons learned and opportunities.
- Key recommendations included:
  - More time/resources for consultation & development of PYS2015 to secure concrete commitment
  - Participation/targeting of marginalised young people
  - Comprehensive implementation plan
  - More robust monitoring and evaluation system transferable to national level including independent review taskforce.
- Includes sector-specific recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>September 2011</th>
<th>State of Pacific Youth Report 2011, UNICEF Pacific and SPC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This report and the Review of the PYS 2010, are considered to be key documents in the formulation of the forthcoming PYDF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highlights a lack of progress since the last State of Pacific Youth Report 2005 and that the same root causes remain. In some instances, the situation of youth is now worse or more critical, given the vulnerability caused by recent global economic crises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Includes analysis structured around three “opportunity profiles” that characterise Pacific young people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discusses the impact of the urban-rural divide on young people and proposes some strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overall, concludes that little had changed since 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The State of Pacific Youth Report 2011 was launched at the Pacific Forum Leaders’ Meeting “side event” in Auckland 2011.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2011</td>
<td>Pacific Island Forum Leaders’ Communiqué (as it relates to youth development), and The Pacific Island Forum Leaders’ Meeting “side event” to promote and advocate for the recommendations resulting from earlier youth development initiatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Acknowledged the need for greater action in mainstreaming youth issues nationally and regionally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Endorsed the Key Guiding Principles in Urban Youth in the Pacific: Increasing resilience and reducing risk for involvement in crime and violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Recognised the need for the development of a regional framework for youth unemployment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Highlighted the importance of sport in assisting young people to stay healthy, contribute to society and develop into leaders of their communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2011</td>
<td>Commonwealth Youth Programme Pacific Young Leaders’ Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th Commonwealth Youth Forum Outcomes and the youth recommendations from the Commonwealth Eminent Persons Group (EPG) Report that was adopted during the</td>
<td>A preparatory meeting for Pacific Commonwealth youth representatives to participate in the 8th Commonwealth Youth Forum.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

33 In response to the Youth Employment Advocacy Initiative.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>November 2011</td>
<td>Meeting of the representatives at the SPC/UNFPA Adolescent Health Division and Directors of Youth.</td>
<td>Confirmed the need for a PYDF and specified required functions of the framework to serve Youth Divisions in the Pacific.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td><em>Pacific Youth Employment Strategy (PacificYES)</em>, prepared for the PYC, with support from ILO.</td>
<td>- Contribution to the proposed Pacific Youth Strategy, and response to March 2011 declaration, and Pacific Leaders’ Communique in September 2011. &lt;br&gt; - Identifies priority initiatives to address critical issues across eight thematic areas: &lt;br&gt;  - Education &lt;br&gt;  - Education to work transitions &lt;br&gt;  - Skills, placements, networks &lt;br&gt;  - Empower community participation &lt;br&gt;  - Labour mobility options &lt;br&gt;  - Self-employment &lt;br&gt;  - Participation in digital economy &lt;br&gt;  - Growth industries &lt;br&gt; - Also identifies themes related to the formulation and delivery of the initiatives (e.g. data collection, engaging the private sector, and developing youth leadership) &lt;br&gt; - Identifies agencies responsible for implementation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C: CONSULTATION SUMMARY

Introduction

This document summarises feedback from the consultation undertaken as a part of the process to develop the Options Paper for the proposed new Pacific Youth Development Framework (PYDF).

A full list of those consulted is included at the end of this document. Twenty-five consultation meetings were held, engaging over 30 key stakeholders nominated by SPC and other members of the Steering Committee. The consultation focused directly on the requirements for the development of the Options Paper, that is, the provision of advice to the PYDF Steering Group on options for the development and implementation of the PYDF.

The methodology for the consultation process was based on a semi-structured interview approach, and included the following guiding questions:

Content and Context Questions

- What do you think are the main strengths of Pacific young people?
- What are the biggest challenges for young people in the Pacific?
- What are some of the opportunities for young people in the Pacific?
- What do you want the PYDF to achieve for young people, and the Pacific more broadly?

Progress/Way Forward Questions

- There’s obviously a lot of good will around youth development, and there’s been a lot of policy-level activity, but there seem to be problems getting real traction and progress. Why do you think this is the case?
- What needs to change going forward?

Development and implementation of the PYDF Questions

- How should the PYDF be developed so it is a useful and effective document in the region?
- Do you know of any examples of effective regional policy development/implementation? Why did/do they work?
- What role do you think your organisation should have in implementing the PYDF?

The majority of interviews were conducted in person, in Suva, Fiji between 9 and 14 July 2012. Two interviews were conducted in person, in Auckland; three interviews were conducted by phone; one by skype; and ten via email.

The short timeframe, financial resources and logistics for this project constrained the breadth of the consultation process, with some notable omissions of stakeholders in this Phase One.

Many of the UN agencies consulted do not cover Papua New Guinea (PNG). Accordingly, engagement with PNG based regional agencies and PNG government, non-government and civil society organisations will be critical in the next phase of the PYDF development, given the significant population of young people in PNG and the unique challenges of PNG.
Government agencies were not consulted as a part of this process. There was some confusion about the best level at which to engage key donors such as AusAID, the EU and the NZ Aid Programme. The project team thought high level engagement during the next phase with key officials engaged in the PYDF development would be more appropriate.

Meaningful and effective youth participation is a strong theme throughout this report. Engagement with youth organisations was limited to an interview with the Pacific Youth Council (PYC), and the PYC asking national youth councils to respond to questions via email. Responses are included within this summary for eight national youth councils.

The feedback from the stakeholder consultation interviews is organised under main headings which reflect the focus of the consultation questions. (The consultation questions are noted under the main headings.) The feedback is summarised in themes, with direct quotations from stakeholders to illustrate key points. This summary reflects back the range of opinions, thoughts and ideas from stakeholders and does not reflect the opinion or analysis of the authors.

Main Strengths of Young People

What do you think are the main strengths of Pacific young people?

Pacific young people are:
- Proud of, and embrace their culture (and they want to develop their cultures for modern times)
- Resilient
- Agile and quick to learn
- Well connected to communities, churches and families – which can act as positive support networks
- Effective at organising themselves into networks
- Creative – great artistic talent and skills
- Energetic and have lots of time
- Often active in sport
- Keen to be included
- Quick and early adopters of technology
- Active in growing numbers on issue-specific advocacy, for example 350.org on climate change
- A significantly large population group in most Pacific countries
- The backbone of many Pacific villages, given the large numbers of young people and the village reliance on young people to undertake important work
- Resource owners (land and sea).

There are plenty of astute, articulate and capable young people that could step up.

Biggest Challenges for Young People

What are the biggest challenges for young people in the Pacific?

- Unemployment: high unemployment has links to other challenges like crime, poor health and poverty.
Engaging in meaningful activity: volunteering opportunities; church; community activities.

- Young people’s reluctance and fear to get involved and participate due to community attitudes to young people’s involvement.
- Young people’s voices not heard at a political/parliamentary level.
- Finding the opportunities to put into practice (in their own countries) the knowledge and skills they have acquired from training opportunities that they have attended.
- Lack of cultural connectedness.
- Lack of decision-making opportunities: young people not involved in local, country level or regional decision making.

They are receiving education that does not meet employment needs:

- How does the Pacific Education Framework fit?
- There is stigma attached to vocational training
- Vocational training programmes and facilities are not attractive, like USP
- The major focus of governments is investment in tertiary training with an academic focus (university based), when vocational skills and trade skills are needed.

Inadequate human rights approach: many of the challenges for young people have a human rights component – Pacific young people have a right to good healthcare, clean water, education, etc. Therefore, is youth development work that realises young people’s human rights, the basis for whole of population development?

Poor health and well-being – the key issues include:

- Sexual and reproductive health (Pacific STI and HIV Strategy has made little difference for young people, e.g. condom availability for young people is still poor)
- There is often a big focus on awareness-raising across public health areas but little focus and measurement of actual behaviour change
- Physical and sexual violence in the home
- Non-communicable diseases
- Alcohol and other drug misuse
- Mental health.

There are silent groups of young people:

- Young people with diverse sexual and gender identities (mahu, vakasalewalewa, palopa, fa’afafine, akava’ine, fakaleiti, fakafifine, gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgender young people) are not included in policy and planning
- Young people with disabilities are not recognised: “... the Pacific has a negative mindset towards people with disabilities.” The challenges for young people with disabilities accessing work are significantly greater.

Challenges associated with climate change: For those from small island states like Kiribati and Tuvalu, the rising sea levels is a real threat to their existence and the smallness of their countries does not offer opportunities to make a living.

- Language skills: for some young people, the fact that they cannot speak English fluently impedes their effective participation and low confidence in speaking out and contributing to discussions.

Young people get very low attention at a national level – they are seen as an annoying group with lots of problems... Many adults have a negative view of young people.

Opportunities for Young People
What are some of the opportunities for young people in the Pacific?

Leadership

- There is a lot of talk about youth participation, but often young people are not organised. There is a real opportunity to harness this energy by investing in youth leadership and organising them to focus more on issues of importance and interest to Pacific young people.
- The International Youth Award Programme was mentioned by a number of youth councils as an opportunity.
- The network of national youth councils and the Pacific Youth Council were seen as an opportunity to develop youth leadership at a country level.

Sport

- A disproportionate number of Pacific young people are successful in professional sport. Some thought this was an employment option that should be promoted more. A majority of stakeholders however thought promoting professional sport as a career pathway would be misguided and an over-rated opportunity limited to a few.

Agriculture

- Many stakeholders talked about the ‘big opportunities’ in agriculture, referencing the large amount of un/under-used land. Some thought there were good ideas identified in Pacific Youth and Agriculture Strategy; however most noted the strategy has not been implemented. The involvement of young people involved in agriculture formally and informally was highlighted as an opportunity, with some stakeholders keen to see more young people involved in local food production. The Tutu Programme in Fiji was seen as a positive model, as was the idea of a country and regional level competition encouraging young people’s productive use of land.

Employment

- Some stakeholders supported young people’s increased involvement in small businesses: “There are many different small business opportunities, what is needed is someone to... identify the opportunities and the start-up resources.” Other stakeholders did not agree: “I don’t know why people are so focused on young people running small businesses. Small businesses are incredibly hard work and take specific skills, a long term view, and dedicated commitment often with little support. These are not aspects that match well to the challenges of adolescent development.”

- Other ideas identified as employment issues and opportunities included:
  - Seasonal Worker Schemes
  - Improving ICT technology is an opportunity for technology based enterprise
  - Internships/Private Sector Partnerships – develop a programme that uses public sector and private sector organisations to take young people as interns. Pilot the programme with a regional organisation (e.g. USP, ANZ, Westpac)
  - Engaging unemployed young people with the high numbers of elderly needing care, instead of using government institutions for elder care?
- Creative industries – young people in the Pacific have significant arts skills and talents (design, fashion, film-making, visual arts, performing arts).

You can not look at youth employment as an issue divorced from employment and economic development generally. We will not be able to create opportunities for young people’s engagement in work, without a wider look at the economy, enterprise development and work creation.

Health

- Stakeholders noted there are excellent models for youth health services internationally, including youth led primary care. UNICEF, UNFPA and SPC could be working together to increase the appropriateness of current services and to develop new youth-led service models.

What Should the PYDF Achieve?

What do you want the PYDF to achieve for young people, and the Pacific more broadly?

The range of aspirations for the PYDF from stakeholders included:

- Sustained commitment to youth development and youth participation – young people supported to take lead roles in the PYDF development and implementation
- More inclusive social and economic opportunities for Pacific young people
- Young people’s voices are heard loudly and celebrated so that governments are informed by young people
- Youth development is not seen as just a “youth issue”, but a core development issue for every country and the region
- Concrete activities/projects for and by young people on youth employment (ongoing, not one-off programmes)
- Integrated effort for youth development with effective donor/UN/Government/CSO partnerships: “PYDF forms the stage for the different organisations”
- The PYDF should contain principles and guidelines on how youth issues could/should be addressed, based on strong youth development analysis around issues like health, agriculture, trade and employment
- The PYDF should contain guidelines on integration: “...there is lots of talk about an ‘integrated approach’ but it is not happening – we need practical ways to do it.”
- National governments recognise the impact positive youth development could have on their international development goals
- Young people with little focus are engaged and have something to do – increased meaningful opportunities for training and employment focused on sustainable livelihoods
- Stigma surrounding vocational training and work is reduced
- The PYDF acts as a moral and ethical code for young people: “What kind of person would I like my son to be in ten years time? You can still talk about economic development, but it is not the bottom line, it’s about how you get there... What kind of rules will young people apply to the decisions they make? Is it fair and just?”
- Development agencies have a firmer commitment to young people
- Rural young people having equal access to the opportunities urban young people have
All national youth policies include a special focus on young people with disabilities and LGBT young people
- Decrease or plateau in teenage pregnancy
- Young people are more environmentally conscious
- Decrease in STI infection rate with Pacific young people.

The PYDF should be:

... the common thread among youth organisations and agencies at the regional level. Organisations will feed youth related information to it and it will disperse this information to the necessary recipients. Organisations can also provide to the PYDF their plans for upcoming activities, budgets and potential partnerships. PYDF can provide this information to other partners who may want to collaborate with the original organisation to conduct the activity together. The PYDF Secretariat will be responsible for initiating co-ordination meetings during which all youth stakeholders at the regional level as well as national youth ministry representatives and young people can discuss... plans and... work out areas for collaboration.

If we get it right for young people, we get it right for the whole population.

The PYDF should be the tool to be used by all the youth stakeholders and national youth ministries to provide the means of enabling young people to become involved (through participation) in order to become economically empowered (through learning entrepreneurial knowledge and skills) as well as to become knowledgeable and credible... in human rights, good governance and democracy.

Issues With Previous Youth Policy

There's obviously a lot of good will around youth development, and there's been a lot of policy-level activity, but there seem to be problems getting real traction and progress. Why do you think this is the case?

Governments’ Capacity and Buy-In

Most stakeholders thought the main reason for the lack of traction with previous youth policy work was a lack of or no buy-in from country governments. Where there was some degree of buy-in, there was often little or no capacity and funding within governments to implement policy actions. Other issues related to country governments included:

- No integration with governments’ youth policy development - national youth policies should be development in the same cycle as the PYDF, and reflect the ‘local plan’ for the PYDF in particular countries
- While youth departments may be engaged, it is not enough (departments of finance, health, education, and the Prime Ministers’ Office all need to be engaged)
- Corruption within governments is stopping resources being utilised for youth programmes
- Staff in youth ministries see their jobs as jobs for life and this does not facilitate career opportunities for young talent to come through.

[It is] lip service that governments give to young people, when in reality governments need to do more than just developing national youth policies.
Co-ordination Capacity

All stakeholders commented on issues related to the importance of co-ordination and challenges with the previous and current co-ordination within the SPC Human Development Programme (HDP). Some stakeholders suggested the HDP had low status within SPC, and that the overall SPC structure contributes to youth issues having low priority. Many suggested that one or two full time positions was not sufficient to co-ordinate the implementation of such a complex project as a youth development framework across 22 PICTs.

Effective co-ordination was seen as the answer to getting real action following the myriad of youth conferences, policies and statements. Other issues related to co-ordination included:

- No one is monitoring or supporting implementation
- Too many stakeholders are going their own ways, and no common agreement or co-ordinated approach
- Communication breakdowns between regional bodies and governments
- Disconnect between youth departments and youth CSOs/NGOs.

Broad and Complex Policy

Stakeholders reported that previous strategies have been complex and nebulous and much of the policy did not make it down to the actual communities and young people it is about. Many regional strategies are broad in scope and become advocacy tools rather than plans or strategies. Stakeholders were clear that the new PYDF needs to be simple, attainable and practical.

Poor Process

Many stakeholders involved when the Pacific Youth Strategy 2010 was developed suggested that the consultation and development process had been poor and failed to get buy-in. This meant that the PYS2010 just functioned as a loose guideline for those that happened to come across it.

Funding

How a PYDF is going to be funded and how resources are going to be allocated is a huge challenge that will need to be resolved according to many of the stakeholders. Other issues related to funding included:

- Donors need to take responsibility for ethical funding – not asking for ridiculously high reporting or providing too little funding for the activities required
- Donors moving to outcomes based funding, that does not focus only on inputs and outputs
- Outcomes for donors should be aligned to the PYDF

ODAs need to either directly fund youth initiatives or make funding contingent on youth development focus.

Youth Participation
Stakeholders suggested that young people have generally been excluded, or only included as a token gesture in regional policy development, whether it is specific youth strategies or general strategies that impact on young people. Some thought traditional leadership structures in the Pacific tended to exclude young people. Some also suggested that young people that do have access to decision-making opportunities tend to be “elite youth” – this issue was also raised in the review of the PYS2010, and is discussed in more detail there.

A number of youth councils commented that often youth development programmes implemented in countries by development partners did not involve national youth focal points (often youth councils) as key advisor and providers of programmes, and that youth designed programmes are not given recognition by development partners.

There is an inherent tension between a youth development approach and Pacific attitudes to the status of young people.

Deficit Focus

There was also a sense that youth issues are presented in a very negative light and that Pacific young people get very ‘bad press’. Stakeholders suggested the new PYDF should be strengths-based.

Changes Required

What needs to change going forward?

Simple and Specific

Stakeholders were very clear that a new PYDF needs to be simple, outcomes-focused and user-friendly, as well as specific enough so that there are clear actions for implementing organisations. There was a clear call to prioritise initiatives that will make the biggest difference and not to develop a strategy like the Pacific Youth Strategy 2010 that tries to cover every possible youth issue. A road map with a massive menu of possible activities will not work.

Other key points related to a simple and specific PYDF included:

- PYDF (or the work programmes that come out of it) MUST articulate the role of key agencies (SPC, PIFS, donors, country governments, PYC, UN agencies, PLP, CYP, et al) and therefore all of those agencies must be involved in the development of the PYDF
- Need to identify one or two priority and common areas and get all organisations (including UN system) to focus on those
- Consideration should be given to a project or programme specific approach – develop just one, or a few specific programmes in pilot countries and then scale up regionally. Programmes could address multiple issues (e.g. employment, health, education) and could increase country level capacity by resourcing the development and implementation. The Oceania Football Confederation’s (OFC’s) Just Play programme is an example. There was a clear view that countries should not be left to ‘go it alone’ with the PYDF implementation
- PYDF needs to have detail – down to activities and concrete proposals, all with a strong evidence base.

**Population vs. Issue-Specific Policy**

Some stakeholders suggested that population policies (e.g. women, young people, people with disabilities) find it very difficult to get any traction when government work programmes are organised around sectors e.g. health, education, employment, agriculture, culture, tourism. Some suggested that a broad PYDF that goes across all ‘issue areas’ will not work, and developing separate sector-specific plans (e.g. youth health, youth employment, youth education) will have more likelihood of success and traction with governments.

**Broad Framework**

While some thought a very focused and practical programme style approach was required, others thought the PYDF should be a broad philosophical framework that defined overarching principles for youth development and a vision for Pacific young people. Some supporters of the broad approach felt that there would also need to be another level under the broad framework, which could include sector- or issue- specific action plans like health, education and youth participation.

**Innovative**

A number of stakeholders emphasised the need for innovation, and pointed to interventions in other regions that could provide new ideas.

> The ideas need to come from outside the Pacific. Here, it is the traditional and cultural patterns and church based organisations that have created the poor environment for young people... Ideas that come from outside, and are tailored to the Pacific context are needed.

> Ideas will not come from an introspective look. They won’t find the solutions there.

**Youth Participation**

A number of stakeholders with youth development specialist skills and experience suggested that increasing effective youth participation (including youth in governance and youth leadership) should be the overall focus of the PYDF. Their hypothesis was that if young people are effectively participating in their family groups, communities, villages, churches, organisations and countries – specific youth challenges will be effectively addressed. In this case, the regional focus should be on establishing the infrastructure and participation practice.

In addition, most stakeholders suggested that a significantly higher and more effective level of youth participation is critical to the success of the new PYDF, including:

- Greater engagement of young people and youth-led organisations
- Strong systems and activities in place to hear and action young people’s voices both nationally and regionally
- The development and implementation of the PYDF should act as a best practice example of effective Pacific youth participation – “doing with, not doing for”
- The PYDF should work to increase opportunities for civic engagement, especially at secondary school
- Provide a live and central feedback mechanism for young people on PYDF progress (use web and social media).

**Funding**

There were divergent views on whether the new PYDF needed to have a specific pool of funding available for implementation. Some were very clear that a specific, central budget/fund attached to the PYDF was essential. Suggestions were made for that funding to come from a core donor (e.g. EU, AusAID) or from a range of UN, regional agencies and donors to pool funds into one central fund. This line of thinking suggested that it was unrealistic to ask governments to commit more funding and if we wanted countries to implement the PYDF we needed to provide financial incentives as a lever for change.

Others did not think a specific PYDF fund was necessary, suggesting that there was a lot of money already being applied to youth issues. They felt that the focus should be on getting donor, government and regional agency budgets spent in ways consistent with the PYDF goals and outcomes. In line with this were some specific ideas and questions:

- A large portion of country budgets are going to youth issues already in areas like education and health, however this spending is not aligned to any youth development framework or principles. Pacific governments invest the highest percentage of their budgets (25 percent) in education compared to other region across the world. It was asked whether governments could commit to certain financial investment in local implementation of the PYDF
- Could the NZ and Australia bilateral agreements include PYDF implementation outcomes?
- Could SPC advocate for a percentage of other SPC programme budgets to be tagged for youth issues/implementation of certain aspects of the PYDF?
- There is a lot of scope in current national and regional budgets
- There needs to be an effective national mechanism using current structures or creating something new, to enable resources to go from the national level to the provinces where the majority of young people are. At the moment, the majority of young people who need assistance the most are missing out on many opportunities.

All stakeholders were clear that the PYDF must be fully costed and engage donors/budget contributors from the outset.

**Governments**

Getting the buy-in of national governments was seen as a fundamental for the success of the PYDF, with stakeholders suggesting that effective government consultation and on-going communication and support were critical. Finding ways for the PYDF to be integrated with government planning cycles was identified as a potentially powerful way to get the PYDF and the youth development agenda into national priorities. Another way to get governments on board was to tie the PYDF actions onto frameworks or instruments that governments are already committed to like the Millennium Development Goals or The Pacific Plan.

Stakeholders suggested that there would need to be excellent communication and relationships with all 22 PICTs governments. This would rely on the presentation of
compelling arguments to persuade governments to commit to the PYDF and youth development activities in their countries. Examples of such arguments could include using investment statistics and analysis to demonstrate that investment in young people leads to increased wealth of the country; and analysis of the opportunity costs of not acting. Providing funding, and highlighting that young people constitute a large group of voters were seen as potential levers to gain political support for youth development. Care also needs to be taken not to present young people as a source of problems.

There were clear concerns about the variable and generally low power of youth ministries and departments, meaning there is a need to get higher level government officials and departments engaged.

At a country level, typically the nodal ministry (youth) has very limited influence, implementation capacity and budget execution capacity compared with our sectoral ministries. It will need to rely on key sectoral ministries, e.g. commerce, industry, and education as well as donors to champion an integrated approach to addressing youth issues, if real results are to be achieved.

Effective Co-ordination Mechanism

The role of SPC as a co-ordination mechanism was widely discussed by most stakeholders, with a range of issues raised including:

- Some countries are sceptical of SPC and other regional agencies’ ability to deliver
- The recent review of SPC suggests that youth development programme leadership should not be located within SPC, which raised some concerns with stakeholders as to the role of SPC leading the development and implementation of the PYDF
- The current SPC mechanism needs to be scaled up with more human resources and funding
- SPC has stronger influence across sectors, and across all 22 PICTs, so is the most suitable co-ordination agency (the view of a large number of stakeholders)
- SPC is the main regional body, works closely with other development partners, and has the mandate for youth development leadership from Forum Leaders
- SPC needs to improve engagement with governments
- SPC’s ‘Joint Country Strategies’ process could be an effective way to get commitment on the PYDF from governments.

Some also suggested the Pacific Islands’ Forum Secretariat (PIFS) would make an effective co-ordination agency for the PYDF, given its significant political power. Others had concern about PIFS, including its focus on policy rather than implementation; having less influence with CSOs, FBOs and NGOs; and representing a smaller number of countries than SPC. Whether or not PIFS is the co-ordinating agency, many stakeholders agreed that PIFS had an important role to play to ensure Forum Leaders engagement with the PYDF.

There was also reference to the Commonwealth Youth Programme (CYP) and Pacific Youth Council (PYC) as points of co-ordination and/or implementation, given their distinct regional youth focus. Some saw the PYDF development as an opportunity to use and strengthen the existing PYC and NYC structure and networks.
Linking in with other structures and networks like young women’s networks, the UN Working Group on Youth, the Pacific Sexual Diversity Network and the youth committee of the Pacific Disability Forum were also seen by stakeholders as important.

Where ever the co-ordination mechanism sits in terms of a host or lead agency, there was a clear acknowledgment that sufficient staffing was important. Developing the coordination mechanism and determining the requisite financial and human resources were identified as key parts of the next phase of the PYDF development. Other ideas about the coordination function included:

- The need to communicate effectively with partners and to effectively keep country governments engaged
- Possibly having a lead officer in each country (e.g. Director of Youth) and each regional agency for PYDF implementation.

_The co-ordination mechanism is so key – it needs to have real influence and power._

**Structures to Support Implementation**

A number of themes became clear about work needed to support effective implementation of a new PYDF, including:

- Technical Support: governments and other potential implementation organisations will need support to implement the PYDF, including youth development, youth participation, monitoring, policy development and implementation, and support for project implementation
- Governance: accountability for delivering on the new PYDF should rest with a strong and effective governance group or groups. The group/s should be working to build the youth development capacity in the region. Ideally the PYDF needs to be aligned with a framework/plan with significant power, like _The Pacific Plan_ or the MDGs.
- Monitoring and Evaluation: a range of issues were raised, including:
  - Increases in domestic budgets for youth could be a good indicator in a Monitoring and Evaluation Framework
  - Applying the five yearly UNICEF _State of Pacific Youth Report_ as the baseline and evaluative data set
  - Data quality and reporting is poor and significant work will need to happen to ensure baseline and on-going data is collected. It is important not to make the data set too complex however. A data facility could be important and may be able to be done through an adaption of SPC’s current data hub (PRISM)
  - Activities and projects/programmes need to be based on evidence to ensure that what we set out to do will actually work
  - Some policy specialists questioned the need for a new, formal set of youth indicators: “...there has been some discussion among development partners about the need to establish a common set of youth indicators across the Pacific Islands countries. It is not clear to me whether or not the current situation merits the establishment of common youth indicators across the region given the time and cost involved; and the fact that many of the countries have different needs.”
Scale

Some stakeholders suggested care was needed with regard to scale, suggesting that there is a need to have real targets in terms of size. One small project being achieved does not mean an overall outcome has been achieved regionally. The Pacific Youth and Agriculture Strategy and many other regional strategies were very weak in this regard. Clear outcomes, targets and indicators developed at the planning stage of the PYDF should address this issue.

Diversity of Region

The diversity of the Pacific Region, across the 22 countries and territories was discussed with most stakeholders. The new PYDF needs to be able to be flexible enough to adapt to very different country situations (e.g. PNG with its vast population and significant urban areas, compared to small micro nations like Niue). Care should be taken to ensure the PYDF is not too general or broad, but if there are no specific actions and projects, it will not work.

Engaging PNG is a major issue and was raised as a concern by some stakeholders, especially when highlighting that many of the UN regional bodies consulted do not represent PNG. PNG is such a vast population of young people with very serious issues on a huge scale compared with the rest of the Pacific. PNG should not just be treated as ‘one of the 22 PICTs’, but should have special and significant status.

Different packages may be needed for different countries, or groupings of countries. There need to be very concrete actions relevant country by country. This could tie in well with the previously mentioned suggestion that the PYDF could include a tool/s for countries to develop a new form of national youth plan/strategy that would act as the local PYDF implementation plan.

Specific Ideas: Champions, Tool-Kit and Levers

Other ideas about changes needed as the PYDF is developed and implemented included:

- Champions - given the current low status of young people, champions are needed to lead youth development in countries and key regional agencies
- The PYDF must provide practical tools and a clear plan for youth mainstreaming/policy integration – there has been lots of talk, with no pragmatic and evidence-based way to actually do it
- A toolkit: that “…looks at a range of practices/promising approaches to youth development that have been implemented and evaluated in the Pacific and/or comparative contexts (low or middle income countries), citing case studies, describing the context and specific nature of such interventions and examining the requirements for improving the impact of youth programmes in the Pacific... The investigative process could query what types of programmes/approaches seems to work and why, and what does not... The toolkit could consider numerous sources of information relating to a wide range of geographic, demographic, institutional, socioeconomic and cultural/community dynamics that are specific to the Pacific and offer policy makers a menu of different interventions to choose from.”

Development and Implementation of the PYDF
How should the PYDF be developed so it is a useful and effective document in the region?

Draft PYDF and Consultation

Consultation during the development process for the new PYDF was a major theme during the discussions with stakeholders. There was universal agreement that a draft PYDF should be developed prior to any consultation, using the multitude of previous youth development policy work and evaluation (refer Appendix B) and the expertise of PYDF Steering Group partner organisations. Consultation would then be based on a draft PYDF. In terms of developing the draft PYDF, it was suggested that a team work on it, rather than one person or a consultant. A number of stakeholders cautioned against the ‘overuse of consultants’. Some stakeholders that knew about the proposed PYDF development process well, suggested that in depth consultation should first be done with pilot countries, and then once the PYDF was being piloted in those countries, broader consultation across the remaining 20 PICTs should occur.

Many stakeholders suggested that the most important indicator of successful consultation would be the level of buy-in to the PYDF. The purpose of the consultation is endorsement and buy-in of the strategy, rather than to obtain substantive content. The importance of getting buy-in should be neither under-estimated, nor under-invested. Key groups from whom to get buy-in included:

- Young people and youth-led organisations and networks
- Potential donors (EU, AusAID, NZ Aid Programme, others)
- Governments, and not just Youth Departments/Directors of Youth, but key influencers in government including the Prime Minister’s Office, planners, finance managers, labour, health and education departments
- Regional agencies (PIFS, SPC, UN agencies, CYP, PYC)
- Churches and traditional leaders - Church structures work well to get buy-in – they’re visible and they’re in most communities across the Pacific
- Private sector - especially around employment issues.

When considering how the consultation could happen, stakeholders had a number of ideas on other processes that the PYDF consultation could tie into and ways to do the consultation, including:

- There may be potential for in-country consultation to be tied to the SPC annual in-country consultation process
- Include in the current consultation processes of the UN and other development partners
- Consultation should work to develop capacity of youth development organisations (including the PYC and NYCs), and to get their buy-in
- PYDF development process should use a ‘Participatory Development Approach’
- Consultation should be led by the Pacific, not an external consulting firm
- Consultation should not be limited to capital cities, and needs to reach rural districts
- Consultation could be used to develop national youth plans that look at how the draft PYDF could be applied country by country
- Could consider using a social marketing approach to get effective buy-in:
  - brand the PYDF well (and any programmes that come out of it)
- run a campaign across countries, sectors (health, education, etc) and groups (young people, churches, private sector, youth workers, and donors) to get people on board with the new PYDF
- careful planning and some investment could be critical component for the success of a new PYDF
- Use success stories (perhaps from the pilot period/countries) as a way to get buy-in
- Use multi media, including film/video within consultation
- Make sure young people have a major involvement in leading consultation process.

**Style**

Stakeholders said that the PYDF needs to be youth friendly and not just in paper form. For example, there could be video and online versions that are regularly updated with reports of progress and implementation. The PYDF needs to be a simple document with plain language (the opposite of *The Pacific Plan*).

**Youth Employment Strategy and PYDF**

Forum Leaders have requested a Youth Employment Strategy, while the Steering Group is working on a broader PYDF. Some stakeholders saw the relationship between these two projects as a fundamental issue that could derail the PYDF process if it is not resolved. It may be important to return to the Forum Leaders meeting in the Cook Islands and inform Leaders that the PYDF will include action for youth employment within the wider youth development agenda. The relationship between the current draft *Youth Employment Strategy* developed by the ILO and the proposed PYDF also needs to be clarified.

**Youth Participation**

Stakeholders were clear that young people must be effectively engaged in the development process of the PYDF. Some thought that NYCs could be the main conduit for national level consultation, and that the PYDF development process could be a key opportunity to develop the capacity for small, youth-led organisations.

Some stakeholders suggested that when you do better participation, you increase accountability. They added that care needs to be taken to design a youth participation approach for the PYDF development phase to make sure the development process does not drown out youth voices.

**Governance and Reporting Mechanism**

Stakeholders thought that a strong reporting and accountability line to a forum with high status could be a key factor to the PYDF having real power. Some suggested the PYDF needs to be integrated into SPC or PIFS structures that have significance such as Forum Leaders, Education Ministers, SPC Committee of Representatives of Governments and Administrations (CRGA). If SPC’s task is to implement policy, and PIFS is to develop and monitor policy, PIFS needs to have a clear lead officer for the PYDF. Currently youth issues are not high on the agenda of PIFS, and where youth related work is happening, it tends to have a conflict resolution or gender focus. Stakeholders suggested that the final PYDF must be signed off by Forum Leaders, and that donors and other development partners are strongly influenced by Forum Leaders decisions.
If the PYDF can in some way influence/tie-in to the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF), it would be a useful lever for UN agency collaboration. However, the UNDAF for the next five year period has already been drafted however.

**Mapping**

A few stakeholders suggested there was a need to do an initial map of what is currently working, and the human and financial resources/capacity available in each country, as a part of the development process. They pointed out that if programmes or projects are developed at a regional level without implementation capacity at a local level, it will not work.

**Effective Examples of Regional Policy**

*Do you know of any examples of effective regional policy development/implementation?*

There was a range of views on effective regional frameworks, policies and strategies, including:

- *Pacific Education Development Framework*
- MDGs (co-ordinated by UNDP) – governments are on board and UN agencies, SPC and PIFS are assisting with support
- Joint Country Strategies between SPC and governments – have high status
- *The Pacific Plan* – has high status and buy-in and has a good Monitoring and Evaluation Framework, although it is very labour intensive
- *UNICEF Child Protection Framework* – only five countries involved, smaller than PYDF but had very good engagement at a country level (3 pillars: legislative and regulatory; child protection and welfare services; and community knowledge, attitudes and practices). All work plans are structured in these areas, ensuring a consistent understanding of child protection. There was good cross-sectoral engagement in implementation of the framework.
- *Pacific Regional Disability Strategy* – was developed by people with disabilities
- *Framework for ICT Development in the Pacific* - has a youth section and is being led by SPC Economic Development Division.
- *Food Security Framework* – is an overall guiding framework and has a number of pillars, each with a lead co-ordinating agency (e.g. FAO, WHO, UNDP)
- Human rights treaty commitments (e.g. CEDAW, UNCRC)
- *Cairns Compact on Strengthening Development Co-ordination in the Pacific* – governments and aid agencies reporting on aid effectiveness.

**Organisation’s Roles in Implementing the PYDF**

*What role do you think your organisation should have in implementing the PYDF?*

The table below how the agency’s consulted could contribute to the implementation of the new PYDF.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UN System</th>
<th>The newly drafted UN Development Assistance Framework for the Pacific</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
has specific outcomes around poverty reduction, health and education that include action for Pacific young people.

| UNDP | UNDP Pacific Centre is developing a new Youth Development and Youth Engagement Policy that will have three key ‘pillars’:
|      |   * Youth Governance, Participation , Leadership and Facilitation*
|      |   * Youth Economic Empowerment (entrepreneurship and financial inclusion)*
|      |   * Gender Equality*

| PLP | Provides support to ‘peak organisations for youth’ in each country (NYCs or similar). It is the principle supporter of the Pacific Youth Council (PYC), and hopes to continue this support. PLP is also interested in supporting issues like unemployment, and supporting the development of case studies of good practice (e.g. the agriculture work of the Tonga National Youth Congress).

| PYC | Will work to engage, get the commitment and support of national youth councils. Specifically, there may be ways the next stage of the PYDF development could tie in to a planned regional meeting of national youth councils being co-ordinated by the PYC. With more capacity, the PYC could play a far greater role in supporting the implementation of the PYDF, perhaps in collaboration with SPC.

| UNICEF | State of Pacific Youth Report – it is likely UNICEF would continue to commission this report every five years or so
|        | Specific work in traditional programmatic areas like health, child protection and education
|        | Technical assistance in the implementation and monitoring of national youth policies
|        | Strengthening youth participation, particularly the inclusion of young women and young people with disabilities, climate change and social media participation initiatives

| UNAIDS | Crowd Out AIDS Programme is a new UNAIDS initiative about how to involve young people in HIV work, with a focus on youth leadership. UNAIDS currently partnered with a Fiji based NGO to pilot the programme in the Pacific. Young people are a key focus population for UNAIDS. UNAIDS Pacific Office in Suva is being scaled back in terms of staff numbers. UNAIDS PNG Office not consulted.

| UNESCAP | Policy and research support to countries and other regional agencies, on request.

| UNFPA | About a quarter of UNFPA’s focus is on young people. A key outcome for UNFPA is to work to improve access to sexual and reproductive health services for young people in the Pacific. UNFPA funds the Pacific Adolescent Health and Development Programme, which has ten country-level AHD programme co-ordinators. These co-ordinators could be used for aspects of the PYDF implementation. Additionally, UNFPA may be able to assist with financial resources for the PYDF country-level consultation process. UNFPA sees itself having a key role in development and implementation of the PYDF.

| OHCHR | The OHCHR Regional Office of the Pacific has small capacity but will be committed to doing work that other agencies are not. This includes supporting work that reduces the discrimination of vulnerable groups of young people, reduces violence and torture, and increases access to fair and equitable justice systems.
Pacific Disability Forum: PDF has a youth action plan (2011-2016) and a region wide youth committee advocating for the needs of Pacific young people with disabilities. PDF is hosting a gathering of Pacific Youth with Disabilities in Noumea in April 2013.

ILO: At the request of the PYC, ILO has led the development of the current draft Pacific Youth Employment Strategy. ILO has said there are further discussions required to ascertain:
- how the current draft is taken forward to final/sign off
- the relationship between the strategy and the proposed new PYDF
- how reporting back to Forum Leaders will work given there has been a request for a youth employment strategy, and there is now work going on with the PYDF
- who will be responsible for implementing the new Pacific Youth Employment Strategy?

World Bank: The Bank can help to generate evidence-based analysis from the youth projects implemented under the PYDF and can provide technical assistance in specific areas. Technical assistance has been provided to SPC in the past. There may also be a possibility of including additional indicators through existing instruments such as the HIES to help establish broad/general trends among the youth population. As an example, the Bank’s Urban Youth Employment Project involves a screening survey developed to complement the HIES. This enables statistical comparison of how well youth are faring compared to averages across different age groups and cohorts within the country.

CLGF: CLGF is working to encourage youth participation at a local government level in partnership with the PYC and NYCs. CLGF is developing a stronger relationship with the CYP.

WHO: WHO would want to contribute to any actions that had a youth health focus, in collaboration with SPC. WHO suggested that SPC’s public health division had the mandate for regional youth health work.

PIFS: Does not have a specific youth policy officer/desk. The youth lead currently sits within the conflict resolution programme. PIFS may be able to provide some facilitation support and some funding for particular activities/aspects that have relevance to PIFS priorities.

SPC: Youth Advisor role could lead the PYDF development process. Other parts of SPC need to be engaged in later stages of the development.

CYP: The CYP is one of the two regional entirely youth focused organisations (the other being the PYC). It covers all commonwealth countries. The CYP is very interested in having a significant role in the co-ordination and implementation of the PYDF.
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mereia Carling</td>
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<td>Salote Kaimacuata</td>
<td>UNICEF (Pacific Centre)</td>
<td>Fiji</td>
<td>Suva (in-person)</td>
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<td>Child Protection Specialist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shairana Ali</td>
<td>UNICEF (Pacific Centre)</td>
<td>Fiji</td>
<td>Suva (in-person)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV/AIDS Specialist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameron Noble</td>
<td>UNICEF (Pacific Centre)</td>
<td>Fiji</td>
<td>Suva (in-person)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme Specialist</td>
<td>Pacfic Islands Forum Secretariat</td>
<td>Fiji</td>
<td>Suva (in-person)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armstrong Alexis</td>
<td>UNICEF (Pacific Centre)</td>
<td>Fiji</td>
<td>Suva (in-person)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-ordinator Programme and Operations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ex-Director, CYP Carribean</em></td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
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<td>Atunaisa Drivatiyawe</td>
<td>UNAIDS (Pacific Office)</td>
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<td>Suva (in-person)</td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
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<tr>
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<td>Suva (in-person)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Lamotte</td>
<td>International Labour Organisation (Pacific Centre)</td>
<td>Fiji</td>
<td>Suva (in-person)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Bernard</td>
<td>International Labour Organisation (Pacific Centre)</td>
<td>Fiji</td>
<td>Suva (in-person)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme Officer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Bernard</td>
<td>International Labour Organisation (Pacific Centre)</td>
<td>Fiji</td>
<td>Suva (in-person)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme Officer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Helen Tavola</td>
<td>UN Economic and Social Commission for Asia and</td>
<td>Fiji</td>
<td>Suva (in-person)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Advisor Social Development</td>
<td>the Pacific (Pacific Office)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virisila Raitamata</td>
<td>UNFPA</td>
<td>Fiji</td>
<td>Suva (in-person)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asst Resident Representative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peni Tawake</td>
<td>Pacific Leadership Program</td>
<td>Fiji</td>
<td>Suva (in-person)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emil Adams</td>
<td>SPC (Land Resources Division)</td>
<td>Fiji</td>
<td>Suva (in-person)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information and Publications Officer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franck Castillio</td>
<td>Oceania Football Confederation</td>
<td>NZ</td>
<td>Auckland (in-person)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of Social Inclusion and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Programmes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarusila Bradburgh</td>
<td>Pacific Youth Council (PYC)</td>
<td>Fiji</td>
<td>Suva (in-person)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-ordinator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name and Role</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Country Location</td>
<td>Consultation Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katrina Ma’u</td>
<td>Pacific Island Forum Secretariat (PIFS)</td>
<td>Fiji</td>
<td>Skype</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young Professional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Hesaie</td>
<td>Pacific Island Forum Secretariat (PIFS)</td>
<td>Fiji</td>
<td>Suva (in-person)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-State Actors Liaison Officer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nainassa Whippy</td>
<td>Consultant to PYC</td>
<td>Fiji</td>
<td>Suva (in-person)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer in Charge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mika Kanervaruori</td>
<td>Office of the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights (Pacific Office)</td>
<td>Fiji</td>
<td>Suva (in-person)</td>
</tr>
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<td>Officer in Charge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sachin Sharma</td>
<td>Commonwealth Local Government Forum (Pacific Centre)</td>
<td>Fiji</td>
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<td>World Bank</td>
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<td>Social Policy Specialist</td>
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<td></td>
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<tr>
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<td>Co-Chair PDF Youth Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Temo Waqanivalu</td>
<td>World Health Organisation (South Pacific Office)</td>
<td>Fiji</td>
<td>Suva (in-person)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-ordinator Non-Communicable Disease (NCD) and Health Promotion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laila Harre</td>
<td>Ex ILO, Suva and Ex Minister of Youth Affairs, NZ</td>
<td>NZ</td>
<td>Auckland (in-person)</td>
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<td>Principal Author of Pacific Report 2020</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>Foundation for Development Corporation (FDC)</td>
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</table>

**National Youth Council Responses**

- Kiribati
- Solomon Islands
- Samoa
- Palau
- Fiji
- Tonga
- Tuvalu
APPENDIX D: PURPOSE, BACKGROUND, SCOPE AND OBJECTIVES (FROM PROJECT PLAN AGREED BETWEEN SPC AND INNOVATE CHANGE)

PURPOSE

This document is the project plan for the project Innovate Change is undertaking for the Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC) to develop an Options Paper on the purpose, structure and content of a Pacific Youth Development Framework (PYDF).

The document provides background to the project and outlines:

1. the stages of the project
2. the timeframes SPC and Innovate Change have agreed to
3. the minimum set of key documents to be reviewed as a part of the project
4. the minimum list of people to consult as a part of the project
5. the key questions for consultation
6. the broad format of the Options Paper.

BACKGROUND

The Human Development Programme of the Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC-HDP) provides technical support to Pacific Island Countries and Territories (PICTs) in partnership with a range of organisations to implement regional and national youth policy commitments. This project builds on a number of inter-agency initiatives that have contributed to addressing youth issues and engaging with the region’s rapidly growing population of young people in social and economic development. It reflects high level recognition and commitment from Pacific Island leaders. This project is the first step in responding to the recommendation from the Commonwealth Youth Programme (CYP) Pacific Young Leaders’ Conference held in 2011, to develop a strategic youth development framework.

The overall objective is to develop a framework that enhances working relations and collaboration between partners. It will set out shared objectives and a guide for action at regional and national levels. The partner agencies will be able to use the framework to map their respective roles and how they will co-operate in working towards agreed outcomes. The framework will support a more focused and targeted approach for the development of young people in Pacific Island countries and Territories. It will address current and future challenges in youth development, and will lead to improved outcomes for young men and women.

Problem Definition

SPC and its partners have agreed there is a need for a regional Pacific Youth Development Framework. This is in response to an increasing population of young people, and high level commitment from Pacific Island leaders who recognise the need to engage young people in economic and social development, and in particular to improve their opportunities for employment.

The decision to develop a framework comes on the back of a range of youth-focused initiatives, including:
• Review of the Pacific Youth Strategy 2010 and compilation of the State of Pacific Youth Report 2011 (UNICEF and SPC partnership)
• Report: Urban Youth in the Pacific: increasing resilience and reducing risk for involvement in crime and violence (UNDP Pacific Centre, the Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat, with SPC, Pacific Youth Council, ILO, UNICEF, UNFPA and UNESCO)
• The Pacific Declaration on Investing in Youth Employment (Commonwealth Youth Programme, ILO and the Pacific Youth Council)
• The Wansolwara Youth Statement on Peace Building and follow-up activities (young Pacific Islanders attending the Wansolwara Youth Peace Building Conference, with the CYP, UNDP, PIFS and UNESCO)
• The Youth Employment Advocacy (YEA) initiative (Pacific Youth Council, in partnership with SPC, ILO, UNICEF and the Pacific Leadership Programme)
• A Pacific Young Women’s Leadership Strategy 2011-2014 (The Young Women’s Christian Association’s in collaboration with regional partners)
• The Pacific Island Forum Leaders Meeting “side event” in Auckland, September 2011, to promote and advocate for the recommendations resulting from these initiatives.

A broad range of regional youth development issues were raised during the 2011 Pacific Island Leaders’ Forum, as set out in their Meeting Communiqué. The Leaders:

• Acknowledged the need for greater action in mainstreaming youth issues nationally and regionally
• Acknowledged the need for increasing employment and other meaningful opportunities for youth, including the voice of youth in decision-making
• Endorsed the Key Guiding Principles in Urban Youth in the Pacific: Increasing resilience and reducing risk for involvement in crime and violence
• Underlined the important role of government, the private sector and technical and vocational training institutions in urgently addressing youth unemployment
• Recognised the need for the development of a regional framework for youth employment
• Emphasised the importance of having annual labour and employment statistics that are disaggregated by gender and age
• Highlighted the importance of sport in assisting young people to stay healthy, contribute to society and develop into leaders of their communities.

In relation to the development of a regional framework, the above will influence:

1. the purpose and content of the framework
2. how it will be used to progress youth development in the region
3. the process for developing the framework
4. implementation including coordination and resourcing
5. monitoring and review.

Following the PIF Leaders meeting, Pacific government representatives, young people’s organisations, development partners, and other stakeholders met at the Commonwealth Youth Programme Pacific Young Leaders’ Conference held in Brisbane in early October 2011. They discussed and agreed the next steps in developing a strategic regional framework for youth development that would include the issue of youth employment.
Government views were expressed at this meeting, and at the SPC/UNFPA Adolescent Health Division and Directors of Youth Meeting in November 2011 in Nadi. In summary, they supported a Pacific youth framework. They recognised that there are different organisations and mechanisms in the region focused on youth development that need to align to one regional framework in order to maximize the limited resources available for positive youth outcomes.

Government representatives consider that a Pacific youth framework should:

- Guide coordination and define the roles of the partners including the SPC
- Address the resource commitments, and provide guidance for the partners
- Consider other regional models
- Focus on strengthening the evidence base, and national data collection and analysis systems, including standardized national/regional indicators
- Facilitate well-coordinated and resourced monitoring of progress (led by SPC), which will take into account the Pacific Plan, other regional commitments (e.g. PAYE, MDGs) and youth development work of the partners
- Apply monitoring results to develop more targeted actions as required
- Strengthen networking and sharing of up-to-date information between countries and across the region, and between governments and development partners
- Reflect shared national priorities and policies as the basis for a regional approach, and identify gaps in national level approaches that could be supported at regional level
- Support full participation of young people in the development of the Pacific youth framework, and facilitate youth perspectives on relevant development issues
- Integrate gender equality and disability dimensions into the framework taking into account related regional frameworks in these areas.

The review of the Pacific Youth Strategy 2010 also highlighted:

- the need for an effective monitoring and evaluation system that could be easily applied at a national level; and
- the importance of rigorous consultation with government departments to obtain buy-in for the Framework, in particular the Departments of Youth and the Directors’ of Youth as the key implementation agents, and policy directors in national planning offices.

Full development of the Framework (Phases 1-3) is likely to take 18 months, and will probably involve two regional consultations. A draft of the Framework will be presented to Commonwealth Youth Ministers in November 2012 at the Commonwealth Youth Ministers Meeting (CYMM) in Papua New Guinea. The final Framework will be launched in New Caledonia in 2013 at the 2nd Youth and Sports Ministerial Meeting to be held in conjunction with the 2nd Pacific Youth and Sports Conference. The launch will also include demonstration of how the Framework has been used to progress youth development at both regional and national level.

**PROJECT SCOPE AND OBJECTIVES**

The Framework will be developed through a three phase project over an 18 month period. The objective of this project (Phase 1) is to develop an Options Paper based on a desk review and consultation with the full range of stakeholders on the purpose, structure, and content
of the PYDF and the process for developing the Framework in subsequent phases. The
outputs will be the Options Paper, a report on the process undertaken, and a presentation of
the Options Paper to the project partners.

The primary focus of the Options Paper will be to identify, analyse and present options for
the key components required in the development of an effective and sustainable PYDF. The
will include:

- the purpose, or objectives
- structure
- content
- regional and national priorities and implementation strategies
- reference to coordination and review mechanisms
- reference to a monitoring and evaluation framework
- the process for developing the Framework in Phases 2 and 3, including identification
  of any further work required during these phases.

The methodology for this first phase will involve a comprehensive desk review of the
relevant documents, consultation with key stakeholders, and collation and analysis of
relevant statistics to support the options presented.

This is the first phase in a three phase project. This paper will outline options and
recommendations to enable the project partners to make decisions about proceeding with
the subsequent phases.
### APPENDIX E: GLOSSARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AusAID</td>
<td>Australian Agency for International Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEDAW</td>
<td>The Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHOCHM</td>
<td>Commonwealth Heads of Government’s Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLGF</td>
<td>Commonwealth Local Government Programme (works to promote and strengthen effective democratic local government and to facilitate the exchange of good practice in local government structures and services in the Cook Islands, Kiribati, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tuvalu and Vanuatu)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRGA</td>
<td>Committee of Representatives of Governments and Administrations (governing body of SPC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSO</td>
<td>Civil Society Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYMM</td>
<td>Commonwealth Youth Minister’s Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYP</td>
<td>Commonwealth Youth Programme (has a Pacific Centre based on Solomon Islands that works across the 14 Pacific Commonwealth member countries)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPG</td>
<td>Commonwealth Eminent Persons Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAO</td>
<td>Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FBO</td>
<td>Faith-Based Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDC</td>
<td>Foundation for Development Co-operation (an independent Australian Foundation committed to enabling better development outcomes in the Asia-Pacific region through collaboration and innovation – FDC completed the Review of PYS2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDP (SPC-HDP)</td>
<td>Human Development Programme of the Secretariat of the Pacific Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT</td>
<td>Information and Communications Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILO</td>
<td>International Labour Organization (a United Nations specialised agency which seeks the promotion of social justice and internationally recognized human and labour rights)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDG (MDGs)</td>
<td>Millennium Development Goals (the eight Millennium Development Goals form a blueprint agreed to by all the world’s countries and all the world’s leading development institutions that have galvanized unprecedented efforts to meet the needs of the world’s poorest)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEET</td>
<td>Not in Education, Employment or Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-Government Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYC (NYCs)</td>
<td>National Youth Council(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NZAP</td>
<td>New Zealand Aid Programme, NZ Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFC</td>
<td>Oceania Football Confederation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHCHR</td>
<td>Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (represents the world’s commitment to universal ideals of human dignity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAYE</td>
<td>The Commonwealth Plan of Action for Youth Empowerment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDF</td>
<td>Pacific Disability Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PICT</td>
<td>Pacific Island Countries and Territories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIFS</td>
<td>Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat (works across 16 member countries)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLP</td>
<td>Pacific Leadership Program (a regional initiative of the Australian Agency for International Development)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRISM</td>
<td>Pacific Regional Information System and Statistics for Development Programme at SPC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSDN</td>
<td>Pacific Sexual Diversity Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PYC</td>
<td>Pacific Youth Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PYDF</td>
<td>Pacific Youth Development Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PYDF (PYS2010)</td>
<td>Pacific Youth Strategy 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPC</td>
<td>Secretariat of the Pacific Community (Pacific international organisation for sustainable development governed by the 22 Pacific Island countries and territories and founding members Australia, France, New Zealand and the United States of America)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNAIDS</td>
<td>Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNCRC</td>
<td>United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDAF</td>
<td>United Nations Development Assistance Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>United Nations Development Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNESCAP</td>
<td>United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNESCO</td>
<td>United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA</td>
<td>United Nations Population Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>United Nations Children’s Fund (UN organisation for children)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHO</td>
<td>World Health Organization (the directing and coordinating authority for health within the United Nations system)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEA</td>
<td>Youth Employment Advocacy (initiative of the Pacific Youth Council, in partnership with SPC, ILO, UNICEF and the Pacific Leadership Programme)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Youth Employment Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YSFP</td>
<td>Youth for a Sustainable Future (a major partner in the Pacific Youth MDG Summit)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX F: REFERENCE LIST

Note that significant Statements and Declarations on Pacific youth issues are listed in Appendix B.


