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Abstract:

Many studies demonstrate the predisposition of Small Island Developing States (SIDS) to climate risk based on geographic location and socio-economic levels, but few have assessed their negotiation strategies for international agreements on sustainable development. I examine the negotiations of the S.A.M.O.A. Pathways Document (SPD) to improve the process by which international agreements are made in the future. I address the following specific questions: what were the negotiators’ perceptions and values while negotiating the SPD and how did these influence the strategies used? I performed extensive research on SIDS history and culture to show how traditional values are integrated into contemporary policy. I developed a typology according to the negotiator’s level of vulnerability to the impact of climate change, perceived efficacy of negotiator, and negotiator personal concern for climate change. I also conducted nine interviews with negotiators from six SIDS and three Development Partners (DPs). Using NVivo software, I coded interviews to determine the relevant themes each negotiation group associated with most. Results showed that despite how their perceptions, values and socio-economic factor influence the way they talk about negotiations, all of the negotiators from both SIDS and DPs chose to cooperate and therefore ended up with greater gains on both sides and a shorter negotiation time. Due to the cultural influence of SIDS, the lack of experience on both sides of the table and the large amount of trust and comradery between the negotiators, the SPD was able to be agreed upon in a relatively short amount of time with a high degree of satisfaction from all parties. I recommend this analysis being duplicated for each SIDS region. I believe that the results would vary significantly in the Caribbean or AIMS regions due to their unique historical and cultural factors.
Chapter 1 – Introduction

Many studies demonstrate the predisposition of Small Island Developing States (SIDS) to climate risk based on geographic location and socio-economic levels, but very few have assessed their negotiation strategies for international agreements on sustainable development. For this thesis, I will be examining the negotiations of the S.A.M.O.A. Pathways Document from the perspective of six Pacific SIDS and three Development Partners (DPs). I chose this document because it is the first time in the history of the United Nations that an agreement has been reached by negotiators prior to the conference where these documents are normally finalized and agreed upon. By assessing and sharing the negotiation strategies used in these negotiations we can ultimately help to improve the process by which international agreements are made in the future.

I have learned a great deal about “The Pacific Way”, looking back over the last year of working for the United Nations Division for Sustainable Development in their Stakeholder Engagement program and the research I conducted while there including: watching the Preparatory Committee negotiate the SPD till sometimes three o’clock in the morning, meeting all the negotiators at the 4th International Conference on SIDS in Samoa, sitting down with each of the negotiators at the United Nations Headquarters in New York and listening to their perspectives, researching the history of the Pacific Islands, analyzing the data and writing the results. The principles they share, such as a people-focused position, respect, cooperation, honesty and integrity, can help guide negotiations for years to come, potentially leading to shorter negotiation times and greater gains for both sides.
The overarching questions that orient this research are: What does it take to be a successful negotiator and how do vulnerable countries get what they want out of negotiations? In this thesis, I address the following specific questions: what were the negotiators’ perceptions and values while negotiating the SAMOA Pathways Outcome Document and how did these influence the strategies used? I conducted extensive research into SIDS history and culture to show how traditional values are integrated into contemporary policy. I also looked at their current economic and social capacity to help gain insights as why each chose between two negotiation strategies: competitive vs. collaborative. I developed a typology according to the negotiator’s (i.e. country, or international actor) level of vulnerability to the impact of climate change, perceived efficacy of negotiator, and the negotiator’s personal concern for climate change. I also conducted nine interviews with negotiators from six Pacific SIDS and three DPs.

Using NVivo software, I coded interviews to determine the relevant themes each negotiation group associated with most. My assumptions led me to believe the more vulnerable a country is, the more cooperative their approach, whereas countries with greater resilience would chose a competitive strategy. In truth, the fact that all the negotiators mostly chose a cooperative strategy allowed the negotiations to conclude ahead of schedule with the result that all the negotiators were able to secure their political position within the document. In other words, a more cooperative strategy leads to shorter negotiations and greater gains for both parties. I recommend this analysis being duplicated for each SIDS region. I believe that the results would vary significantly in the Caribbean or AIMS regions.
Chapter 2 – Pacific Island History

Section 2.1: Pre-Colonialism

The Pacific islands are rich with culture and tradition spanning thousands of years. Incorporating a historical analysis to this research allowed me to understand how and why traditional values are integrated, or not, into contemporary policy. The first settlers of the islands, starting at least 3,000 years ago, were of Micronesian, Indonesian and Polynesian descent (Sherry, 1994; Campbell, 1989; Sahlins, 1985). They held animistic religious beliefs more focused on appeasing rather than worshiping a number of gods or evil spirits (Campbell, 1989). Although over 1200 distinct languages can be found in a region encompassing approximately 1/3 of the earth’s surface area, they all share a common structure and phonetic characteristics (Sahlins, 1985). The islands are divided into three regions: Polynesia, Micronesia and Melanesia (Campbell, 1989). More commonalties exist between Polynesia and Micronesia than Melanesia shares with the other two regions; this phenomenon can best be explained by the proximity of Melanesia to the mainland of Australia, Indonesia and China.

Social class was, and for many islands remains, largely determined by kinship ties with local chiefs governing the populous. While chiefs were historically men, social standing and land tenure was passed down through matrilineal descent, which gave women a unique and powerful status often greater than her brothers (Campbell, 1989). Kinship remains a primary form of social organization in three of the SIDS counties I conducted interviews with. A rule dominated by warrior-ethic lead to many wars and
successive leadership. The spoils of these wars ranged from territory to restitution from real or imagined grievances (Sherry, 1994). With a limited range of commodities that could be accumulated or preserved, most pacific nations were generally free from social inequality. Historically subsistence farmers, the inhabitants of the islands lived on fish, yams, coconuts and sugar cane among other crops, including evidence of the first examples of aquaculture (Campbell, 1989; Sahlins, 1985). Life was not idle with a majority of the population engaged in food production, canoe building, house-building and maintenance, tool making and ceremonies (Campbell, 1989). This simple yet arduous life led to an average life expectancy of forty years (Sahlins, 1985). The abundance of resources for crops and building supplies were an obvious enticement for the European explorers that would eventually discover these hidden islands.

Section 2.2: Colonialism

Attempting to discover convenient trade routes to the Spice Islands, the Portuguese were the first to land in Micronesia followed by the Spanish. Europeans first entered the Carolina Islands in the late 16th century; the Spanish however were the first to envision the possibility of colonization and ultimately the first to establish sovereignty (Campbell, 1989). Many European expeditions of the mid to late 17th century in the pacific were motived by the search for a great southern continent that would never be found (Campbell, 1989). Instead, they discovered a plethora of unique cultures and an untapped wealth of resources that would motivate future exploration. The late 17th century witnessed the greatest advancement in the science of cartography in the region with the famous expedition of James Cook. Indeed the maps of the Pacific which we use today are not that dissimilar to those created by Cook over two-hundred years ago.
The dawning of the Industrial Revolution brought about significant advances in navigational technology and a renewed interest in the natural resources the Pacific Islands offered.

By the 18\textsuperscript{th} century, tribal structures were starting to break down and political centralization became prominent (Foster, 2005). Political ambitions among the chiefs shifted from those of social standing to ones of unification which was more in conformance with colonialism. The early stages of state formation were rapidly accelerated with the introduction of European settlers (Campbell, 1989). The instability of leadership proved a fertile ground for those wanting to take advantage of trade agreements and economic interests. Russian, French, Dutch, American, British and later German merchants were keen to control the entrance to the great sea (Sherry, 1994). With the local population becoming increasingly dependent on imported goods, a willing commercial partnership soon developed. Questionable scruples common on both sides of the agreements, however; led to as many friendships as it did civil wars. Profits were squandered and debts accrued which eventually lead to exploitation and a loss of political independence (Campbell, 1989). Surprisingly, it was not the great explorers or merchants of the time that would catalyze the eminent change in governing structure but the foreigners with seemingly altruistic intentions.

In the absence of rule of law, chaos reigned. One group of immigrants sought to induce order to these barbaric lands. Starting in the late 18\textsuperscript{th} century missionaries began their arduous work to tame the savages and bring peace through the word of god (Foster, 2005; Campbell, 1989; Sahlins, 1985). After decades of failed attempts, the shepherds finally were able to expand their flock with the induction of local chiefs. Conversion then
became a question of fealty rather than faith. Through their hard work of teaching, healing and preaching, the missionaries conveyed an impression of good will and disinterested goodness (Foster, 2005; Campbell, 1989). With few allies to turn to in an unfamiliar, developing political landscape, chiefs sought out the advice of these worldly men (Campbell, 1989). New ideas began to emerge, all of which influence negotiations today, such as the separation of church and state, dissolving serfdom, regular taxation, compulsory education for children and new laws for land distribution (Foster, 2005).

As more and more settlers began to call the islands home, the need for rule of law became increasingly evident. Seeking to secure their wealth and increase it, early colonists continually sought the intervention of naval officers leading to exploitive treaties, the success of which emboldened the newcomers to demand more (Campbell, 1989; Sahlins, 1985). Examples of Victorian life pervaded the once simple towns and turned the humble settlements into colonial outposts. Paved roads, public libraries, Sunday picnics and social clubs cultivated civilization from fringe-dwellers (Campbell, 1989). The increase in demand for European goods by both the natives and the newcomers created an economic pocket the German merchants were happy to fill.

By 1900, all but one of the Pacific Islands were annexed by a European power with many of the islands being sold or traded as conciliations of war. International treaties were being signed thousands of miles away from the Pacific governments they would ultimately impact (Aldershot, 2002; Campbell, 1989). This shift into neo-colonialism led to a lack of trust between the locals and the settlers and would continue to influence the way independent states would ultimately negotiate for their independence and trade agreements. Trade continued to boom and extraction of limited resources led to
decimation of the natural landscape. When World War I entrenched the globe, German interests which dominated the area were usurped by Japan, New Zealand and Australia who continued to maintain control after the war’s end (Shigematsu & Camacho, 2010; Campbell, 1989). World War II witnessed a change in protectorate as thousands of lives, both native and foreign, were lost seeking control of the strategic position the Pacific Islands presented.

At the end of World War II, most of the lands and people of the Pacific Islands had been devastated by bombing and exploitation. Fortunately, the peace treaties enacted through the work of the newly formed United Nations promoted a sentiment of self-determination for the battered islands. Unfortunately, the economic development of these future nations was not at a point conducive to independence (Aldershot, 2002; Campbell, 1989; Hoyt 1986). With native welfare and economic development at the forefront of priorities, the South Pacific Commission was formed in 1947.

The six colonizing governments that formed the commission were Australia, France, New Zealand, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom and the United States of America (Aldershot, 2002; Hoyt 1986). These nations were charged with developing an independent political system, rebuilding infrastructure, instituting an education system, cultivating agricultural resources and providing health care. Much research would need to be done to determine the state of affairs, thus many of these proposals for development were not to be taken up until the 1950’s (Shigematsu & Camacho, 2010; Campbell, 1989). For the next twenty years, Pacific Islands remained under the protectorate of their trustees and slowly developed their own political structure and a growing inclination towards independence.
Section 2.3: Contemporary Pacific Politics

Figure 1: Map of Pacific Islands (1997)

The 1970’s witnessed a time of independence and “The Pacific Way” (Campbell, 1989). Looking to cultivate a more transparent and honest ideology in politics the pacific leaders sought to find solutions and address conflict in a manner that would benefit all parties involved. Armed with compromise, consensus and a feeling of possibility incited by the successful independence of Samoa from New Zealand, multiple islands of the pacific began proceedings to institute their international autonomy (Shigematsu & Camacho).

By 1980, almost all of the trusteeships had been dissolved and those countries that did not opt for the nationality of their protectorate had formed their own constitution and independent governments (Shigematsu & Camacho, 2010; Campbell, 1989). Three of the states maintained a ‘Compact of Free Association’ with the United States. Although governed by national interests, the US would provide funding, trade rights and access to
many American services in exchange for full international defense authority and responsibilities thus allowing the US to maintain its strategic military interests in the Pacific (Campbell, 1989). This seemingly equal trade of privileges left the newly formed Pacific Nations dependent on their colonizer for constitutional structure.

Most of the nations adopted the governance structure of their colonizers. For example, some of the colonies of the United States maintained three distinct branches of executive, legislative and judicial government while those from the Common Wealth of Great Britain had formed a parliament with a prime minister (Shigematsu & Camacho, 2010; Campbell, 1989). Although adopting conventional administrations, all of the Pacific Islands maintain a varying degree of ties with their traditional method for governing. Whether it be parliament or congress, depending on the country, leaders are comprised of regional tribal chiefs (Foster, 2005). Many local traditions are still practiced including tributes and competitive gifting (Campbell, 1989). Constitutional requirements have preserved traditional knowledge and the village way of life for some communities. The ‘Pacific Way’ is upheld in most negotiations strategies and in fact is the most noted reason for their ability to conclude negotiations of the Samoa Pathways Outcome Document before the 3rd International Conference on SIDS began. Their focus on mutually beneficial partnerships and cooperation has given them a unique advantage despite their economic and environmental hardships.

SIDS are by definition developing states. According to the World Trade Organization website (WTO, 2015), “Members announce for themselves whether they are ‘developed’ or ‘developing’ countries. However, other members can challenge the decision of a member to make use of provisions available to developing countries.”
Countries will choose to challenge one state’s right to claim themselves as developing because being a developing country comes with certain rights. It should be noted that just because a WTO member claims developing country status, they are not automatically entitled to these benefits. Ultimately, the designation lies with those countries providing the benefits.

During the negotiations for the Doha Declaration, member governments agreed on a certain list of provisions, which would promote the economic and social development of these struggling nations (WTO, 2015). Collectively these provisions are referred to as “special and differential treatment” (S&D) provisions by the WTO and they include:

- longer time periods for implementing agreements and commitments,
- measures to increase trading opportunities for developing countries,
- provisions requiring all WTO members to safeguard the trade interests of developing countries,
- support to help developing countries build the capacity to carry out WTO work, handle disputes, and implement technical standards, and
- provisions related to least-developed country (LDC) Members.

Although these provisions are helpful for developing a nascent economy, the challenges facing SIDS are many and varied.

Vulnerabilities common among SIDS nations include insularity, a limited-land area and remoteness (UNDESA, 2014). A narrow range of resources results in market specializations that are often susceptible to even the slightest of economic shocks. Their small size and diseconomies of scale make the effects of unstable markets even more pronounced than those faced by other developing countries (UNCTAC & IOC, 2014). Adding in the extra transport costs and a high reliance on imports, further impedes their
ability to compete internationally (ILO, 2014). The average percentage of their gross national income (GNI) from official development assistance (ODA) is around 14% making them highly dependent on their developed partners (UNCTAC & IOC, 2014).

SIDS often rely on their ODA to support social services like sanitation, health and education. Almost 90% of their trash ends up in landfills resulting in even further limitations on land for agricultural production (UNDESA, 2014). In addition, the lack of regulations leads to environmental damage and public health risks (UNDESA, 2014). The level of funding allocated to health services depends greatly on the amount of aid received. In the absence of sufficient funding, health care often falls on the limited resources of a country’s families and households (UNDESA, 2014). Many Pacific SIDS have acknowledged the need for capacity-building especially among their youth where unemployment rates are as high as 37% (ILO, 2014). Educational and occupational opportunities are increasing but nonetheless cannot compete with stronger economies located not far off their shores.

Seeking opportunities elsewhere, SIDS suffer from what is known as “brain drain” where those that are most qualified to help their countries emerge from poverty and emigrate to more developed countries (UNDESA, 2014; Campbell, 1989). This is especially true in the Pacific where countries like Australia and New Zealand offer a range of options for education and employment that cannot be found domestically. Although many of the Pacific SIDS GNI’s rely heavily on family remittances to supplement their income, the lack of capacity for growing their economy results in a disadvantageous trade-off (UNCTAC & IOC, 2014; UNDESA, 2014; Campbell, 1989).
Section 2.4: Challenges of a Changing World

Another challenge facing SIDS, and every other nation in the world whether they care to admit it or not, is climate change. Unfortunately, SIDS are experiencing the extreme of what the rest of the world is only just now becoming aware of: climate change (UNDESA, 2014). All the aforementioned socio-economic challenges exacerbate impacts of a changing environment. It is no wonder then that negotiators from SIDS take a firm position on climate change policies even when they are up against their donor partners. Their small size, isolation and percentage of the population living near the shores results in a perfect storm of vulnerabilities they have no fault in creating or control in abating.

The greatest natural threats to the Pacific Islands are cyclones (UNDESA, 2014). As greenhouse gases such as CO2 accumulate in the atmosphere, they block the escape of thermo-radiation creating an increase in temperature in both our oceans and the air in the lower stratospheres; this process is also known as the greenhouse effect (Foster, 1999). The warm air provides fuel for the devastating vortex of tropical storms laden with humidity and ultimately drenching rains. Shifts in jet streams caused by melting polar ice can slow down or even divert the paths of the storms causing them to move further inland, slow down and dump more rain while causing unheard of destruction (Voiland, 2013). The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (Stocker et al., 2013) recently released their fifth assessment report stating with near certainty that global warming is human induced.

The effects are obvious even for the staunchest deniers with oceans warming, icecaps melting, sea-levels rising and powerful superstorms moving further inland (Stocker et al., 2013). Sadly, SIDS are responsible for less than 1 percent of greenhouse
gas emissions (UNDESA, 2014). The SIDS position is shifting from the blame game to advocating support for their islands to help them adapt to an increasing onslaught of challenges. Climate change deniers would love to write these tragedies off as part of a natural weather pattern (Murphy, 2007), but not only are these calamities caused by human activity, so too are the circumstances that lead to impoverished nations being under-resourced and ill-equipped to prepare for, withstand or rebuild after the storm has passed.

The Pacific has been deemed the most disaster affected region in the world with an average of 16 storms per year (UNCTAC & IOC, 2014; UNDESA, 2014). Tropical Cyclone Evan devastated Fiji and Samoa in December of 2012, leaving over 5,000 residents without a home, trapping tourists on a nightmare vacation and costing millions of US dollars in damages (UNDESA, 2014). The worst cyclone to hit the area in over 20 years, Evan destroyed so much of their infrastructure that these two strong nations are still rebuilding to this day (UNDESA, 2014). In April of 2014, the Solomon Islands faced their own horrific disaster in the form of flash flooding in the capital city of Honiara. Bridges were swept away, infrastructure demolished, almost 10,000 people were left homeless and dozens of people lost their lives (UNDESA, 2014). As if this were not enough, SIDS are also prey to a number of other environmental complications.

Other factors contributing to the vulnerability of SIDS include: a large population and a majority of their tourism industry located near the coast, limited groundwater reserves that are increasing in salinity, their small land mass means that most of their agricultural commodities are devastated and then take years to return to a productive stage, and the isolation of the island themselves make it difficult to receive aid even if
their airports are still operational (UNCTAC & IOC, 2014; UNDESA, 2014). A report from the United Nations Department of Ecological and Social Affairs (2014) shows that food security, water resources and coastal zones/marine ecosystems are the sectors of highest concern for most SIDS. Adding in sea-level rise causing a significant loss in landmass, some atoll islands over the next decade will be facing the harsh reality of becoming a nation of climate refuges.

To prepare for these shocks SIDS are adopting stricter building codes and zoning practices. Some islands are giving financial incentives to homeowners that put preventative measures in place like elevating their homes (Yamamoto 2012). In the Pacific, islands are joining forces and spreading the costs of expensive weather-monitoring equipment. One island tracks oceanographic observations while another monitors the satellite and radar stations. (UNFCCC, 2007) Some nations like Vanuatu are moving entire low-lying villages to higher ground (Caldwell, 2005). Other nations like The Maldives are commissioning Dutch companies to create man-made floating islands while more extreme measures are being taken by purchasing land in foreign countries in order to relocate their entire population (Golijan 2010; Yamamoto 2012). Focus groups are being led to share traditional knowledge on risk and resilience among nation states leading to a greater application of old-coping strategies for new climate conditions (UNCTAC & IOC, 2014). Each of the 14 Pacific SIDS has a unique cultural, political and economic structure, but they all struggle with having their grievances heard at the global level.
Chapter 3 – Negotiation Theory

Section 3.1: The Pacific Way

Negotiations are a process by which two or more conflicting actors find solutions collectively, through compromise, to problems which cannot be solved independently (Thompson, 2005). Culture has been defined as the product of long experience and tradition resulting in a distinctive set of enduring values and attitudes, which help to guide a group’s actions and orient their behavior (Faure 2002). The degree to which cultural change influences one’s behavior varies from one group to another, due to certain factors like urbanization, globalization, the influence of other cultures, and sometimes, government policies (Faure and Sjostedt 1993).

One diplomat wrote, “‘[P]atterns of personality do exist for groups that share a common culture.... [I]n the process of being socialized ..., the individual picks up the knowledge, the ideas, the beliefs and values, the phobias and anxieties of the group.’” (Fisher 1980) Often people perceive situations “‘according to their subjective attitudes, ... their likes and dislikes, their attachments and inclinations, their predispositions, hopes, fears, aversions, habits, and logics—in short, according to their culture’” (Walsh 1981). Cohen (1997) states that “the art of negotiation includes reading the signals that one’s counterpart is sending, consciously or subconsciously, regarding the shared problem under consideration, grasping verbal and especially nonverbal cues, may well require familiarity with his or her culture.” Culture tends to influence negotiations in a number of unique manners further complicating assumptions depending on the extent to which their counterparts interpret cultural influences (Fowler, 2009). Therefore, negotiators from divergent cultures face the added complication of contending histories and beliefs absent
to those negotiating within the same culture (Fowler, 2009). Conversely, skillful negotiators are able to draw on cultural differences to bring negotiations to successful conclusions. The “Pacific Way” seeks to bridge these cultural divides by building strong relationships.

Pacific Islanders tend to focus on establishing a range of relationships with the public and private sector previously considered foreign. Their revolutionary approach to the engagement of foreign entities is geared towards generating an action-oriented and reciprocal relationship. Foster (2005) states that “such relationships have assumed multiple shapes of varying symmetry, including ones in which neither side concedes its autonomy and both sides achieve their aspirations—a durable relationship between sovereign partners; ones in which each side accommodates the other from their proper positions within an encompassing hierarchy; and ones in which both sides merge or incorporate to form new conditions for social existence.” One could say that this perspective was formed through the influence of Christian missions from the mid 1800’s.

Foster (2005) states that “Christianity in the Pacific can hardly be regarded as exogenous; it is the preeminent local language in which compelling claims of shared humanity and universal equality are advanced. Love underpins a definite vision of community in which people live together in peace and prosperity.” The myriad of colonial histories and cultural values has influenced the lives of subjects and citizens for over two centuries, leading to mixed bag of tools negotiators can use to their advantage (Foster, 2005). The Pacific Islands are naturally a place where people with mutual interests, informed by unique situations and historical circumstances, invariably attempt to make and sustain relationships (Foster, 2005).
As we have seen in the previous chapter many of the issues SIDS are facing are global in nature with the root causes originating externally. In order to address these issues, SIDS will need to prepare a new generation of negotiators armed with effective tools for finding solutions. I chose to study the SAMOA Pathways Outcome Document (SPD) because it is the first outcome document in the history of the United Nations that was agreed upon before the conference even started. Most conference outcome documents tackle the easy issues during the preparatory phase and then leave the hard items for the conference itself, thereby putting pressure on the negotiators to reach consensus. This rush to sign often forces the negotiators to compromise in ways that lead to weaker text or greater concessions than were initially intended. By studying the methods used by the Pacific SIDS and their partners, I hope to share some best practices for the debate of future generations.

Section 3.2: Negotiating the SAMOA Pathways Outcome Document

For this study I have considered two different approaches and two different goals. First, we have the competitive approach, in which one or both sides attempt to defend and promote one’s own self-interests and the cooperative approach, where one or both sides attempt to find a suitable solution for both parties or foster a long-term relationship. Liu and Wilson (2011) claim that “negotiation is a dynamic social interaction between interdependent individuals who have conflicting interests, negotiators tend to pursue interaction goals that are both competitive (to defend and promote one’s own interests) and cooperative (to foster a settlement or a long-term relationship).” Obviously, these are not mutually exclusive terms and can be interchanged throughout the negotiations.
Goals can be defined as both tangible and intangible (Liu and Wilson, 2011). Tangible goals often come in the form of Official Development Assistance (ODA), technology transfer or access to services. Intangible goals are more like power grabs, relationship building or saving face. A large body of evidence suggests that cooperative approaches lead to stronger relationships and greater joint outcomes than competitive approaches. This is due to less contentious negotiators with cooperative social motives engaging in more problem-solving strategies than those with competitive social motives (for a review, see De Dreu, Weingart, & Kwon, 2000). However, it should be noted that negotiators enter the bargaining process with a myriad of subjective notions from culture to personal beliefs that invariably color their chosen strategies.

The main actors in the negotiations for the SPD were made up of a motley crew of new faces and limited skills. I say this not to discredit them in anyway, I say this as a compliment. By shucking the old ideologies of negotiation tactics and deceptive strategies, these fresh players came to the table with a very pragmatic approach for addressing the issues and finding solutions without the “normal game playing” that is associated with negotiating parties. Reciprocating competitive tactics, such as making positional statements and contentious arguments, prevent negotiators from discovering integrative potential that is needed for formulating mutually-beneficial proposals, and therefore, hurts joint gains (Liu, 2011). According to Adair et al (2004), once negotiators move away from a competitive focus, they tend to have a detailed discussion of the issues and reciprocate priority information before starting to generate solutions.

The lack of experience present at the SPD negotiations allowed participants to complete what other negotiators with decades of experience could not produce: an
agreement where everyone won. Existing research has demonstrated that inexperienced negotiators are more likely than experienced negotiators to adopt an integrative, win-win approach to negotiations (Neale & Northcraft, 1986). Through interviews with the most active participants, I was able to examine their perceptions and their values that led to the effective negotiation of the SPD. These perceptions and values resulted in unique approaches for attaining the various goals sought through negotiations.

Integrity, respect and honesty can be subjective concepts in the global arena to some, but for the people of the Pacific, they maintain an easy definition: do what is best for your people. Culture can affect what each negotiator values with differing strengths of feeling across issues, therefore allowing negotiators to find a mutually beneficial resolution (Fowler, 2009). In an environment increasingly affected by transnational issues, it is of vital importance that negotiators are able to address cultural divides by listening to their opponents’ views. Research has consistently shown that social motives drive strategic behavior (De Dreu et al., 2000). Social motives can be influenced by situational cues like rewards, instructions, expectations of future cooperative interaction, individual differences, or culture (De Dreu et al., 2000). A less skillful negotiator may ignore cross-cultural dimensions and be tempted to interpret statements as irrational that could be easily understood within the context of the speaker’s culture (Fowler, 2009).

As will be seen in the results section, the traditional beliefs of Pacific Islanders are represented through the various positions they take on issues. Without so many interests to appease, the governments are able to focus on a limited range of topics that will improve the lives of their citizens. That is not to say that corruption does not exist in the Pacific, as a matter of fact, the intermingling of kinship ties and public roles with
political parties based not on intellectual convictions but held loosely together by various personal bonds can lead to favoritism and inequality. On the flip-side, these personal relationships and direct ties to family also result in greater advocacy for community needs. Who’s going to fight harder for you, your father or a stranger? Based on the foundation of genuine relationships between people and families, Pacific governments act with respect as their guiding principle. The idea of using smokescreens or grandstanding to make a power grab are as foreign to them as a snow storm, but their unique circumstances allow them to maintain their integrity and negotiate from a place of honesty; something very rare in politics. A quick review of trade agreements in the Pacific reveals that this result was not unique to the SPD.

Section 3.3: Pacific Trade Agreements

According to the World Bank, “Studies have shown that there is likely to be a permanent wedge between the cost of production in the Pacific and the world price in both manufacturing and services, making it difficult for the islands to compete in all but a few niche markets.” To illustrate the cooperative nature of Pacific SIDS, I looked at three different trade agreements made throughout the last decade: Pacific Island Countries Trade Agreement (PICTA), The Pacific Agreement on Closer Economic Relations (PACER Plus), and the European Union Economic Partnership Agreement for the Pacific (EU-EPA Pacific).

PICTA is a free-trade agreement between 14 countries, excluding Australia and New Zealand, associated with the Pacific Island Forum. Under this agreement, virtually all barriers to merchandise trade between Forum Island Countries (FICs) have been subsequently removed (WTO, 2015). The initial PICTA, which only covered trade in
goods, was ratified by ten FICs. The agreement was signed in 2001 and came into force in 2006. In 2004, the PICTA Trade Ministers' agreed to broaden the free trade area among the FICs to include trade in services. PICTA was so successful that Australia and New Zealand decided to join in under another agreement called ‘PACER Plus’.

The Pacific Agreement on Closer Economic Relations (PACER) is an umbrella agreement between members of the Pacific Islands Forum which provides a framework for the future development of trade cooperation. It was first signed in Nauru on 18 August 2001, and entered into force on 3 October 2002. It is a framework agreement that sets an outline for the future development of trade and economic relations across the Forum region as a whole. It does not contain substantive trade liberalization provisions; rather it envisages a step-by-step process of trade liberalization. According to the Australian Government Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade, the main goals of PACER Plus include:

- A new regional trade and economic agreement which provides **long-term opportunities** to create jobs, enhance private sector growth, raise standards of living, and boost economic growth in Forum Island Countries.
- Negotiations will include elements of trade **capacity-building** and trade development assistance designed to strengthen Forum Island Countries’ ability to trade.

These negotiations are ongoing with a number FICs reluctant to sign due to the distributive nature of the agreement with the developed countries benefiting more than the developing. Concerns include: loss of policy space for nurturing local industry and employment, threats to food security and rural livelihoods and potential business closures.
as well as job losses. Another agreement is in the early negotiation phases with the European Union (EU).

The EU is currently negotiating a comprehensive Economic Partnership Agreement with all fourteen countries of the region (Cook Islands, Fiji, Kiribati, the Marshall Islands, Micronesia, Nauru, Niue, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, the Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tuvalu and Vanuatu). The comprehensive agreement would cover trade in goods, trade in services, development co-operation and trade-related issues like food health and safety issues, technical barriers to trade, agriculture, sustainable development and competition. This agreement has already been piloted with Papua New Guinea and Fiji in 2004. The successful implementation of this agreement has led to the expansion of terms for the rest of the islands in the region. These partnerships with neighboring islands and DPs are just one example of the cooperative nature of SIDS.

The notion of partnerships is a strong one in the Pacific Region. With so many obstacles to development it is only natural that burden sharing is a common and favorable options for negotiators. One of the benefits of completing the negotiations for the SPD early was the ability to focus on building partnerships throughout the 3rd International Conference on Small Island Developing States held in Apia, Samoa in September 2014. Over 300 partnerships were formed within, and across all sectors including: member states, local government, private, non-profit, religious, and political organizations coming together to increase the likelihood of each achieving their mission and to amplify their reach. Some examples follow below.

Whether looking at clean oceans, sustainable tourism or healthy transportation, the Pacific Islands have some great ideas to implement over the next few years. The
Pacific Ocean Alliance aims to mobilize resources for healthy ocean related activities at all levels including training of government officials, journalists and other stakeholders to raise awareness, strengthen decision-making and improve implementation of ocean-related policies and programs. The Tourism Resilience Partnership will work with five different agencies to identify and collaborate with key agencies in the South Pacific working together towards a Strategy for Climate and Disaster Resilient Development for the Pacific (SRDP). This strategy will elevate tourism as a major regional economic sector effectively strengthening resilience and enabling sustainable development. Finally, the Bicycles for Capitals initiative will introduce 500 bicycles in major cities across Nauru, Niue and Tuvalu. Accompanied by a promotional DVD and airtime on national television, the cycle-to-work program, presented at workplaces and schools, aims to get citizens on board thereby reducing heart disease and pulmonary problems prevalent in the SIDS region (SDKP, 2015).

These local examples of partnerships demonstrate the SIDS spirit of working together to advance the sustainable development of their nations at the regional level. Partnerships such as these, exemplify the benefits of cooperative goals which not only increase their counterparts’ successful outcomes but also advance their own positions as well. It has been shown that a cooperative nature will cause their counterparts to share useful information concerning priorities (Liu and Wilson, 2011). Moving from the local to global perspective, Pacific SIDS include themselves in three governing blocks to help them maximize their successful outcomes and capacity when negotiating abroad.
Chapter 4 – Political Coalitions

“Our coming together in the Group of 77 has the purpose of enabling us to deal on terms of greater equality within an existing Center of Power. Ours is basically a unity of opposition. The unity of the entire Third World is necessary for the achievement of fundamental change in the present world economic arrangements.... The object is to complete the liberation of the Third World countries from external domination. And unity is our instrument—our only instrument—of liberation.”
Mwalimu Julius K. Nyerere, former president of Tanzania

Section 4.1: G77

As previously mentioned, one of the greatest challenges facing SIDS is a question of capacity. In fact, of the states I chose to focus on for this study, one mission to the United Nations is staffed only by one ambassador while at the other end of the spectrum one country has a staff of 20 with over eight representatives available for negotiations (UN Blue Book, 2015). The United States Mission to the UN boasts a staff of 126 ambassadors, councilors and advisors not including their army of interns and administrative support (UN Blue Book, 2015). This can be a very difficult prospect for small islands when attempting to navigate the Second Committee to the General Assembly, which focuses on economic and financial issues, taking action on 44 draft proposals in the current session. Through my work at the UN, I have discovered that there can be up to four different sessions on unique topics occurring simultaneously. Therefore, to be able to attend one needs a staff of at least four capable ambassadors or councilors; this does not even take into account the level of expertise needed to speak reliably on each subject. To circumvent these shortcomings, developing states, including all but two Pacific Islands, decided to form a new coalition, despite their inherent disagreements.
One of the most influential organizations capitalizing on the opportunities available through the UN to manage the rise of globalization is the Group of 77. This group includes nations from every continent attempting to bring equality and integrity to global politics through the unified voice of developing countries. The Group of 77 came together in preparation for the first United Nations Conference on Trade and Development-UNCTAD I (Allen & Dauvergne 2013; Merrils, 2011; Iida, 1988; Geldart & Lyon, 1981). It was initially comprised of the Latin American, African and Asian groups of countries, together with Yugoslavia as a meeting of countries independent of the major power blocs, and formally was outside the United Nations system (Merrils, 2011). From the early 1960s the nascent Group of 77 was mainly concerned with economic issues at a time when the international economic order was a primarily American-dominated system (Allen & Dauvergne 2013). To be able to have their concerns heard, developing countries decided their voices were louder as a coalition.

Released on October 18, 1963 in the UN General Assembly, the original 75 member-states jointly sponsored a resolution entitled ‘Joint Declaration of the Developing Countries’ (Chasek, 2001; Allen & Dauvergne 2013). The 75 were inspired by the possibilities presented by the forthcoming Geneva conference as, ‘conducive to the development of their economies and to the integrated growth of the world economy as a whole’ (Geldart & Lyon, 1981). The group was made up of twenty-one states from Latin America and the Caribbean, thirty-one from Africa, and twenty from Asia and the Middle East; with the final three from Cyprus, New Zealand and Yugoslavia (Chasek, 2001; Geldart & Lyon, 1981). By the end of UNCTAD I, 75 became 77 as New Zealand withdrew and Kenya, South Korea and South Vietnam joined the Group by signing on to
the Joint Declaration, which was annexed in the Conference’s Final Act and Report (Chasek, 2001).

Following UNCTAD I, the G77 was mainly a caucusing group focusing on UNCTAD with little attention to other United Nations purposes. Without a continuing program or clearly agreed purpose, they found themselves less effective as their potential had promised (Allen & Dauvergne 2013; Iida, 1988). In October 1967, The Group convened a ministerial level meeting in Algiers with seventy countries represented. The largest and most important single gathering of the Third World in the 1960’s, they agreed upon a 'Programme of Action' adopting the principle modalities observed to this day (Chasek, 2001). Their unique approach – at the time- of setting up both Main Committees and Working Groups enabled them to facilitate work both during and after the main meetings. The G77 was now able to focus attention and expertise on cross-cutting issues affecting all states like sustainable development and most recently climate change (Chasek, 2001). In addition, The G77 now takes part in the debate raised by the ILO, UNCLOS, UNDP and other relevant United Nations bodies. Chairpersons continue to be selected on various issues according to their expertise, negotiating skill and interests of national delegates to represent the voice of the G77 (Geldart & Lyon, 1981).

Despite its current membership of 134 countries the name Group of 77 persists; they are most often referred to as the G77. Due to the increase in member states, the G77 now boasts a diverse and heterogeneous membership and can sometimes struggle with preserving and promoting its unity. Williams (2005) writes, “developing countries thus tend to create and recreate a fragile unity in opposition to existing structures of power that leave its policy makers feeling vulnerable.” Certain topics can fracture the group
with the more powerful actors pressuring other members to support their positions (Allen & Dauvergne 2013; Geldart & Lyon, 1981). The rising stars in the global economy, Brazil, India, and China and states in the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC), have very distinct views on climate change from those of the other developing countries in the group. Because of their influence on the global economy, these states often wield more power over G-77/China policy formation than SIDS.

This internal imbalance of power, which ironically was the original purpose for the formation of the G77, is overcome by focusing on the tangible benefits coalitions provide including legitimacy, more financing, technology transfers and longer timeframes to implement agreements (Allen & Dauvergne 2013; Geldart & Lyon, 1981). The original method of the G77 for reaching agreement persists to this day by finding regional consensus before compiling these regional views into and aggregated G77 position. The shared experience of fighting against a North–South divide stemming from colonialism, imperialism and globalization is ultimately the basis of the South’s unity. Their joined efforts to link traditional environmental and development goals are common during environmental negotiations along with a desire to protect natural resources.

Section 4.2: AOSIS

Every relationship has its struggles and often developing countries are simply too divided on the issues to reach consensus. The formation of smaller coalitions is common with smaller states venturing out alone to maintain their integrity and fight for their beliefs. Recognizing power asymmetries helps us to understand why SIDS will sometimes seek influence through coalitions while at other times will resist working collectively. Facing different views on human rights and development, countries may
choose to bypass the original method for reaching agreement by seeking the shelter of regional consensus. SIDS have formed their own coalitions both globally and regionally through the Alliance of Small Island States (AOSIS), Pacific SIDS and the Pacific Island Development Forum.

On the global level, SIDS have decided to form their own governing-bloc unified by the common concerns and perspectives these islands share. Historically, representation of small island states in the international realm was uncoordinated and disjointed with most of their issues being swept aside for the greater cause of global development (Heileman, 1993). Separately SIDS abilities to stand out in the UN system and even the G77 was hindered by their inherent lack of finance and capacity, but together they were much more effective in raising awareness of the global threats that ultimately affect us all. Additionally as the threats and causes of global-warming and sea-level rise have become increasingly evident, SIDS have taken center stage, which is allowing them to present their perilous perspective and gain some ground. AOSIS represents a trans-regional group consisting of small island states from the Caribbean, the Indian Ocean, South China Sea, the Mediterranean Sea, the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans (Larson, 2002; Heileman, 1993).

Another benefit of the coalition is the power they yield in the intergovernmental decision making process of the UN. With small island states comprising up to a sixth of the votes in the United Nations system when acting in a coordinated effort, they constitute a potentially significant trans-regional geopolitical entity which can easily sway a decision one way or another (Larson, 2002). Yet, their traditional beliefs and humble beginnings lend a fresh perspective to intergovernmental negotiations free from
any major economic, political, technological or military concerns. Instead, they are mostly fighting for sustainable development, equality, clean environments and integral living conditions; basically what we all need (Larson, 2002). Recognizing that the major changes in the environmental systems, which we are all experiencing, is indeed a direct result of human activities, the voices of island states are an essential addition to the global conversation.

AOSIS was formed in November 1989 at the behest of the government of the Maldives (Larson, 2002; Heileman, 1993). During the Small States Conference on Sea Level Rise in Male, Maldives, SIDS first attempted to bring together their Ministers of Environment and their senior technical officials to discuss the threats and need for capacity-building within their states (Larson, 2002). As a result, the “Male Declaration on Global Warming and Sea Level Rise”, developed a number of potential solutions and way to move forward including the establishment of an Action Group consisting of representatives from Kiribati, Malta, Maldives, Mauritius and Trinidad and Tobago (Larson, 2002; Heileman, 1993). Their task was to “oversee the implementation of the decisions and recommendations of the Small States Conference on Sea Level Rise, and to pursue and follow-up on global and regional response strategies.” The coalition of the Alliance of Small Island States was further legitimized at the Second World Climate Conference (SWCC) in Geneva in November 1990 where it was listed as part of the taskforce entrusted with ensuring the World Climate Plan was successfully implemented (Larson, 2002; Heileman, 1993). Although their efforts at doing so were largely unsuccessful, the recognition was monumental.
Today AOSIS faces three major challenges in climate change negotiations. First, their focus on global ecological understandings and commitments is hindered by their inability to generate a sense of accountability. The concept of common but differentiated responsibility is a legitimate cause to get behind except that those who have clearly contributed the most to the problem are also the ones least likely to admit it. The second major challenge to AOSIS is their lack of political capital. They are not a major global power and never will be; alone they are unable to institute the necessary regulating body required to control the very elements that directly contribute to their ecological insecurity. Finally, the small island states comprising AOSIS do not have the technical or financial resources needed to adapt to the threats of climate change (Larson, 2002; Heileman, 1993). SIDS lack of resilience coupled with an increase in the intensity of extreme weather events results in a one step forward ten steps back scenario with each “natural” disaster they face. Additionally, without a strong economy able to attract the attention of big business, they have no leverage when trying to convince the most powerful corporations on Earth - in particular, those in energy, transport, and agriculture - that their practices are deleterious for the planet and its inhabitants.

Despite these challenges, delegates from AOSIS have maintained a global alliance of 43 nations and made themselves a force to be recognized (Larson, 2002). Through their efforts of the last 25 years, AOSIS has provided a necessary perspective on global production and consumption practices, pooled resources necessary for building capacity within their governments, and gained the attention of corporate responsibility initiatives allowing them to initiate preventative measures at local levels (Larson, 2002). Their greatest asset is the building of regional alliances through which they can
communicate with one voice for the security of the Earth's ecological system as a whole rather than their individual interests. To build regional alliances, the Pacific Islands have aligned themselves within the P-SIDS group and Pacific Island Development Forum.

**Section 4.3: P-SIDS and Pacific Island Development Forum**

12 Pacific Small Island Developing States make up the regional group known within the United Nations as PSIDS. The islands that constitute this regional bloc are the Federated States of Micronesia, Fiji, Kiribati, Republic of the Marshall Islands, Nauru, Palau, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tuvalu, Vanuatu, and Papua New Guinea. In a statement delivered to the United Nations during the negotiations for the Sustainable Development Goals, PSIDS outlined their predicament as follows:

“Together we comprise a land area of only half a million square kilometers scattered throughout the world's largest ocean, with a significant portion of that land made up of low-lying atolls that do not reach more than a few meters above current sea level. The combination of physical characteristics, remoteness and poor infrastructure make the PSIDS inherently vulnerable, with climate change having a profound impact on PSIDS who face development as well as security issues. For the Pacific Small Island Developing States, the most fundamental threat to security emanates from rising sea levels that threaten the territorial integrity and sovereignty of PSIDS countries and lead to conflict and unrest over resources and land. Several countries are facing the danger of disappearing entirely.”
In an effort to establish a broad alliance among Pacific Small Island Developing States, leaders from governments, civil society and the private sector have created an initiative called the Pacific Islands Development Forum (PIDF) (Navunilawa, 2013). PIDF provides the opportunity Pacific Island Countries to join together through meaningful mutually beneficial partnerships in an effort to implement sustainable development plans for a green/blue economy. Working alongside international institutions, PIDF engages state and non-state actors in an effort to address regional development challenges including disaster risk reduction, sustainable production and consumption patterns, clean energy and preservation of important marine habitats (Navunilawa, 2013). With the realization that the cooperation of all sectors in society are necessary for addressing the complexities of sustainable development, PIDF combines the expertise of the private sector, regulatory leadership of the public sector, and implementation mechanisms of civil society (Navunilawa, 2013). As stated in the PIDF Information Booklet (2013), “Multi-stakeholder partnerships like PIDF provides fresh opportunity for doing development better by recognizing the qualities and competencies of each sector whether government, civil society or private sector, and finding new ways of harnessing these contributions for the common good.”

PIDF acts as the regional counterpoint to the globally focused AOSIS and G77 with an eye on implementation. While most of their concerns are addressed through the G77, it is when the voices of small island states are in conflict with some of their more developed colleagues that AOSIS steps in with SIDS concerns in mind. The need for stronger regulatory practices, capacity-building, data collection and monitoring though an open and transparent process leads to the role of PSID and PIDF being more prominent at
the regional level. Although giving up a portion of their autonomy to compromise within these larger groups, more often than not, Pacific SIDS share common values and obstacles to development that allow them to stand stronger together than apart while being more effective as they negotiate a better life for their citizens.
Chapter 5 – Research Methods

Section 5.1: Research Questions

The overarching questions that orient this research are: What does it take to be a successful negotiator from the perspective of SIDS? In other words, how do vulnerable countries get what they want out of negotiations and what determines their efficacy? The answer to this question would require years of research and a much larger budget than I have. Given my limited timeline and funding I have chosen to focus my research on a topic that positions me to carry out Ph.D. research where I can explore these broader questions. For my master’s thesis, I intend to address the following questions: what were the negotiators’ perceptions and values while negotiating the “SAMOA Pathways Outcome Document” and how did this influence the strategies used?

The purpose of this paper is to highlight one method for facilitating the process by which international agreements are negotiated. Despite the snail’s pace at which multilateral negotiations move, at this point they are the only means by which widespread transboundary environmental accord can be reached. Another option is a transnational body with legislative and enforcement power that governments are willing to give up their sovereignty in return for protection. Unfortunately, this does not look likely in the foreseeable future. In the meantime, a reliance on the international treaty-making process, and the UN system which houses it, is essential. This system can be difficult to navigate and frustrating to endure, but the Pacific representatives have a few guiding principles that make these negotiations successful and equitable: integrity, respect and honesty. When determining my methods for this research, I relied on an often cited text.
Section 5.2: Interview Techniques

According to Bernard (2006), semi-structured interviews are a scheduled activity that is open ended, yet follows a general script and covers a certain set of topics. By opting for a semi-structured interview approach, I was able to determine the negotiators’ perceptions and values that would dictate the approaches taken in the negotiations during the final conference preparatory committee meetings. My questions focused on the negotiators’ own assessment of their abilities and the number of years participating in international negotiations. I also looked at their personal perceptions on national and global vulnerability to climate change. Other items of interest were perceived intentions of donor countries, what constitutes a successful outcome, what they like about negotiating and the challenges negotiators faced both in relations to the SPD and in general. Finally, I wanted to know what sort of personal and traditional values they had and how those translated into the global arena. Research shows that social motives drive strategic behavior (Cohen, 1991). Many of the SIDS negotiations rely on their traditional belief systems to guide their political positions; the “Pacific Way” remains a touchstone in contemporary politics.

Some of the interview questions were generic for all countries’ negotiators and some were specific enough to probe particular negotiators’ expectations and plans for information relevant to answering my question. I also considered a donor country’s potential to benefit from responding to the SIDs’ demands and their ability to donate. The interviews lasted on average one hour and were conducted in person. I recorded each of the interviews to help me collect the responses. Recordings were archived in a way that would not allow identification by an interviewee’s name or country. Their participation in
the study was voluntary and they were offered the right to refuse participation or to stop
the interview at any time, as per Institutional Review Board (IRB) guidelines. No
governments or private agencies or their colleagues will be able to identify the
interviewee as a source of information provided. I plan to publish the results of the
research, but have left out any names or references that would implicate the negotiators.

I asked each negotiator six questions with two to three probing questions per
subject in order to delve further into each topic. The first two questions focused on the
experience of negotiators to determine their perceived efficacy. The next set of questions
were about negotiations both in general and also specific to the SPD. Topics four and five
allowed me to examine the perceptions that negotiators have about their countries
vulnerability to climate change and motivation for selected strategies. Finally, I asked
questions about values and job satisfaction. The questions for both SIDS negotiators and
their DPs varied only in the questions about donor relationships. Interview questions can
be found in the Appendix. Often negotiations will come down to a key set of actors,
therefore, I chose specific negotiators from SIDS and their DPs to interview depending
on their level of participation in the SPD negotiations. To further conceptualize
vulnerability, I decided to include two socio-economic factors into my analysis.

**Section 5.3: Research Variables**

According to the UNDP website: “The HDI was created to emphasize that people
and their capabilities should be the ultimate criteria for assessing the development of a
country, not economic growth alone. (...) The Human Development Index (HDI) is a
summary measure of average achievement in key dimensions of human development: a
long and healthy life, being knowledgeable and have a decent standard of living.” The
score is represented by a percentage with higher numbers resulting in a better standard of living for a country’s citizens. Indicators are measured from the following sectors: health, education, income, inequality, gender, poverty, employment, human security, trade and financial flows, mobility and communication, environment and demography. For this study, I chose to use each country’s gross national income (GNI) and HDI to illustrate how socio-economics influence the perceptions, values and ultimately negotiation strategies of SIDS negotiators.

The World Bank defines GNI PPP per capita as “GNI per capita based on purchasing power parity (PPP). PPP GNI is gross national income (GNI) converted to international dollars using PPP rates. An international dollar has the same purchasing power over GNI as a U.S. dollar has in the United States. GNI is the sum of value added by all resident producers plus any product taxes (less subsidies) not included in the valuation of output plus net receipts of primary income (compensation of employees and property income) from abroad”. This factor allows us to see how variable the incomes are among SIDS and highlights the different degrees to which each one is able to react to and recover from climate change. In other words, each country’s level of vulnerability is assumed to determine the approach they take in negotiations.

These factors and the interviews help to develop a negotiator’s level of vulnerability, cultural values and perceptions that influence their choice in strategy. I used the following categories to help define a scoring system to categorize countries according to three independent variables:

- Level of vulnerability was defined by each country’s GNI level, HDI score and negotiator’s perspective on climate change
• Cultural Values were determined by the number of times each interviewee mentions certain words such as tradition, respect, integrity or honor during the semi-structured interview

• Perceptions of a negotiator’s efficacy were characterized by a negotiator’s number of years participating in international negotiations and their own assessment of their abilities

Section 5.4: NVivo Software

Using NVivo software (NVivo, 2014), I coded the interviews according to the three unique variables listed above and a few others I deemed relevant. A table listing the variables and nodes used to define them can be found in section 5, Table 1. The nature of this research is inductive, but I do expect it to reveal information that speaks to the questions of how SIDS determine which strategy to use when negotiating a favorable outcome for their countries. This research will form the basis for answering the broader questions that interest me, such as what makes SIDS effective in achieving the goals they strategically pursue at the international negotiation and implementation stages of policymaking, which I plan to pursue through a PhD dissertation.
Chapter 6 – Results and Discussion

The thematic content analysis of the interviews from both SIDS and DP negotiators revealed results both surprising and expected. The interviews were coded based on themes identified in the interviews, historical reference and thematic research. The list of themes provided in Table 1 offers a quantitative representation of the data. Percentages are listed according to the number of times specific themes were coded in all interviews for each country bloc (SIDS vs. DPs). Table 2 related the GNI and HDI variables to perceptions of the negotiation process. Finally, using the NVivo software, I created word clouds (see Figures 2 & 3) that represent the terms most often referenced in the interviews for each country bloc.

Section 6.1: Thematic Coding

In review of Table 1, I found the most surprising results within the Honesty, Negotiation Challenges, Unfavorable Outcomes and Dishonesty themes. The impressions that I had from the interviews and research suggested that SIDS would be more concerned with honesty as referenced by the following quotes:

“I think you need to be alert, to listen closely so you don’t misunderstand positions and then be honest. I think that if you have those and you are honest and involved in discussion and participation I think you gain respect. If you are not honest I think people can see through that and then you sort of lose your credibility.”

“I can express my frustration my recommendation and how to do things better but at the end of the day I do the best I can for the specific issue I’m dealing with at that particular time with honesty and integrity so I can sleep at night.”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>% Coded for SIDS</th>
<th>% Coded for DPs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vulnerabilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Country’s Resilience</td>
<td>2.27%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Country’s Sovereignty</td>
<td>2.29%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vulnerability</td>
<td>5.83%</td>
<td>4.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Values</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cultural Influence</td>
<td>5.30%</td>
<td>1.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dishonesty</td>
<td>1.45%</td>
<td>0.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grandstanding</td>
<td>2.20%</td>
<td>0.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Honesty</td>
<td>1.38%</td>
<td>3.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Integrity</td>
<td>4.54%</td>
<td>5.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Optimistic</td>
<td>2.31%</td>
<td>5.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pessimistic</td>
<td>0.92%</td>
<td>0.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pragmatic</td>
<td>1.64%</td>
<td>2.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>2.48%</td>
<td>2.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perceptions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Efficacy of Negotiator</td>
<td>5.36%</td>
<td>5.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Favorable Outcomes</td>
<td>5.80%</td>
<td>4.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>4.26%</td>
<td>3.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negotiation Challenges</td>
<td>4.24%</td>
<td>8.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negotiation Likes</td>
<td>2.69%</td>
<td>4.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perceived benefits of Donor</td>
<td>5.10%</td>
<td>4.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preparation</td>
<td>4.48%</td>
<td>2.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Required Skills</td>
<td>6.08%</td>
<td>10.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unfavorable Outcomes</td>
<td>0.86%</td>
<td>4.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Considered</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td>2.56%</td>
<td>6.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cooperative</td>
<td>8.29%</td>
<td>6.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Partnerships</td>
<td>4.66%</td>
<td>5.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Political Coalitions</td>
<td>11.11%</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strategies</td>
<td>14.07%</td>
<td>17.97%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Thematic Coding Frequencies: List of themes used for NVivo coding of interviews. Percentages are listed according to the number of times specific themes were coded in all interviews for each country bloc (SIDS vs. DPs).
Other quotes from SIDS interviews focused on challenges of negotiating:

“When you are a small delegation like the ones that we represent you do end up doing a little bit of everything. At the same time you also have to prioritize on what issues you have to follow, what issues can you only be following reactively and which ones do you actually have the luxury of being proactive and being fully engaged in.”

“You know you can’t fight especially if you are a small nation you can’t fight for every issues you want and expect to come out on top, you have to pick your battles which is hard because it mean prioritizing some issues over others even if both might have great merit.”

However, the thematic coding showed that DP’s more frequently referenced Honesty and Negotiation Challenges, almost twice as often as SIDS did. In the case of Unfavorable Outcomes, DP’s mentioned this theme over five times as often as SIDS negotiations.

Examples of DP’s focus on the above themes include:

“I think they trusted me and the others and I trusted them to test a little bit the limit of the mandate and usually we don’t have that with other negotiations. And we were able on a couple of issues to by understanding each other’s hard lines and red lines to appear much more constructive with less of the traditional drama here in negotiations because we trusted each other. And I know that they wouldn’t trick me and they know I wouldn’t trick them…”

“The phrasing of the language can be very difficult, we want to agree to things that are realistic. For example we have a different perspective on framing the document. It was phrased to be legally binding and that’s not standard for an outcome document. Member States shall commit to xyz, which is not the aspirational document it was meant to be. When you use legal words like that it’s harder to be ambitions when the accountability is not there.”

“I’m very disappointed that we have not been able to convince the SIDS of the short political declaration; I think it’s a loss for everyone. It’s very frustrating [because] the idea was good. [A simple text] would get more support and influence, but it was just complicated with too much stuff about preamble sections and a lack of political vision.”
The focus of DPs on these themes could be the result of their need to balance a multitude of interests and therefore present a certain image in the global arena; that image is that they are not competing unfairly but that they are cooperating. Many of the SIDS negotiators I spoke with were more concerned with the people they were representing and the positive aspects of their negotiations rather than the potential perception of what they said. One negotiator even mentioned their inability to influence power dynamics as a benefit in the sense that they could then focus more on the issues affecting their people and less on their image.

With such a focus on interests and image, interestingly the opposite affinity – SIDS over DPs - was found in the thematic coding of dishonesty. The queries conducted in NVivo produced a list of quotes in which this theme was four times more prevalent in the interviews conducted with SIDS countries:

“I mean ideally you lay your cards out on the table but of course it’s a game and so that I think …is the bad part because it takes away from the trust you build with the partners and all of the stakeholders.”

“A lot of people say they need to go back to capital and of course no one will ever say yeah, ‘we’re just trying to buy time’, not even to their friends but you know it’s very clear that it doesn’t take two weeks to go back to your capital.”

The context in which these statements were made help to explain them. Most often when SIDS are referencing Dishonesty it is when they are talking about why they themselves chose to be honest, or why they think that dishonesty is an ineffective strategy to adhere to. Despite the minimal number of anomalies found, most of the results from the thematic coding were as predicted (see Table 1).
Expected outcomes came in most of the categories, but a few need explanation: such as Cultural Influence, Political Coalitions and Vulnerability. Cultural Influences is obviously more relevant to SIDS than the more heterogeneous societies of DPs. In fact, when mentioned by DPs, Cultural Influence is taken in the context of speaking about SIDS:

“That’s what I mean about the sort of traditional influence, their world view, in the Pacific especially. I find that SIDS are generally sort of a pragmatic group. They’re not in this really just to make statements. They want to solve the problem so generally speaking that was helpful and allowed us to make an agreement overall. The agreement we struck and the way that we did it in a very civilized respectful way, was a reflection [of their traditional influence].”

Whereas SIDS spoke about Cultural Influence in the first person perspective:

“In the sense that we’ve tried to merge the two [Cultural Influence and Contemporary Policies] and allow them to work together. Not necessarily preferring one but to say that either can be most useful. To take what is useful at a particular time for a particular issue. So for instance, right now...we are very strong advocates of healthy oceans... And our advocacy has actually been based on our tradition of conservation and use of resources. So we have taken that to use it as our modern strategy for conservation of the oceans and resources in the oceans... We want it also for our children for our future. We believe we are stewards of those resources and that’s a value that has come to us through the traditions.”

As expected, Political Coalitions were almost three times more relevant for SIDS negotiators. When DPs were talking about coalitions it was most often in relation to the challenges they pose to negotiations such as:

“Had we simply been negotiating with SIDS I think you would have seen a much more focused document, probably more effective. But that’s a reality of the situation. They have to work within their group, the small group [AOSIS] and the big group [G77], and that’s what you come up with. We would have preferred and I suspect they might have too if we could have focused our energy and all of our implementation on the specific needs of SIDS rather than the larger G77. We probably would have done an even better job.”
SIDS are more often comparing the benefits and challenges associated with belonging to such coalitions:

“Now that’s why we get coalitions so we can stand up to these big countries. But then within the coalitions, we still have many different fractions and it can be hard to reconcile those interests. Because there was a bunch of extra stuff in the document that was not ours that we knew was going to cause a whole lot of objections. But we knew at least where our first choices were for the core group, so I think there was a time for us where we had to make a choice ok you’ve taken us this far and we’ve decided that you’re just not helping us we need to pull this out of the document, so we either have to choose the language or the country.”

Although both interview groups recognize the importance of vulnerability, SIDS countries mentioned this theme slightly more often than DPs and in a more urgent context focused on people rather than economies. For example compare this quote from a DP:

“We all suffer from climate change and there is now a lot of evidence from government agencies highlighting the vast losses. I mean we’re not talking about if you only see climate change on how many inches of your soil is impacted in the next 50 years, ok, but there are so many other way that large economies can be impacted.”

With this quote from a SIDS negotiator:

“[Development is] almost impossible and that challenge has been exacerbated because of climate change and sea level rise. Thinking alone about natural disasters. So even the basic needs people fight for, the food sustenance and the health care access, it’s already difficult because of all the things that we were talking about earlier and then you add in the soil, the salt water.”

Clearly there is a greater focus for SIDS on these three themes. Cultural Influence is the result of many of the Pacific Islands actively preserving their cultural heritage through language, the arts and - for some - their political systems. The need to burden share with such small delegations and capacity challenges naturally leads to an affinity for cooperation and Political Coalitions. Finally, the fact that many of these islands have
been experiencing the effects of climate change since the subject was first globally acknowledged in the Rio Earth Summit in 1992, vulnerability is not only what brings these islands together, but is also the main basis for their political positions. As evidenced in the coding of themes, SIDS use multiple avenues at the global level to address these vulnerabilities, but overcoming their inherent difficulties often comes down to a question of economic resilience, or the lack thereof.

Section 6.2: Socio-Economic Factors and Pacific Perspectives

Of the Pacific Island developing countries I focused on for this study, only one can report a per capita GNI (PPP) higher than $15,000 USD with the rest coming closer to the $2,000 – $4,000 range (see Table 2). A meager gross national income matched with a continuous onslaught of environmental issues makes the accumulation of a national surplus, needed to provide basic social services, next to impossible for most of the Pacific SIDS. Another factor I considered when predicting a countries negotiation strategy was their Human Development Index (HDI).

A country’s HDI score improves the closer it gets to one. Although GNI is one variable to consider, the link between the two factors is not always positively correlated, as it is in the SIDS countries I interviewed, because the HDI takes into account many other variables such as inequality, access to health care and quality of education just to name a few. The lowest reported score in the index for 2013 (0.33) can be found in Sub-Saharan Africa. The HDI scores for Pacific SIDS, including my representative sample, range from very high to low with the highest at 0.9 and the lowest at 0.491 (see Table 2). Results showed that countries with a lower vulnerability to climate change tended to talk
about competitive strategies more than those with a higher vulnerability who often spoke about cooperative strategies.

Other factors I chose to consider relate mostly to years of experience and the personal perceptions of the negotiation on both themselves and their country. Multiple negotiators interviewed said that their own personal beliefs and ideals help to direct the positions they take, with of course, their main guiding principles coming from their capitals. That being said, a negotiator will fight harder and longer for something they believe in. With this in mind I asked two specific questions of each negotiator to determine their perceptions that influence their positions. The first question was “Do you think you are a good negotiator?” with answers ranging from yes to no with a myriad of responses in between. I chose to rate their answer on a high, medium and low scale with the obvious yes answers providing a high level of competency, no relating to a low level and anything in between resulting in a medium perceived level of efficacy. The final factor related to climate change.

From the question, “Are you personally concerned about climate change?” most negotiators, for both SIDS and DPs, said yes with only two outright saying no. The answers in between ranged in levels of intensity and therefore were given a rating of very concerned, concerned, and not concerned. I expected most DPs to be mildly concerned while I thought all SIDS would be very concerned, but this was not the case. Some of these discrepancies were based on the level of resilience that some of these countries have incorporated into their national strategies; others were simply more focused on sustainable development and left the climate change issues to the UNFCCC negotiators.
All of these variables together, plus a number of them I did not include, help to influence how a negotiator approaches the table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Negotiators Affiliation</th>
<th>Country GNI PPP per capita, 2013*</th>
<th>Country HDI Score, 2013</th>
<th>Negotiators years of experience</th>
<th>Perceived Efficacy of Negotiator</th>
<th>Negotiator’s personal concern for climate change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SIDS</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>0.491</td>
<td>18 months</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Concerned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIDS</td>
<td>$3,000 (2005)</td>
<td>0.721 (2008)</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Concerned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIDS</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>18 years</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Very Concerned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIDS</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>0.694</td>
<td>10 years</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Concerned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIDS</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>0.775</td>
<td>13 months</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Very Concerned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIDS</td>
<td>$77,000</td>
<td>0.901</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Not Concerned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>0.933</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Very Concerned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP</td>
<td>$42,000</td>
<td>0.876</td>
<td>6 years</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Not Concerned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP</td>
<td>$54,000</td>
<td>0.914</td>
<td>18 months</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Concerned</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*amounts rounded to the nearest thousand to protect identity of country.

Table 2: Variables potentially influencing negotiation strategies including two socio-economic factors, efficacy of negotiator and negotiators perception on climate change

A negotiators strategy changes considerably as the negotiations progress. That being said, some negotiators are in it for the game of negotiations and therefore like to withhold information, hold-up meetings and introduce drama to the proceedings. This was exceptionally minimal in the negotiations for the SPD, but it still occurred. Often this was represented by those from states with a higher GNI and HDI and a lower concern for climate change. One SIDS negotiator mentions this:

“I mean one of the things I think is more like a basic assumption that you have to base on, is you have the power to move the UN just by voting however or blocking. I mean you have one of two options and you can move the group to do that if you are in the right. Well if you think you are in the right.”
Another example of competitive strategies is from one the DPs:

“Negotiating in NY is a completely different thing, where there is more concern with psychology and deception and political image. It’s a world of perceptions so one of the most important things is to be perceived the way that your country wants to be seen. It’s not about saying something, it’s mostly about how you say it. And sometimes do you even say something at all or get someone else to say it for you.”

These sorts of pretenses are examples of what other negotiators hate about negotiations, including the ones that I took these quotes from. What made the SPD a successful negotiation was the exclusion of a lot of these games. Negotiators trusted each other enough to simply throw their cards on the table and find solutions where everyone could go back to their respective capital proud of what they had accomplished. Looking at the word clouds we can see what each group of negotiators focused on in their interviews. The results are as predicted.

Section 6.3: Word Clouds

Figures 2 & 3 Word Clouds Created from SIDS (left) and DP (right) interviews represent the terms most often referenced in the interviews for each country bloc with larger and bolded words depicting those most often cited
Looking at the above word clouds, it is not surprising to see that the most frequently used word for SIDS was *people* nor that the most frequently used word for the DP’s was *SIDS* as these were most often cited as the main objectives for each one during the negotiations. SIDS were naturally concerned about the well-being of their people whereas the DP’s were concerned about the wellbeing of SIDS. Both negotiation groups used the word *different* quite a lot. Looking through the interviews, the word “different” refers to socio-economic factors, different perceptions, different values and different strategies. Despite their many differences, the negotiators for the SPD found a way to overcome them through building relationships and ultimately enough trust so they could deal honestly throughout the proceedings. Even if they were not all happy with the outcome document itself, they were all proud of the way in which it was negotiated.
Chapter 7 – Conclusions

Results showed that despite how their perceptions, values and socio-economic factor influence the way they talk about negotiations, all of the negotiators from both SIDS and DPs chose to cooperate and therefore ended up with greater gains on both sides and a shorter negotiation time. Due to the cultural influence of SIDS, the lack of experience on both sides of the table and the large amount of trust and comradery between the negotiators, the SPD was able to be agreed upon in a relatively short amount of time with a high degree of satisfaction from all parties.

Looking back over the last year of research, from watching the preparatory committee negotiate the SPD till sometimes three o’clock in the morning, to meeting all the negotiators at the 4th International Conference on SIDS in Samoa, to sitting down with each of the negotiators at the United Nations Headquarters in New York and listening to their perspectives, to researching the history of the Pacific Islands, to analyzing the data, to writing the results, I have learned a great deal about “The Pacific Way”. The principles they share, such as a people focused position, respect, cooperation, honesty and integrity, can help guide negotiations for years to come potentially leading to shorter negotiation times and greater gains for both sides. Their approach not only changed my misconceptions about negotiations but also those of the DPs:

“*In the case of SIDS, negotiations were extremely good and powerful and constructive and filled me personally with a lot of pleasure because they were just a bunch of nice people and after five years negotiating stupid things in the UN, it restored my faith in the process.*”

“*[Those negotiations were] Extremely unique, I mean the only time I’ve experienced that is with the SIDS there’s nothing in my year and a half to even come close to it.*”
“We had some great personalities and built some strong relationships in that negotiation. We were more active about reaching out and we had the time and space to moderate. The nature of SIDS countries is all about cooperation so I think that set a really nice tone for the negotiations.”

The goal of this project was to learn from this successful negotiation and share a few of these best practices for future and present negotiators. Some of the most interesting tips from the SIDS negotiators were on the subject of respect and integrity. All of the SIDS negotiators mentioned the importance of respect in negotiations and being sure that you have the best interest of the people you are representing in mind. Respect for your culture, your counterpart and especially yourself are the fastest ways to form relationships in New York. The need for diplomacy is obvious, but in order to build political capital you must build trust and respect with your colleagues. This is mostly done through relationships and honest dealings within the negotiation room. The avoidance of deception and drama are key components to the SIDS strategy. This stems mostly from their traditional beliefs blending in with their contemporary circumstances. Their most referenced tactic was trying to find solutions that benefit both sides; the beauty of SIDS negotiation strategy is they truly believe that everyone can win.

From the DPs, I leaned a number of useful tactics that could apply to any negotiation from global policy to fighting a traffic ticket. The importance of knowing the political process and legal language of your subject matter is key. One negotiator taught me that in order to thrive at the global level, more important than strategy, is knowing about UN protocol and having a data-base of agreed language. For the SPD, knowing the strategies they used and what was agreed upon for the LDC outcome document or “The Future We Want” is what gives you the ability to help move the negotiations forward.
Within global negotiations, it’s not just the subject of the paragraph which is contentious, but rather one little word that cripples agreements. That is because one word can be interpreted many different ways using a variety of languages, and finding the perfect text to agree upon can make or break a negotiation. With this in mind, the only thing that matters for the preparation is your knowledge on what the approved language is and the appropriate protocols for accomplishing your objective.

One of the DPs gave me some ‘food for thought’ that I found worthy enough to share. The variability in socio-economic factors among SIDS countries can prove to be a difficult situation for DPs trying to provide assistance:

“It’s hard to grasp and understand what SIDS really are because you know when you do your briefing for you minister about SIDS and you start with well they’re small islands but they are not all small, they’re not all islands, they’re not all states, they’re not even all developing.”

He suggested that instead of forming a political coalition among SIDS that they instead find partnerships among those truly affected by climate change whether these are islands or countries. By banding together through their shared vulnerability to climate change instead of their geographically similar traits they might have a stronger voice and therefore be able to focus the eye for aid from DPs. Although I cannot say I completely agree with this approach, I do see the merit in its consideration.

Both SIDS and the DPs agreed that listening is the most important skill a negotiator could have. Being able to truly listen and understand what your counterpart wants and where their red lines are enables you to not only find compromises, but also discover where the flexibility lies within the negotiation. Strategy is all about finding the flexible point within the contention and landing on the middle ground where everyone wins. Tricks and drama will never compete with a cooperative nature as long as everyone
is on the same page. This cannot be done without building trust and honest relationships.

The greatest thing that the “SAMOA Pathways Document” gave the global agenda was not a revolutionary set of principles, but a solid example that by talking to each other from a human perspective, being honest, sticking to your integrity, listening to your counterparts, raising trust and building relationships sustainable development is possible but only through genuine and durable partnerships.

I would like to end with a quote from one Pacific SIDS Ambassador that I think sums it up nicely:

“I like to think that down deep in the heart of men they are good and they want to do the right thing so you know even if they are hampered sometimes by political bondage or whatever has changed them, you have to keep working and try to bring the good part out.”
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Annex 1: Questions for SIDS Negotiators:

Disclaimer: I scheduled this interview to talk about your experience with international negotiations. This interview should take less than an hour. I will be recording the interview to help me collect the responses. Recordings will be archived in a way that will not allow identification by your name or country. Your participation in this study is voluntary and you have the right to refuse not to participate or to stop the interview at any time. No governments or private agencies or your colleagues will be able to identify you as a source of information provided. The results of the research study will be published but your name will not be used. If at any time during this interview you experience feelings of distress or anger please let me know and I’ll stop the interview immediately. May I proceed with the questions?

1. How did you get into your line of work?
   1. What is your favorite part about negotiating?
   2. What are the biggest challenges?

2. How many years have you been negotiating international agreements?
   1. What do you think are the required skills of an effective negotiator?
   2. Do you think you are a good negotiator?

3. Negotiation
   1. What would you consider a successful outcome of a negotiation?
   2. For the SIDS ACCELERATED MODALITIES OF ACTION [S.A.M.O.A.] Pathways Document, What would you consider a favorable outcome for your country? Challenges? Unfavorable outcomes?
   3. How did you prepare for the negotiation SIDS Pre-Com? Was it different from your regular preparations.

4. Level of vulnerability will be defined by each country’s (a) GDP, and (b) EVI score
   1. Do you think your country is vulnerable to climate change?
   2. If they don’t mention economics, physical risk, freshwater probe further.

5. Level of perceived motivation of donor countries will be defined by each county’s (a) potential to and nature of benefit from responsiveness to SIDS, and (b) ease of contribution by donor country
   1. What do you think is the potential to and nature of benefit for a donor country favorably responding to SIDS requests or needs?
   2. Does the ability of donor countries to provide a favorable outcome to your requests influence your approach to the negotiations?

6. Personally curious…
   1. Are you personally concerned about climate change?
   2. Are you an optimist?
   3. Do you like your job?
Annex 2: Questions for Development Partner Negotiators:

Disclaimer: I scheduled this interview to talk about your experience with international negotiations. This interview should take less than an hour. I will be recording the interview to help me collect the responses. Recordings will be archived in a way that will not allow identification by your name or country. Your participation in this study is voluntary and you have the right to refuse not to participate or to stop the interview at any time. No governments or private agencies or your colleagues will be able to identify you as a source of information provided. The results of the research study will be published but your name will not be used. If at any time during this interview you experience feelings of distress or anger please let me know and I’ll stop the interview immediately. May I proceed with the questions?

1. How did you get into your line of work?
   1. What is your favorite part about negotiating?
   2. What are the biggest challenges?

2. How many years have you been negotiating international agreements?
   1. What do you think are the required skills of an effective negotiator?
   2. Do you think you are a good negotiator?

3. Negotiation
   1. What would you consider a successful outcome of a negotiation?
   2. For the SIDS ACCELERATED MODALITIES OF ACTION [S.A.M.O.A.] Pathways Document, What would you consider a favorable outcome for your country? Challenges? Unfavorable outcomes?
   3. How did you circumvent or achieve these outcomes?
   4. How did you prepare for the SIDS Prep-Com? Was it different from your regular preparations?

4. Level of vulnerability will be defined by each country’s GDP and EVI score
   1. Do you think your country is vulnerable to climate change?
   2. Do you think the vulnerability of a country influences their negotiation strategy?

5. Level of perceived motivation of donor countries will be defined by each county’s (a) potential to and nature of benefit from responsiveness to SIDS, and (b) ease of contribution by donor country
   1. Do you have trade agreements or do you provide ODA to any SIDS?
   2. What benefits does your country gain by supporting SIDS?
   3. How does the relationship you have with specific SIDS influence your approach to the negotiations?

6. Personally curious...
   1. Are you personally concerned about climate change?
   2. Are you an optimist?
   3. Do you like your job?
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