

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Committee, Treaties \(REPS\)](#)
Subject: submission: Agreement to Establish the Pacific Resilience Facility
Date: Wednesday, 19 November 2025 1:53:09 AM

To the committee,

I have concerns regarding some of the clauses allowing a very wide scope. Pretty much all of the listed climate resilience concerns can be solved with cement so it seems like more of an agreement to deliver cement but funds may also be used for other purposes. Referring to Article 3(a) of the Treaty. With the establishment of the Pacific Resilience Facility I would urge that a large bucket of seed capital not be delivered. The United Nations Development Program has a relevant report discussing the lack of investor confidence in the Pacific. Without a clearly defined code of conduct defining corruption it's unlikely to be successful other than as a vehicle for entrenching bribery and corruption. A continuation of colonial practices. According to the UNDP, there is no distinction between Pacific culture and corruption even going so far as to equate anti corruption measures with genocidal intent. Further that development funding must be tied to concrete issues and outcomes to deter corruption. I look forward to the proceedings related to the development of the rules of procedure and regulations because the success of the Pacific Resilience Facility as defined in Article 3 depends upon it.

Of course there is the cynical lesson of St. Francis Xavier's shoes. There is the potential for the PRF to be a sustainable development vehicle but Pacific leaders might also choose for it to be a boat load of holy regalia. A veritable cargo cult and the road to hell being paved with good intentions.

B, Manuhua. (2007) Corruption in Pacific Island Countries. UNDP Pacific Centre.
<https://www.undp.org/asia-pacific/publications/corruption-pacific-island-countries>

Robert Heron

