



ASEAN-CANADA FORUM 2014

Natural Resources
Management For Sustainable
Growth

Event Report
24-25 July 2014

Event Report

ASEAN-CANADA FORUM 2014: NATURAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT FOR SUSTAINABLE GROWTH

JOINTLY ORGANISED BY:

CENTRE FOR NON-TRADITIONAL SECURITY (NTS) STUDIES,
S. RAJARATNAM SCHOOL OF INTERNATIONAL STUDIES (RSIS),
NANYANG TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY (NTU),
SINGAPORE

INSTITUTE OF ASIAN RESEARCH,
UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA (UBC),
CANADA

SUPPORTED BY:

THE INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT RESEARCH CENTRE (IDRC), CANADA

RSiS
Nanyang Technological University

S. RAJARATNAM
SCHOOL OF
INTERNATIONAL
STUDIES



IDRC
International Development
Research Centre

CRDI
Centre de recherches pour le
développement international

Canada

24–25 JULY 2014
HOLIDAY INN ATRIUM, SINGAPORE

S. RAJARATNAM SCHOOL OF INTERNATIONAL STUDIES (RSIS)
NANYANG TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY
2014

CONTENTS

Executive Summary	4
Opening Plenary Session of the Forum	6
Session 1: Natural Resources Management (I)	10
Session 2: Natural Resources Management (II)	12
Session 3: Coastal Communities in Southeast Asia	14
Session 4: Cooperation or Competition for Sustainable Growth	16
Session 5: Regional Approaches	18
Closing remarks	21
Programme	24
List of Participants	28
About the RSIS Centre for Non-Traditional Security (NTS) Studies	32
About the S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS), Nanyang Technological University	32

Recommended citation

Centre for Non-Traditional Security (NTS) Studies, ASEAN-Canada Forum 2014: Natural Resources Management for Sustainable Growth (Report, Singapore: Centre for NTS Studies, S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS), 2014).

Photo credits

Flickr / International Rivers and flickr / WorldFish (cover)

Centrespread: RSIS Centre for Non-Traditional Security (NTS) Studies.

Rapporteurs: Sofiah Jamil, Margareth Sembiring, Maxim Shrestha, Gianna Gayle Amul, Julius Trajano

Terms of use

You are free to publish this material in its entirety or only in part in your newspapers, wire services, internet-based information networks and newsletters and you may use the information in your radio-TV discussions or as a basis for discussion in different fora, provided full credit is given to the author(s) and the Centre for Non-Traditional Security (NTS) Studies, S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS). Kindly inform the publisher (contact_rsis@ntu.edu.sg) and provide details of when and where the publication was used.

This report summarises the proceedings of the meeting as interpreted by the rapporteurs and editors of the Centre for NTS Studies. This report adheres to a variation of the Chatham House Rules.



This publication is also available online at:
<http://www.rsis.edu.sg/research/nts/centre-resourcescnts/cnts-rsis-publications/>
Alternatively, access the website using the QR code on the left.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The ASEAN-Canada Research Partnership was launched in 2012 by the Centre of Non-Traditional Security (NTS) Studies at the S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS), Nanyang Technological University (NTU) and the Institute of Asian Research, University of British Columbia (UBC), with the support of the International Development Research Centre (IDRC), Canada.

The Research Partnership aims to facilitate cooperation in research among Canadian and Southeast Asian scholars and institutions on regional development issues using a Track 2 approach. It builds on the objectives of the ASEAN-Canada Enhanced Partnership Plan of Action (2010–2015), which states that ASEAN and Canada are to ‘work and consult closely in responding to regional and international challenges, and in building an ASEAN-centred regional architecture which is open and inclusive, promote the development of enhanced ASEAN connectivity which will help foster the building of an ASEAN Community by 2015’.

Towards this end, the research partnership awards Senior and Junior Fellowships to scholars based in Canada and Southeast Asia under specific research themes. The first phase – conducted in 2012–2013 and concluded with a Forum in Ho Chi Minh City – discussed the theme of economic inequality, a potentially unintended result of greater regional integration and strong economic growth. In addition, the research and policy papers explored alternative means of enhancing regional economic development.

The second phase discussed the theme of ‘Natural Resource Management for Sustainable Growth’, which builds on the first phase as unsustainable natural resource management has been a significant factor in growing economic inequality in Southeast Asia. Moreover, the challenge of balancing development goals with environmental protection becomes more acute as ASEAN member countries move towards establishing the ASEAN Economic Community. Several significant themes emanated from

the presentations and discussions at the 2014 ASEAN-Canada Forum on ‘Natural Resource Management for Sustainable Growth’.

- **Ecosystem and geography paradigms must be given greater priority and consideration in natural resource management policies**

Whether it be the management of water resources, forestry or fisheries, the management of these trans-boundary resources cannot be simply divided based on political boundaries. These shared ecosystems require cooperative mechanisms that transcend borders and encourage mutual responsibilities of actions. Scientific studies on ecosystems should not be disregarded, but rather prioritised with other economic development considerations, which may be of more interest to policy makers.

An ecosystems paradigm is also necessary in being better able to mitigate disasters and the potentially adverse effects that disasters have on the agricultural and fisheries sectors. Increasing incidents of erratic weather patterns have increased the likelihood of floods and droughts in Southeast Asia, which have taken a toll on not just economic growth of ASEAN countries, but also basic livelihood sources for communities in Southeast Asia. Research has also shown that the intensity of these adverse implications is exacerbated for communities who face existing forms of marginalisation.

- **Perceptions and actions at the local level are critical in facilitating natural resource management**

There is critical importance in improving policy implementation and awareness initiatives at the local level for sustainable natural resource management. While regional frameworks and national policies may call for improved rights and conditions for local communities, the lack of awareness of these policies and legislation by locals themselves will continue to leave them potentially vulnerable to further exploitation or to environmental hazards as a result of

unsustainable resource management. One of the major challenges in greater local awareness is the difficulty in effectively disseminating tacit knowledge, which may vary depending on one’s perspective of the issue at hand. There is also a need to review the effectiveness of community based solutions to determine which stakeholders truly benefit from community-based initiatives. Field research conducted by some Junior fellows has demonstrated that the proposed economic incentives of community based solutions, do not necessarily trickle down to communities that require them the most, but rather sections of society above them that have a relatively better capacity to take advantage of the opportunities that are offered. In addition, there is also the trend of ‘green washing’ in some environmental conservation efforts in Southeast Asia, where the assumed economic incentives and alternative sustainable livelihood options bring little benefit to local communities.

Indigenous knowledge should also be taken into greater consideration for effective local level solutions. In many cases, the lack of effective local level implementation is due to limited capacity and resources. In this regard, existing local knowledge not only fills gaps in technical capacities, but also facilitates local level awareness and implementation as these are practices that communities are accustomed to and would be more willing to accept rather than initiatives that are foreign or not as conducive.

- **Enhancing the relevance and effectiveness of regional cooperative mechanisms in natural resources management.**

Regional cooperation on trans-boundary environmental issues in Southeast Asia has not had much of an impressive record. The focus on economic growth and regional economic integration has to a large extent ignored environmental concerns, which are largely perceived to impede economic development policies. Regional cooperative frameworks on natural resources and environmental issues have thus been perceived

by civil society networks as superficial efforts to reduce opposition to existing and proposed development policies.

That said, however, there is a need to understand the complex challenges in making regional cooperation work. Firstly, while there are genuine concerns expressed by communities and civil society organisations, the tendency to cast states and government officials in a generalised negative light does little to solve the problem. Rather than being averse to community level concerns, policy makers are challenged in terms of having to take into account other stakeholders perspectives and nationwide considerations. These challenges also at times make it difficult for policy makers to effectively incorporate the above mentioned points of adopting an ecosystems approach and maximising the potential of local perspectives and action.

Secondly, it is necessary to understand the appropriate ways of engaging stakeholders in various contexts. The ASEAN way of consensus building, for instance, may be perceived as slow and ineffective for civil society organisations that want swift action to be taken. Yet, it is this current mode of operation that continues to prevail amongst ASEAN member states. In this regard, rather than simply seeking to aggressively oppose government officials in formal meetings, engagement through informal meetings and taking time to build trust amongst various stakeholders, coupled with incentives to act, would potentially be an alternative approach to regional cooperation.

With the conclusion of the second phase of the ASEAN-Canada research partnership at the end of 2014, a final workshop will be held in 2015, to showcase the research and policy recommendations made over the course of the three years. It is envisioned that further dissemination of the research partnership’s outcomes as well as the enhanced exchanges between academics, practitioners and members of civil society in ASEAN and Canada will facilitate further action-oriented research for effective policy making.

OPENING PLENARY SESSION OF THE FORUM

Opening Remarks - ASEAN Perspective

Assoc. Prof. Mely Caballero-Anthony

Head

*Centre for Non-Traditional Security (NTS) Studies
S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies
(RSIS)*

*Nanyang Technological University; and
Secretary-General*

*Consortium of Non-Traditional Security Studies
in Asia (NTS-Asia)*

Singapore

In her opening remarks, Assoc. Prof. Mely Caballero-Anthony noted that the theme of the Forum “Natural Resources for Sustainable Growth” is timely given the recent Presidential election results of ASEAN’s biggest member, Indonesia, which is a source of much of the region’s natural resources and biodiversity. She noted that the complex issues relating to energy and food security and land management in Indonesia are reflective of the circumstances in most of the other ASEAN countries. Although countries in the region are increasingly industrialised and urbanised, agricultural production still plays a major part of their economies (with the exception of Singapore and Brunei).

Assoc. Prof. Caballero-Anthony also cautioned that viewing ASEAN’s natural resources simply in terms of productivity acutely reduces the significance of the region’s vast biodiversity, which is crucial not only to sustain productive ecosystems but also enhance future research and development. She noted two observations that suggest how the focus on productivity dominates both national and regional thinking. Firstly, amongst the three pillars of building an ASEAN community by 2015, the socio-cultural community – which includes environmental protection – is the least actively pursued amongst practitioners in ASEAN member states vis-à-vis the Political-Security Community and Economic community. Hence, while regional economic integration has the potential of narrowing the development gaps between ASEAN states, the emphasis on economic growth for most policy makers is still

within the conventional paradigm of economic development, and thus may still adversely impact natural resources in Southeast Asia.

Secondly, research – including those conducted in the first round of ASEAN-Canada research fellowship – has demonstrated that while there has been enhanced economic development at the national level, there is widening economic inequality within national boundaries. A substantial proportion of this inequality stems from inequitable access and distribution of resources, as well as the depletion of these resources due to growing trends of urbanisation and industrialisation in Southeast Asia.

In this regard, this year’s Forum’s theme on the management of natural resources for sustainable growth is apt as it builds on last year’s research and policy papers by touching on several pertinent issues. Firstly, the papers highlight the complex and interdependent relationships amongst various natural resource and development sectors such as agriculture, fisheries and coastal industries, energy and urban development. Central to these dynamics is the competition for access to land and water use, which has had socio-economic implications for the local communities living around these areas, some of whom have experienced a greater brunt due to their marginalised status/circumstances. Secondly, the papers touch on how the growing rates of natural disasters and environmental change have implications on the way natural resources are managed in Southeast Asia. Thirdly, some of the papers have provided alternative viewpoints, which would be useful in deliberating other solutions to long standing issues.

In concluding, Assoc. Prof. Caballero-Anthony noted that how such initiatives such as the ASEAN-Canada Research Partnership are a means of further enhancing on-going efforts in Asia to mainstream and sensitise non-traditional security issues.

Opening Remarks - Canadian Perspective

Prof. Paul Evans

Professor

Institute of Asian Research

University of British Columbia (UBC)

Canada

Prof. Evans began by thanking RSIS for their cooperation in facilitating the ASEAN-Canada Research Partnership, and the ASEAN Senior and Junior fellows for their efforts in examining timely issues for the development of the ASEAN region. He also welcomed other participants for making time to share their views on the papers and policy recommendations presented. Finally, he thanked H.E. Heather Grant for agreeing to deliver the keynote address and described her as one of the most dynamic representatives of the Canadian government.

Prof. Evans noted that the significance of bringing together such a diverse group of academics and practitioners was primarily to support the betterment of the Southeast Asian region. Not only do developments in Southeast Asia affect Canada’s vital interests such as trade, but the developments also allow Canadians to reflect in understanding their own country. The topic of sustainable development and natural resources management is also a major concern in both Canadian civil society and policy circles. One of the most recent instances of this is a ruling by the Canadian Supreme Court on first nation community’s involvement in resource management. The new ruling established that not only would indigenous communities need to be consulted on natural resource management issues, but the community would also have the right to provide consent for natural resource development projects. In this regard, while Canada may be in a different context than Southeast Asia, the challenges that they face are similar.

Prof. Evans also noted that the ASEAN-Canada forum is not a conventional academic research conference, but rather one that makes bigger

demands from its fellows to provide actionable ideas either in a national or regional context. Despite the intergenerational, international, inter-subject matter nature of the meeting, there is a level of coherence coming from the papers. In addition, the forum is a space for young scholars to build their networks and relationships, which will potentially serve them well further down the track. He concluded by encouraging the fellows to ‘think big’ for the betterment of Southeast Asia.

Opening Remarks - IDRC perspective

Dr Ann Weston

Director, Special Initiative Division

*International Development Research Centre
(IDRC)*

Ottawa, Canada

Echoing the sentiments of Prof. Evans, Dr Weston noted that Canada’s keen interest in the management of natural resources for sustainable development provides opportunity to share experiences with its Southeast Asian counterparts. In this regard, Dr Weston gave a brief overview of the IDRC’s work. Commenting on its role in the ASEAN-Canada Research Partnership, she noted the inception of the project was based on discussions between former IDRC regional representative in Singapore, Dr Rosalia Sciortino, and Assoc. Prof. Mely Caballero-Anthony. The ASEAN-Canada Research Partnership is part and parcel of the IDRC’s work in advancing democracy and ensuring stability and security, through supporting practical results driven work. As a part of the Canadian foreign policy, the IDRC has invested heavily in building the capacity of researchers through post-graduate programmes and other major projects.

One such graduate studies programme is a Consortium of development studies masters programmes at three universities in Thailand – namely the Asian Institute of Technology, Chulalongkorn University and Chiangmai University, which is led by the latter’s Regional Centre for Science and Sustainable Development. Intellectually spearheaded by Dr Sciortino,

this programme provides the opportunity to less privileged Thai researchers to conduct field research on transborder Southeast Asian issues, and thereby serves to also strengthen links amongst research institutes in the region. Another IDRC supported master's programme relates to food security in the upland areas of Southeast Asia. The primary research areas of this programme is in the Philippines and Thailand, where a series of workshops and field visits were organised in a bid of cultivating a cohort of researchers and policy analysts to have frank and in-depth discussions on food security.

Dr Weston also mentioned several major research projects, of which many post-graduate Southeast Asian researchers are involved. First a project in Cambodia, facilitated by UBC and an NGO in Cambodia, and co-sponsored by the IDRC and the Canadian Department for Foreign Affairs and Trade, examines how Cambodian households can introduce nutrient rich fish for personal consumption as well as big fish for earning an income. The success of this model would have the potential of being scaled up for the wider region. There have also been similar projects on themes such as infectious diseases, environmental and economic approaches to climate change adaptation. IDRC is also a co-funder of Social Sciences and Humanities research council with a project on urban governance and process in addressing climate vulnerabilities. The key to these projects is again to ultimately provide support to young scholars, and strengthen the capacity of current and future leaders to be able to address contemporary and emerging developmental issues.

Keynote address

H.E. Heather Grant

High Commissioner of Canada in Singapore

H.E. Grant began her keynote address by thanking the RSIS Centre for NTS Studies, the Institute of Asian Research at UBC and IDRC for organising and supporting this event. She noted Canada has a history of supporting research to provide sound advice to policymakers on these important issues. Through the IDRC's Environmental Economics Program in Southeast Asia, which began in 1993, Canada has worked to enhance regional research capacity on economic analysis of environmental issues.

H.E. Grant's address covered three main points. First, she elaborated on why the Southeast Asian region and ASEAN are important to Canada. She noted that ASEAN plays an important strategic role in helping secure long-term economic prosperity for Canadians. As economic partners, Canadian direct investment in ASEAN member states exceeds that of mainland China, Japan and India – a good proportion of which is in the natural resources sector. Canada's status as a Dialogue Partner of ASEAN has facilitated cooperation from initiatives in recent years including the ASEAN-Canada Joint Declaration on Trade and Investment (JDTI) and the ASEAN-Canada Research Partnership. Canada continues to value Southeast Asia as reflected in its commitment to ASEAN Community building. Recent Canadian contributions include \$10 million to the Integrated Disaster Risk Management (IDRM) Fund administered by the Asian Development Bank; \$4.5 million dollars over three years in supporting an ASEAN infrastructure centre of excellence; and increasing the number of ASEAN countries under its development assistance program – namely adding Philippines and Myanmar to join existing recipients Indonesia and Vietnam.

Second, H.E. Grant explained what Canada and the 10 countries of ASEAN are trying to accomplish in the region through their cooperation. This was summed up by the need to support the growth of a well-managed natural resource economy in Southeast Asia. Given the tremendous potential

for the mining, oil and gas sectors to fuel growth and job creation in developing countries, natural resources are an opportunity to be seized. However without proper management, these resources can fuel corruption, social unrest and armed conflict. They can cause significant environmental damage, and undermine development. In this regard, Canada is poised to provide its experience in responsible resource development to Southeast Asian countries that are developing their extractive industries.

Thirdly, H.E. Grant noted how the output from the ASEAN-Canada Research Partnership contributes to realising the above mentioned objectives. This is primarily through equipping Southeast Asian governments with better knowledge to help them make better decisions on how these can be managed in a way that reduces poverty and benefits all citizens. That said however, there are several challenges ahead. Firstly, weak governance capacity and poor accountability in many countries prevent transparency and a stable business environment by increasing the likelihood of corruption, bribery, the abuse of human rights and other illicit activities. Secondly, limited private sector engagement undermines the ability of local entrepreneurs to engage with extractive industries and create lasting jobs. Thirdly, the lack of technical and vocational training impedes local labour from taking advantage of job opportunities. Finally, insufficient consultation and engagement with communities not only compromises the responsible management of resource wealth, but limits distribution of the benefits and may also lead to protracted disputes and even conflict if not properly shared.

H.E. Grant concluded by noting that Canada is focused on growing economies more sustainably, managing resources more responsibly, and working more closely with the private sector and other partners to advance global development objectives. She also commended the efforts of research institutions in Canada and Southeast Asia in boosting research collaboration on these strategic issues.

SESSION 1: NATURAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT (I)

Session 1 examined issues relating to water resource management in mainland Southeast Asia. Most of the presentation case studies focused on Vietnam with some comparative analysis of Laos, Cambodia, Thailand and Myanmar. The presentations highlighted the significance of water resources in achieving sustainable development objectives at the local level.

Physical, not political, geography-centred approach

Water resources are often trans-boundary in nature. Whether it is surface channels or water bodies, aquifers, catchment areas and watersheds do not always follow international borders or administrative boundaries. The Mekong River which runs through five mainland Southeast Asian countries (Myanmar, Thailand, Laos, Cambodia, and Vietnam), serves as a good example of this.

What is largely missing from existing water resource management policies is a perspective based on natural geography and hydrology. Such a perspective, however, could potentially mean international political boundaries being of secondary importance so as to effectively manage these transboundary water resources. It is therefore critical for various country officials as well as administrative agencies and non-state actors to be work towards common understanding and cooperative water management arrangements based on this perspective.

Understanding water resource management through this physical geography approach is necessary given the fact that water availability

from these sources vary according to seasons. Not only are most rivers and freshwater resources in mainland Southeast Asia primarily rain-fed as part of the Asian monsoon system, but there are also direct consequences on the rate of flow, quality and quantity of water downstream as a result of how it is used or managed upstream. A comprehensive understanding of the hydrological cycle and system (discharge-storage-recharge) as a whole thus becomes extremely important in order to achieve effective management in water storage and water use by various stakeholders.

A more holistic natural geographic perspective is also required in the face of emerging changes in weather and climatic conditions. Variations in the hydrological cycles and increasingly inconsistent precipitation patterns have been noticeable and emerging trends, such as through a higher incidence of floods and droughts. In addition, the average land area affected by these climate-related phenomena is also steadily increasing. A more regional/trans-boundary perspective would thus help to better monitor and assess new trends and potential risks in the natural system better.

Balancing national interests with local-level benefits

Another challenge in water resource management is the competing use of water in varying communities, regions and countries, which arise from differing needs and priorities of sectors like agriculture, industry, hydropower, tourism, as well as everyday household consumption. These demand pressures raise the degree of importance of questions such as who ultimately benefits from these competing demands, what the potential positive and negative impacts are, and the decision making processes of how resources are used or misused.

What is particularly evident from the research is that any form of water resource exploitation will ultimately have direct consequences on the livelihoods of communities dependent on it. Activities such as the construction of large scale irrigation projects, pursuit of hydropower through the construction of dams, or the use

of water resources by industries (including the improper disposal of wastewater in major water resource areas), can all potentially result in reduced availability and quality of water, potential community displacement and relocation (especially in the case of hydropower dam construction), or loss of socio-economic livelihoods.

In this regard, water is inherently linked to development and development in turn affects the availability, quality and access to water. This strong link demands for a better conception and computation of the value of water resources which is more comprehensive than one based purely on an economic paradigm. Moreover, any assessment of water resources should factor in socio-cultural values that are attached to the actual resource, or the physical/geographic location of the resource.

Discussion

The discussions at the end of the session revolved around a number of issues and themes. Among these were the links between the food-water-energy nexus and other natural resources, the often overlapping roles of institutions, organisations and bureaucracy which deal or impact water management on both the micro and macro levels, as well as challenges in national policy enforcement at the local level. In addition, there are concerns that policy development and planning at the central level do not effectively incorporate “pro-poor” and “pro-community” mechanisms to bring about benefits to local communities.

Inefficient use of water resources both at the local level and national levels continues to be a major challenge across mainland Southeast Asia. While introducing pricing systems is seen as a potential mechanism to mitigate this challenge,

enforcement capabilities remain weak. Different solutions (other than pricing) ought to be explored to create greater awareness with regards to efficient water use and reduced waste.

In further mainstreaming the real “value” of water resources, it is necessary to consider how best to quantify and package the research so that it can effectively inform governments and authorities in their cost-benefit analysis and policy making. It is often the case that issues such as hydropower transcend national or regional levels and heavily involve economically-focused development models, capital interests, and certain cultural complexities, which need to be contextualised on a case-by-case basis. However, when assessing sustainable development and water resource management, it is important to think in terms of implications that transcend cultural differences.

SESSION 2: NATURAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT (II)

This session focused on three comparative studies in the Mekong sub-region, including village-level studies on land and forest-based livelihoods, the impact of natural disasters on local agricultural production and the dynamics of Chinese foreign investment for large-scale extractive industries and localised resistance.

Increasing policy awareness and effective implementation

There is a heightened need for increased awareness and implementation of resource management laws, as well as adaptation and mitigation measures at the village level. Such measures can contribute to improving livelihood options, food security, natural disaster management and environmental protection. In addition, these measures can be expedited with the existence of a legal framework, which is easily understood by the layman and can be utilised in cooperating with civil society organisations – whether local or international – to support activities that improve opportunities for livelihood, mitigation and adaptation, disaster risk management and resistance to foreign investments.

An example of the gap between national legislation and local public awareness is evident in Myanmar where various legislation related to land, including the Land Law, Forest Law, Vacant, Fallow, and Virgin Lands Management Law, are enforced but the public are not aware of the pros and cons of these laws. In addition, the socio-cultural connotations and relevance of land embedded within communities can complicate the implementation of these laws and can even lead to inter-communal conflicts when customary laws are not respected. Moreover, some of these laws, particularly the Vacant, Fallow, and

Virgin Lands Management Law, allow for private businesses to acquire portions of land for rural farming as well as commercial business. In doing so, there is the potential that rural farming communities will be exploited if they are not made aware of legal protective measures.

Natural disasters can exacerbate the ineffective implementation of adaptation and mitigation measures. For example, construction of hydropower projects in the Cambodia, Laos and Vietnam Development Triangle Area – combined with increasing populations – have raised local communities' vulnerabilities to natural disasters, which adversely impact agricultural production in terms of loss of land for cultivation, loss of livestock (as a result of selling livestock to cover loss and damages) and changes in the agricultural infrastructure system.

To address this problem, the role of civil society organisations as the facilitator of engagement between government agencies and communities should be further explored. Increased collaboration among these sectors can promote: (1) community awareness on land and forest resources; (2) adoption of conservation farming; (3) support for adding values to existing forest products and community forestry initiatives and; (4) community organising.

Focusing on political and economic dynamics on the ground

Disaster management in Cambodia, Laos, Myanmar and Vietnam (CLMV) requires further attention due to overlapping functions of institutions and limited inter-departmental or inter-agency coordination to respond and mitigate natural disasters. These agencies may even have limited access to data as well as

technical and human resources. Civil society networks play an increasing role in generating pressure on all stakeholders – whether governments, state-owned enterprises or foreign investors – to adapt to norms for increased transparency and accountability.

In the context of resource development schemes in the CLMV area, environmental spaces have become the site of contention between state-led development and community rights due to the high degree of state restrictions and increasing ecologically fragile large-scale resource development projects sites. The tense dynamics between civil society networks, foreign investors and governments have thus stimulated civil society-led initiatives to attempt to regulate the private sector. This has developed into a complementary bottom-up process to enhance transparency and governance mechanisms at national and regional levels. Cases of tempered opposition in Cambodia and Laos and local resistance in Vietnam and Myanmar demonstrate how the capacity of civil society networks matter, particularly in terms of access to information, ties with the policymaking elite and transnational

organisations, as well as wide support bases and international linkages.

While some disaster management programmes are integrated in national development plans, it is indigenous knowledge that contributes substantially to adaptation and mitigation activities at the local level. This is mostly due to the lack of application of technological advancements for disaster management. As such, indigenous and practical experiences for disaster mitigation and adaptation compensate for lack of technical assistance and capacity building. However, as with the influx of regional and international organisations that have capacity building programmes, the technological gap can be slowly addressed but the local socio-cultural context needs to be taken into account.

Discussion

The policy agenda for ASEAN, the thrust of civil society engagement and grassroots activism towards policy change, and the importance of framing the evidence to interest policymakers to act were highlighted during the discussion. The discussion also emphasised the importance of being familiar with the political and economic dynamics in a regional (i.e., geopolitics), national (i.e., trade and investment policies) or local (i.e., socio-economic status and community organising) level.

It is also necessary that such policy-oriented research feed into the wider ASEAN agenda. For instance, highlighting the importance of agricultural production and natural disaster management to food security would provide better chances of influencing policy behaviour not only at the grassroots and national level but also at the regional level. Opportunities to tap into existing regional civil society networks should also not be neglected.

In addition, the way in which perceptions are framed is also significant. In this regard, it is necessary to frame recommendations appropriately for relevant stakeholders, whether they are policymakers, civil society organisations or the private sector. Caution must be exercised however in recommendations that aim to change individuals' way of thinking. Rather, the recommendations should provide suggestions in enhancing collaborative networks and action-oriented research. Recommendations that aim to encourage development aid and the influx of foreign direct investment should also be minimised as these can be seen as moral hazards of external resources on developing countries.

In terms of research, researchers must continue to engage the existing literature extensively and provide clear methodological clarifications as to how the proposed causalities come about.

SESSION 3: COASTAL COMMUNITIES IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

This session examined the significance of the fisheries sector in Southeast Asian economies. It also examined the challenges faced by the fisheries sector and the potential solutions available to them.

Challenges Faced by Small-scale Fishermen in Southeast Asia

Growing global demand for cheap and abundant seafood has led to an increase in fisheries production in Southeast Asia. Southeast Asia's aquaculture industry experienced a 6 per cent growth throughout the 2000s with Thailand, Vietnam, and Indonesia currently rank among the top-five aquaculture exporters in the world. Despite their important contributions to the overall GDP, the economic benefits of the fisheries sector do not trickled down to small fish-farmer level. Small-scale fishermen are in fact leading very difficult lives as they struggle with various challenges to make ends meet, and this often leads to unsustainable fishing practices.

One of the main challenges emanating from research in the field is the dire living conditions of the fishermen. In Vietnam, these results were based on a study of small-scale fishermen's annual income, the types of fish they cultivate or

Marine Resources Overexploitation and Alternative Livelihoods

Given the need to meet growing demands for seafood, the fisheries sector in Southeast Asia also suffers from unsustainable practices such as overfishing and marine overexploitation. Fish stocks in the region are believed to be over-depleted although no exact figure is available due to the complexity of marine ecosystems. A lack of law enforcement is identified as one of the factors that drive irresponsible fishing activities. To conserve marine ecosystems, Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) are designated in some identified places. The MPAs concept of co-management involves local communities in decision-making processes, and this is believed to increase coastal communities' awareness of the impacts of unsustainable fishing practices and thereby encourage them to switch to alternative livelihoods.

catch, and the kinds of fishing and non-fishing activities. Similarly in Thailand, the conditions of workers – particularly those originating from Myanmar and Cambodia – on off-shore boats were found to resemble 'modern day slavery'. Such observations have received a lot of media attention in the West and have significantly impacted Thailand fisheries sector's reputation.

Another challenge faced by small-scale fishermen is the stress created from other development projects. The activities of small-scale fishermen in Cambodia, for instance, are hampered by large-scale resource extraction projects such as sand dredging in protected areas. As such, the harsh conditions that small-scale fishermen have to operate in to meet growing demands for seafood and economic growth, brings little benefit to their own personal socio-economic development.

In Indonesia, MPAs are found in the National Parks of Wakatobi, Karimunjawa, and Komodo, among others. Alternative livelihoods planned at these locations include ecotourism-related businesses such as tour-guiding, restaurants, lodging, souvenirs, and cultural performances, and mariculture such as seaweed and fish farming. Despite the noble intentions of diversifying coastal communities' sources of income and introduce more sustainable forms of livelihood, ecotourism has yet to exhibit desirable outcomes. On the contrary, it has led to a different set of problems. In the Karimunjawa National Park, the sheer number of tourists has created environmental stresses. This is partly due to a lack of environmental awareness on the part of tour guides and other tourism workers which result in little dissemination on the environmental dos and don'ts to tourists.

In the Wakatobi National Park, the economic benefits of ecotourism are confined to resort owners and their staff. As local communities do not get a fair share from ecotourism activities, people are reluctant to make a switch from fishing to ecotourism. In the Komodo National Park, foreign investments have driven properties price up and this has hindered the local population from renting spaces and taking part in ecotourism activities. Additionally, in all three national parks, there appears to be a disjunction between tourism promotion campaigns and environmental conservation efforts. A lack of collaboration among relevant government agencies has resulted in

an insufficient framework for the promotion of sustainable tourism.

With regard to mariculture, more efforts can be put forward to increase its effectiveness. As seaweed and fish farming are relatively simple practices, ensuring sufficient supplies of seedlings and fingerlings would significantly help these activities to grow. As it currently stands, however, local and provincial governments do not give adequate attention to this matter and little assistance is given to eradicate diseases that threaten seaweed and fish productions.

Discussion

Country studies on fisheries transitions need to consider the broader challenges within the regional framework. With a growing population in Southeast Asia and the distribution of new population at the coastal zones, the environmental impacts of fisheries activities are getting more critical. This is further exacerbated by a growing Southeast Asian middle class that leads to rising fish consumption. The effects of both population and economic changes, coupled with a lack of governance capacity, leads to fish stocks depletion and overfishing. The establishment of the ASEAN Economic Community (AEC) would also impact small fish-producers across Southeast Asia as they do not have the means to compete with market-dominating big corporations.

The alternative livelihoods are not without challenges. While the MPAs bring demonstrable benefits for the environment through an increase in the number of protected areas, their

contributions for livelihoods are questionable. Places of ecotourism are usually situated at a great distance, and this makes them difficult to access. As the high cost associated with inaccessibility results in a relatively low number of visitors, the livelihoods of local people involved in ecotourism become uncertain. Furthermore, the zoning of protected areas brings various problems for small communities as they have neither the ability nor the capacity to recognise the tension between conservation and livelihoods. In the case of mariculture, the often great distances between seaweed farms and in-city processors render the production of seaweeds costly and inefficient. Resource-based livelihoods, therefore, will only work partially at best. A possible solution to making livelihoods work in conformity with MPAs is by integrating both sea- and land-based livelihoods. The combined aqua-terrestrial approach is needed as problems on water may find their solutions on land.

SESSION 4: COOPERATION OR COMPETITION FOR SUSTAINABLE GROWTH

This session explored the competing narratives concerning the top environmental issues in Indonesia and in the Borneo Economic Corridor, whose borders are shared by Brunei, Malaysia (Sarawak and Sabah) and Indonesia (Kalimantan).

Environmental Conservation Versus Economic Development

A major environmental issue in Southeast Asia is the rapid deforestation and mismanagement of natural resources on the island of Borneo, which comprises the territories of Indonesia (Kalimantan), Malaysia (Sabah and Sarawak) and Brunei Darussalam. Borneo is a resource-rich island where oil, coal, and gas are exploited. Its tropical rainforest area serves as a valuable ecosystem with rich biodiversity.

The strategy of economic improvement in Borneo focuses on its resource base as the subregion's greatest comparative advantage. That said, enhanced economic activity in this sub-region is seen to be inextricably linked to deforestation and rapid depletion of major natural resources. Rising greenhouse emissions, threats to wildlife through the fragmentation of forests by road infrastructure, the degradation of forest resources, and the general deterioration in water and air quality are the major indicators of environmental degradation in Borneo. Intensive land use and building of transport infrastructure systems are the most striking examples of how regional integration and economic growth can directly conflict with nature conservation efforts. In the last two decades, the establishment of infrastructure supporting the palm oil industry has been followed by rapid growth of independent smallholders in Malaysia and Indonesia which further led to environmental degradation.

There have been efforts by the governments of Indonesia, Malaysia and Brunei to merge environmental conservation projects with developmental initiatives. The Heart of Borneo (HoB) agreement amongst these three respective

states seeks to ensure effective management of forest resources and conservation of protected area has been established. Furthermore, Ministers of ASEAN have agreed to implement measures to mitigate climate change particularly in the promotion of energy efficiency and sustainable urban transport in ASEAN cities. In addition, civil society groups have proposed various studies to promote social welfare and economic improvement that are in line with conservation efforts through green growth.

That said, some sectors believe that there will always be a trade-off in any conservation project. Some local governments and their constituencies, for instance, perceive conservation efforts to be an impediment to development project plans in their area. They believe that forest land is better used for other more productive purposes, such as cash crop plantations, which can generate jobs for locals and revenue for local governments. This trade-off has become an inevitable factor that inhibits the progress of conservation.

Limited institutional capacity and contestation between local and central governments are some other potential factors that hamper conservation efforts. Remote locations of protected areas and poor infrastructure also limit any control and monitoring abilities. This may also indicate that there is an absence of a clear division of authority, coupled with inconsistent regulations which are not completely enforced. Such issues consequently make it difficult for conservation programmes to be maintained sustainably.

Influencing policy through narratives

Deforestation and environmental degradation in Southeast Asia has also been due to the growth of the palm oil industry as a result of rising global demands. Indonesia and Malaysia together supply around 90% of crude palm oil (CPO) in the global market (with around 51% from Indonesia). In 2013, palm oil plantations in Indonesia were located in 23 provinces, with 26.5 million tonnes of Crude Palm Oil (CPO) produced, with revenues making up 5 per cent of Indonesia's GDP. Rising demands from China and India have driven the development of the palm oil industry further. That said, however, the palm oil sector has been the main cause of deforestation in Indonesia during 2009-2011, and accounts for about a quarter (300,000 hectares) of forest loss.

Various perspectives have emerged as a result of the growing tension between meeting global CPO demands and environmental degradation. Amongst these are two conflicting narratives in the palm oil industry-related policy making process. The first narrative evident amongst NGOs, is the "Source of Destruction Narrative," which portrays the palm oil industry as destructive. This narrative asserts that the rapid expansion of the industry with the acquisition of large tracts of plantations has resulted in environmental destructions and various negative social impacts. State efforts to halt further destruction were partly successful, but were not enough. Corruption, involving private companies and government officials, made it difficult to institutionalise real reform.

Apart from pressing the government, NGOs also attempt to influence the market and disrupt the demand from palm oil companies which do not comply with environmental regulations.

Greenpeace, for example, frequently directs their criticism towards global companies who bought palm oil from 'dirty' sources in Indonesia.

The second narrative, known as the Trade War narrative, comes from palm oil companies. They argue that Indonesia's palm oil industry is a target of a trade war waged by developed countries. Developed countries, who are the producers of these less competitive vegetable oils, began a black campaign against palm oil to regain control in the lucrative vegetable oil market. The narrative also argues that the strategy of developed countries is to support efforts by the NGOs to pressure the companies and the government to curtail the growing demand for 'dirty palm oil.'

Despite the opposing views, both narratives claim that they can influence the Indonesian government's policies on palm oil. The narrative from NGOs asserts that it compelled the government to issue several new regulations aimed at making palm oil companies socially and environmentally responsible. The government also imposed a moratorium for forest conversion in 2010 (Presidential Instruction No. 10/2010), which was extended until 2015 (Presidential Instruction No. 6/2013).

The Trade War narrative has also been successful in stopping significant demands from NGOs, such as reviews on existing concession permits. In addition, the narrative has also contributed to the establishment of the inter-ministerial task force against the anti-palm oil black campaign and the inclusion of palm oil as an agenda in Indonesia's economic diplomacy.

Discussion

With environmental issues in ASEAN now being highlighted by both state and non-state actors, it is imperative to harness the potential of relevant research studies to make a stronger impact on policy-making. Since environmental issues affect the whole region, there is a need to scrutinise how policy-making is done at the ASEAN level in order to clearly convey the message of the research to policy-makers. Intensive fieldwork is also crucial in making a policy-oriented research since policy-making requires inputs from the ground. Researchers should not rely solely on theoretical frameworks and “propaganda” in substantiating their claims; instead, they should diversify their primary sources of information.

With regard to narratives presented, researchers were reminded not to take sides, especially openly endorsing extreme narratives. In the

context of the ASEAN region, taking the middle way is still the best approach to convince policy-makers as taking extreme narratives without enough solid evidence from the ground would just make the research irrelevant. Also, researchers were advised to examine other equally important narratives and to look at not only their differences but also their overlapping perspectives. To attain a balanced presentation of evidence, the side of commercial entities should be accurately explained by the researchers, including their response to the accusation of civil society organisations. They must also get the narratives from other civil society organisations, not just from the extreme ones, as the NGO sector is not monolithic. Narratives from small-scale farmers, religious institutions and other countries in the region, must also be considered.

SESSION 5: REGIONAL APPROACHES

This panel discussed how evidence-based research is able to contribute to policy in an ASEAN community in 2015. While methodological inputs are an internal aspect of research, actionable policy recommendations can be taken at the regional level.

Understanding and acting within local contexts

A primary point emanating from presentations is the importance of understanding and acting in accordance to what is appropriate in local contexts. For instance, it is vital to understand how historical events have shaped the nature of natural resource management in a given country or area. In the case of land policies and administration in Southeast Asia, two sets of events are significant. First, the effects of colonialism and second, local factors such as regime type, state ideology, political system, the political role of military, and poverty. Indonesia, for instance, experienced more land conflicts after 1998 (Reformasi era), such as disputes over ownership. It was also the case in Cambodia and Laos, as a result of dispute over boundaries and the lack of acknowledgement of customary rights.

In Malaysia, land management administration has notable differences between East and Peninsula Malaysia. In Myanmar, all land belongs to the state. Given the diverse range of effects, it is necessary for regional policies to be sensitive to these nuances in order to be effective.

A landscape approach would also be another means of better understanding local context. This multi-disciplinary approach – including conservation biology and anthropology – accepts that people are part of the landscape. The landscape approach is useful given the fact that existing politics places too much emphasis on ‘grand design’ and lacks recognition of long term conservation pressures and has weak local level constituencies for conservation. As such,

what arises is a problem of disconnect with the local level (horizontal silos), which needs to be addressed through building human capacity and institutions. Also central to the landscape approach is the significance of streamlining technological innovation into governance capabilities.

By embracing this “3rd industrial revolution”, it would provide an opportunity to overcome not only biodiversity loss, but also advance the paradigms of thinking needed in the 21st century.

Addressing the uneven playing field for stakeholders

A common feature of approaches to regional cooperation are the numerous meetings organised to facilitate discussion and plan of action amongst countries, such as ASEAN and the Mekong River Commission (MRC). While these meetings are important mechanisms in building trust amongst regional neighbours, the high number of annual meetings have been criticised as being merely talk-shops due to the slow pace of negotiations which often leaves many observers frustrated with the process.

These regional meetings are also an opportunity for government officials to engage other relevant stakeholders such as members of civil society, often through parallel side-line events. However, some research suggests that there is a lack of diversity and inclusivity in the meetings. Based on observatory participation during the 2nd MRC Summit & International conference on transboundary rivers in April 2014, there are some sentiments particularly amongst CSOs that are more critical of government inaction, that marginalised voices at the local level are not effectively represented. This is partly due to the practice of countries in the region to select CSOs that they prefer to be represented during these forums. This practice thus

raises questions over the neutrality of CSOs representation. In addition to this, the officious atmosphere - characterised for example by eight key addresses - also limits the amount of real dialogue amongst different stakeholders.

The uneven playing field begins with development plans that do not give equal benefits to all. Natural resource management issues have often resulted in conflict and environmental degradation and damage. This is further exacerbated by what appears to be the lack of attention given to stakeholders with limited means of expressing their concerns. These stakeholders could range from countries which are less powerful than their neighbours, to local communities whose traditional livelihood options are affected by regional development plans. An example of this would be the Xayaburi Dam on Mekong River in Laos. The project was essentially a Thai project in Laos as the hydroelectric power generated in the dam is channeled to Thailand, with little benefit to Laotians living along the river. In addition to this, there is also the tendency to invoke sovereignty rights as a means of legitimising state action, or what can be termed as a “normalisation of nation” as a form of governance and thus avoid contending concerns.

Challenges in implementing global initiatives at the regional level

Research has shown how global frameworks and initiatives often face the challenge of implementation at the local, national and regional level. An example of this would be the push by Indonesia and Thailand to establish a regional carbon market in ASEAN. Establishing a carbon market in the ASEAN in the region is

seen as a potential means of enhancing regional economy activity (by creating incentives through market forces), technological advancements (by encouraging innovation and capacity building), and governance capabilities (via monitoring and evaluation mechanisms).

There are, nevertheless, challenges facing ASEAN in doing so. Firstly, the carbon market in ASEAN is the by-product of the international deliberations, and has been developed in the West. In this regard, ASEAN is lagging behind in developing a carbon market and would do best in first learning best practices from Western developed countries. That said, there is the second challenge of establishing the right carbon price, so as to provide stakeholders in Southeast Asia with incentives to upscale carbon market projects. At present, there are

Discussion

It was observed that the presentations in this session have provided roadmaps and general principles, but have been light on empirical examples and applications to either local level situation or at the regional level. It was further noted by some academic participants who have been involved in international negotiations, that there continues to be a sense of frustration with the lack of connection with the local level. Moreover, limited effectiveness of projects at the local level is often due to the challenges in engaging key stakeholders such as degrees of tacit knowledge in Southeast Asia, where a landscape approach for instance can mean different things to different people. It was also noted that the establishment of coordinating government agencies for resource management may not always be effective, as it only adds further layers of bureaucracy.

Several comments were also made on the interactions between government officials and civil society in regional cooperation activities. On the one hand, there is the perception of uneven power, where national governments ultimately have the last say and can ignore inputs by civil society. An example was cited which was when the ASEAN Peoples' Assembly (APA) Forum to deliver recommendations to the ASEAN summit was cancelled. On the other hand, what is often not highlighted is an issue of mutual respect for other stakeholders. In this regard,

two main types of carbon markets – namely the top-down “command and control” approach led by the state, and the bottom up approach led by industries – which would likely entail varying the price of carbon markets. Secondly, there is still general pessimism towards the prospects of the UN's Clean Development Mechanism, as well as the ability to operationalise carbon market mechanisms in deficient Southeast Asian market. As such, the establishment of a carbon market remains low priority for most Southeast Asian government agendas.

It was noted that the APA event was cancelled as some civil society organisations were seen to be disrespectful to government officials despite the latter giving the space for engagement. As such, there is a need to understand that civil society has a limited space in the existing structure, and hence would need to review its modes of engagement with government stakeholders.

There were some reservations as to how effective a regional carbon market would be in Southeast Asia. ASEAN schemes have been introduced but are not yet in operation. Moreover, environmental issues remain predominantly as a secondary concern in policymaking in Southeast Asia. Rather, the drivers for carbon markets are primarily economic and incentive driven. As such, the initial steps have been to engage the least controversial sectors, such as the electrical power and cement industry rather than the mining industry. In this regard, there is much more room for improvement before a regional carbon market can effectively take root in Southeast Asia. Comments were made on what the potential role of China would be in carbon markets in ASEAN. In this regard, it was suggested that China could take the lead to finance ASEAN's carbon markets if they wanted to. Moreover, aside from shouldering potential risks, there is the potential for China to invest directly, such as providing technical assistance to Southeast Asian countries.

CLOSING REMARKS

Assoc. Prof. Mely Caballero-Anthony

Head

*Centre for Non-Traditional Security (NTS) Studies
S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS)*

*Nanyang Technological University; and
Secretary-General*

*Consortium of Non-Traditional Security Studies
in Asia (NTS-Asia)*

Singapore

Prof. Paul Evans

Professor

Institute of Asian Research

University of British Columbia (UBC)

Canada

In her concluding remarks, Assoc. Prof. Caballero-Anthony noted the richness of the discussions over the past day and a half. Not only did the forum cover a wide range of issues related to resource management and sustainable development in Southeast Asia, but also that the forum has provided a space for peer-review of studies by domain experts, such as practitioners from the ASEAN secretariat and those engaged in regional discussions on the various natural resource sectors. The latter was highly beneficial for the junior fellows of the ASEAN-Canada Research Partnership. Discussions from the Forum have also demonstrated that the issues relating to natural resource management are more acute due to the tensions between stakeholders and interests, which made narratives from various sides more pronounced. Such developments are significant from an NTS perspective, which is interested in understanding how natural resource management issues are being framed as a security issue. One example in this regard would also be how the depletion of resources potentially exacerbates the movement of people, which may result in other human insecurities.

Assoc. Prof. Caballero-Anthony also observed that there had been more attention to the problems of natural resource management rather than success stories during the Forum. This would thus require greater evidence-based research

that examines the nuances and interdependence of these natural resource sectors as well as solutions for effective governance at multiple levels. In concluding, she thanked the IDRC and UBC for their support in the partnership, Dr Sciortino for spearheading the idea of the research partnership, as well as the RSIS team for their hard work in making the Forum a success.

Prof. Evans commended the efforts of paper presenters in their efforts to try to connect natural resources management issues in Southeast Asia to broader regional contexts. He also noted how this setting is not a customary academic group, but rather one that is focused on delivering actionable policy recommendations. This has been possible by operating on four levels – (1) a description of what are the problems facing Southeast Asia; (2) Research, i.e. why have these problems come about? ; (3) Predictions: Where is it going and what are the future trends? ; and (4) Prescription: what should be done and who should do it? He also encouraged Senior and Junior Fellows to connect and continue the discussions beyond the research partnership for future action-oriented outcomes.

Prof. Evans concluded by summarising future steps in the research partnership. On research, he looked forward to connecting further with the Junior Fellows in Vancouver for the Junior Fellow Research Training workshop. Not only would this provide Junior Fellows with the opportunity to engage with Canadian academics but also interact before research papers and enhance people-to-people contact between Canada and Southeast Asia. On policy-related activities, Prof. Evans noted that the research partnership will host a final showcase workshop which will highlight the research and policy recommendations from both rounds of the ASEAN-Canada Research Partnership.



Front Row (L to R):

Prof. Richard Barichello, Dr Josef Yap, Mdm Ton Nu Thi Ninh, Prof. Paul Evans, Prof. Mely Caballero-Anthony, H.E. Heather Grant , Ms Ann Weston, Dr Rosalia Sciortino

Second Row (L to R):

Ms Cheryl Lim, Ms Liliana Camacho, Mr Gilles Maillet, Dr Vanessa Lamb, H.E. Amb Pou Sothirak, Ms Myat Myat Moe, Dr Nguyen Thi Lan-Anh, Ms Paramitha Yanindraputri, Prof. Nguyen Huu Ninh, Mr Apichai Sunchindah, Ms Shelly Hsieh, Ms Sofiah Jamil

Third Row (L to R):

Dr Shofwan Al Banna Choiruzzad, Ms Lina Alexandra, Dr Jonatan Lassa, Mr Ali Muhyidin, Dr Gary Q. Bull, Dr Nguyen Huy Hoang, Prof. Koh Kheng Lian, Dr Pichamon Yeophantong

Fourth Row (L to R):

Mr Nguyen Tuan Anh, Dr Tulus T.H. Tambunan, Mr Ly Quoc Dang, Prof. Supachai Yavaprabhas, Mr Cin Khan En Do Pau, Dr Raman Letchumanan, Dr Danilo C. Israel



PROGRAMME

Day 1 (24 July, Thursday)
Venue: Holiday Inn Atrium
Dress code: Office Attire

08:30–09:00 **Registration**

09:00–09:30 **Opening/Welcome Remarks**

09:00–09:10 **ASEAN Perspective**
Prof. Mely Caballero-Anthony
Associate Professor, S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS); and Head, RSIS Centre for Non-Traditional Security (NTS) Studies, Singapore

09:10–09:20 **Canadian Perspective**

Prof. Paul Evans
Professor, Institute of Asian Research (IAR) University of British Columbia Vancouver, Canada

09:20–09:30 **IDRC Perspective**

Ms Ann Weston
IDRC Representative and Director, Special Initiative Division International Development Research Centre (IDRC) Ottawa, Canada

09:30–09:45 **Keynote Address**

H.E. Heather Grant
High Commissioner of Canada to Singapore

09:45–10:00 **Photo Opportunity and Tea Break**

10:00–12:10

Session 1: Natural Resources Management (I)

Moderator:
Dr Nguyen Thi Lan-Anh
Vice Dean International Faculty Diplomatic Academy of Vietnam, Hanoi

Presentations:

10:00–10:20

Enhancing Water Use Efficiency for Sustainable Development for Cambodia-Laos-Vietnam Development Triangle: The Case Study of the Central Highlands of Vietnam

Dr Nguyen Huy Hoang
Deputy Director Institute for Southeast Asian Studies Vietnam Academy of Social Sciences, Hanoi

10:20–10:40

Impacts of Hydropower Development to Natural Resource Access and the Livelihoods of Local People (Case Study of Quang Nam Province, Vietnam)

Ms Pham Thi Nhung
Researcher, Consultative and Research Center on Natural Resource Management (Corenam); Lecturer, Faculty of Extension and Rural Development, Hue University of Agriculture & Forestry, Vietnam

10:40–11:00

Water Management through the Lens of Gender, Class and Ethnicity: A Comparative Case Study between an Upstream and Downstream of Mekong Delta's Vietnam

Mr Ly Quoc Dang
Research & Lecturer Mekong Delta Development Institute Can Tho University, Vietnam

11:00–11:20

Valuing the Invaluable: Using a Total Economic Value Method to Integrate Well-being of Ethnic Communities into the Value of Alternative Uses of Water Resources along the Salween River

Ms Liliana Camacho
Policy Advisor, International Affairs Department of Environment Canada, Ottawa

11:20–11:30

Discussant:
Mr Apichai Sunchindah
Development Specialist and Independent Consultant, Bangkok, Thailand

11:30–12:10

Q and A

12:10–13:40

Lunch
 Venue: Melting Pot Café, Holiday Inn Atrium (Level 4)

13:40–15:30

Session 2: Natural Resources Management (II)

Moderator:
Prof. Supachai Yavaprabhas
Professor and Dean Faculty of Political Science Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok, Thailand

13:40–14:00

Linking Resources to Livelihoods: A Comparative Study of Two Villages in Chin State of Myanmar

Mr Cin Khan En Do Pau
Research Fellow Regional Center for Sustainable Development, Chiangmai University, Thailand

14:00–14:20

Research on the Effects of Natural Disasters on Agricultural Production Activities in the Cambodia-Laos-Vietnam Development Triangle Area: The Case Study of Rattanakiri (Cambodia), Attapeu (Laos) and Kon Tum (Vietnam) Provinces

Mr Nguyen Tuan Anh
PhD Candidate & Research Fellow Institute of Southeast Asian Studies Vietnam Academy of Social Sciences, Hanoi

14:20–14:40

Civil Society Networks, Localised Resistance and Chinese Investment in Mainland Southeast Asia's Extractive Industries

Dr Pichamon Yeophantong
Global Leaders Fellow Niehaus Center for Globalization and Governance Woodrow Wilson School, Princeton University

14:40–14:50

Discussant:

Prof. Caroline Brassard
Adjunct Assistant Professor Lee Kuan Yew School of Public Policy (LKYSPP) Singapore

14:50–15:30	Q and A
15:30–15:45	Tea Break
15:45–17:00	Session 3: Coastal Communities in Southeast Asia
	Moderator: Prof. Paul Teng <i>Senior Fellow and Advisor (Food Security)</i> <i>RSIS Centre for NTS Studies; and Dean of Graduate Studies and Professional Learning,</i> <i>National Institute of Education (NIE)</i> <i>Nanyang Technological University, Singapore</i>
15:45–16:05	Fisheries Transitions in Southeast Asia
	Dr Melissa Marschke <i>Associate Professor</i> <i>School of International Development and Global Studies</i> <i>University of Ottawa, Canada</i>
16:05–16:25	Sustainable Growth in Indonesian Marine Protected Areas: Alternative Livelihood Development as a Coastal Resource Management Strategy
	Mr Gilles Maillet <i>GIS Specialist</i> <i>Yarmouth Active Transportation</i>
16:25–16:35	Discussant:
	Dr Jonatan Lassa <i>Research Fellow</i> <i>RSIS Centre for NTS Studies</i> <i>Nanyang Technological University, Singapore</i>
16:35–17:00	Q and A

19:30 – 21:00	Dinner
	Venue: Red House Seafood Restaurant, Robertson Quay Invited guests to gather in hotel lobby by 7.10pm

End of Day 1

Day 2 (25 July, Friday)

08:45–10:30	Session 4: Cooperation or Competition for Sustainable Growth
	Moderator: Dr Josef Yap <i>Former President</i> <i>Philippine Institute for Development Studies</i>
08:45–09:05	Victim or Culprit? Competing Narratives on Palm Oil Industry in Indonesia
	Dr Shofwan Al Banna Choiruzzad <i>Executive Secretary, ASEAN Study Center, and</i> <i>Lecturer, Faculty of Social and Political Sciences</i> <i>University of Indonesia</i>
09:05–09:25	When the Forest is Depleted: Resource Conservation in Border Regions; A Case Study of Governing Forest in Kapuas Hulu, West Kalimantan, Indonesia
	Mr Ali Muhyidin <i>PhD candidate, University of Tokyo;</i> <i>Lecturer, Department of Political Science; and Executive Director,</i> <i>Centre for Development & Political Studies</i> <i>University of Indonesia</i>

09:25–09:45	Fostering Green Growth through Spatial Development in Borneo Economic Corridor (Brunei Darussalam, Kalimantan Indonesia, Malaysian Borneo)
	Ms Paramitha Yanindraputri <i>Research Coordinator</i> <i>Save the Children International</i> <i>Indonesia</i>
09:45–09:55	Discussant:
	Dr Raman Letchumanan <i>Head, Environment Division</i> <i>ASEAN Secretariat</i> <i>Jakarta, Indonesia</i>
09:55–10:30	Q and A
10:30–10:45	Tea Break
10:45–13:00	Session 5: Regional Approaches
	Moderator: Mdm Ton Nu Thi Ninh <i>Director, Tri Viet Center for Social and Educational Research</i> <i>Ho Chi Minh, Vietnam</i>
10:45–11:05	An Approach to Forest and Conservation Policy in Southeast Asia
	Dr Gary Q. Bull <i>Professor of Forest Sciences</i> <i>University of British Columbia</i> <i>Vancouver, Canada</i>
11:05–11:25	Seeking the Appropriate Systems for Managing Natural Resources to Allow Sustainable Economic Growth and Meet Growing Food Demand in the ASEAN Region
	Dr Tulus T.H. Tambunan <i>Head and Senior Researcher</i> <i>Center for Industry, SME and Business Competition Studies</i> <i>Trisakti University, Indonesia</i>

11:25–11:45	ASEAN Regional Energy Development, Sovereign Authority, and the Environmental Impact Assessment
	Dr Vanessa Lamb <i>Postdoctoral Associate</i> <i>York Centre for Asian Research</i> <i>York University</i>
11:45–12:05	Carbon Market Development in Indonesia and Thailand: Prospects and Challenges
	Ms Shelly Hsieh <i>Postgraduate Research Fellow</i> <i>Asia-Pacific Foundation of Canada</i>
12:05–12:15	Discussant:
	Prof. Richard Barichello <i>Professor, Department of Agricultural Economics</i> <i>University of British Columbia</i> <i>Vancouver, Canada</i>
12:15–13:00	Q and A
13:00–13:10	Concluding Remarks
	Prof. Mely Caballero-Anthony <i>Associate Professor, S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS); and</i> <i>Head, RSIS Centre for Non-Traditional Security (NTS) Studies, Singapore</i>
	Prof. Paul Evans <i>Professor, Institute of Asian Research (IAR)</i> <i>University of British Columbia</i> <i>Vancouver, Canada</i>
13:10–14:10	Closing Lunch
	Venue: Melting Pot Café, Holiday Inn Atrium (Level 4)
	End of Programme

LIST OF MODERATORS, SPEAKERS AND DISCUSSANTS*

Prof. Richard Barichello

Professor,
Department of Agricultural Economics,
University of British Columbia,
Vancouver, Canada

Prof. Caroline Brassard

Adjunct Assistant Professor,
Lee Kuan Yew School of Public Policy (LKYSPP),
Singapore

Dr Gary Q. Bull

Professor of Forest Sciences,
University of British Columbia,
Vancouver, Canada

Ms Liliana Camacho

Policy Advisor,
International Affairs,
Department of Environment Canada, Ottawa

Mr Cin Khan En Do Pau

Research Fellow,
Regional Center for Sustainable Development,
Chiangmai University, Thailand

Dr Shofwan Al Banna Choiruzzad

Executive Secretary, ASEAN Study Center;
Lecturer, Faculty of Social and Political Sciences
University of Indonesia

Prof. Paul Evans

Professor,
Institute of Asian Research (IAR),
University of British Columbia,
Vancouver, Canada

H.E. Heather Grant

High Commissioner of Canada to Singapore

Ms Shelly Hsieh

Postgraduate Research Fellow,
Asia-Pacific Foundation of Canada

Dr Vanessa Lamb

Postdoctoral Associate,
York Centre for Asian Research,
York University,
Toronto, Canada

Dr Raman Letchumanan

Head,
Environment Division,
ASEAN Secretariat,
Jakarta, Indonesia

Mr Ly Quoc Dang

Research & Lecturer,
Mekong Delta Development Institute,
Can Tho University, Vietnam

Mr Gilles Maillet

GIS Specialist,
Yarmouth Active Transportation

Dr Melissa Marschke

Associate Professor,
School of International Development and Global
Studies,
University of Ottawa, Canada

Mr Ali Muhyidin

PhD candidate, University of Tokyo;
Lecturer, Department of Political Science; and
Executive Director, Centre for Development & Political
Studies,
University of Indonesia

Dr Nguyen Huy Hoang

Deputy Director,
Institute for Southeast Asian Studies,
Vietnam Academy of Social Sciences, Hanoi

Dr Nguyen Thi Lan Anh

Vice Dean,
International Faculty,
Diplomatic Academy of Vietnam

Mr Nguyen Tuan Anh

PhD Candidate & Research Fellow,
Institute of Southeast Asian Studies,
Vietnam Academy of Social Sciences, Hanoi

Ms Pham Thi Nhung

Researcher, Consultative and Research Center on
Natural Resource Management (Corenam);
Lecturer,
Faculty of Extension and Rural Development,
Hue University of Agriculture & Forestry, Vietnam

Mr Apichai Sunchindah

Development Specialist and Independent Consultant,
Bangkok, Thailand

Dr Tulus T.H. Tambunan

Head & Senior Researcher,
Center for Industry, SME and Business Competition
Studies,
Trisakti University, Indonesia

Mdm Ton Nu Thi Ninh

Director,
Tri Viet Center for Social and Educational Research,
Ho Chi Minh, Vietnam

Ms Ann Weston

IDRC Representative;
Director, Special Initiative Division,
International Development Research Centre (IDRC)

Ms Paramitha Yanindraputri

Research Coordinator,
Save the Children International, Indonesia

Dr Josef Yap

Former President,
Philippine Institute for Development Studies

Prof. Dr Supachai Yavaprabhas

Professor & Dean,
Faculty of Political Science,
Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok, Thailand

Dr Pichamon Yeophantong

Global Leaders Fellow,
Niehaus Center for Globalization and Governance,
Woodrow Wilson School,
Princeton University, the USA

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

Ms Lina Alexandra

Senior Researcher,
Centre for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS),
Jakarta, Indonesia

Dr Malcolm Cook

Senior Fellow,
Institute of Southeast Asian Studies (ISEAS),
Singapore

Ms Cheong Poh Kwan

Media Senior Executive / Policy Research Analyst,
Singapore Institute of International Affairs (SIIA)

Dr Michele Chew

Senior Analyst,
National Security Coordination Secretariat, Singapore

Mr Chua Chin Wei

Deputy Director and Fellow Environment and Resources,
Singapore Institute of International Affairs (SIIA)

Dr Danilo C. Israel

Research Fellow,
Philippine Institute for Development Studies
Makati City, the Philippines

Prof. Koh Kheng Lian

Professor Emeritus, Faculty of Law; and
Director, Asia-Pacific Centre for Environmental Law
National University of Singapore

Dr Lin Pei-Shan

Visiting Post-Doc,
Department of Geography,
National University of Singapore

Dr Michelle Y. Merrill

Post-Doctoral Research Fellow,
School of Humanities and Social Sciences,
Nanyang Technological University, Singapore

Ms Myat Myat Moe

Senior Consultant, EcoDev,
and Advisor, Myanmar Institute of Strategic and
International Studies

Prof. Nguyen Huu Ninh

Chairman, CERED; and
Lead Author, Fourth Assessment Report,
Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change

Dr Rosalia Sciortino

Advisor to 2012-15 ASEAN-Canada Research
Partnership Project

H.E. Amb Pou Sothirak

Executive Director,
Cambodian Institute for Cooperation and Peace
(CICP)

Prof. Euston Quah

Head, Division of Economics,
School of Humanities and Social Sciences,
College of Humanities, Arts, & Social Sciences,
Nanyang Technological University, Singapore

Ms Shivani Ratra

Research Associate,
Institute of Water Policy,
Lee Kuan Yew School of Public Policy, Singapore

Prof. Pranee Thiparat

Department of International Relations,
Faculty of Political Science,
Chulalongkorn University, Thailand

Assoc. Prof. Tong Yen Wah

Co-Director,
Energy and Environmentally Sustainability Solutions
for Megacities Programme (E2S2),
National University of Singapore

Dr Yeo Lay Hwee

Director,
EU Centre in Singapore

LIST OF RSIS STAFF
Mr Mushahid Ali

Senior Fellow
S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies
Block S4, Level B4, Nanyang Avenue
Nanyang Technological University
Singapore 639798

Dr Mely Caballero-Anthony

Associate Professor, S. Rajaratnam School of
International Studies (RSIS);
Head, RSIS Centre for NTS Studies; and
Secretary-General, Consortium of Non-Traditional
Security Studies in
Asia (NTS-Asia)
Nanyang Technological University, Singapore

Ms Gianna Gayle Amul

Senior Analyst
Centre for Non-Traditional Security (NTS) Studies
S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies
Block S4, Level B4, Nanyang Avenue
Nanyang Technological University
Singapore 639798

Ms Sofiah Jamil

Adjunct Research Associate
Centre for Non-Traditional Security (NTS) Studies
S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies
Block S4, Level B4, Nanyang Avenue
Nanyang Technological University
Singapore 639798

Mr Kwa Chong Guan

Senior Fellow
S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies
Block S4, Level B4, Nanyang Avenue
Nanyang Technological University
Singapore 639798

Dr Jonatan Lassa

Research Fellow
Centre for Non-Traditional Security (NTS) Studies
S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies
Block S4, Level B4, Nanyang Avenue
Nanyang Technological University
Singapore 639798

Ms Cheryl Lim

Programme Manager
Centre for Non-Traditional Security (NTS) Studies
S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies
Block S4, Level B4, Nanyang Avenue
Nanyang Technological University
Singapore 639798

Ms Maria Carmencita S. Morales

Associate Research Fellow
Centre for Non-Traditional Security (NTS) Studies
S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies
Block S4, Level B4, Nanyang Avenue
Nanyang Technological University
Singapore 639798

Ms Josephine Ng

Admin Executive
Centre for Non-Traditional Security (NTS) Studies
S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies
Block S4, Level B4, Nanyang Avenue
Nanyang Technological University
Singapore 639798

Ms Margareth Sembiring

Research Analyst
Centre for Non-Traditional Security (NTS) Studies
S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies
Block S4, Level B4, Nanyang Avenue
Nanyang Technological University
Singapore 639798

Mr Maxim Shrestha

Associate Research Fellow
Centre for Non-Traditional Security (NTS) Studies,
S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS),
Nanyang Technological University, Singapore

Mr Tan Seng Chye

Senior Fellow
S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies
Block S4, Level B4, Nanyang Avenue
Nanyang Technological University
Singapore 639798

Prof. Paul Teng

Senior Fellow and Advisor (Food Security)
RSIS Centre for NTS Studies; and
Principal Officer,
National Institute of Education (NIE)
Nanyang Technological University, Singapore

Mr Julius Trajano

Senior Analyst
Centre for Non-Traditional Security (NTS) Studies
S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies
Block S4, Level B4, Nanyang Avenue
Nanyang Technological University
Singapore 639798

Mr Yang Razali Kassim

Senior Fellow
S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies
Block S4, Level B4, Nanyang Avenue
Nanyang Technological University
Singapore 639798

ABOUT THE RSIS CENTRE FOR NON-TRADITIONAL SECURITY (NTS) STUDIES

The Centre for Non-Traditional Security (NTS) Studies based in the S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS) was inaugurated on 6 May 2008. It maintains research in the fields of Climate Change, Resilience and Sustainable Development; Energy Security; Food Security; Health Security; Water Security; and Peace, Human Security and Development. It produces policy-relevant analyses aimed at furthering awareness and building capacity to address NTS issues and challenges in the Asia-Pacific region and beyond. The Centre also provides a platform for scholars and policymakers within and outside Asia to discuss and analyse NTS issues in the region.

The Centre is the Coordinator of the ASEAN-Canada Research Partnership (2012–2015) supported by the International Development Research Centre (IDRC), Canada. It also serves as the Secretariat of the initiative. In 2009, the Centre was chosen by the MacArthur Foundation as a lead institution for its three-year Asia Security Initiative (2009–2012), to develop policy research capacity and recommend policies on critical security challenges facing the Asia-Pacific. It is also a founding member of and the Secretariat for the Consortium of Non-Traditional Security (NTS) Studies in Asia.

More information on the Centre can be found at www.rsis.edu.sg/research/nts/.

ABOUT THE S. RAJARATNAM SCHOOL OF INTERNATIONAL STUDIES (RSIS), NANYANG TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY

The S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS) is a professional graduate school of international affairs at the Nanyang Technological University, Singapore. RSIS' mission is to develop a community of scholars and policy analysts at the forefront of security studies and international affairs. Its core functions are research, graduate education and networking. It produces cutting-edge research on Asia Pacific Security, Multilateralism and Regionalism, Conflict Studies, Non-Traditional Security, International Political Economy, and Country and Region Studies. RSIS' activities are aimed at assisting policymakers to develop comprehensive approaches to strategic thinking on issues related to security and stability in the Asia Pacific.

For more information about RSIS, please visit www.rsis.edu.sg.

