

16TH ASIA-EUROPE THINK TANKS' DIALOGUE ON "ASIA-EUROPE MEETING (ASEM): THE WAY FORWARD"

5-7 June 2014
Singapore

Jointly organised by



Centre in Singapore



Konrad
Adenauer
Stiftung



AGORA
ASIA - EUROPE

INSTITUTE for STRATEGIC
ISDS
and DEVELOPMENT STUDIES

16TH ASIA-EUROPE THINK TANKS' DIALOGUE ON "ASIA-EUROPE MEETING (ASEM): THE WAY FORWARD"

Roundtable Report

5 – 7 June 2014

Singapore

Jointly organised by



Centre in Singapore



Konrad
Adenauer
Stiftung



AGORA
ASIA - EUROPE

INSTITUTE for STRATEGIC
ISDS
and DEVELOPMENT STUDIES

Contents

Introduction	3
Report	4
Think Tanks' Dialogue Programme	25
About the Organisers	28

Introduction

On 16-17th October 2014, the 10th Asia-Europe Meeting (ASEM) Summit will be held in the city of Milan, Italy. ASEM is the only platform solely dedicated to Asia and Europe where 49 European and Asian nations, the European Union and the ASEAN Secretariat meet to address the future of mutual relations and global affairs. ASEM not only brings together leaders from both sides, but also provides a continuous dialogue mechanism for ministers and specialists on foreign affairs, economic, financial, environmental, cultural and educational issues. Launched almost 20 years ago, ASEM is an important bridge between Europe and Asia and its relevance is set to increase given developments in both regions which underline a greater need for engagement and cooperation. However, at the same time, ASEM faces today a new set of challenges that have to be addressed for ASEM to retain its relevance and thrive in an increasingly complex environment.

Given the importance of ASEM for relations between Asia and Europe, the Konrad-Adenauer-Stiftung (KAS), the Institute for Strategic and Development Studies (ISDS) of Philippines, the EU Centre in Singapore and FRIDE (the Foundation for International Relations and Foreign Dialogue) jointly organised a dialogue on 5-7 June 2014 in Singapore on "ASEM: The Way Forward". This event gathered the heads and senior representatives of major think tanks and institutes in the Asia-Pacific and Europe, as well as experts and opinion shapers on both sides, to debate the key issues within EU-Asia-Pacific relations and the role and future of ASEM. The aims of this event were to contribute a set of recommendations to the ongoing debates on the relevance of ASEM and propose ideas on reinventing ASEM and its agenda.

Report

Dinner Dialogue with Ambassador Viorel Isticioaia Budura, Managing Director, Asia-Pacific Department, European External Action Service (EEAS)

The think tanks' dialogue on "ASEM – The Way Forward" kicked off with a welcome dinner and dialogue with Ambassador Viorel Isticioaia Budura, the Managing Director for Asia and the Pacific of the European External Action Service (EEAS).



Above: Ambassador Viorel Isticioaia Budura

Ambassador Budura began his speech with an important premise that Asia matters for Europe and similarly, Europe matters for Asia, They matter for each other not only in economic terms, but also political and security terms. The EU seeks to build up its engagement with Asia to tackle global challenges, as well as to further strengthen trade and investment ties with Asia. He also acknowledged that the EU's ability to recover from the financial and economic crises and stepped up on the growth path would hinge on whether it is able to make full use of the growing economic opportunities in Asia. In return, the EU is also keen to step up its role in the area of soft-security, regional integration and offered to Asia a model for reconciliation. He added that the wider thrust of the EU's engagement in Asia depends on how co-operation

between Europe and Asia is framed within the Asia-Europe Meeting (ASEM) process.

ASEM is a particularly useful framework for cooperation and it is increasingly becoming more relevant for its partners. He hailed the theme of this year's ASEM summit, "Responsible Partnership for Sustainable Growth and Security" as one which reflects the enlarging scope of the EU-Asia relationship and noted that the timing of the summit – in the light of the upcoming COP20 in Lima and COP21 in Paris - comes at the right moment to seek greater congruence among ASEM partners on global issues such as climate change and sustainable development. The ASEM Summit can also serve as a forum to reaffirm the shared interest to promote peace and security in Asia and Europe, and to share the EU's experience in promoting reconciliation and settling disputes.

Ambassador Budura also touched on the need to work on the public image of ASEM. He informed the audience that while a working group has already been created by foreign ministers to draft a new ASEM press and public awareness strategy; he would also like to invite the academics and think-tanks to actively engage with ASEM in order to raise the public awareness of this inter-governmental forum.

The Q&A session saw Ms Shada Islam (Friends of Europe) asking Ambassador Budura if there are any new communication ideas to present to the public on EU-Asia cooperation, while Prof Philomena Murray (University of Melbourne) asked the Ambassador to elaborate on the twin roles of the EU

being a security actor and economic partner in Asia.

Welcoming Remarks

Prof Carolina Hernandez, Institute for Strategic and Development Studies (ISDS), Philippines

Dr Giovanni Grevi, Foundation for International Relations and Foreign Dialogue (FRIDE), Belgium

Dr Yeo Lay Hwee, Director, EU Centre in Singapore

Dr Wilhelm Hofmeister, Konrad Adenauer Stiftung (KAS), Singapore

The organisers of the 16th Asia-Europe Think Tanks Dialogue on "Asia-Europe Meeting (ASEM): The way forward", represented by Prof Carolina Hernandez of the Institute for Strategic and Development Studies (ISDS), Dr Giovanni Grevi of the Foundation for International Relations and Foreign Dialogue (FRIDE), Dr Yeo Lay Hwee, Director of the EU Centre in Singapore and Dr Wilhelm Hofmeister Director of Political Programme of the Konrad Adenauer Stiftung, Singapore, warmly welcomed participants and outlined the agenda for the two-day event.

Gathering in Singapore heads and senior representatives of think tanks based in Asia and Europe, scholars, diplomats and opinion-shapers engaged in fostering Asia-Europe relations, the 16th Think Tanks' Dialogue is an opportunity to enrich the ASEM process with new ideas and suggestions. Taking place after the 9th ASEM Summit held in November 2012 in Vientiane and ahead of the 10th ASEM Summit that will take place in October 2014 in Milan participants were encouraged to share their views on how to reinvent ASEM to make it more relevant and thriving. The organisers also



Above: ASEM Think Tanks' Dialogue

looked forward to in-depth discussions to address some of the challenges faced by ASEM, discussed issues that should be in upcoming ASEM agenda and proposed some specific areas of cooperation between Asia-Europe.

First Panel: ASEM's Role in a Crowded Regional Environment

Moderator

Prof Carolina Hernandez, Institute for Strategic and Development Studies (ISDS), Philippines

Speakers and Discussant

Dr Bart Gaens, Finnish Institute of International Affairs (FIIA)

Dr Yeo Lay Hwee, EU Centre, Singapore

Prof Philomena Murray, University of Melbourne, Australia

During the 6th ASEM Summit in Helsinki in 2006, which also marked the tenth anniversary of the ASEM forum bringing together two continents, guidelines for the future of the cooperation process were approved and the Helsinki Declaration on the Future of ASEM was adopted. However, not only has ASEM membership expanded since then to include 49 countries plus the European Union and the ASEAN Secretariat, but also many other circumstances have changed. The first panel of the think tank dialogue

encouraged the participants to deliberate on the relevance of ASEM in the face of these changes of greater interdependence while facing heightened global and regional volatility. Among the key questions were what has ASEM become, what is its added value and what role it should play in a global environment that has become very crowded and is likely to become even more so.

A crowded regional environment



Above: Dr Yeo Lay Hwee, Dr Giovanni Grevi and Prof Carolina Hernandez

As highlighted by Ambassador Budura during dialogue dinner, the ASEM dialogue process does not exist in vacuum. Instead, it exists in an increasingly crowded environment composed of various institutions, multilateral and bilateral cooperation frameworks, agreements and arrangements. The regional environments in Asia and Europe are especially among the most crowded with various sub-regional and regional architectures. Dr Yeo Lay Hwee in her presentation highlighted that the trends towards proliferating forums is unlikely to subside in the near future because of the emergence of the phenomenon of "forum shopping" as coined by scholars such as Prof Juergen Rueland. When an emerging power feels that it is not getting the desired outcomes from its participation in a multilateral forum, it would seek to

establish a new forum. Dr Yeo demonstrated the crowdedness of the Asian and European regional environments in her presentation, listing abbreviations for the various sub-regional, regional, inter-regional and trans-regional forums that exist in Europe and the Asia-Pacific now.

Transformations of the global environment

Apart from this feature, the environment that ASEM operates in has been shaped by other important transformations that need to be considered when preparing strategies for the re-invention of ASEM. Dr Bart Gaens listed some of these transformations. In the 21st century, with the decline in relative power of the US and rise BRICs and most particularly China, the world order has become increasingly multipolar. The global economy is seeing a shift from West to East and there is a proliferation of multilateral and bilateral trade agreements within Asia. With the entry into force of the Lisbon Treaty, the EU has managed to increase its political actorness and is since represented around the globe by its diplomatic service, the European External Action Service (EEAS). However, at that same time, its normative power and confidence in itself as a model has decreased significantly in the aftermath of the Eurozone debt crisis.

The ASEM process has also expanded to a very diverse membership on both continents, having among itself the world's greatest democracy and the nation with the largest Muslim population. Both Dr Gaens and Dr Yeo noted the weakening of multilateralism's appeal as the world witnessed what may be an increasing emphasis on inter-

governmentalism and bilateralism in cooperation between countries. Dr Yeo further highlighted that within societies in both Asia and Europe nationalist and populist movements are rising making politics more national and inward-looking at a time when the economies are becoming more and more interdependent. Within this complicated and crowded environment, there are many countries with one leg in the globalised world, and the other in the old Westphalian zero-sum age. Moreover, relations between countries have grown to become more complex and multi-dimensional, possibly being cooperative, competitive and conflicting all at the same time.

ASEM's added value



Above: Dr Bart Gaens and Dr Yeo Lay Hwee

It is a fact that ASEM is an intergovernmental forum representing 62.5 per cent of the world population, 60 per cent of world trade and 57 per cent of the world's GDP. Among its key characteristics are informality, equal partnership and a dual track approach where biennial summits of heads of states and other official meetings are supplemented by a people-to-people process. But what is ASEM's added value that will allow it to secure a place in a crowded environment and justify its existence in the future? The uniqueness of ASEM is often summarised into three

points: a dialogue facilitator, policy-making laboratory and a tool and catalyst for wider Asia-Europe relations. With regards to its working method, recent meetings have reaffirmed the idea of having a retreat to provide a space for Asian and European leaders to truly engage with one other rather than spending time drafting and reading out carefully prepared statements. This retreat format and informality is enabled by the nature of ASEM being a forum for information sharing and confidence building rather than negotiation and problem solving. Dr Yeo added that the uniqueness of ASEM is that it is the only forum where Europe cannot be overshadowed by the US, which is a feature often equally welcomed by Asian partners. Yet, as Dr Gaens pointed out, ASEM should not be understood as a balancing tool against the US. Although this argument was present during its early stages, it does not have much relevance today when Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership is underway and tensions continue to grow over Russia's role in the Ukrainian crisis.

Opportunities for ASEM

1. Establishment of a coordinating body

Among the opportunities that ASEM could explore in order to become stronger and more relevant some mention establishment of a body that would ensure coordination and continuity. Some experts see this as a logical next step following the establishment of ad hoc supportive structures such as coordination office and technical support team. It has been described by some as potentially very useful, especially given the different degree of coordination between European member countries on one side and Asian member countries on the other. However,

ASEM does not bring together two homogenous groups of countries. Mr Karsten Warnecke of the Asia-Europe Foundation (ASEF) shared his view that ASEM has become more than an interregional dialogue. Despite the procedure that all members join ASEM as members of one block or the other, this division is becoming less and less important.

In view of the lack of consensus with regards to a secretariat or coordinating body, Dr Yeo suggested that the EU should take the lead in managing the growing Asia-Europe relations within ASEM. With its high degree of internal coordination and institutional memory, the EU is best positioned to take on this role.

2. Issue-based leadership and increased informality

Dr Yeo remarked that to push the concept and implementation of issue-based leadership, officially discussed and implicitly endorsed in earlier ASEM summits, perhaps one could propose that within the three ASEM pillars (Political, Economic and Social, Cultural and Educational) ASEM members should be asked to suggest topics of interest. Those topics that gathered the most interest would then be placed in concurrent sessions, and the various ASEM member states can decide to join the respective concurrent sessions according to their interests and priorities. The creation of such clusters of countries engaged in particular topics would also support ASEM's informality, encourage more in-depth discussions at the same time and enable countries interested in taking the lead in specific topics or issues to go forward.

3. Greater stakeholder involvement

To build on ASEM's potential as a test bed for policy ideas ASEM should encourage greater involvement of various civil groups, NGOs and business sector. Their engagement should not only be complementary, but rather an integral part of the process. In this regard Dr Yeo suggested that ASEM should take a leaf from the Davos meeting and organize televised debates around the meeting pitching leaders from different sectors debating on certain timely topics and issues. On this, Mr Michael Matthiessen pointed out that currently, with regards to some stakeholder groups, there is still a lack of coordination across ASEM. This is an obstacle to their constructive engagement in the ASEM process. Mr Matthiessen further added that special efforts have been made to give greater space to the various different actors to engage the official ASEM process in the upcoming ASEM Summit in Milan in October 2014.

4. New ASEM communication strategy



Above: Prof Carolina Hernandez and Prof Philomena Murray

According to Prof Murray of the University of Melbourne, a major challenge for ASEM to remain relevant is its lack of image and its invisibility. Dr Yeo shared her thought on the erosion of trust in established institutions in an age of social media, be it

governments or commercial institutions. In what she described as a move from institutions to intuition, people are more likely to rely on "star power" rather than "expert power" and be engaged through drama rather than debates. Hence, perhaps more "drama" could be put into ASEM by having short and sharp Chairman statements that highlight the disagreements amongst leaders rather than long and bland statements trying to portray consensus. While maintaining informality, it would be also helpful for ASEM's image and visibility to open up the process more to the public with the use of the mass media.

5. Need for Flexibility to Respond to Changes

Prof Hernandez remarked that one of the lessons learnt since the first review of ASEM in 2006 in Helsinki is that it is not possible to plan for everything perfectly. Not only ASEM but all cooperation platforms face dramatic changes of the environments they operate in brought about by developments far beyond their control. It is therefore important for ASEM to remain fluid and flexible and more network-based than institution-based in order to be able to respond adequately and effectively to these changes.

Second panel: Patchwork governance: Asian and European perspectives on global governance

Moderator

Major Gen Muniruzzaman, Bangladesh Institute of Peace and Security Studies

Speakers and Discussant

Dr Giovanni Grevi, Foundation for International Relations and Foreign Dialogue (FRIDE), Belgium

Dr Akiko Kiki Fukushima, The Tokyo Foundation

Ambassador Peter Kennedy, New Zealand Institute of International Affairs

The global governance architecture is a system that comprises various organisations, platforms, agreements, arrangements and mechanisms that in many different ways bring together countries and other actors in international relations. Current global governance is marked by increasing fragmentation and lack of universality, the degree of which varies across policy areas. In no current policy domain under discussion are all countries subject to the same regulatory framework, or able to agree on the same mechanism and on the same core set of common commitments. The distinct components of the architecture exist and interact within this system, forming a so called "patchwork governance" where several alternative approaches to a policy issue are practised. One of the reasons why this is so is the fact that economic globalisation is occurring faster than political globalisation. The second panel invited participants to comment on Asian and European perspectives towards this global governance architecture.

Developments with significant impact on global governance



Above: Dr Giovanni Grevi, Major Gen Muniruzzaman and Dr Akiko Fukushima

The state of global governance is shaped by four current key developments. Firstly, international cooperation is becoming harder as the current order developed after the end of World War II is increasingly being questioned. Yet at the same time rising powers are unwilling to lead and declining powers find it harder and harder to lead. We see a simultaneous reassertion and erosion of sovereignty. Governments are becoming less able to respond to the demands of their societies. Interdependence is deepening while globalization is met with insufficient regulations. This creates growing tension between the prevalent national discourse and its inability to offer solutions. Lastly, there is a trend in rising middle classes. Convergence of living standards may lead to convergence of aspirations and be a positive impulse for the creation of global governance architecture. However, according to Dr Grevi, convergence of aspirations unfortunately does not necessarily entail convergence of norms and approaches.

European perspective on global governance

Among the most evident shortcomings of global governance today is the deficit in the rule-making capacity of international institutions. This deficit is reflected in the stalemate of international trade negotiations under the WTO, the inability to agree on common financial and labour standards, inability to find a common position on the concept of responsibility to protect and to come up with a common strategy to fight climate change. From a European perspective, this deficit is an acute problem. The EU itself is the most advanced regional experiment in managing interdependence between countries and EU member states share the same belief that on the global level, rules-

based multilateralism is the way forward. However, despite this belief in multilateralism and the relevance of the EU as an international norm setter norms that apply in Europe sometimes cannot be applied in, or are rejected in the global environment (as Ambassador Kennedy's example of the 2009 UN Climate Change conference in Copenhagen showed) Europe believes that with rules-based multilateralism as a basis for global governance, change can be delinked from conflict. We can learn from the past and history does not need to repeat itself.

Asian perspective on global governance



Above: Major Gen Muniruzzaman, Dr Akiko Fukushima and Ambassador Peter Kennedy

Dr Akiko Fukushima noted that while the EU is the key focal point for Europe, ASEAN has been the driver in Asia. Although Asia has been said to be void of multilateralism, in the past two decades ASEAN has solidified itself by adopting its Charter and has moved to building ASEAN Community. Capitalizing on its asset of meetings with dialogue partners, it has launched pan-Asian institutions such as ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF) ASEAN plus China, ROK and Japan (APT), ADMM plus etc.

From an Asian perspective, global governance is in flux. Formal key institutions like the UN are being challenged on grounds of its capacity and

effectiveness and the WTO has not been able to move forward with the Doha round and is instead bypassed by many bilateral and multilateral trade agreements. Informal G-groups such as G7, G8 and G20 may develop concrete institutional capacity for decision making. But their representativeness and legitimacy is questioned. Witnessing the shortcomings of global institutions and the development of other regional institutions elsewhere, ASEAN has played a central role in launching Asian regional cooperation. However it has been pointed out that there is yet no leader in Asia to pull together Asian regionalism. China and Japan are limited by historical tensions and territorial disputes and China does not seem ready to bear the burden of leadership.

Japan has long been supportive of multilateral initiatives including ASEM but has led from behind rather than standing at the top table. Therefore within Asia, instead of a clear single leader, we have seen more issue-based leadership. Japan has recently tried to play a more proactive role. Dr Fukushima noted that there is a need to find some glue of multilateralism, as having rules in place is not enough unless there is a mechanism to make sure they are observed by all and provide diffused reciprocity. All the more because global governance institutions are not providing sufficient global solutions to issues, it is time for us to utilize ASEM as part of the patchwork governance to provide concrete solutions on both economic and security issues which is the theme of the 10th ASEM Summit. It is time for us to fully recognize the nexus between economy and security.

Role for ASEM in the current state of global governance

Dr Grevi suggested that we are not in a constitutional moment for global governance, and patchwork governance is perhaps the new normal. We find ourselves in an experimental phase of trial and error. Global governance is only going to get more complicated. This represents a challenge not only for ASEM, but to any other cooperation platform. Given the number of multilateral platforms that compose a patchwork structure of governance, ASEM as a broad dialogue process could play an important role of aggregating some of the various components and positions of the patchwork system. Within ASEM, coalitions of countries willing to move forward on a certain topic could be created. In addition, policy issues tend to be interlinked and therefore links and networks reflecting this should be built into the patchwork architecture.

Third panel: Sustainable growth (I): The role of education

Moderator

Ambassador Pou Sothirak, Cambodian Institute for Cooperation and Peace (CICP)

Speakers and Discussant

Prof Kerry Kennedy, Centre for Governance and Citizenship, Hong Kong Institute of Education

Prof Bruce Wilson, EU Centre at RMIT, Australia

Dr Kavi Chongkittavorn, Institute for Strategic and International Studies (ISIS), Thailand



Above: Prof Bruce Wilson and Prof Kerry Kennedy

Education is a way to break the circle of poverty and is essential for growth to be inclusive and sustainable. Europe has finally recognised the importance of Asia in its policy priorities and Asian leaders increasingly look to Europe not only for trade and investment opportunities, but also for cooperation on education and other policy areas. The topic of the third panel was the nexus between sustainable growth and education and opportunities for further ASEM cooperation in education.

ASEM cooperation on education

The ASEM Educational Process is an informal dialogue taking place on two levels. Firstly, on the political level, a conference of Ministers for Education is convened once in every two years. Secondly, at the stakeholder level, a continuous dialogue involving policy-makers, practitioners, experts and other stakeholders exists. In 1998 during the 2nd ASEM Summit in London, the ASEM Higher Education Programme (initially called the ASEM Education Hub) was established. Currently it coordinates several ASEM initiatives promoting inter-regional university exchanges and cooperation in high education.

So far the focus of educational cooperation in ASEM has been on higher education, student mobility, funding,

relations with business and general issues of management and administration. In 2005 the ASEM Education and Research Hub for Lifelong Learning (ASEM LLL Hub) was set up in Copenhagen. It is a network of European and Asian universities whose aim is to promote dialogue between researchers, practitioners and policy makers on educational reforms. During the 2006 ASEM Summit in Helsinki, heads of states underlined the importance of education as investment in human resources. The second ASEM Education Ministers meeting in 2009 agreed on the establishment of a rotating international ASEM Education Secretariat (AES) hosted by Germany for the first four years and later transferred to Jakarta.

Sustainable Development Goals and education

With the deadline for the Millennium Development Goals (MDG) drawing near, it is necessary to start thinking of post-2015 development goals. Within UN, the process of formulating post-2015 Sustainable Development Goals has long been underway. It has been agreed that there will be a specific goal on education with the priority to "ensure equitable and inclusive quality education and lifelong learning for all by 2030". In more specific terms, this goal on education will have five output targets and two input targets. They will reflect the research findings on early childhood as a crucial phase in terms of the economic development impact of education. Among others, ten years of free and compulsory education will be set as a target and a minimal level of government budgetary spending on education will also be set as a target.

Both Europe and Asia have been active in this UN process. ASEM is a good platform to help its members meet these targets

through information and experience sharing. Unlike Europe, there are many Asian countries that still do not have laws on compulsory education, or if it is the case that these laws are in place, implementation of these laws and other challenges such as high drop-out rates have to be addressed. Many ASEM members also face the problems of low quality of their education systems because of low incentives for teachers, insufficient training and imperfect evaluation.

Schools

Prof Kerry Kennedy founded his presentation on three cornerstones: schools, skills and lifelong learning and working. He stressed that what society expects from schools is students who are creative, innovative, critical thinkers and problems solvers that will contribute to economic development. Overall quality, not merely the number of schooling years, should be used as the criteria for assessment. Schools should be for everyone and on no basis should someone be excluded from schools. In developed countries this may be a natural thing, but in developing countries, many of them in Asia, this is not even distantly the case and massive exclusions exist. This has serious consequences for economic growth because the more people are in schools, the more skills are produced and the better the economic development potential of the country. This is the reason why laws on compulsory schooling are very important. In addition to the relevance of education to economy, education equally plays an important role in supporting democracy and citizenship. Education contains both, an individual element and a collective societal element. The fruit of education should therefore be shared by the whole societies.



Above: Ambassador Pou Sothirak and Dr Kavi Chongkittavorn

Schools should also provide a foundation for future learning and hence beyond formal curriculum should also teach generic skills. The teaching of 21st century generic skills which are universal, irrespective of profession, need to be updated in response to a changing world.

Skills

The question of whether governments should do skills forecasting and have policies in place to address needs of industries and businesses have often been debated. There is a disagreement among economists on the advantages and disadvantages of skills forecasting. However, without skills forecasting, situations such as the one in Laos where 4000 lawyers graduate each year that are not needed instead of mining and construction engineers that are greatly needed may occur. In many countries, vocational schools are unattractive and regarded as last resort, leading to numbers of young people earning a university degree that do not match the needs of society. In this regard, Germany could prove to be a good model for reform to many ASEM countries and cooperation on this topic should therefore be encouraged.

Lifelong working

In some countries, like Australia and most European countries, people retire at a certain age whereas in other, mostly Asian countries they work until they are unable to. There has been growing interest in promoting a system where an individual never really retires but instead is more flexible to take leaves from work throughout his life. When planning to solve skills shortages by making people work longer, however, it is important to keep in mind that the cognitive abilities of a 60-year-old is different than of a 25-year -old.

Opportunities for ASEM cooperation

Despite competitive international benchmarking tools such as PISA (Programme for International Student Assessment) receiving increasing attention of states, the way forward is dialogue and cooperation. The important outcomes of education such as creation of opportunities for the disadvantaged, capacity for innovation, promotion of greater understanding of complex issues and greater tolerance in all countries would benefit all. In addition, to the surprise of many, most education system assessment tools show that many young Asian populations scored better than their European counterparts in not only numeric skills and reading but also creativity. This proves that through cooperation, sharing of experiences and comparison of approaches, much can be gained and learnt by both European and Asian countries.

Fourth panel: Sustainable growth (II): Climate change and energy

Moderator

Dr Wilhelm Hofmeister, Konrad-Adenauer-Stiftung (KAS), Singapore

Speakers and Discussant

Mr Manish Tewari, Observer Research Foundation, India

Ms Gauri Khandekar, Foundation for International Relations and Foreign Dialogue (FRIDE), Belgium

Major Gen Muniruzzaman, Bangladesh Institute of Peace and Security Studies

Climate change has been framed by many countries as a major security issue. Climate change affects communities and individuals all around the globe, with Southeast Asia being among the most hardly hit. Yet, approaches on how to respond to the rise of temperature vary greatly and so far Asia and Europe also cannot agree on a common global response. Cooperation in the areas of climate change and environmental protection is made harder by different levels of expertise and capacity devoted to these topics. Whereas some countries have at their disposal highly specialised ministries and public service devoted to these issues, there are countries where only a single person is responsible for a vast portfolio, within which environmental protection is only one of many. When representatives of the latter countries meet with representatives of the former countries or with representatives of the European Commission, it is difficult for them to find a common language and trust. This is the reason why ASEM as a multilateral information sharing platform has great potential to make a strong positive impact with regards to cooperation on climate change and this is also the rationale for having this panel.

Challenges posed by climate change to human security



Above: Mr Manish Tewari and Dr Wilhelm Hofmeister

Through its many foreseeable impacts, climate change represents a threat to both human security and could also be a source of conflicts flowing into the realm of hard security issues. Firstly, the changes brought about by the rise in temperature will affect agricultural productivity and water supplies and hence present a major threat to food security. Some studies estimate that with a global rise in temperature by 3°C, the number of people suffering from hunger is likely to double. Climate change is also often linked to the frequency and intensity of natural disasters. Together with rising sea levels, this will make millions of people become environmental refugees. By 2050, 150 million people are expected to be displaced by climate change-related phenomena. A changing climate affecting availability of clean water, food and shelter will also have negative effect on human health. It is projected that climate change will likely cause over 150,000 deaths annually and 45 million people are estimated to be malnourished because of climate change. Reduced access to clean water will also make people more susceptible to diseases like cholera, diarrhoea, hepatitis, malaria, etc. Impacts of climate change may also damage key infrastructure, reduce energy security and

destabilise public order. The Fukushima tragedy highlighted vulnerability of energy infrastructure. Overall these impacts create additional obstacles to development.

Challenges posed by climate change to hard security

When governments are not able to sufficiently respond to the impacts of climate change and their ability to provide public goods and security to their populations reduces, extremist and terrorist groups are likely to take advantage of these circumstances to try to fill the vacuum. Greater scarcity of resources will likely increase chances of inter-state conflict and contribute to greater regional instability. Also within countries, fragmentation of societies and break down of established order could go as far as to increase the number of failed states.

Complicated relationship between sustainable development and climate change

At the global level, Europe has been championing its regional approach to tackling climate change. Its strategy consists of promotion of renewable energy resources, increased energy efficiency and the European Carbon Emission Trading Scheme. Developing countries, however, find this proposed strategy difficult to follow. Making clean energy cheap and available to all is important for development and at the same time is a key challenge. Developing countries are caught in the middle of a complicated relationship between pursuit of sustainable development and response to climate change. In many of these countries, the environmental agenda is still sometimes seen as an obstruction to

growth. A new definition of sustainable development that would take into consideration these realities could make a positive contribution.

Opportunities for ASEM cooperation



Above: Major Gen Muniruzzaman and Ms Gauri Khandekar

ASEM can provide a convenient platform for information and opinion sharing on climate change and can be catalyst for finding common approaches. It is well suited for the task because of its member base which is vast and comprising both of the most developed and world's poorest countries. At the same it is not as stretched out as the UN. Ms Gauri Khandekar of FRIDE raised the question of establishing an ASEM Centre for human security and disaster management. Currently, disaster management in Asia remains uncoordinated, and protocols are causing obstacles in the way of efforts to provide timely humanitarian aid. By assuming a leading role in this and being active in an issue important to societies, ASEM could become more publicly recognised.

However, some participants raised a cautionary note that under ASEM, several centres have been established which later languished such as the AEETC and several Centres have been set up which are not well publicised such as the ASEM Eco-innovation Centre for SMEs based in

South Korea. Initiatives and centres created under ASEM need to be interlinked, need to become known and need to create relevant output which has not always been the case. This example of insufficient visibility of various ASEM's initiatives, suggest, and perhaps confirm, the need for better coordination and communication by the various stakeholders in ASEM.

Fifth panel: Sustainable Stability (I): From the Gulf to Central Asia and Europe's Neighbourhood - Promoting security in an insecure environment

Moderator

Dr Gudrun Wacker, German Institute for International and Security Affairs

Speakers and Discussant

Dr Patryk Kugiel, Polish Institute of International Affairs (PISM)

Dr Masuma Hasan, Pakistan Institute of International Affairs (PIIA)

Dr Nishchal N. Pandey, Centre for South Asian Studies, Nepal

The EU in Afghanistan

Dr Patryk Kugiel noted the general pessimism over the Western intervention in Afghanistan, but from his perspective, he felt that the country is a "much better place today than in 2001". For instance, improvements have been made in the infrastructure, though much more remained to be done. Afghanistan would probably need continued support from the international community for the next ten years or so. Unfortunately, he also felt that NATO and its western partners have continued to make mistakes in Afghanistan. In particular, they have underestimated the regional complexities surrounding Afghanistan. There is also the

persistent problem of corruption and bad governance in a country that has lagged behind on many social indicators.



Above: Dr Gudrun Wacker, Dr Patryk Kuigel and Dr Masuma Hasan

In Afghanistan, the EU has been engaged primarily as a development cooperation partner – 15 to 20 per cent of all international aid channelled into Afghanistan comes from the EU. At the member states' level, several EU countries have also been actively engaged, with 16,000 troops in Afghanistan coming from EU member states. The training of police personnel is another area the EU has been supporting.

The EU has also been active in supporting democratic transition, such as in monitoring the latest presidential elections in which Abdullah Abdullah and Ashraf Ghani emerged as the two front runners for a run-off.

Such development roles are important as one cannot solve the Afghan issue by military means alone – the problems in Afghanistan also have broader regional dimension and implications, in areas from terrorism to drug trafficking and arms smuggling.

The role of the EU in supporting connectivity in Central Asia

The EU has committed to staying in Afghanistan until after 2014, through its Partnership and Cooperation Agreement. Dr Kugiel noted that the EU is interested in doing "pretty much everything" in Afghanistan, but he questioned if this was the right approach. Given limited resources, the EU should prioritise and choose a few key areas to support Afghanistan.

Supporting Afghan's regional connectivity to other parts of the world should be a priority for the EU. There are a number of connectivity projects that seek to connect the Central Asian region with Europe. For example, the US is pushing for its New Silk Road initiative to integrate the Central Asian region and boost its potential as a transit area between Europe and East Asia. There are also the six Central Asia Regional Economic Cooperation (CAREC) corridors which connect its landlocked member countries to other global markets. Then there is also the North-South Transport Corridor, connecting India to Europe.

There are naturally problems of coordination in building these corridors, and this is perhaps where the EU could help. Dr Kugiel suggested that ASEM could be the forum for crafting a Eurasian strategy.

Dr Nischal Pandey began his comment on the situation in Afghanistan by noting ironically that a hundred years ago the borders in South and Central Asia were far more porous than it is today. He said that the region must "be a bazaar again", and cited former Indian Prime Minister Manmohan Singh who said that he dreamt of the day when "one can have

breakfast in Amritsar, lunch in Lahore and dinner in Kabul".

However, besides infrastructural developments, such as roads, railroads, ports, electricity transmission lines, there is also a need for broader institution building in Afghanistan to underpin regional connectivity there. The problem, however, is that the EU budget for the area of regional cooperation is relatively small. Moreover, Europeans are not willing to pay anymore for Afghanistan – not only because of the financial and economic crisis which struck the EU, but because European citizens are getting tired of the long war in Afghanistan. There is also the added complexity given the EU's current relationship with Russia over the issue of Ukraine.

Role of the EU in peace and reconciliation in Afghanistan



Above: Dr Masuma Hasan

Dr Masuma Hasan believed that the EU could play a role in peace and reconciliation in Afghanistan through ASEM. She felt that importance should be given to people to people contacts. The big corridor projects planned would not come into effect if turmoil returns to Afghanistan.

She also believed that an area such as women's rights, in which Afghanistan ranked a dismal 147 out of 148, is where

the EU could play a role. She noted with dismay that recently Afghan President Hamid Karzai had signed decrees that are against women's rights – such as on the sexual rights of Shia men over women – as a result of some of the political compromises he has had to make domestically with the regional warlords.

Aid money can also be used to help rehabilitate cultural life and heritage in Afghanistan, as part of reconciliation efforts. In this regard, she mentioned the aid from Japan for the reconstruction of the Bamiyan Buddhas – historic statues which were destroyed by the Taliban during their rule over Afghanistan.

Trade versus military means

For Dr Pandey, the South and Central Asian region can learn from the EU experience that trade can prevent conflict. The EU is a civilian, normative player in Afghanistan, as the military role is taken on by NATO. The EU should thus concentrate on its expertise in building trade and create economic opportunities for the region.

Afghanistan is blessed with mineral deposits – the country is said to be sitting on \$3 trillion worth of mineral wealth, as yet untapped. By focusing on economics, such as in making Afghanistan the hub for the Silk Road initiative, it can transform the country and make it a symbol of collective security.

If the situation in Afghanistan is over-secured, either the Taliban would triumph politically, or the country would be led to military rule like neighbouring Pakistan had been at various points. Nonetheless there is also the understanding that a strong, professional military is needed to secure and underpin

Afghanistan's fragile institutions of democracy. This would mean the need to strengthen the Afghan national army.

The frontrunner in the current presidential election, Abdullah Abdullah, is against the idea of having any dialogue with the Taliban, believing that the only way to deal with them is through military means. The result, however, is that the Afghan government exercises the most effective control only over Kabul, which has become like a fortress in the midst of a country in turmoil. If Afghanistan slips back into civil war, the country would pass into the hands of its traditional warlords.

Sixth panel: Sustainable Stability (II) – The Indo-Pacific security agenda and priorities for cooperation

Moderator

Dr Tang Siew Mun, Institute of Strategic and International Studies, Malaysia

Speakers and Discussant

Prof Seung Joo Lee, East Asia Institute (EAI), Republic of Korea Chung-Ang University

Dr May-Britt U. Stumbaum, Free University Berlin

Dr Shafiah Muhibat, Center for Strategic and International Studies, Indonesia

Prof Axel Berkofsky, University of Pavia

Conceiving of the Indo-Pacific region: bringing India into the fray

Earlier in 2014, Indonesian Foreign Minister Marty Natalegawa announced that he would push for a peace treaty in the Indo-Pacific region, which could be modelled on ASEAN's Treaty of Amity and Cooperation (TAC). His rationale was that a regional treaty to renounce use of force was necessary, because "standing still" is

not an option as conflict could always arise from miscalculation. But there is scepticism over such an "idealistic" treaty, and not least because there would be a change in the Indonesian presidency and his administration by the end of the year, prompting doubts about whether the momentum surrounding the treaty idea would carry. There is also doubt about the real impact of such a treaty.



Above: Dr Shafiah Muhibat and Dr Tang Siew Mun

In moving away from an East Asian- and China-centric approach, some policymakers and observers have begun to speak of the "Indo-Pacific" by bringing in Indian Ocean periphery countries, the chief of which is of course India. Besides being a recognition of the growing naval power of India, to speak of the Indo-Pacific is also to move away from a fixation on the maritime conflicts in the South and East China Seas. In doing so, maritime security is thereby highlighted as the security threat in Indo-Pacific, relating to issues of piracy which affects trade along the sea lanes of communication in the Indian Ocean.

Some are of the opinion that bringing India into conversations on the region is "awkward, because the salient conflicts in Asia now are in East and Northeast Asia. Yet others believe India should be part of the game in Asia, especially since China and Russia have often abstained themselves from dispute resolution

mechanisms, such as in the United Nations Security Council.

The multi-dimensional nature of security uncertainties in East Asia: the perspective from South Korea

While economic interdependence has deepened and widened in East Asia, military tension and disputes have also become more frequent – albeit in the absence of war. One only has to think about the South- and East China Sea disputes which frequently occupy the headlines, or the long-standing tensions in the Korean peninsula. South Korean President Park Geun-hye has referred to this situation as the “Asian paradox”, in which Northeast Asia is not able to deepen economic integration into more institutionalised arrangements.



Above: Dr Tang Siew Mun, Dr May-Britt U. Stumbaum and Prof Seung Joo Lee

Some have explained that East Asia countries are interested in institution building in as far as they are instruments not only for cooperation but more importantly for balancing or hedging against any given target state. This could be seen in the proliferation of Free Trade agreements (FTAs) in the region because of the explicit linkage between foreign economic and security policies. For instance the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) is used to “reward military allies”, according to Prof Seung Joo Lee, while

some observers believe that the TPP is a classic case of Japan and US trying to contain China. Indeed, China sees the TPP as the economic dimension of the US alliance with Japan, a prospect more threatening to them than stationing US troops in Australia.

In realising South Korea’s goal to be a responsible middle power, the Park Geun-hye’s administration adopted a foreign policy of “trustpolitik” – building trust between competing nations in a realist framework of international relations, particularly on the Korean peninsula. Through its “Northeast Asia Peace and Cooperation Initiative”, the Park administration seeks to create a political environment that can induce a change in North Korea’s behaviour. Sceptics, however, have pointed out that “trustpolitik” is not very different from the earlier Sunshine Policy pursued by then President Kim Dae Jung, which was officially declared by the South Korean government as a failure in 2010. The fact is that “trustpolitik” also hinges on whether North Korea would give up its nuclear programme, which is admittedly a limited prospect.

The role of the EU in the Indo-Pacific: “what are you doing here?”

In relating the story of an EU representative who was asked “What is the EU doing here?” in the most recent Shangri-La Dialogue held in Singapore, Dr May-Britt U. Stumbaum reiterated the general perceptions of the EU as primarily an economic actor in the Asia-Pacific. Yet at the same time, it cannot be overlooked that security has in fact been on the ASEM agenda for a while. Here, it is commonly cited that the value of the EU’s participation in Asia is that “it is not the US”, in how it uses soft rather than hard

power as the principal tool of foreign policy. The EU clearly has interests in issues such as maritime security since much of its trade with Asia is carried by containers through the sea lanes of communication. That is one of its key rationale in contributing resources towards combating piracy in the Indian Ocean.



Above: Dr Shafiah Muhibat, Dr Tang Siew Mun and Dr May-Britt U. Stumbaum

Observers may quibble as to whether EU's dialogue on security issues with China has had any effect on China's stance on the territorial disputes. But it must be kept in mind that the EU also plays a role in security in how its national defence companies supply submarines and weapons to countries in Asia, contributing to the rise of 5 per cent in military expenditure in East Asia in one year.

From the European perspective, it would be a huge waste of resources and a major setback if Asian countries were to clash over some rocks in the East and South China Seas. There are many lessons the EU could impart from its experience of peace and reconciliation after World War II and recent examples of conflict resolution. But the EU certainly cannot play any integral role in traditional territorial disputes in faraway Asia. Moreover the EU is currently in conflict with Russia over territorial issues in Ukraine. In this thinking, the areas in

which the EU should concentrate on in supporting Asia are in the preservation of cooperation, training and in disaster relief. The EU – as represented by High Representative Catherine Ashton and her spokesperson – has also been more outspoken on the key issues in Asia such as the maritime dispute issues and calling on all parties to observe international law like the UN Convention of the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS). The guideline for the office of Baroness Ashton now provides for the High Representative to issue foreign policy statements without consulting member states, allowing it to be more responsive to external events.

Final panel: Reinventing ASEM

Moderator

Prof Philomena Murray, University of Melbourne

Speakers and Discussant

Mr Michael Matthiessen, European External Action Service (EEAS), Brussels

Ms Shada Islam, Friends of Europe, Belgium

Ms Gauri Khandekar, Foundation for International Relations and Foreign Dialogue (FRIDE), Belgium

Towards the 2014 ASEM summit in Milan, Italy

There is a plan to introduce a retreat session at the 2014 ASEM summit, in an effort to make it more like an EU summit where leaders interact with each other without their staffers. Part of this was due to the complaints at the last ASEM summit in Vientiane, Laos, in 2012 where officials spent 25 hours crafting tedious statements. To focus so much on Chairman's statements would be to put resources in the wrong places as the value

of ASEM is its informality. Government leaders are also not keen to sit and listen to lengthy prepared statements – which has tended to be the case at recent ASEM summits – so the retreat format may help inject some interest among leaders who have not showed up in the past few summits.

Bilateral and even trilateral meetings are a very important part of ASEM. For instance in how the new Norwegian Foreign Minister Børge Brende used the 2013 ASEM foreign ministers meeting in New Delhi to get to know his counterparts. As such, leaders are encouraged by the hosts to arrive in Milan early to set up their own meetings around the Summit.



Above: Prof Philomena Murray, Mr Michael Matthiessen, and Ms Gauri Khandekar

Work would be done to ensure that the Asian partners of ASEM would accept Croatia as a new member, since membership of ASEM is not automatic upon that of EU membership. While some have raised the issue of balance in membership between Asia and Europe – 20 Asian members versus 31 in Europe – Mr Michael Matthiessen said this is “inevitable”, as it also proves “that ASEM is interesting”.

All in all, the atmosphere at ASEM summits have happily not shown signs of a “us and them” type of post-colonial conversations – rather, the summits have

been constructively played out as a gathering of leaders talking about common challenges and opportunities.

Nonetheless there are some areas which could be acted upon to bring dialogues in ASEM to a higher level – for instance, it was noted that a number of key European countries are not in any of the 12 thematic working groups of ASEM.

Three stages in the history of ASEM: A view from the media



Above: Ms Shada Islam, Prof Philomena Murray and Mr Michael Matthiessen

For Ms Shada Islam, ASEM has been through the stages of the initial “euphoria”, followed by a period of “boredom”, hopefully to be superseded now by a phase of “reinvention” and hopefully “revival.”

Back when ASEM was launched in 1996, it was not easy to sell a story on Asia-Europe cooperation to the media. There were two angles, however, that captured the interests of editors and readers alike – that ASEM was about Europe and Asia talking together *without* the US, and that it was about Europe seeing tiger economies of Asia and “taking a piece of the cake”.

Then British Prime Minister Tony Blair realised it was important to have an ASEM

summit in London to emphasise Europe-Asia cooperation and relationships. Former German Chancellor Helmut Kohl remarked that it was "an exciting time" for Europe-Asia relations. But what followed after the 2nd Summit was a period of inertia, apathy, in which some leaders even felt that ASEM was not worth their time. The challenge, therefore, is to find excitement in ASEM again. The ASEM membership has indeed increased significantly ever since, with countries like Russia, India, Australia, New Zealand and Bangladesh joining, in addition to the numerous new EU member states since the inaugural 1996 ASEM summit – but question has to be asked as to whether ASEM is successful just because it is enlarging.

For Ms Islam, the initiative for driving ASEM should be given back to the leaders, rather than to the bureaucrats who are fixated on negotiating on every single word or paragraph of a chairman's statement. Informality in ASEM should also be brought back, to get away from the rituals. ASEM, after all, is about bringing people together.

There has been a sense that ASEM's focus is too wide – it needs to move away from the kitchen sink approach and narrow its focus down to two to three areas. These could include women's issues, addressing extremism and populism in Asia and Europe; and threats faced by journalists in Asia – areas that are thus far not sufficiently covered by other institutions or bodies.

ASEM needs interesting ideas to revive Asia-Europe engagement and to capture the popular imagination. At the 1998 ASEM summit in London, then British Prime Minister Tony Blair organised a European-Asian rock concert; at the 2010

summit in Brussels, the Belgian hosts ran a well-received "Passage to Asia" exhibition. Inspiration could also be taken from the Commonwealth in creating concrete initiatives to relate to the people, such as in organising the equivalent of the Commonwealth games and the Commonwealth Literature Prize.

More efforts should also be channelled towards businesses, especially since it has been often noted that a major part of Europe's interest in Asia is in trade and economics.

Rapporteurs

Mr Loke Hoe Yeong

Associate, EU Centre

Mr Dexter Lee

Programme Executive, EU Centre

Ms Kamila Slavikova

Intern, EU Centre

Edited by:

Dr Yeo Lay Hwee

Director, EU Centre

Think Tanks' Dialogue Programme

Asia-Europe Meeting (ASEM) – The Way Forward

Pan Pacific Orchard, Singapore
5 – 7 June 2014

5 June 2014

Arrival in Singapore

19:00 **Dinner Dialogue with Ambassador Viorel Isticioaia Budura**
Managing Director, Asia and Pacific Department, EEAS
Picasso I & II, Level 3, Pan Pacific Orchard

6 June 2014

08:30-09:00 **Registration**
Picasso I & II, Level 3
Pan Pacific Orchard, Singapore

09:00-09:20 **Opening Remarks**
Prof Carolina Hernandez
The Institute for Strategic and Development Studies (ISDS),
Philippines
Dr Giovanni Grevi
Foundation for International Relations and Foreign Dialogue (FRIDE),
Belgium
Dr Yeo Lay Hwee
EU Centre, Singapore
Dr Wilhelm Hofmeister
Konrad-Adenauer-Stiftung (KAS), Singapore

1st session:

09:20-10:50 ***ASEM's role in a crowded regional environment***
Moderator:
Prof Carolina Hernandez
The Institute for Strategic and Development Studies (ISDS),
Philippines

Speakers:
Dr Bart Gaens
The Finnish Institute of International Affairs (FIIA), Finland
Dr Yeo Lay Hwee
EU Centre, Singapore

Discussant:
Prof Philomena Murray
University of Melbourne, Australia

10:50-11:15 Coffee break

2nd session:

11:15-12:45

**Patchwork Governance:
Asian and European Perspectives on global governance**

Moderator:

Major Gen Muniruzzaman (Retd)
Bangladesh Institute of Peace and Security Studies

Speakers:

Dr Giovanni Grevi
Foundation for International Relations and Foreign Dialogue (FRIDE),
Belgium

Dr Akiko Kiki Fukushima
The Tokyo Foundation

Discussant:

Ambassador Peter Kennedy
New Zealand Institute of International Affairs

12:45-14:00

Lunch @10 Claymore, Lobby Level

3rd session

14:00-15:30

Sustainable growth (I): the role of education

Moderator:

Ambassador Pou Sothirak
Cambodian Institute for Cooperation and Peace (CICP)

Speakers:

Prof Kerry Kennedy
Centre for Governance and Citizenship at the Hong Kong Institute
of Education

Prof Bruce Wilson
EU Centre at RMIT, Australia

Discussant

Dr Kavi Chongkittavorn
Institute for Strategic and International Studies (ISIS), Thailand

15:30-16:00

Coffee break

4th session

16:00-17:30

Sustainable growth (II) climate change and energy

Moderator:

Dr Wilhelm Hofmeister
Konrad-Adenauer-Stiftung (KAS), Singapore

Speakers:

Mr Manish Tewari

Observer Research Foundation, India

Ms Gauri Khandekar

Foundation for International Relations and Foreign Dialogue (FRIDE),
Belgium

Discussant:

Major Gen Muniruzzaman (Retd)

Bangladesh Institute of Peace and Security Studies

19:00

Dinner

Venue: @Level 1 Lobby Lounge

Networking Europe-Asia relations: How to strengthen inter-regional cooperation via network building, how to improve results.

Key Note Speaker

Mr Manish Tewari

7 June 2014

5th session

9:00-10:30

Sustainable Stability (I)

From the Gulf to Central Asia and Europe's Neighbourhood - Promoting security in an insecure environment

Moderator:

Dr Gudrun Wacker

German Institute for International and Security Affairs

Speakers:

Dr Patryk Kugiel

The Polish Institute of International Affairs (PISM)

Dr Masuma Hasan

Pakistan Institute of International Affairs (PIIA)

Discussant:

Dr Nishchal N. Pandey

Centre for South Asian Studies, Nepal

10:30-11:00

Coffee break

6th session

11:00-12:30

Sustainable Stability (II)

The Indo-Pacific: security agenda and priorities for cooperation

Moderator:

Dr Tang Siew Mun

Institute of Strategic and International Studies, Malaysia

Speakers:

Prof Seung Joo Lee

Chung-Ang University, Seoul, Republic of Korea

Dr May-Britt U. Stumbaum

Free University Berlin, Germany

Dr Shafiah Muhibat

Center for Strategic and International Studies, Indonesia

Discussant:

Prof Axel Berkofsky

University of Pavia, Italy

12:30-14:00

Lunch @10 Claymore, Lobby Level

14:00-15:30

Reinventing ASEM

Moderator:

Prof Philomena Murray

University of Melbourne

Speakers:

Mr Michael Matthiessen

European External Action Service (EEAS), Brussels

Ms Shada Islam

Friends of Europe, Belgium

Discussant:

Ms Gauri Khandekar

Foundation for International Relations and Foreign Dialogue (FRIDE), Belgium

15:30-15:45

Closing remarks

Prof Carolina Hernandez

Institute for Strategic and Development Studies (ISDS), Philippines

Dr Giovanni Grevi

Foundation for International Relations and Foreign Dialogue (FRIDE), Belgium

Dr Yeo Lay Hwee

EU Centre, Singapore

Dr Wilhelm Hofmeister

Konrad-Adenauer-Stiftung (KAS), Singapore

About the Organisers:

EU Centre in Singapore

Established in 2008, the EU Centre in Singapore is a joint project of the European Union, the National University of Singapore (NUS), Nanyang Technological University (NTU) and the Singapore Institute of International Affairs (SIIA), and is part of a worldwide network of EU centres and EU institutes. We aim to promote knowledge and understanding of the EU and its impact on Singapore and the region, through activities revolving around outreach, education and research.

As part of our public outreach activities, the Centre organises an ongoing series of talks, lectures and seminars. The Centre contributes to education and research on the EU through organising academic conferences and by publishing background briefs, working papers, and policy and research briefs.

Konrad Adenauer Stiftung (KAS)

The Konrad Adenauer Stiftung is a political foundation associated with the Christian Democratic Union of Germany that was founded in 1964. It has representative offices in 70 countries and supports projects and activities in more than 120 countries. It carries out programmes in the fields of political training and international dialogue on democracy and human rights, good governance and rule of law, civil society development, social market economy and freedom of press. Its project the "EU-Asia Dialogue" is managed by the KAS regional programme "Political Dialogue with Asia" located in Singapore. The project aims to contribute to the international dialogue on issues of cross-border interest with focus on political analysis and training of politicians and social actors, regional integration, cooperation between Asia and Europe and issues of relevance for global governance such as international security and climate change.

Foundation for International Relations and Foreign Dialogue (FRIDE)

FRIDE is a European think tank for global action, which provides innovative thinking and rigorous analysis of key debates in international relations. Its mission is to inform policy and practice in order to ensure that the EU plays a more effective role in supporting multilateralism, democratic values, security and sustainable development. Based in Madrid, FRIDE seeks to enhance the southern European perspective within EU debates and the European perspective within Spain. Its initiative "Agora Asia-Europe" provides a knowledge hub on Asia-Europe relations, connecting think tanks, analysts, policy-makers, opinion leaders and other experts from both regions. Through dialogue it provides input and advice for EU's approach towards Asia.

Institute for Strategic and Development Studies (ISDS Philippines)

The Institute for Strategic and Development Studies is an independent non-profit, policy research and advocacy institution based in Quezon City, Philippines. In cooperation with other training institutions at home and abroad it is also involved in training activities. It was founded by a group of academics from the University of the Philippines Diliman in April 1991. It was established in response to the need for an ongoing evaluation and interpretation of the changes in national and international affairs by serious international, regional, and national analysts. It was also aimed at responding to the need to provide academics a venue for research to enrich teaching and to provide inputs to policy-making.



EU Centre in Singapore

Established in 2008, the EU Centre in Singapore is a joint project of the European Union, the National University of Singapore (NUS), Nanyang Technological University (NTU) and the Singapore Institute of International Affairs (SIIA), and is part of a worldwide network of EU centres and EU institutes. We aim to promote knowledge and understanding of the EU and its impact on Singapore and the region, through activities revolving around outreach, education and research.

As part of our public outreach activities, the Centre organises an ongoing series of talks, lectures and seminars. The Centre contributes to education and research on the EU through organising academic conferences and by publishing background briefs, working papers, and policy and research briefs.

Copyright © 2014 EU Centre in Singapore

EU Centre in Singapore
11, Slim Barracks Rise
(off North Buona Vista Road)
#06-01 Executive Centre
NTU@one-north campus
Singapore 1388664

Tel: +65-65132007

Fax: +65-67741445

The EU Centre in Singapore is a partnership of

