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1. FOREWORD

The 4th Connecting Civil Societies of Asia and Europe Conference: Changing Challenges, New Ideas (CCS4) was held on 2-3 October 2010, in Brussels. Organised by the Asia-Europe Foundation (ASEF) and its partners in the Europe-Asia Policy Forum (Singapore Institute of International Affairs, International Institute of Asian Studies and European Policy Centre), this landmark conference took place on the eve of the 8th Asia-Europe Meeting (ASEM8 Summit).

While the global and regional environment in which the Asia-Europe Meeting (ASEM) operates has changed significantly since its inception in 1996, the ASEM process – through its broad range of dialogue channels and activities – continues to respond to the changing challenges facing Asia and Europe. As the only permanent ASEM institution, the Asia-Europe Foundation (ASEF) has an important function in connecting reflections on the ASEM level with the concerns of civil societies in the two regions.

The Connecting Civil Societies conference series has since its inception in 2004, provided a platform for constructive dialogue for greater cooperation across the ASEM countries. In recognition of the fact that the efforts of civil society actors are indispensable to bridging the ASEM community in the two regions, the conference series has facilitated dialogue between ASEM partners and civil society through an unconventional mix of participants from diverse sectors.

With 150 participants from 36 countries, CCS4, which took the format of seven concurrent workshops on key ASEM themes (education; lifelong learning; culture; public health; governance; regional community-building; and inter-regional integration processes) analysed and identified the current trends and issues for civil society cooperation, and forecast emerging issues that could have an impact on future ASEM dialogue and directions. The conference also featured the 5th Asia-Europe Editors’ Roundtable, which brought together 17 eminent editors and commentators to examine recent trends in global governance.

The conference deliberations took the form of a focused report which outlined key civil society concerns that could contribute to the ASEM agenda in the next two years and beyond. ‘Eight Points for ASEM8’ was delivered to the ASEM leaders at the ASEM8 Summit and has been well received. We thank all the conference participants for their active participation and hope that they will apply the workshop and conference outcomes to their own work.

The organisers also acknowledge the participation of the speakers at the opening and closing plenaries of CCS4. The panels were vital components of the conference and helped place the relevance of the conference in the context of the ASEM summit. We thank all our speakers for their contributions; in particular, we thank H.E Steven Vanackere, Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs, Belgium, for taking the time from his busy schedule to deliver the keynote conference address.

ASEF and the Europe-Asia Policy Forum organised the conference workshops in cooperation with 15 Asian and European institutions across a wide field of expertise. We are appreciative of this collaboration and thank all the workshop co-organisers for their cooperation.

We also acknowledge and thank the Belgian Federal Public Service of Foreign Affairs and the Japanese Ministry of Foreign Affairs; without whose kind support, the organisation of the CSS4 would not have been possible.

We are also grateful to the Belgian Federal Public Service of Foreign Affairs for coordinating with us on the administrative working of the conference details.
Finally for ASEF, as the main organiser of the event, CCS4 was a significant undertaking; and we thank all our ASEF colleagues for their hard work and dedication to ensure the success of the conference.

On behalf of the organisers

Ambassador Dominique Girard
Executive Director of the Asia-Europe Foundation (ASEF)
(November 2008 – July 2011)
2. SPEECHES

2.1. Speech by His Excellency Mr Steven Vanackere

**Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs, Belgium** (November 2009 – December 2011)

**Key Note Speech**

Ladies and Gentlemen,

Dear friends from Civil Society, Dear Guests,

Some of you have come a long way to exchange views on issues of shared interest between Asia and Europe. After all, this gathering brings together civil society representatives from Asia, the thriving region of these times, and from Europe, the single most advanced integration project in the world. It used to be the “East end” of the Eurasian continent meeting the “West end”, overcoming a long distance. Now, with the accession of Russia, Australia and New Zealand, whom we warmly welcome to the ASEM and the ASEF family, we are linking up.

Let me first of all express our common gratitude to Ambassador Dominique Girard, Executive Director of the Asia-Europe Foundation, Dr. Yeo Lay Hwee, Senior Research Fellow, Singapore Institute of International Affairs and Dr. Philippe Peycam, Director of International Institute of Asian Studies, for organising this Asia-Europe Connecting Civil Societies Conference in this recently refurbished SQUARE facilities, in the heart of our capital.

The Connecting Civil Societies Conferences have been there since 2004. They have provided over the years some outstanding examples of bringing together Asian and European civil societies, stimulating exchanges and doing their part in bringing Asia and Europe closer together.

I would dare to go a step further. The success of Connecting Civil Societies Conference is in itself an expression of the high degree of commonality that exists between Asia and Europe. Political structures in both regions have grown out of a long and turbulent history. Both can pride themselves of age old traditions and both present a wealth in cultural diversity. We have a common predilection for organised and structured relationships which foster security and stability between nations. We both strive for an economic model that is balanced between consumption, saving and investment and that can prove sustainable over the long term. Also, we both, I hope, place human development at the centre of our policies and favour multilateral and equitable governance of the world.

The truth is that Asia and Europe “face forward” together in the quest for greater wellbeing and more dignity for all citizens, the guiding idea announced by Belgium two years ago at the ASEM 7 Summit in Beijing. Captured in short as “Quality of Life”, the idea points to more than just material prosperity. It points to the essence of the human being, namely that he have the opportunity to live a dignified life, the possibility of conceiving projects and of implementing them, in short that he have the perspective of accomplishing his own destiny in life.

Indeed the last twenty years, enormous progress has been achieved (at least in the statistics) in raising the quality of life of Europeans and Asians alike. It is the result of a flourishing Asia and Europe have now become each other’s main trading and investment partner. Still, it is a secret to no one that now is not the time for complacency. We face important challenges. Two of them are at the top of the agenda of the ASEM8 Summit next week.
The first challenge remains the financial and economic crisis. Millions of citizens still suffer from its consequences. Government stopped the downward spiral in economic activity and in employment levels by rescuing the financial sector and by stimulating the real economy with increased expenditures. However, public finances are showing the strain, particularly in Europe. In spring, the Euro crisis forced the European governments to pursue accelerated fiscal consolidation and we will be busy with that kind of work for many years to come. Asia for its part faces the dangers of overheating economies, rising inflation and speculative bubbles. It is of utmost importance that Europe and Asia face these challenges without playing the blame game. In Beijing two years ago, the 3rd Connecting Civil Societies Conference, on managing the global financial crisis, recommended that, and I quote, “ASEM should promote greater co-operation in monetary and financial affairs within Asia and Europe and between the two regions.” This recommendation remains very valid today, with a view to sustaining the recovery, putting order in the public finances and completing the reform of banking regulation and supervision. As Asia and Europe have flourished together, they have to challenge the present difficulties together as well.

Moreover, next November, about a month after ASEM8, the G-20 gathers for a Summit in Seoul, the first such Summit to take place in a non-G-8 country, demonstrating that the G-20 is taking on a life of its own. Considering also that 12 ASEM members are simultaneously members of the G-20, ASEM8 strikes me as a good opportunity for Asia and Europe, in view of the Seoul meeting, to show leadership and promote the kind of measured and balanced responses to which both are historically inclined.

The second challenge equally concerns the quality of life of millions of European and Asians. We all know that the production and consumption patterns of the last years are not sustainable. Energy saving, resource efficient and clean technologies must be developed and deployed in order to pursue the objective of providing prosperity to all. Also, under the present difficult economic conditions, the preservation of social safety nets and of mechanisms for social solidarity has become an uphill battle. The European social system appeared quite surprisingly not only efficient to promote social justice but also a social stabilising system during the recent crisis.

Climate change, losses of biodiversity and rapid urbanization are endangering the future of our people. The 2nd and 3rd Connecting Civil Societies Conference concluded before, in both Helsinki in 2006 and in Beijing in 2008, that increased dialogue can contribute to address these issues. For instance, Helsinki recommended to expand dialogue on energy security and sustainable development with other key players outside the 2 regions (e.g. Russia, Middle East and USA) while the Beijing Conference urged European and Asian countries to work together towards a transition to low carbon energy. I can only agree and we hope that this 4th Connecting Civil Societies Conference will give a further impulse in this direction. The objective is to move together to more sustainable forms of development, and in this context also, to fight the persistence of poverty more efficiently. The recent UN High-Level Plenary Meeting in New York assessed progress towards the implementation of the Millennium Development Goals. Again, this is not the time for complacency. The crisis of the two last years has had an impact on the prospect of decisive progress towards reaching these goals but not all delays are attributable to it. We hope that this 4th Connecting Civil Societies Conference will look at concrete ways to raise the efficiency of our action.

The truth of the matter is that Europe and Asia are mutually fascinated by each other. This mutual curiosity is a common strategic asset. It is a solid basis to build a tighter relationship in the interest of achieving more sustainable development. Consolidating and enlarging the common ground would allow Europe and Asia to play a greater role in defining the outcome of important gatherings.
Ladies and gentlemen,

The first ASEM meeting in Bangkok in 1996 stated up front that an important goal of ASEM is to build greater understanding between the peoples through closer people-to-people contacts.

True to this mandate, ASEM8 is proving to be more than the Summit of the leaders alone. The 6th Asia-Europe Parliamentary Partnership Meeting took place earlier this week. The 8th People's Forum is bringing together non-governmental organisations, including trade unions, from both regions, 300 people in all. The 12th Business Forum will meet on the side on October 4th, with a focus on the integration of the respective financial sectors. All these are very important because they assure the continuity of the ASEM process and for the friendship among Asians and Europeans.

Talking about friendship, I cannot but evoke the magnificent exhibition “A Passage to Asia” which I opened at BOZAR, Centre for Fine Arts of Brussels, a few months ago. The exhibit tells the impressive story of 25 centuries of exchanges between Asia and Europe. There is no better illustration of the historical background to the current ASEM meetings. Yet, the way the exhibit came about is a story in itself. Everyone should know that it results from the collaborative efforts and resources from the participating Asian countries and from Belgium. A nicer symbol can hardly be imagined for the commonality of enterprise which ASEM embodies.

Dear friends,

Belgium is of course particularly proud to host the ASEM8 Summit and the parallel and outreach gatherings. I say this not only because it promises to be a grand event, one of the greater challenges while my country holds the rotating presidency of the EU. I say this also because I sense an opportunity for Europe and Asia to make new steps forward and towards each other.

In the name of the Belgian Government, I express the sincere hope that this 4th Connecting Civil Societies Conference will contribute to new developments in the relationship, to new plans for the future, to new projects around which to mobilize our people's energies. As we ponder the measures to take in response to the crisis, as we seek to tackle the longer term challenge of fostering sustainable development, we have a duty to be imaginative. We also must produce concrete results, because you know, as one of my favourite saying goes: good ideas not only need wings, they also need landing gear. As we prepared for all these Asia-Europe encounters together with our European and Asian partners, we realized that we can do more and also that we can do better. I would like to call also on you to help us move the comprehensive, equal and mutually beneficial Asia-Europe strategic partnership to a new level.

In my view, the Asia-Europe Foundation plays a specific role in this relationship. Because you are from within the societies and contribute to shape perceptions, your work enjoys natural attention, visibility and, as a politician I would like to add, credibility. You are the opinion makers and what you jointly say carries the authority of a debate held.

Thank you very much.
2.2. Speech by Ambassador Dominique Girard

ASEF Executive Director (November 2008 – July 2011)

Welcome Speech

Good morning distinguished participants, ladies and gentlemen,

I warmly welcome you to Brussels and to the 4th Connecting Civil Societies Conference, or what we call CCS4.

Connecting Civil Societies takes place as an official side event of the ASEM8 Summit. It is a joint venture of four institutions that work together in a consortium called the Europe-Asia Policy Forum: the International Institute of Asian Studies (IIAS), the Singapore Institute of International Affairs (SIIA), the European Policy Centre (EPC), and the Asia-Europe Foundation (ASEF), ASEM’s only permanent institution.

I am very happy for the honour to welcome today nearly 150 people from 35 countries - a rich diversity of ASEM voices. Connecting Civil Societies brings together government and civil society representatives who work in the field of education, public health, research and think tanks, human rights, youth, the arts and culture, urban planning and the media. I am also glad to welcome representatives from the ASEM community – the Asia-Europe Business Forum (AEBF) and the Asia-Europe People’s Forum (AEPF).

ASEF is proud to organise this conference for three reasons – which also form the basis of our mission:

1) Connecting Civil Societies is a platform for unique dialogue and networking;

2) It is a forum where priority issues in Asia-Europe relations are identified and discussed, and recommendations and solutions are formulated;

3) It complements the ASEM process with a civil society component and contribution.

1) CCS4 as a platform for unique dialogue and networking

Since the Asia-Europe Foundation was founded thirteen years ago in 1997, our constant objective has been to build bridges and networks between the two regions. ASEF’s mission is to create better mutual understanding between Asians and Europeans, to replace existing indifference and ignorance with awareness and knowledge, to change inaccurate perceptions and overcome prejudices, and to build common ground for future action.

His Excellency Steven Vanackere, Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs for Belgium, has earlier mentioned that we neither “look East nor West, but forward”. We do, because Asia and Europe are built on a century-long, rich history of political, economic and cultural engagement. We had and have so much to share.

There is no doubt that ASEF’s mission is ambitious. If we want to be successful, we have to design our projects and activities in a way that they can modify attitudes, to encourage people’s willingness to view one another as equals worthy of respect. ASEF does not offer room for arrogance or condescension. How shall we otherwise be open and learn from each other? ASEF’s activities are engaging, involving people from all walks of life. Our work is based on the spirit of mutual respect and trust.
Connecting Civil Societies is an important step in this direction. The conference invites you to an open exchange – on an intellectual, people-to-people and cultural level. I am glad that all of you will experience over the next two days the gist of ASEF’s work, and ASEF’s idea of providing platforms for constructive dialogue. I encourage you to speak frankly with one another, to be led by both curiosity and courtesy. Only knowledge leads to understanding, and understanding leads to respect.

As with all our activities, ASEF has also adopted an inclusive approach for Connecting Civil Societies. We worked in close partnership with other institutions from Asia and Europe. The potential of such partnerships is tremendous and, if I count the number correctly, we have involved 16 institutions in the conceptualisation and organisation of this meeting, always matching Asian with European partners.

This is ASEF’s modus operandi and exactly what we are supposed to do: being a facilitator and a multiplier. We target institutions and individuals whose exchanges will help clarify issues, establish connections, bring about confidence or just knowledge – to further improve the conditions for higher level interaction.

2) CCS4 as a forum to formulate recommendations on issues of common concern to the leaders

The second significance of this conference can be found in the choice of the theme and content of our meeting, “Changing Challenges, New Ideas”. Seven thematic workshops take place at Connecting Civil Societies. They touch a number of specific and sometimes difficult and sensitive issues, including regional conflict management, regional integration, the financing of higher education, challenges in lifelong learning policies, the role of the youth in promoting public health, the right to information for environmental protection, development and anti-corrupt practices, and the role of arts in globalised urban contexts. On Sunday, ASEF in partnership with Chatham House also organises a roundtable discussion with senior editors of European and Asian media who will deliberate on the topic “Asia and Europe: Engaging for a Post-Crisis World”.

You will have many important issues to raise and questions to ask in the next two days. Yes, do engage in a free and candid exchange of views, even if some topics may be controversial. A clear consensus may not always be found, but I am confident that you will gain insight into current challenges and highlight particular areas of action for Asia and Europe. Joint reflection and exchange of perspectives will plant the seed for future initiatives.

At the end of the conference, the results of seven workshop discussions will feed into a focused report that will outline the main concerns of civil society that could contribute to the ASEM agenda in the next two years and beyond. Key recommendations will be formulated in a joint conference declaration and conveyed to the ASEM Leaders.

3) CCS4 complements the ASEM process as a civil society component

Inter-regional dialogue is an indispensable facility, and ASEM’s sustainability directly derives from that fact. ASEM was founded in 1996 as an “incarnation” of the existing Europe-Asia partnership to renew the commitment to and build a framework for co-operation in the area of politics, economy, and culture. It has a unique role with its informal dialogue structure. But ASEM’s political dialogue need not and cannot be conducted only on an official track.
ASEF was created as the political tool of ASEM to help the two regions to develop, beyond their immediate interests, the ability to communicate and co-operate with the support and involvement of the people. Through ASEF’s activities, civil society concerns are included as a vital component of deliberations of the Asia-Europe Meeting. Connecting Civil Societies is an excellent example of this component – a dialogue among the real people of Asia and Europe, which will hopefully enrich the dialogue between Asian and European policy makers.

Allow me to provide you with the history. This is the fourth edition of the Connecting Civil Societies Conference series that started in 2004 in Barcelona. On the occasion of ASEM6 Summit in 2006, ASEF organised the 2nd Connecting Civil Societies Conference in Helsinki, in Finland. The third conference, held as an official side-event of ASEM7 in Beijing in 2008, took place in the midst of the financial and economic crisis and focused on the topic “Dialogue on Economy and Society”.

On Monday and Tuesday, leaders of 46 Asian and European countries plus the European Commission and the ASEAN Secretariat will meet in Brussels for the 8th Asia-Europe Meeting (ASEM8). Connecting Civil Societies will complement this process by involving civil society voices from both regions to reflect on their common concerns. I hope that conference participants will find areas of convergence in their discussions and reduce the areas of divergence between Asians and Europeans. Deep and robust Asia-Europe relations are the cornerstone of the global architecture. It is only logical and natural that both regions work towards closer links as the significance of Asia-Europe relations will increase with time.

Thank you for your attention.
3. EIGHT POINTS FOR ASEM8: CONFERENCE REPORT

Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs of Belgium, H.E. Mr Steven Vanackere delivered the key note address of the 4th Connecting Civil Societies Conference to an audience of more than 150 leading representatives from diverse sectors in ASEM countries, thereby marking the official opening of the conference. The Asia-Europe Foundation (ASEF) and the Europe-Asia Policy Forum organised the event in cooperation with 15 Asian and European institutions across a wide field of expertise. The conference also featured the 5th Asia-Europe Editors’ Roundtable, which brought together 17 eminent editors and commentators to examine recent trends in global governance.¹

I. Advance Inter-regionalism and Regional Integration

Asia and Europe need more knowledge about each other and about their inter-regional relations. ASEM should therefore mobilise civil society organisations, higher education institutions and think-tanks in order to facilitate the creation of an ASEM knowledge community that enhances mutual understanding. Three concrete avenues for this are proposed:

• ASEM should create more space for mutual learning by facilitating civil society exchanges between Europe and Asia and by increasing the civil society participation to ASEM processes.

• ASEM should put Higher Education and Research cooperation as one of its top priorities, and stimulate long-term research cooperation between young researchers on topics of common interest.

• ASEM should contribute to strengthen the capacity of academic research institutes and think-tanks in Europe and Asia to understand each other's societies by facilitating exchanges, mobility and collaboration, as well as by facilitating the set-up of an ASEM network of think tanks.

II. Mobilise Resources for Higher Education

• Higher education is a public good and a fundamental element of economic, social and cultural development. Governments need to provide continued support to ensure continuity, quality, diversity, equity and access.

• Governments need to facilitate an effective and efficient degree of autonomy in higher education institutions. Higher education institutions should actively involve other stakeholders, including students, in managing their resources, in defining strategic priorities and in evaluating outcomes.

• Costs and funding models should be defined by the needs and expectations of students as well as employers and the wider society. In the ASEM context, an effort should be made to explore supranational and cross-regional strategies.

¹ The 4th Connecting Civil Societies Conference was jointly organised by the Asia-Europe Foundation (ASEF) and the Europe-Asia Policy Forum consortium: the European Policy Centre (EPC), the International Institute for Asian Studies (IIAS) and the Singapore Institute of International Affairs (SIIA). The content of this Briefing is derived from the workshop discussions and does not reflect the official position of the conference organisers, nor their sponsors.
III. Harness Voluntary Service for Lifelong Learning

Living and working in the ASEM area increasingly demands new and more complex skills and competences in personal, social and professional spheres. Therefore, experts on lifelong learning, non-formal education and voluntary service recommend:

• The development, maintenance and updating of these skills and competences through lifelong learning to build and enhance constructive and closer co-operation in the ASEM region;

• The development of sustainable and participative learning societies by redesigning relations between all forms of education and working activities through lifelong learning;

• Strengthening civil societies through lifelong learning that encompasses formal, non-formal and informal learning and by recognition of prior learning and voluntary activities.

IV. Build Regional Communities for Post-Conflict Reconciliation

Civil society organisations urge ASEM leaders to identify a common regional vision founded on common goals, affirmed by historical recognition, and supported by trans-regional and multi-stakeholder cooperation. There is a critical and urgent need for Northeast Asia in particular, and East Asia as a whole, to develop a mechanism for, at minimum, dialogue and confidence-building in order to guard against violent conflict. The region remains divided, with the Korean peninsula divide one of the most dangerous flashpoints in the world. There remain many other points of potential conflict, including unresolved territorial disputes linked to natural resources such as those over the Diaoyu/Senkaku Islands and the Spratly Islands. ASEM governments are urged to:

• Set up an independent, multi-stakeholder grouping (comprising educators, education ministries, media and NGOs) to address issues of historical recognition based on or connected to existing mechanisms in Northeast Asia and the European Union.

• Strengthen the ASEAN+3 dialogue specifically at an informal working level, for example, amongst mid-level government officials.

• Critically assess the successes and failures of both Asian and European post-war reconciliation experiences, like the European Coal and Steel Commission and Article 9 of the Japanese Constitution, with a view to building strategies for regional stability and trust building.

V. Guarantee the Right to Information

The right of individuals to access information held by public authorities is essential for civic engagement, to make governments accountable and ensure sustainable development – including the fight against poverty and corruption. ASEM governments are urged to:

• Recognise and respect the right of the public to seek, receive and impart information by adopting and implementing comprehensive national rights to information legislation based on international standards; and to ensure the fullest transparency and citizen’s access to information in all bilateral and multilateral negotiations leading to treaties and agreements.
• Accede to and extend their commitment to international treaties and conventions that advance the right to information, in particular the UNECE Convention on Access to Information, Public Participation in Decision-making and Access to Justice in Environmental Matters (Aarhus Convention). Furthermore, they should require that the international institutions (to which they are a party) adopt transparency policies. In particular, they should proactively provide information needed by the public, especially vulnerable groups, to hold these institutions accountable.

• ASEM leaders should enable and encourage civil society initiatives that promote the right to information and facilitate the exchange of experiences and resources across ASEM countries to effectuate this right.

VI. Promote Public Health through “Young” Ideas

• Relevant government ministries, in cooperation with civil society, are called upon to develop and address greater inter-regional mechanisms for sharing knowledge on the development and delivery of school curricula on Sexual and Reproductive Health and Rights (SRHR) and on healthy lifestyles including nutrition, sports and avoiding drug abuse. Similar financial and policy support can also be extended to informal and non-formal education as well as to strengthen web-based access to youth-friendly health information and services.

• Considering that the current level of engagement of both governmental and non-governmental actors in the promotion of public health for the youth is still insufficient, equal weight must be accorded to the youth sector as a valued partner in policy-making, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of public health programmes for young people in both regions.

• ASEM governments should empower and mobilise young people in public health promotion by strengthening Asian regional youth structures as a partner to their existing European counterparts. Governments, in cooperation with civil society, are called upon to enable capacity development such as inter-regional youth camps and leadership trainings. Particular support to encourage social entrepreneurship is needed. Examples include training young people in social entrepreneurial skills as well as providing incentives to young entrepreneurs active in public health promotion.

VII. Apply the Arts in Sustainable Urban Development

To meet the demands of living well together in the future, the art of “city-making” must embrace ecological growth to mean social, environmental, cultural and economic diversity. Inter-sectoral, transversal and sensitive approaches to urban development are needed, e.g. creating indeterminate common spaces for shared use in cities. Governance must involve transparent forms of dialogue, mutual learning as well as genuine and effective participation. The arts can serve these processes as a dynamic catalyst and generate imagination among all other disciplines. To this end, it is recommended that:

• ASEM governments need to integrate the significant contributions of artwork and art-creating processes in urban development. They are urged to establish an enabling environment for the active involvement of artists and other creative practitioners in urban development policies. In particular, they should create enabling environments for the development of greater numbers of small arts organisations/initiatives. These initiatives must be engaged in participatory and trans-disciplinary processes that respond to the needs of diverse communities.
ASEM governments should actively consider looking beyond arts education towards a deeper role for art-in-education. This should include artistic ways of learning (such as experiential learning, question-based learning and non-linear problem-solving skills). The arts have a relevant role to play in formal, informal and non-formal education as well as in lifelong learning. Artists and other creative practitioners should be included in consultative bodies on education policies.

VIII. Asia and Europe: Engaging for a Post-Crisis World

The 5th Asia-Europe Editors’ Roundtable

The ASEM8 Summit is occurring at a critical moment of profound global transition. There is an urgent need for Asia and Europe to learn from each other as challenges and risks are increasingly inter-connected across borders as well as across sectors. The issue of global governance reflects the impact of a shift in power from the West to the East. Europe is over-represented in global institutions and growing focus on the legitimacy of institutions has led to a questioning of this over-representation. However, it is difficult to conceive of EU member states willingly giving up global political power. Consequently, a flourishing of ad hoc G20-like institutions (or indeed the entrenchment of the G20) seems more plausible than the adaptation of existing institutions.

European engagement with Asia therefore needs to recognise widespread Asian distrust of the EU’s perceived morally-superior agenda predicated on human rights. This agenda is undermined by, for instance, the treatment of immigrants to the EU. In short, Europe-Asia engagement should focus on institutional processes, and issues of governance enabling Asia to learn practical lessons from the EU. Projects need to be constructive, and Europe needs to recognise its own limitations.

More than this, the EU needs vision. A serious intra-EU dialogue on over-representation in global institutions would allow for a more serious and deeper partnership with the rising powers of Asia, and concrete acceptance of the importance of Asia. ASEM Leaders are aware of the real challenges posed by a rising Asia. However, Leaders should also persuade the public that this development provides a good opportunity for both regions to engage each other and to work towards international mechanisms that will facilitate cooperation and minimise friction.
4. PROGRAMME

Workshops

**Workshop 1**
Who Should Pay for Higher Education?

“Who should pay for (higher) education?” was the question discussed among higher education and finance experts and students alike. The workshop presented recent research on future funding for universities. Public funding as well as ways of diversifying universities’ income streams and cost-sharing approaches in higher education in various ASEM countries was tackled. This workshop facilitated an exchange between students – as beneficiaries of higher education – and finance and education experts about possible funding models for a sustainable higher education landscape.

*Co-organised with the Asian Institute of Management (AIM) and the European University Association (EUA)*

**Workshop 2**
Creating Skills and Competences for Living and Working in the ASEM area

Living and working in the ASEM area increasingly demands skills and competences in the personal, public and professional spheres. These skills and competences should be developed, maintained and updated as part of lifelong learning to respond successfully to changes in the growing inter-regionalisation process. The development of ASEM dialogue and cooperation in the field of lifelong learning has since 2005 been mainly between policy makers and researchers. This workshop aimed to involve civil society partners in this existing dialogue and create an expanded platform for stakeholders from non-formal and voluntary work in adult learning. This workshop in particular focused on future cooperation between research in lifelong learning and the voluntary sector, and formulated recommendations for new Asia-Europe initiatives.

*Co-organised with the Co-ordinating Committee for International Voluntary Service (CCIVS) and the ASEM Education and Research Hub for Lifelong Learning (ASEM LLL Hub)*

**Workshop 3**
Sustainable Creative Cities: The Role of the Arts in Globalised Urban Contexts

The workshop addressed the roles of artists and creative workers in the evolution of globalised cities across Asia and Europe, assessing how an “artistic mode of knowing” can contribute to a transition from creative cities to sustainable creative cities. The aim was to facilitate the emergence of local urban processes of social change in partnerships between artists, cultural practitioners and communities, as opposed to top-down urban planning. The workshop engaged artists and cultural practitioners, as well as architects, urban planners, cultural policymakers and experts of local governance. Outcomes of the workshop bear relevance for local governance and for ASEM cultural policy.

*Co-organisers: ASEF, Institute of Cultural Theory, Research and the Arts, Leuphana University and Urban Research Plaza, Osaka City University*
Workshop 4
The Role of Youth in Public Health Promotion: New Ideas, Young Ideas

Transnational outbreaks of infectious diseases like SARS and H1N1, and the continuing spread of HIV/AIDS, all serve to illustrate the diversity of global health threats and their impact on economic and social stability. The exchange of health knowledge between Asia and Europe has been described as extremely asymmetrical: “the West” gave the concepts, institutions and practices, while Asia received. In this process of knowledge-sharing and collaboration the role of youth has often been neglected. Following on the 16th ASEF University on Public Health and Vulnerable Groups: Access to Quality Healthcare Services, this workshop focused on the role of youth organisations, networks and movements in the field of Public Health, and the possible government programmes to support these youth initiatives. Special attention was placed on reviewing lessons learnt from ongoing projects in Asia and Europe, and on seeking ways to improve capacity building and information sharing.

Co-organised with the ASEF University Alumni Network (ASEFUAN) and Prospex

Workshop 5
Building Regional Community: Translating the European Experience to East Asia

While the European region managed to transform itself from a continent destroyed by World War II and divided during the Cold War to arguably the world’s most effective and active regional community, East Asia – particularly Northeast Asia – remains largely fragmented and divided along Cold War lines, and is a dangerous flashpoint for potential regional and global conflict. What can East Asia learn from groupings like the EU and ASEAN, to build regional community in both the formal and informal sectors?

Co-organised with Peace Boat, the Georg Eckert Institute for International Textbook Research and the European Centre for Conflict Prevention

Workshop 6
The Right to Information

Governments across the world are adopting Right to Information laws and regulations that require public bodies to make available information of public interest to their citizens. This reflects the recognition of the Right to Information as a fundamental human right, essential for meaningful democracy and the realisation of other human and socio-economic rights. This workshop examined the trends and best practices in effectuating this right, in particular those relating to environmental protection, development and anti-corruption.

Co-organised with Article 19 and the Foundation for Media Alternatives (FMA)
Workshop 7
The EU and Asia: Inter-Regionalism and Regional Integration

As the world becomes increasingly regionalised, new avenues for inter-regional relations between Europe and Asia have opened up. Regional integration however, can take many forms. This workshop examined the role of civil society in regional and inter-regional integration processes with a special focus on think-tanks as actors and education as a subject of inter-regionalism.

Co-organised with the United Nations University Institute on Comparative Regional Integration Studies (UNU-CRIS) in Bruges (Belgium) and Institute on Comparative Regional Integration Studies at Tsinghua University (Tsinghua-CRIS) in Beijing (China)

The 5th Asia-Europe Editors’ Roundtable
Asia and Europe: Engaging for a Post-Crisis World

In the aftermath of the international financial and economic crisis, and with lessons drawn from the United Nations Climate Change Conference 2009 in Copenhagen, there is widespread recognition that there are serious shortcomings in the present global architecture for responding to these new challenges. Given these, as well as international media attention on the Eurozone crisis, the 5th Asia-Europe Editors’ Roundtable was a unique opportunity for eminent editors and commentators to participate in a focused discussion on re-thinking necessary international mechanisms and institutions for credible and effective governance. The Roundtable also examined recent trends in global governance and find shared ground between Asia and Europe for building consensus on the future international financial architecture.

Co-organised with Chatham House
## Summary Programme

### Friday 1 Oct 2010
@ Crowne Plaza Europa Hotel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19:00 – 20:30</td>
<td>Informal Welcome Reception and Dinner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Crowne Plaza Europa Hotel, Schumann Room</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Saturday 2 Oct 2010
@ The Square

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:30 – 10:00</td>
<td>Keynote Speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H.E. Steven Vanackere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs, Belgium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00 – 10:30</td>
<td>Welcome Remarks by Organisers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 – 12:30</td>
<td>Panel: Views from the ASEM community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30 – 13:45</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:00 – 18:00</td>
<td>Workshop Sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:00 – 21:00</td>
<td>Dinner Reception and Cultural Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A Passage to Asia: 25 Centuries of Exchange between Asia and Europe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sunday 3 Oct 2010
@ The Square

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09:00 – 12:00</td>
<td>Workshop Sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:15 – 13:45</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:00 – 16:00</td>
<td>Plenary Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Presentation of workshop outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:00 – 17:00</td>
<td>Conference Report Preparation session for Workshop Rapporteurs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:15 – 17:45</td>
<td>Closing Plenary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

In parallel: 5th Asia-Europe Editors’ Roundtable
5. DETAILED THEMATIC WORKSHOP REPORTS

Workshop 1

Who Should Pay for Higher Education?

Co-organisers: ASEF, Asian Institute of Management (AIM), European University Association (EUA)

Background

The number of students in higher education has doubled in the past thirty years. In some Asian countries, the demand is likely to triple over the next ten years. A recent workshop for higher education and finance experts, organised by the ASEM Education Hub (the higher education initiative under the auspices of ASEF) and the Asian Institute of Management, Manila, on the “Impact of the Financial Crisis to Higher Education” prompted the organisers of this CCS4 workshop to further explore the question of higher education funding at ASEM level. The core of the debate: Who will bear the cost of the rising number of students seeking higher education? What can we learn from current funding practices and what are the views of the various stakeholders involved?

Workshop objectives and participants

This workshop brought together practitioners and researchers from higher education and finance, as well as students as the main beneficiaries of higher education. The first part of the workshop addressed aspects of higher education funding from the perspective of governments and institutions. Two experts from higher education and finance gave an introduction to start off panel discussions representing various stakeholders from ASEM. Mr. Thomas Estermann of the European University Association (EUA) presented the results of a Europe-wide research project on the diversification of universities’ income streams and sustainable public funding. Prof. Brahm Prakash, professor at the Asian Institute of Management and a consultant for the Asian Development Bank and UNESCO, provided a macroeconomic approach to funding higher education, system inefficiencies and the limits of public funding in the wake of the global economic and financial crisis. The second part of the workshop looked at specific cost-sharing models for student loans and grants, as introduced by Dr. Igor Kitaev of UNESCO's International Institute for Education Planning. The inclusion of students in the workshop ensured that experts and practitioners considered their perspective in the funding debate.

Discussion on “Who Should Pay for Higher Education?”

In general, there was little dispute among the participants about higher education as a merit good that needed public support. There was less consensus on the magnitude and exact form of the support. How much higher education is needed and how should the cost be shared? In countries with a growing but still quite exclusive tertiary education sector especially, like India and other emerging economies, concerns were expressed whether many should pay for the education of a few. Indeed, the cultural background and history of higher education in a country is an important factor in the expectations of stakeholders. In traditionally fee-free countries like Germany, Belgium and Scandinavian countries, the change of funding models to include cost-sharing mechanisms would be much more of a diplomatic than a technical challenge. However, the sheer lack of comparable data also made the search for consensus more difficult.
The role of the government(s)

As some participants noted, the question is not only who should pay, but who can pay for higher education. The meeting identified possible sources of funding:

- Public (i.e. State), divided into ‘core’ funding that does not interfere with autonomy, ‘targeted’ funding that does interfere with autonomy, and ‘variable’ funding, based on meeting pre-defined objectives, that also limits autonomy.

- Private, understood to be the payment of fees by students and/or households

- Contracts (for research, continuing education, etc.)

- Philanthropy (endowments, donations)

- The sale of service or the entrepreneurial management of the higher education institute’s patrimony.

Moreover, there was a call for an even more specific formulation of the question to possibly distinguish between who should pay for which level and type of education. As a case example, the Dutch model was mentioned as it charges different levels of tuition fees for pre- and post-experience Master’s degrees. Another variable could be the timeline: who paid and pays before/now/in the future? One can also distinguish between different rates that beneficiaries pay, e.g., state residents and non-state residents in the US. Another important question regards the mismatch between theory and practice of funding models. A case example from India illustrated that student loans in India are tied to high securities, which those that are in need usually cannot provide. The exercise of determining who is asking the question and identifying to whom the question is addressed helped clarify how the workshop should formulate recommendations. Clearly, any recommendation issued to governments must take account of the impact on other stakeholders involved, such as, in particular, the universities and their fiscal arrangements.

So, what should be the role of government in funding higher education? The participants agreed that the state should not look at funding in isolation, but in the context of its objectives for the Higher Education sector. Both the government and the universities must look at output with efficiency and equity in mind. The workshop supported the view expressed by the European Students’ Union that state funding should ensure equitable access to higher education (see recommendations).

Autonomy and accountability

The autonomy of universities must be guaranteed to ensure the effectiveness and efficiency of higher education. The financial crisis showed that in some countries, the lack thereof has led to the collapse of the sector (e.g. Latvia). This plea towards government, however, needs to be matched by a rethinking within higher education institutions themselves. Several participants from both ASEM regions gave examples of the inefficient use of universities’ resources. From a macroeconomic perspective, these problems arise from the conflicting roles between financers and managers of education, i.e. those who pay are not those who manage. As Prof. Prakash pointed out: “How does it usually work? The one who pays is the one who decides what is proposed – that is not the case in higher education”. Higher education institutions must therefore cultivate a better accountability model. In fact, there is little information on the real costs in many ASEM countries. Universities need to be encouraged to use their resources efficiently and effectively as enterprises responsible for their products, outcomes and processes. Mr. Estermann proposed to support leadership development within institutions, e.g. for the professionalisation of management to translate...
governance and university autonomy reforms into success stories. Understandably, the call for greater autonomy and accountability leads to further discussion about which stakeholders should be involved in university governance.

Common challenges in ASEM

The terms “university as an enterprise” and “higher education as a product” rang disharmoniously in the ears of some participants, and not without some justification. The position of the German Students’ Union illustrated that the degree to which higher education can be understood as a product depends on the cultural and geographic background of the speaker. The challenge for Germany, for example, lies more strongly on ensuring equitable access, starting at secondary school level. Regardless of whether higher education is understood to be a product or a cultural good, participants recognised that higher education has entered a competitive age. It is globally lucrative, linked to immigration policies, and has become a make-or-buy decision in several countries. For instance, in many Asian countries, money is invested in (outbound) international education. Higher education will therefore need to be defended at the global level. ASEM/ASEF was called upon to use its strategic role in this field.

Role of higher education in society

Participants noted that some profound rethinking of the role of higher education is needed. Parallels to the health sector were drawn, in the sense that health is also seen as a merit good. Their impact on society, the costs of inertia and of reacting late, the diversity of sources and the need for efficient use thereof are challenges that both sectors have in common.

Strategic planning for higher education should therefore include research and lifelong learning, amongst others. As brought up in the context of universities’ accountability culture, a “revolving door policy” might be encouraged, to expose university staff to other sectors (governments, business and civil society organisations) and vice versa. This will enhance collaboration, mutual understanding and mutual support. The role of the government will be, as mentioned above, to provide the framework conditions to ensure that higher education institutions have the necessary resources to fulfil their mission to society at large.

Key message and recommendations

Members of the workshop “Who should pay for higher education?” submitted the following recommendations to ASEM leaders. Overall, the workshop aimed to contribute to strengthening the ability of higher education to fulfil its social dimension to provide equal opportunities to quality education.

1. Establish the right framework conditions to ensure sufficient and sustainable public funding.

Higher education is a public good and a constituent element of economic, social, political and cultural development. The role of the government is to provide continued support to ensure continuity, quality, access, equity, diversity and sustainability. Diversity encompasses academic disciplines, fields of research, variety of services, transfer of knowledge, technology, culture, values and beliefs, as well as geographic diversity.
In practical terms, this means that governments should formulate a strategy for determining funding priorities and levels. Where demand for higher education goes beyond the limit of public funding, the government should ensure that someone pays, e.g. by stimulating the private sector. Public support is needed to support the overall objectives. In particular, governments should compensate for the shortcomings of market-driven higher education by guaranteeing access for meritorious students from households that are marginalised territorially or socio-economically. On the other hand, it should subsidise the disciplines and research fields that are not supported by market forces.

As national systems are highly diverse and as we lack comparable data, we further recommend ASEM-wide data collection or pilot studies to make informed decisions, in particular to identify whether and what kind of support can be provided at supranational (ASEM) level.

2. Promote autonomy and accountability

Governments should facilitate the effective and efficient autonomy of higher education institutions in managing their resources, i.e. in defining strategic priorities and in evaluating outcomes. Universities further need to be encouraged and supported in cultivating better accountability models that engage other stakeholders, including students.

In practical terms, support can be provided by leadership development within institutions (for the professionalisation of management) or by breaking down the “ivory tower” paradigm: for instance, through support for arrangements to circulate academics through the private sector, government and civil society organisations, and vice versa, in order to enhance collaboration, mutual understanding and mutual support.

3. Engage stakeholders across sectors and borders

Higher education today has diverse sectoral and geographic dimensions more than ever before. Government and the public must therefore make a careful determination of what are the “musts” (elements that the state must provide to everyone) and the “wants” (elements that are desirable but not essential or even possible for everyone). The levels of costs and models of funding should correspond to these considerations.

In the ASEM context, an effort should be made to explore multi-sectoral, supra-national and cross-regional strategies.

4. Invest in pilot studies

For an informed comparison, ASEM should commission pilot studies on:

- Private/public education and the full range of potential funding sources for the teaching and research mission of higher education institutions;

- Models of higher education governance that promote autonomy and accountability. The pilot projects could be used to identify and experiment with innovative models of funding in two to three countries in each region and to consolidate collaboration among higher education institutions, productive forces, wider society and government at all levels. The aim is to establish a minimum model of funding (public, private, philanthropic and through sale of services) and of direct (individual income and taxes) and indirect returns (social benefits, transfer of knowledge and culture).
ABOUT THE CO-ORGANISERS

ASEF organised this workshop with

**Asian Institute of Management (AIM)**
http://www.aim.edu.ph

The Asian Institute of Management (AIM) is one of the leading international graduate management schools in Asia. It was founded in 1968 as a joint project of the Inter-University Consortium consisting of three of the top schools in the Philippines – Ateneo de Manila, De La Salle College and the University of the Philippines. The consortium had received a grant from the Ford Foundation for the development of a full-time MBA program, with Harvard University as project grant administrator. For 40 years AIM has been known as “Harvard of Asia” using the case method as the primary mode of learning in all its programs.

AIM has received numerous awards and was voted into the Partnership in International Management (PIM), an international association of the finest management schools in North America, Latin America and Europe. In 2000, it became the first graduate school of management in the world to receive ISO 14001 Certification, and in 2004, AIM was accredited by the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB). It was the first graduate business school in Southeast Asia to attain accreditation from the two major international accrediting institutions, AACSB and European Foundation for Management Development (EFMD)

**European University Association (EUA)**
http://www.eua.be

The European University Association (EUA) represents and supports higher education institutions in 46 countries across Europe, providing them with a unique forum to cooperate and keep abreast of the latest trends in higher education and research policies. Members of the Association are over 800 European universities involved in teaching and research, 34 national associations of rectors and about 40 other organisations active in higher education and research.

EUA plays an essential role in shaping tomorrow’s European higher education and research landscape thanks to its unique knowledge of the sector and the diversity of its members. The Association’s mandate in the Bologna process, contribution to EU research policy-making and relations with inter-governmental organisations, European institutions and international associations, ensure its capacity to debate issues which are crucial for universities in relation to higher education, research and innovation.
Workshop 2
Creating Skills and Competences for Living and Working in the ASEM Area
Co-organisers: ASEF, Co-ordinating Committee for International Voluntary Service (CCIVS), ASEM Education and Research Hub for Lifelong Learning (ASEM LLL Hub)

Background

The development of ASEM dialogue and cooperation in the field of lifelong learning has since 2005 been mainly between policy makers and researchers, in order to facilitate education reforms based on research evidence from comparative studies and good practices in Asia and Europe. However, the extent and growing potential of the wide network of civil society organisations building ASEM relations through the “Solidarity of facts” prospected by EU father Jean Monnet, is still to be fully understood and exploited by the different stakeholders.

Workshop objectives and participants

This workshop brought together researchers from universities, experts from international organisations, practitioners from NGOs and various networks of volunteers.

The key questions that this workshop sought to answer were:

- How to build future cooperation between research in lifelong learning and the voluntary sector in ASEM countries?
- How to develop a set of standards to measure the impact of voluntary work in creating skills and competences for individuals, organisations, communities and societies at large?
- How to combine formal and non-formal education in promoting adult learning through voluntary activities and coordinating students’ and young adults’ participation in voluntary work?

Discussion on “Creating Skills and Competences for Living and Working in the ASEM Area”

To answer the questions, the workshop participants analysed the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats in creating possible links between the five thematic research networks of the ASEM Lifelong Learning (LLL) Hub and international voluntary service in Asia and Europe, which bring about the development of key competences and facilitate lifelong learning, especially non-formal learning for personal and professional development of young adults.

Strengths

- The knowledge and expertise of the two organisations are seen as a strength and potential for developing complementary linkages between LLL and Voluntary sector.

- Voluntary sector can implement and disseminate research results by engaging thousands of adult learners in voluntary activities. Voluntary service can also serve as site for research in LLL.

- LLL research can improve practices in the voluntary sector, which in turn supports the development of civil society through lifelong learning.
LLL research brings about better understanding of different forms of learning, and therefore enables voluntary organisations and professionals to develop contents and processes that serve as tools for competence development.

Linkages between LLL research and the voluntary sector can provide potential for redesigning relations between education and work in today societies.

Linkages between LLL research and voluntary work help to improve recognition of the value and meaning of voluntary activities, and increase the opportunity for recruiting volunteers.

**Weaknesses**

- There are different understandings of lifelong learning.
- There is a lack of interaction between stakeholders, a lack of recognition of scope and values of LLL and the voluntary sector.
- Voluntary service and LLL are marginalised sectors in many countries. Therefore it is difficult to sustain cooperation between LLL and voluntary service due to shortage of financial and political support.
- The LLL research and voluntary service have different philosophies, and different professional and cultural contexts.
- The ASEM LLL Hub and CCIVS have their own objectives, organisations and distinctive features.

**Opportunities**

- Who are the volunteers? Only youth or also senior citizens? Possibilities have to be identified for reaching different groups through voluntary work in various fields. This will assist in developing a set of indicators to measure the impact of voluntary work, especially for competence development of individuals, organisations, communities and society at large.
- The increasing need for LLL in the globalised economy has pushed many governments to recognise LLL as the way forward in developing their education systems.
- Voluntary service is seen as a field of practice that uses formal, non-formal and informal learning continuum in diverse ways.
- Research in eLearning and the use of information and communication technology (ICT) can facilitate knowledge sharing between LLL research and the voluntary sector.
- In some ASEM countries, LLL research has high institutional status, but low recognition from politicians and the public. The voluntary sector has lower institutional status, but higher recognition from politicians and the public at grassroots level. The synergy between LLL research and voluntary service may give better access to financial resources.
Threats

- There is a lack of empirical data.
- The different understanding of non-formal education in Asia and Europe leads to different approaches.
- The participants identified a lack of recognition, differing political support from the government, differing concepts of democracy or even blockage of ideas for innovation, limited scope for new initiatives from civil societies in some ASEM countries.
- Imbalanced opportunities exist for European and Asian volunteers.
- Funding for joint projects between LLL and voluntary sector is unstable.

Areas of common interest

- To validate and recognise learning through voluntary work as personal development for working and living as a well-rounded person (professional knowledge, language, cultural skills). Self-assessment and external assessment for measuring impact: what have I learnt, what have you learnt. Validity of each assessment.
- To encourage conceptual understanding – to share and enhance the understanding of non-formal learning and concept of core competences.
- To create the potential for re-designing the inter-relation between education and work, and shifting the concept of the workplace, from solely a work environment to seeing a learning space, changing the conventional concept of workplace as an office, factory, etc., to a wider context, neighbourhood for community and through voluntary work.

Ideas for future cooperation

- CCIVS has started a qualitative research using the Radar model. The research included 17 volunteers in 5 countries, interviews, life stories, life experiences and assesses the impact of voluntary work on learning for individual volunteers, and at the organisation and community levels.
- A set of standards to measure the impact of voluntary work could be developed. An online questionnaire could address the questions of what young adults learnt through youth projects and volunteers trainings.
- A small taskforce group could be established to develop instruments for measuring the impact with: could include desk review, case studies, consultations of some European-wide projects, such as www.youthstudies.eu.
- How can formal and non-formal education be combined to co-ordinate university students’ participation in voluntary work? Regarding youth and voluntary work, what competences do employers require? Are most competences developed in formal education?
• The handbook “Training of trainers tools: manual for project manager, project volunteers, people who live and work in multi-cultural environment” developed by Service Civil International's (SCI) Ms Margherita Serafini could be shared among relevant target groups.

• The research results of the ASEM LLL Hub project on “Participation in and motivation for workplace learning: voluntary or compulsory” could be circulated among relevant target groups.

**Key message and recommendations**

Living and working in the ASEM area increasingly demands new and more complex skills and competences in personal, social and professional spheres. Therefore the workshop participants recommended:

1. Developing, maintaining and updating these skills and competences through lifelong learning to build and enhance constructive and closer cooperation in the ASEM region;

2. Developing sustainable and participative learning societies by redesigning relations between all forms of education and working activities through lifelong learning;

3. Strengthening civil societies through lifelong learning that encompasses formal, non-formal and informal learning and by recognition of prior learning and voluntary activities.
ABOUT THE CO-ORGANISERS

ASEF organised this workshop with

Co-ordinating Committee for International Voluntary Service (CCIVS)
www.ccivs.org

The Asia-Europe Co-operation in Voluntary Service (VolunAEt) activities were initiated in 2001 as part of an ASEF programme to promote the International Year of Volunteering 2001. The first project organised under this pillar, entitled the Asia-Europe Young Volunteers Exchange (AEYVE) 2001, was co-organised with the Co-ordinating Committee for International Voluntary Service (CCIVS), who became ASEF’s long-lasting partner in the field of volunteering and non-formal education, with a network of 132 organisations in 45 countries in Asia and Europe. The results of the first exchange proved that voluntary service “helps to widen social, economic and cultural networks, enhances self-esteem, meets the need of people to learn from each other and facilitates acquisition of skills and experience thus widening employment options” (Report A/56/288 of the UN Secretary-General of 14 August 2001) and determined the involvement of ASEF in future initiatives.

ASEM Education and Research Hub for Lifelong Learning (ASEM LLL Hub)
www.dpu.dk/ASEM

The ASEM Education and Research Hub for Lifelong Learning was established in 2005 as a network of Asian and European higher education institutions, committed to supporting quality research in the field of lifelong learning and to pursuing excellence by mutual peer learning. They also facilitate researcher and student mobility and exchange within and between the two world regions. Its five research networks exchange knowledge, conduct comparative research and produce coordinated publications and reports. The ASEM LLL Hub provides a platform for dialogue between researchers and policy makers in order to facilitate research-based policy making. The Hub currently brings together 70 researchers in its five Research Networks, senior representatives of 35 universities in its University Council and has an advisory board of representatives from ministries of education from 25 countries and international organisations. It is part of ASEF’s ASEM Education Hub and its substantial role was highlighted in the Chair’s conclusion from the ASEM Education Ministers Meeting in Hanoi 2009.
Workshop 3  
Sustainable Creative Cities: The role of the arts in globalised urban contexts  
Co-organisers: ASEF, Institute of Cultural Theory, Research and the Arts, Leuphana University and Urban Research Plaza, Osaka City University  

Background  
As the arts sectors in Asia and Europe are increasingly affected by global cultural developments, interest is growing in exploring the possible roles of arts and cultures as catalysts in contemporary processes of social and cultural transformations. Researchers across Asia and Europe are discussing how to rethink the concept of “Creative Cities” towards the achievement of urban sustainability, as expressed by the notion “Sustainable Cities”. Networks of artists engaged with communities and with ecology are also growing in both regions. These parallel developments presently stand in need of transversal integration and interdisciplinary approaches, beyond the limited rationality of so-called “sectoral” policies, which would limit their scope to predefined sectors of society. 

Contemporary urban contexts across Asia and Europe reveal comparable challenges, such as the proliferation of diffuse cities with a pattern that metaphorically evokes an archipelago, or ‘leopard skin’. In these urban archipelagoes, the traditional center-periphery order is replaced by different combinations of patterns of space, settlement and mobility, between high- and low-densities of population and of architectural elements. Private and public spaces shift accordingly. The separation between city, suburbs and country is losing its clarity and with it the established perceptions of culture and nature too are shifting. Urban spaces begin to operate in different speeds and un-planned hybrid voids, which do not fit with the limited and linear formal rationality of urban planning, are emerging. As a consequence, lifestyles and modes of living the urban space are changing, but not always for the better. As much as these evolutions reveal bottom-up creativity in the uses of urban space by inhabitants, they also reinforce unsustainable models such as consumerism and commuting traffic. 

Furthermore, the logic of the “Creative Class” tends to establish real estate speculation, short-sighted competition between cities as well as social and ecological imbalances in the long term. That unsustainable model is heralded by the urban economist Richard Florida, who coined the concept in The Rise of the Creative Class (2002), a book that is still influencing urban policies worldwide. For Florida, social and ecological unsustainability are a fatality in the “spiky” world of creative cities. However, a growing number of artists, concerned local communities and advocates of sustainable cities do not share Florida’s fatalism and are exploring alternative developments. They do not try to oppose or cure problematic urban developments from a top-down or outsider perspective which would ignore the specific context and emerging creativity of each community. Rather, they cherish bottom-up, collaborative processes in communities as well as the transversal and transformative potential of an “artistic mode of knowing”. 

Unlike the formal rationality of planners, the “artistic mode of knowing” develops intuitive processes of learning, exploring, being open to surprises, and being “iterative” (i.e. not deciding/thinking and then implementing in a linear sequence, but learning-while doing and thinking-while-doing in circular reflexive sequences and in parallel, overlapping, telescoping processes). In other words, it fosters an ability to evolve, rather than enclose ourselves in pre-defined ideological frames. In the context of complex ‘archipelagos’ of urban-&-suburban spaces, the evolutionary qualities of such an expanded mode of knowing are relevant, not only for a specific category of people labeled as ‘artists’, but for everyone. Specifically among artists, the transformation at hand is moving them towards inter- and trans-disciplinary collaborations, leaving behind the outdated modernist roles assigned to the artist in ‘white cube’ art institutions.
Workshop objectives and participants

The workshop raised some key questions, including: how should arts and culture institutions respond to cultural globalisation within cities? What would be appropriate policy frameworks to support these new roles of culture and the arts and create Asian-European synergies to achieve such policy goals?

In doing so, the workshop reviewed issues related to creative collaborativity, including interdisciplinary networks and links between artists and communities; the artistic mode of knowing and its transversal integration in an expanded rationality; arts education and arts-in-education; public spaces and the place of the arts therein; and, key civil society values, including human rights, cultural diversity, non-segregation and ecology.

The participants included artists and cultural practitioners representing key artistic/cultural organisations in Asia and Europe, academics and professionals working on the themes of creative cities and sustainable cities and experts on cultural policy and local governance.

The process

The preparatory phase for the workshop involved two rounds of online discussion between participating experts from Asia and Europe over a period of two months, on the basis of a concept paper prepared by the workshop hosts. This preparatory work helped to define the parameters for the debate and identified the focus points and key values.

The workshop gave specific attention to participants who were unable to participate in the preparatory phase. Short introductions were made to place the topic within the context of each participant’s experience. After an Impulse Presentation on ‘Re-thinking the creative city theory’ by workshop co-host Prof. Dr. Masayuki Sasaki, the workshop was facilitated by workshop co-host Sacha Kagan on the basis of both one-on-one discussions while walking, and group debates. Discussions focused on the notion of sustainable creative city, the arts and the role of the arts, and working towards concrete recommendations.

Much time was spent on the exact wording for the recommendations. Aware that different sectors and different (sub-)cultures attribute different meanings for the same words, and that the use of some complex terms should not be avoided, the group agreed that a glossary must accompany the workshop report (attached as appendix to this report). The group also decided that in addition to this short workshop report, a longer document will be created by the group, and that the participating experts will communicate the results of the workshop in their respective networks.

---

2 The workshop’s concept paper, agenda and list of participants is available online at http://www.asef.org. The online preparatory phase also involved input from Ada Wong (Hong Kong Institute of Contemporary Culture), Low Kee Hong (Singapore Arts Festival) and Jordi Pascual (Agenda 21 for Culture - United Cities and Local Governments). In addition to the participants listed in the online document mentioned above, Waltraut Ritter (Hong Kong Foresight Centre) also joined the workshop.

3 The longer document, including a more detailed discussion and several ‘good practice’ cases, are available online at http://www.leuphana.de/institute/ikkk/aktuell/ansicht/datum/2010/11/02/sustainable-creative-cities-the-role-of-the-arts-in-globalised-urban-contexts.html
Discussion on “Sustainable Creative Cities: The Role of the Arts in a Globalised Urban Context”

In his presentation on “Re-thinking creative city theory” Prof. Sasaki reflected on the notion of “creative city” and on the unsustainable impact that Richard Florida’s “Creative Class” theory (cf. glossary) has had on the development of creative cities. He pointed out the importance of a culture-based production system where small sized businesses are supported and a network of horizontal and regional cooperation is set up. He stressed the importance of social participation and the role the arts have to play in social inclusion. Research and education programmes for developing human capabilities in creative cities are needed, as illustrated by lessons learned from Japanese cities. A high level of cultural diversity is required for a social transformation towards more sustainable cities. Real and diverse spaces of creativity and active citizen participation would be important building blocks for an educational and industrial system to foster creativity.

What is a sustainable creative city?

The participants were asked to further discuss what “sustainable creative cities” are or would be. A ‘walking’ discussion resulted in the following reflections:

A Sustainable Creative City should embrace participatory, bottom-up, inter-generational approaches where ‘trial and error’ (i.e. iterative – cf. glossary) experiments are fostered. In such a city, long-term developments and processes are regarded as important, rather than products. The whole city is mobilising creative potential to ‘re-invent’ the ‘logic of the house’ or “oikos logos” (Greek etymology of the word ‘ecology’ – cf. glossary). Viewed as living organisms, sustainable creative cities build on their capacities and resources to create tangible and intangible values for the present and the future. Bio-cultural diversity (cf. glossary) should be a basis for urban resilience (cf. glossary).

Sustainable Creative Cities include understanding art as process (i.e. art as a verb, not only a noun), through infrastructural support, by engaging with spiritual/mental and physical/environmental contexts, how these elements are played out with individual and societal opportunities to learn skills in perception, and an ability to articulate and share common values such as creativity, conservation, expression and diversity. The process should be inclusive and genuinely participative allowing urban and non-urban actors to engage.

Participants also discussed how policy for sustainable creative cities should be made and who the decision makers are if a genuinely participatory process is followed. The group discussed the key cultural values attached to sustainable creative cities and wondered what cultural infrastructure would be needed to support those values. Moving governments away from catering to the so-called creative class towards allowing for more participatory processes is important, but what are the preferred modes of participatory processes? How should vested interests and politics/power issues be managed? These important questions were raised but no definitive solutions were drawn out of the workshop, nor would it be advisable to propose ready-made solutions in the form of toolkits for creative cities. Participants agreed that the Florida model should be opposed as it does not take sustainability (cf. glossary) into consideration. Also, specific consideration should be given to Asian urban contexts and to the issue of cultural infrastructures in Asia.

What are the roles of the arts?

Before delving into the recommendations, several participants expressed the need to discuss the different definitions of art and the role of the arts, in order to reach a better common understanding in relation to the topic of the workshop.
Reflections focused on how art (cf. also the glossary) can not only be a way to express feelings, emotions and ideas but also a way to create meaning in a certain place and time through creative expression, keeping things dynamic and evolutionary. Art can be an experimental and rule-breaking process based on subversive imagination, creating messages that articulate contemporary discussions. It can question existing assumptions and make independent suggestions concerning societal issues, and offer alternatives. Art, as a verb, should not be understood as limited to a specific sector of society (i.e. the arts), but professionals who do work in the artistic sector can be catalysts for others to become reflective practitioners (cf. glossary). Artists can open up new worlds of possibilities and spaces for dialogue, sharing their creative thoughts with communities. Artists can work in service to society and contribute to long-term social transformations through creative forms of education (cf. glossary).

These reflections echoed the notions discussed in the concept paper and online preparatory phase, i.e. the importance of an "artistic mode of knowing" (or "artistic rationality" – cf. glossary) as an opportunity to move beyond the developmental autism of narrowly-rational modernisation policies.

These reflections also led to a discussion on the role of the arts and the meaning of their ‘independence’ in an interdependent world. The facilitator evoked the many “declarations of interdependence” that flourished across cultural actors and civil society in the past decade, stressing “the ways in which our fates are bound together, both with distant and future humans, and with the non-human natural world”. A complex (cf. glossary) balance between independence and interdependence has to be found.

**Key message and recommendations**

The participants elaborated the following three recommendations, which were to be delivered to the 8th ASEM Summit following the Connecting Civil Societies conference:

1. **To meet the demands of living well together in the future, we recommend that the art of city-making embrace ecological growth as social, environmental, cultural and economic diversity; and governance as transparent forms of genuine, effective participation, dialogue and mutual learning. The arts can serve these processes as a dynamic catalyst and as a generator of imagination among all other disciplines. To this end, we recommend the creation of enabling environments for the development of larger numbers of smaller arts organisations/initiatives, which engage in participatory and trans-disciplinary processes –cf. glossary- directly responsive to the needs of diverse communities.**

2. **We call for inter-sector, transversal (cf. glossary) and sensitive approaches to urban development. Such approaches should allow indeterminate common spaces for shared use in our cities. We recommend ASEM governments to integrate the significant contributions of artwork and art-creating processes in urban development. We urge them to establish an enabling environment for the active involvement of artists and other creative practitioners in urban development policies. This would include determining the modalities of such participatory processes.**

3. **To generate the capacity and the capabilities for sustainable cities, the arts have a role to play in formal, informal and non-formal education (cf. glossary) as well as in lifelong learning. Furthermore, we urge ASEM governments to actively consider looking beyond arts education towards a deeper role for art-in-education. Such an approach should include artistic ways of learning (with experiential learning, question-based learning and non-linear problem-solving skills – cf. glossary). We also recommend the inclusion of artists and other creative practitioners in consultative bodies on education policies.**

---

4 This quote is taken from an online article at: http://www.opendemocracy.net/globalisation-vision_reflections/interdependence_3658.jsp
The formulation of these recommendations in the workshop unfolded a number of further discussion points, including:

- The necessity to re-orient keywords from dominant discourses (such as “growth”) away from their unsustainable meanings (e.g. quantitative economic growth fuelling a society of hyper-consumption) and towards more sustainable alternatives (e.g. a more qualitative and more spiritual idea of growth, better embedded in the imperatives of ecological resilience);

- The strategic importance of fostering transversal social-ecological dimensions not only across small arts and cultural organisations, but also in existing/established larger art/cultural organisations;

- How to best stress our opposition to cultural policies supporting grandiose “flagship” art, generating superficial image-returns for city marketing, narrowly elitist “art for art’s sake” and creative industries (cf. glossary) serving globalised markets within a short-sighted competition between cities;

- The challenge of achieving genuinely participative processes (cf. glossary) on the ground, and about the modalities and extent to which artists should and could be engaged in transforming urban development policies;

- The need to “de-plannify” urban planning and about the value of, and need for more undesignated spaces in the city, where communities and creative practitioners can experiment with more sustainable ways of life (in contrast to overly planned creative/cultural districts).

A fuller discussion of the reflections developed by participants in the process towards the formulation of the recommendations (including the online preparatory phase and the workshop itself), was conducted in the longer document (cf. the weblink in footnote 2 above). The longer document also included some good practice cases selected by the workshop participants, offering concrete examples of urban cultural activities working in the spirit of this workshop report.
APPENDIX | GLOSSARY

This glossary is intended as a reference for some terms used in the document above. However, it does not in any way give full definitions of the terms discussed, and it only gives very brief, summarised explanations as discussed by the participants.

Agenda 21 for culture:
Declaration approved in 2004 by the world organisation of cities (United Cities and Local Governments). It has 67 articles. It is the only declaration relating sustainable development and local cultural policies. Cultural rights, inter-cultural dialogue, citizen participation, grassroots creativity and transversality are some of the keywords. Agenda 21 for culture is translated into 19 languages, has 5 written thematic reports and connects 409 cities, local governments and other organisations worldwide.

Art:
As the above document (workshop report) suggests, differences and commonalities have been found among workshop participants with regard to our understandings of art. Some commonalities were summarised in the document above. Concerning the differences, they can be seen at least partly under an Asian/European dichotomy. In the originally European and now globalised tradition of modernity, art is seen as a distinct social sector (involved in the production and consumption of sets/systems of objects with symbolic values). Under Asian perspectives, art can be understood more widely as rooted in the creativity of the natural world, seeing human cultures as embedded in nature and not only as setting themselves apart from nature. In the words of Chatvichai Promadhhattavedi, “Art is a manifestation of the necessity of man to communicate to one another, noting that this is as much an organic need of all living things to send messages to each other, either to act together or act against threats, to co-operate for survival. The methods of communication rely on all perception channels, skills in all the senses, conditioned by biological and cultural imprints”. As David Haley pointed out, “Asian perspectives include the Indo-Arian, Sanskrit etymological root of the word art, rta. This can be understood as the dynamic process by which the whole cosmos continues to be created, virtuously. This suggests a trans-disciplinary aesthetic and ethical imperative to engage the world ecologically.”

In the 20th century, with a growing understanding of “art as process” (recognising the formation of social processes and of modes of knowing reality, as artistic work), some European art-worlds have begun opening up to inspirations from Asian perspectives on art. Still today, for example concerning the question of independence/inter-dependence (as discussed in the workshop report), Asian-European dialogues have a deep potential for expanding our understandings and working definitions of art.

Artistic rationality:
Art is not necessarily “irrational”. On the contrary, art can potentially expand rationality beyond the limits of modernist thinking. In cognitive terms, the superiority of an “artistic rationality, (as coined by Hans Dieleman) lies in the balanced usage of both hemispheres of the human brain, i.e. both the capabilities for analytical and for intuitive thought. Ultimately, an “artistic rationality” may lead to a trans-disciplinary practice of “artscience” (bridging art and science).

Bio-cultural diversity:
The expression bio-cultural diversity points to the complex inter-dependence of biological diversity and cultural diversity, and in this case to the importance of this inter-dependence for urban resilience (see also “resilience”). The importance of the link between biodiversity and cultural diversity is increasingly recognised at the international level (e.g. at the UNESCO) as a priority for sustainable living.
Complex / complexity:
Complexity is the combining and contrasting of unitary, complementary, competitive, and antagonist relationships, in the “unity in diversity” of our real world. Reality does not fit nicely in human concepts, theories and ideologies. French complexity researcher Edgar Morin pointed to the necessity for a sensibility to complexity: “The systems of sensibility will be like that of the musical ear which perceives the competitions, symbioses, interferences, overlaps of themes in one same symphonic stream, where the brutal mind will only recognise one single theme surrounded by noise” (Edgar Morin, La Méthode, vol. 1: la nature de la nature, Paris: Seuil, 1977, pp. 140-141).

Creative class:
See “Florida (Richard)”

Creative education:
This expression may be related to art-in-education, but generally refers to forms of education that are experiential, learner-led, non-didactic, and may incorporate elements borrowed from art practices (e.g. drama games, making, singing). Creative Education is a two-pronged approach in education:

- Teaching for creativity, meaning teaching to enhance creative problem-solving, sensitive experiences and lateral thinking, as well as critical thinking.

- Teaching creatively and moving away from the usual or traditional teaching methods, and finding methods and approaches that are more flexible to learners’ interests.

Learners are diverse and this is true at all levels of education. Creative Education is not only relevant to primary and secondary education, but at all levels of education, both formal and non-formal. See also ‘informal and non-formal education’ in this glossary.

Creative industries:
Creative industries refer to economic sectors involved in the generation and exploitation of value from intellectual property. An exact definition is not internationally agreed upon, but for example, the UK government’s Department for Culture, Media and Sports (DCMS) lists the following as creative industries: advertising, architecture, arts and antique markets, crafts, design, designer fashion, film, video and photography, software, computer games and electronic publishing, music and the visual and performing arts, publishing, television, radio.

Creative industries are considered, in contemporary economic discourses, to be the engine of a new knowledge economy. However, these discourses often do not address the ecological and social “unsustainability” of the economic development models they are promoting in a satisfactory way.

Ecology / “Oikos Logos – the logic of the house”:
A definition of ecology may include the study of organisms, their relationship to each other, and their relationship with their environment. This notion of relationships has been taken from its use in the natural sciences to the social sciences, predominantly through the work of Gregory Bateson and Ilya Prigogine, and the work of Deep Ecologists like Arne Naes and Fritjof Capra.

The ecology of cities is also about cultural heritage and identity, and governments should recognise the cultural significance of nature and the natural significance of culture in urban ecologies.
Experiential learning:
Experiential learning is learning by doing, learning from experience. It stresses the value of embodied knowledge as opposed to abstract intellectual knowledge, and of contextual (i.e. eco-logical) knowledge as opposed to the belief in universal laws. In the arts, the importance of the context is also stressed by the notion of site-specificity, that is, art that relates to its specific geographic, social, ecological context. This term also offers a third path between objective and subjective form of knowing.

See also the terms ‘artistic rationality,’ ‘iterative’ and ‘reflective practitioner’ in this glossary.

Florida (Richard, & the “creative class”):
The urban economist Richard Florida has, with his discussion of the Creative Class, gained a wide influence on urban planners and city officials in the past decade. His views have framed much of the recent creative city policies, stressing the importance of culture and the arts in an urban context marked by the global competition of cities, whereby culture, entertainment, consumption, and urban amenities enhance locations and allow economic development. As the argument goes, in the context of a contemporary creative economy and knowledge society where creative industries are engines of growth, the higher concentration and activity of “creatives” (e.g. artists, designers, musicians, scientists) in a city fosters economic development. In the economic competition, the “winners” are the cities and urban districts that are more attractive to the members of the creative class.

Florida’s theory was criticised on many accounts, i.e. on the validity of the category “creative class,” on the unsustainability of the economic development in cities aiming to only attract the creative class and on the effects of his influence on cultural policy. Indeed, the effects of Florida’s influence on cultural “creative city” policies are increasingly denounced worldwide, as fostering gentrification and the segregation, exclusion, and displacement of the poor (ultimately reducing the attractiveness of gentrified places for “creatives”). The creative class model leads to a disconnection of artists and other creative workers from local urban communities, constituting an unsustainable model of cultural policy.

Informal and non-formal education:
Both terms refer to ways of learning that are not part of the formal and institutional education curriculum. Informal education or learning may take place as part of everyday life. It is often un-planned and may be experienced as tacit knowledge (i.e. the knowledge itself is informal, as well as the means of delivery). Non-formal education sits between formal and informal modes of education. It may use semi-structured forms of learning, such as workshops rather than lectures, yet it may be based on a formal curriculum (i.e. the delivery of the education is not formal).

Iterative:
“Iteration means the act of repeating a process usually with the aim of approaching a desired goal or target or result. Each repetition of the process is also called an iteration, and the results of one iteration are used as the starting point for the next iteration” (Wikipedia article on iteration – retrieved on September 14th 2010).

An iterative process in the context of artistic rationality means, as argued in this workshop’s concept paper, “not deciding/thinking and then implementing in a linear sequence, but learning-while-doing and thinking-while-doing in circular reflexive sequences and in parallel, overlapping, telescoping processes.” Iterativity is the principle of allowing iterative processes to happen and of continuously learning from them.

Non-linear (problem-solving):
Non-linearity is interesting for us here as an alternative to cause and effect linearity. Linear problem-solving is the traditional methodology of planning schemes (including the local Agenda21 processes): first formulate a vision, then diagnose the problems, then develop alternatives, then seek consensus, then take decisions, and finally implement and execute. The problem with this way of working is that it is rigid, disjunctive (i.e.
autistic) and incapable to properly incorporate experiential learning and artistic rationality into decision-making. Instead, non-linear problem-solving is based on iterative processes and on questions-based learning, i.e. a capacity to ask wider questions, reframing the problems in new ways rather than being trapped in the path-dependency of pre-established problem-definitions.

**Participative processes:**
Participative processes relate to the modalities of participative democracy, i.e. decision-making processes directly involving local communities, rather than limited forms of consultation. Beyond participation as a consensual keyword and superficial slogan, the challenge is how decision-making processes can be genuinely participative, and how issues are managed, such as conflicts, toleration of dissent, diverging interests and values, rights of minorities and marginalised people, power-sharing and individual freedom of expression.

In the arts, a participatory event allows the spectators to interfere and interact. The art-piece is not seen as a finished product that the audience can observe, but the active participation of the audience makes it complete. In the workshop, we also discussed the importance of acknowledging artistic processes and artworks as valuable within the very process of taking decisions. Art can sometimes open the eyes more than intellectual discussion. See also ‘experiential learning.’

**Reflective practitioner:**
Donald Schön’s book *The Reflective Practitioner* is the origin of our use of this term. We use it to stress that artistic rationality is not reserved to artists or to members of a creative class but may be practised, under certain circumstances, by any reflective practitioner, i.e. by professionals who are not only narrowly-rational but also allow emotions, intuitions and creativity in their working processes. Donald Schön, a management expert, analysed how professionals are often not as rational (in the narrow sense of the word) as they claim to be.

**Resilience:**
Resilience refers to a system’s capacity to endure, withstand, overcome, or adapt to changes from the “outside” or from the “inside” environments. In other words, resilience points at the ability to survive in the long term by transforming oneself in relation with one’s environments. “Resilience is the ability to absorb disturbances, to be changed and then to re-organise and still have the same identity, same basic structure. It includes the ability to learn from the disturbance” (Christina Stadlbauer).

The term is used in ecology, referring to the limits of a system’s capacity to be perturbed. Once the limits are reached, the system either collapses or finds a new state of equilibrium. In ecology, resilience necessitates the preservation of diversity (i.e. both biodiversity and cultural diversity): “Sustainable systems can only exist as long as diversity is preserved, so that the exogenous shocks of the unexpected may give way to the endogenous responses of resourceful (social or eco-) systems” (Sacha Kagan).

**Sustainability:**
A keyword, since the Brundtland Commission introduced “sustainable development” (i.e. development that “meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs”) in policy discourse. The word has several contradicting definitions, depending especially on whether one wants to stress “limits to [economic and industrial] growth” or one believes in technology’s miraculous power to infinitely “substitute” non-renewable natural resources. Sustainability can also be understood from a cultural perspective as the search for alternative sets of values and knowledge of the world founding a “sensibility to patterns that connect” the economic, social, political, cultural and ecological dimensions of reality. Sustainability is then the search for models of civilisation that are both resilient and just.
Trans... (transversal, trans-disciplinary):
Generally, the transversal is that which runs across different sets or ensembles. In cultural terms, “transversal values are values that cross two or more cultures and are common to them but they are not transformed into universal values. If a cultural transversal is to remain transversal, it must retain its specificity” (Michael Palencia-Roth, “Universalism and transversalism: dialogue and dialogics in a global perspective”, in UNESCO, Cultural Diversity and Transversal Values: East–West Dialogue on Spiritual and Secular Dynamics, 2006, p. 38.).

“Trans-disciplinarity” refers to a transversal unity of knowledge beyond disciplines (whether scientific, artistic or professional), i.e. not a universal, reductionist or holistic unity but a complex unity, where inter-connections are sought but also where differences are not denied (see glossary entry on “complexity”). It represents a further step in addition to inter-disciplinary exchange and its mutual inspirations between areas of knowledge and practice. Artistic rationality, with the above-mentioned practice of “artscience”, is aiming to be trans-disciplinary.
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Workshop 4  
The Role of Youth in Public Health Promotion: New Ideas, Young Ideas  
Co-organisers: ASEF, ASEF University Alumni Network (ASEFUAN), Prospex

Background

There are more than 1.1 billion people between the ages of 10 and 24 today — the largest generation in human history. Yet the significance of drawing heightened attention to this group is determined not by its sheer size alone, but also its vulnerability. This vulnerability of young people continues to be omni-present due to barriers such as lack of access to health promotion and services, the emergence of risk behaviour such as unsafe sex practices, unhealthy eating habits, poor hygiene and sanitation, and the continuing spread of HIV. Global and national interest in health aspects of adolescent or youth\(^5\) has manifested itself in the last two decennia through international commitments such as the United Nations International Conference on Population and Development (ICPD). Nonetheless, even with the best of intentions, health policy and decision makers and healthcare providers continue to make choices that do not maximise health returns for the youth. A carefully calibrated and targeted approach must be adopted.

Civil societies in many countries have been playing an active role in supporting governments at national and local levels to ensure youth access to health promotion and services. Recognising both the abovementioned significance and vulnerability of the youth in health, it is only imperative today that civil societies and state actors in Asia and Europe intensify their knowledge-sharing and collaboration among each other in identifying ways to further improve health services for the youth and thus remove barriers to access. As societies continue their search for the best possible means to avail youth of needed medical service and information provision, the cross-cultural sharing of lessons learned is likely to facilitate the debate over the promotion of youth involvement in public health. To ensure sustainability, transparency and accountability of services and policies, it is pertinent that youths are actively involved in the health policy making process and the above-mentioned knowledge sharing mechanisms.

Workshop objectives and participants

Following on the 16th ASEF University (AU16) on “Public Health and Vulnerable Groups: Access to Quality Healthcare Services”,\(^6\) the 4th Connecting Civil Societies of Asia and Europe Conference (CCS4) Workshop on “The Role of Youth in Public Health Promotion: New Ideas, Young Ideas” formed the excellent forum to capitalise on the policy recommendations crafted by the participants of AU16 and push the boundaries further in exploring a more specialised set of recommendations to ASEM policymakers on health and the youth. More particularly, the objectives of CCS4 were to explore areas of knowledge-sharing and collaboration among government and non-governmental actors in Asia and Europe and identify what role both actors should play in this process. The expectation is that increased collaboration would support stakeholders’ ability to ensure: 1) increased access for the youth to youth-friendly public health services and information channels; and, 2) enhanced participation of the youth in the shaping, implementation and monitoring of youth-related health policies and programmes.

Sixteen youth participants from 15 countries representing both civil society and government were invited to share experiences, network, and identify concrete areas of future Asia-Europe public health-related cooperation aimed at the two above-mentioned areas.

---

\(^5\) Around the world, the terms “youth”, “adolescent”, “teenager”, and “young person” are interchanged, often meaning the same thing, occasionally differentiated. Youth generally refers to a time of life that is neither childhood nor adulthood, but rather somewhere in-between. (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Youth#cite_note-1)

\(^6\) The 16th ASEF University was held in Lodz, Poland, from 29 June to 9 July 2010 under the topic “Public Health and Vulnerable Groups: Access to Quality Healthcare Services”
Discussion on “The Role of Youth in Public Health Promotion: New Ideas, Young Ideas”

Through intensive group discussions and break-out sessions, participants identified a range of public health challenges for the youth in Asia and Europe. Participants recognised that between and within Asia and Europe, there are different public health issues and the level and quality of information and services that the youth can access differ from country to country. Furthermore, it was noted that while in many countries young people are still most vulnerable to infectious diseases, participants stressed the need for the youth to be fully equipped to undertake preventive measures to reduce the chances of contracting chronic diseases.

Access to information to help the youth in making well-informed decisions was also emphasised during the discussions. Reference was made to the United Nations International Conference on Population and Development (ICPD) that resulted in a commitment of governments to actively involve the youth in the planning, implementation and evaluation of information, education and communication (IEC) activities and services concerning reproductive and sexual health. Such commitments and follow-up actions were recognised as the evidence of the important role that governments play in creating space not only for intervention but for a pro-active stakeholder role of the youth in policymaking.

However, one of the participants raised the notable fact that though governments today seem to be open for dialogue, too often they are still close-minded when it comes to “our” (youth’s) issue. This interestingly highlights the concern that the youth’s active involvement must be meaningful involvement and not just mere presence in meeting rooms where decisions are made by still an exclusive club of policymakers who may or may not be fully cognisant of the whole depth and expanse of youth considerations. It was stated by a participant that governments must cultivate trust in the youth’s capacity to engage meaningfully in the decision-making process and to prevent a patronising/matronising perspective on the capability of the youth to be an equal partner in such endeavour. It was pointed out during the discussion that whereas in the past, the youth sector was regarded as a problem or issue, the view has shifted to the youth being a resource, and now, as a crucial partner in a policy environment that focuses more on inclusion, participation and joint decision-making.

The existing gap between policymakers and actual health practitioners with respect to how they view and deal with the youth on public health issues was also raised by the participants. While it is the politicians who make the decisions that have ramifications on the youth, it was deemed as crucial that the technical expertise and field knowledge of the health practitioners be heard and incorporated in the policy-making process to make it truly apt and responsive to the peculiar needs and concerns of vulnerable youths.

Aside from the need for greater cooperation and coordination between policymakers and health practitioners, the networking must also include the government civil society in general in both Asia and Europe. For this to truly work, there must be constant exchange of best practices, challenges and innovative approaches between the two regions and the networks found therein.

Participants also saw the powerful role of new media in not only disseminating information but also in acting as an interactive communication channel for the youth, on the one hand, and policy-makers and health care providers, on the other. This realisation recognised the pervasiveness of new media such as social networking platforms and other Internet gateways in the lifestyles of the youth today. Examples of the Philippines and Sweden were mentioned on how the Internet has helped young people obtain public health information and has facilitated the diminishing of barriers in accessing not only information but also actual health services for the youth.

---

Throughout the discussions, the subject of healthy lifestyles was recurring. The youth’s vulnerability to unhealthy behaviour such as smoking, excessive drinking, unsafe sex and limited physical activities is worrisome. Young people’s health, it was also agreed upon by the participants, is not merely the absence of disease or infirmity but the state of complete physical, mental and social well-being. The mental and social well-being of young people is often taken for granted and was identified as an area where governments and civil societies should focus on when developing youth-oriented programmes.

Proceeding from this subject of totality of one’s well-being, participants probed deeper into lifestyle patterns and choices of the youth today and the need for them to be equipped with the information and skills to make decisions that would support them in living a meaningful and healthy style. Discussion on this necessarily focused on the concern that the youth in Asia and Europe continue to be vulnerable to early and unwanted pregnancies and sexually transmitted diseases. Participants however saw that in most countries, governments and civil societies are working together to equip the youth with the proper knowledge and life skills to make informed life decisions.

Finally, the concept of meaningful existence and totality of well-being also meant adopting a lifestyle that contributes to environmental sustainability. Noting the considerable niche market that the youth occupy, the group underscored the necessity to educate the youth to not only be informed health service consumers but also active and vocal citizens.

In relation to this, the concept of social entrepreneurship, which was contained in the AU16 policy recommendations, was discussed and forwarded for serious consideration by the participants. The idea was that in order to support the initiative to enhance participation of the youth in health care issues, policies must be adopted by governments which encourage a kind of participation by the youth that looks into and responds to social needs and issues, or what may be termed “social entrepreneurship”.

Key message and recommendations

Participants recognised that the government has a comparative advantage in addressing youth-related public health issues. For example, informing young people about the dangers of smoking, unsafe sex and promoting a healthy lifestyle can be effectively undertaken by government institutions due to its existing mechanism and resources. This can then be further complemented by civil society, with its expertise and immersion in the field.

The group focused on recommendations that could result in real, tangible actions. Though aware that the following recommendations may be broad, the hope is that these recommendations will be translated into real actions, not by governments or civil societies themselves but through close collaboration between and amongst them that ensures active youth involvement.

1. Youth/adolescent reproductive health education knowledge exchange mechanism

Both governments and civil society are called upon to: a) develop and address greater inter-regional knowledge-sharing mechanisms through the development and delivery of school curricula on sexual and reproductive health and rights (SRHR) and on healthy lifestyles, including nutrition, sports and drugs; b) provide financial and policy support to inter-regional civil societies including youth organisations to develop and deliver non-formal education in the fields of SRHR and healthy lifestyles; and, c) provide financial and policy support to strengthen web-based access to youth-friendly health information and services.
2. Enabling the youth to actively and meaningfully contribute to policy making, implementation and monitoring of health issues of young people

Considering that the current level of engagement of both governments and NGO actors in the promotion of public health for the youth is still insufficient, governments must give priority to accord equal weight to the youth as a valued partner in all relevant health policy and promotion developments. In relation to this, governments must encourage social entrepreneurship among the youth by training young people in social entrepreneurial skills and also providing benefits and recognition to young entrepreneurs active in health promotion.

3. Governments to encourage closer collaboration between Asian and European youth health networks and societies

ASEM governments are called upon to emphasise mobilisation and empowerment of young people in the efforts of health promotion by strengthening Asian regional youth structures as a partner to existing European regional youth structures and recognise these as equal and valued partners in policy making, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of programmes regarding public health of young people in both regions. Governments in cooperation with civil societies are called upon to provide adequate political, financial, and technical support for genuine and meaningful youth participation in health promotion through capacity development interventions such as inter-regional youth camps and leadership trainings.
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ASEFUAN is an association of former participants of the Asia-Europe Foundation University, a two-week intensive scholarship programme for undergraduates at venues alternating between Asia and Europe, which has been running since 1998. The alumni network was created in Bali, Indonesia, in 2002 and, in 2009, became an international non-profit organisation under Belgian Law. ASEFUAN organises activities to maintain and reinforce the relationships forged among participants of the ASEF University programme and undertakes projects to promote a meaningful inter-cultural dialogue between Asia and Europe, particularly among the younger generation.

Prospex
http://www.prospex.com

Prospex is a Belgian-based company that enables organisations to develop cooperation for excellence. It acts as an interface between people and ideas. That means Prospex cooperates with companies, public institutions and outside stakeholders, supporting their values and strategic choices. Prospex provides top-level services for negotiation, mediation, facilitation, future foresight, management training and coaching. With its public and institutional experience, it is unique in its approach to set clear objectives, stimulate consensus and enhance communication. For example, Prospex coordinated a series of future scenarios for the European Environment Agency and the European Commission FP7 and facilitated the ASAP (Accurate Scenarios Active Preparedness) health project on pandemic preparedness for ASEF. In this way, Prospex creates real win-win potential for organisations and becomes a partner of choice.
Workshop 5
Reconciliation and Community Building: Translating the EU Experience to East Asia
Co-organisers: ASEF, Peace Boat, European Centre for Conflict Prevention, Georg Eckert Institute for International Textbook Research

Background

While the European region managed to transform itself from a continent destroyed by World War II and divided during the Cold War to arguably the world’s most effective and active regional community, East Asia – particularly Northeast Asia – remains largely fragmented and divided along Cold War lines, and is a dangerous flashpoint for potential regional and global conflict.

What can East Asia learn from the European experience, and in particular from the European Union (EU), to build regional community in both the formal and informal sectors?

Workshop objectives and participants

Given that the building of a political and economic community has been a successful process in Europe, the aim of the workshop was to discuss the European experience of regional community building against the background of the challenges ahead for East Asia, in particular Northeast Asia. The workshop was based on the assumption that East Asia could strongly benefit from a dialogue at an Asia-Europe level and that multi-track diplomacy, confidence building, and reconciliation in post-conflict situations could result in meaningful cooperation. Simultaneously, the process of this dialogue could generate new ways to consider the EU’s own challenges. Therefore, the workshop attempted to:

- Develop recommendations on measures to support civil society and multi-track confidence building efforts in East Asia based on European experiences
- Explore possibilities for Asia-Europe information exchange on lessons learned in historical recognition and reconciliation
- Identify specific areas of potential regional cooperation within East Asia
- Generate a concrete project for grassroots-level Asia-Europe dialogue on post-conflict reconciliation and development of new paths for stable and sustainable regional cooperation

The workshop brought together representatives from academia, civil society organisations, media, and political stakeholders on the national/ regional level both from Europe and East Asia.

Discussion on “Reconciliation and Community Building: Translating the EU Experience to East Asia”

Reflections on Europe and East Asia.

On the one hand, East Asia, and in particular Northeast Asia, is in the midst of a serious crisis of peace and security. Northeast Asia remains fractured along Cold War lines, with the divided Korean peninsula a critical fault-line, exacerbated by the question of North Korean nuclear capabilities and recently elevated tensions between North and South. The Cross Straits issue is also a serious structural concern. Underlying these...
specific issues is the general paralysis of relations in the region; the result of a lack of true reconciliation following World War II. The failure of the region to tackle issues of historical recognition, with Japan's role being particularly problematic, hampers dialogue at every level from the grassroots up. Further, since Northeast Asia lacks even a regional organisation, there is a severe lack of opportunity for interaction and cooperation.

On the other hand, the European region has managed to transform itself from a continent destroyed by World War II and divided during the Cold War to arguably the world's most effective and active regional community. Although Europe is also facing a variety of challenges, it has created political structures of cooperation that serve to tackle these challenges and to enhance further regional development.

How the regional community building process in East Asia could be fostered despite these political tensions was discussed by posing two main questions:

1. How could the European experience of reconciliation following World War II and the end of the Cold War be understood and evaluated, and could these experiences be translated to Asia?

2. To what extent does the European Union, and the process towards its formation, help to preserve peace and security in Europe? What were the elements that could catalyse East Asian efforts to build a community that would encompass both the ASEAN nations and Northeast Asia?

Various speakers pointed out the current tensions in Northeast Asia, especially with regard to the dispute on the Senkaku/Diaoyu islands and the atomic threat. However, despite the severity of the situation, the participants emphasised that there were also a number of signs that point to possibility for progress. Especially in Southeast Asia, ASEAN is developing into an effective and productive regional organisation, despite the peace and security challenges the region faces. Japan's new government has embraced a far more conciliatory approach to its neighbours in a break from the often adversarial tactics pursued by the previous administration. For the first time ever, the Japanese government has begun to talk of a regional community, and the form such a community could take has become one of the hot issues in the region. Whereas strong economic and cultural relations and a growing number of activities on the civil society level are seen as achievements, participants recognised the issue of historical recognition and reconciliation as one of the main obstacles for further progress.

There was no consensus amongst participants whether the previous apologies by the Japanese government towards China and Korea were sufficient for the region to come to terms with the past. However, all participants agreed that firstly, a trust-building process amongst Northeast Asian countries based on cosmopolitan values (especially the recognition of the other by maintaining one's own identity) would be the pre-condition for regional community building. Second, drawn from the experience in Europe it was stated that community building would need the development of common visions and values with regard to the overall goals of this future community. Third, it was suggested to foster the regional relations between Northeast and Southeast Asia at all levels – political, economic, cultural – and among different stakeholders including civil society organisations.

Some of the main issues about the way in which Europe has become a region of economic prosperity, political stability, peace, and regional cooperation were highlighted. The process of community building started in the economic sector in the 1950s and was followed by the political unification process that culminated in the founding of the European Union in 1992. Since the end of the Cold War, the development of the European region has reached a new level; first because it is challenged by the so called “Eastern extension”, and second because the unification process has reached the domain of European identity building on the cultural level.
One major point of the discussion was the question of what had been the history of regional reconciliation and cooperation in Europe, and how the burden of the war legacy was overcome. In the discussion it became clear that four reasons were in favour of regional community building in Western Europe after 1945:

- The specific political context (Cold War);
- The development of common visions by political leaders (Robert Schuman);
- The tradition and continuation of textbook revision/education and historical reconciliation;
- The fact that Germany took responsibility for its war atrocities and took action to reconcile with former adversaries.

The workshop also discussed the role the European Economic Community, the EU, and Council of Europe played in the community building process. The development of a supra-national political and economic structure and the fact that European institutions contributed financially to a large extent to regional development and conflict solution were main components of the successful European unification process.

Main issues and lessons learned

The main issues and lessons learned that were identified can be clustered in three overarching sections, namely:

1. Common Vision/Strategy development

To develop a coherence strategy for reconciliation and community building between conflict and prone states, it is important to:

- Define common values and goals;
- Think strategically;
- Apply the principle of voluntariness and incompleteness (differentiated integration);
- Proceed with politics of taking little steps

2. Historical recognition/reconciliation

Reconciliation will only be possible if conflicting states agree and are able to:

- Learn from history and focus on issues that can be resolved;
- Resolve conflicts peacefully based on legal instruments, institutions, and equality;
- Conduct formal apology and forgiveness process;
- Acknowledge perception as key issue for communication (reciprocity of perception)
3. Regional and trans-regional cooperation in East Asia

For East-Asia specifically, it is important that countries:

- Simplify processes, proceed on informal level;
- Use experiences of other regions

**Key message and recommendations**

Civil society organisations urge ASEM leaders to identify a common regional vision founded on common goals, affirmed by historical recognition, and supported by trans-regional and multi-stakeholder cooperation. There is a critical and urgent need for Northeast Asia in particular, and East Asia as a whole, to develop a mechanism for, at minimum, dialogue and confidence-building to guard against violent conflict. The region remains divided, with the Korean peninsula as one of the most dangerous flashpoints in the world. There remain many other points of potential conflict, including unresolved territorial disputes linked to natural resources such as those over the Diaoyu/Senkaku Islands and the Spratly Islands. Participants of this workshop urged ASEM governments to consider the following points:

1. **Common Vision/Strategy development**
   - Critically assess the successes and failures of both Asian and European post-war reconciliation experiences;
   - Build up a concrete strategy to resolve existing territorial disputes using historical examples such as the European Community of Steel and Coal, and existing legal mechanisms such as Article 9 of the Japanese Constitution;
   - Create a high level group to develop visions and goals for a secure and peaceful Northeast Asia;
   - Organise multi-national strategy centres with universities that will create strategic and visionary goals for the region

2. **Historical recognition/reconciliation**
   - Set up an independent, multi-stakeholder grouping (comprising educators, education ministries, media and NGOs) to address issues of historical recognition based on or connected to existing mechanisms in Northeast Asia and the European Union;
   - Build up structures to foster reconciliation on two levels: on the bilateral and/or Eminent Person Group (EPG) level;
   - Explore possibilities for Asia-Europe information exchange on lessons learned in historical recognition and reconciliation. First, to continue with and intensify existing modes of cooperation and information sharing, e.g. via the Trilateral History Forum. Second, to promote the founding of bilateral history commissions and, third, – on the regional basis – the creation of an EPG group
3. Regional and trans-regional cooperation in East Asia

- Strengthen the ASEAN+3 dialogue specifically at an informal working level, for example, amongst mid-level government officials;

- Facilitate space for civil society to come together by bringing different existing initiatives (e.g. ASEF, AEPF, all ASEM inspired civil society engagement);

- Start dialogue between ASEAN and Northeast Asian countries for the creation of an East Asian community to, amongst other things, stimulate the free flow of people;

- Build up sustainable regional structures; use ASEM Education Secretary to improve the dialogue between Europe and East Asia on the cultural and educational level (exchanges in higher education, academic cooperation, ASEM Mundus);

- Identify specific areas of potential regional cooperation within East Asia. Mobility between Northeast and Southeast Asian countries needs to be improved to facilitate mutual dialogue and cooperation. Establish an East Asian civil society network to improve direct dialogue between ASEAN and Northeast Asian countries.

- Generate a concrete project for grassroots-level Asia-Europe dialogue on post-conflict reconciliation and development of new paths for stable and sustainable regional cooperation. Request ASEF to expand its Connecting Civil Societies theme to facilitate EU and East Asia stakeholders to discuss recognition/reconciliation issues drawing on successful experiences elsewhere. The foundation of an independent multi-national history commission would be strongly suggested.
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Peace Boat
http://www.peaceboat.org/english

Peace Boat is a Japan-based international non-governmental and non-profit organisation that works to promote peace, human rights, equal and sustainable development and respect for the environment.

The organisation carries out its main activities through a chartered passenger ship that travels the world on peace voyages. The ship creates a neutral, mobile space and enables people to engage across borders in dialogue and mutual cooperation at sea, and in the ports visited. Since its foundation in 1983, Peace Boat has carried out over 70 voyages in the Asian region and worldwide.

Peace Boat is a leading advocate for grassroots reconciliation in the Asian region, and has consistently focused on issues of historical recognition, in particular between Japan and its neighbouring countries.

Georg Eckert Institute for International Textbook Research (GEI)

The Georg Eckert Institute is an accredited reference centre for textbook research. Its central competence lies in the research of collective patterns of interpretation, concepts of identity and representations as conveyed through textbooks and other educational media. The institute’s research and transfer activities reflect the complex character of textbooks and their embedding in various social and political contexts. The GEI contributes to the deconstruction of prejudices and concepts of the other and develops recommendations for the objectification and advancement of instructional media. Particularly in (post-) conflict and transformation societies, it also acts as a mediator in textbook conflicts. The GEI increases awareness for the diversity of the identity concepts that are formed in schools and develops models for the handling of textbook-oriented conflicts. It has been the coordinator of various bilateral textbook commissions whose main goal is history reconciliation and the promotion of mutual understanding.

European Centre for Conflict Prevention (ECCP)
http://www.conflict-prevention.net/

The ECCP is the Global Secretariat of the Global Partnership for the Prevention of Armed Conflict (GPPAC), which most of ECCP’s activities currently centre on. The GPPAC is a worldwide civil society-led network that works for the spread of the consensus on peacebuilding and prevention of armed conflicts. The Global Partnership aims at strengthening civil society networks for peace and security, diffusing the awareness of the urgency and need for peace on a world-wide basis. It gives an international echo to local and regional organisations working for peacebuilding and conflict prevention.
Workshop 6
The Right to Information
Co-organisers: ASEF, Article 19, Foundation for Media Alternatives (FMA)

Background

Governments across the world are adopting Right to Information (RTI) regulations to obligate public bodies to collect data, publish information and promote openness. This reflects the growing recognition of the right to information as a fundamental human right essential for meaningful democracy and the realisation of other human rights. This workshop examined best practices in effectuating this right, in particular those relating to environmental protection, socio-economic development and anti-corruption:

Information is the oxygen of democracy. Without information, people have no power to make choices about their government – no ability to participate in the policy-making process, to hold their governments accountable, to prevent corruption, to reduce poverty or ultimately, to live in a genuine democracy. Since governments hold massive amounts of information on behalf of the public, public bodies should - with limited exceptions - provide access to that information. Studies have also shown that policies are better developed when the public is consulted and their concerns taken into consideration.9

The United Nations has described the Right to Information (RTI) as “a fundamental human right and … the touchstone of all the freedoms to which the UN is consecrated”.10 Subsequently, the right to “seek, receive and impart information and ideas” was guaranteed globally through Article 19 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and Article 19 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR).11

Increasingly, over the past 10 years, a growing number of countries across a wide range of economic development levels and political systems have adopted or are in the process of preparing RTI laws. Today, around 90 countries have laws granting individuals the right to access information held by public bodies. This global trend reflects an increasingly universal recognition of the right to information.

This workshop brought together a total of 18 RTI civil society representatives and government officials from 6 Asian and 6 European countries to facilitate learning and understanding across the two regions on how to best effectuate RTI.

Workshop objectives and participants

The overall objective of the workshop was to contribute towards the strengthening of governance, public participation and achievement of developmental goals in Asia and Europe, by facilitating dialogue and exchange on right to information policies and implementation. The specific objectives of the workshop were:

1. To establish an Asia-Europe Right to Information network for future interactions;

---


10 UN General Assembly Resolution 59(1), 14 December 1946.

2. To share best practices between Asia and Europe on implementing right to information laws and the use of this right to protect the environment, support development and combat corruption;

3. To derive and deliver key recommendations to ASEM leaders on securing the right to information;

4. To contribute Asia-Europe responses to relevant international guidelines and discussions relating to the right to information

Representatives from civil society organisations (CSO), government agencies and other public bodies that are active in the promotion and/or provision of access to public information participated in this workshop.

Discussion on “The Right to Information”

The workshop worked towards the above objectives through five sessions:

Session One: Overview of the Right to Information

This session provided an overview of RTI development in Asia and Europe. The panel discussed the benefits of RTI for the public, civil society and government agencies; why and how countries have adopted RTI laws; the impact of new technologies on access to information; and the challenges faced in implementing RTI.

Presentation and Discussion:

Gergana Jouleva, Executive Director of Bulgarian NGO Access to Information Programme (AIP) presented the case of Bulgaria as an example of how RTI is being implemented in countries in transition. Bulgaria adopted the Freedom of Information (FOI) Law in 2000 after a two-year civil society campaign. As public trust in public officials was low at that time, no attempt was made to include a separate government institution such as an Information Commission as part of the regulatory mechanism. As a result, all RTI complaints were either handled by the Ombudsman or settled in court. AIP developed a country-wide RTI network consisting of media and NGO representatives that mobilised the public to submit complaints especially at the local level, and provided consultation and legal advice. Simultaneously an information campaign was launched with outreach materials widely distributed through the RTI network and trainings conducted for government officials, journalists and NGOs members. Input collected through these activities led to substantive changes in the legislation in 2007/2008, with specific disclosure obligations for regional bodies and the concept of public interest override. Partly as a result of the RTI campaign and the legal cases taken up by AIP, public awareness of RTI has risen by 39% between 2000 and 2010. The workshop participants agreed that in comparison to other countries this is an outstanding achievement. As for the benefits of the Freedom of Information (FOI) law, Gergana named a more pro-active disclosure of public bodies’ audit details, government policies and court decisions, in particular through online platforms. Challenges remain in terms of public bodies meeting their RTI obligations, a general lack of public education on RTI and the quality of information disclosed.

A.Alamsyah Saragih, Chairman of the Central Information Commission of Indonesia described the ten-year process of Indonesia’s RTI Law, which was first tabled in 2000 by 40 NGOs, and only adopted in 2008 and promulgated in 2010. The end of the New Order authoritarian regime had allowed for a paradigm shift that recognises human rights principles and RTI in the Constitution. The FOI law would benefit the general public, civil society and government alike, through the development of a more institutional approach to information disclosure and the monitoring of public bodies, the strengthening of public participation and support to champions of public administration reform. He pointed out that the key challenges in implementing RTI lie in
harmonising the RTI law with the State Secrecy Act, fighting resistance among public bodies and protecting whistleblowers. As the law is relatively new, there is a lack of understanding between public officials and the general public on the types of information that should be considered public information, which has created obstacles in accessing information at the grassroots level.

From the examples of Bulgaria and Indonesia, participants acknowledged that the implementation of RTI legislation takes time and requires strong civil society and public support. In terms of comparing the mechanisms of information commission or ombudsman, their effectiveness very much depends on the level of trust the public has in the government structure. The example of Bulgaria shows that RTI can work without a formal institution. This could be a possible approach for Malaysia; it was argued that the public has little trust in the Malaysian Commissioner for Human Rights and establishing a new public body is not likely to establish public trust overnight. On the other hand, there were concerns from some participants that in other countries, such an approach could undermine RTI as governments might disregard RTI if it does not have a ‘separate’ status overseen by a new body.

Session Two: Access to Environmental Information

This session discussed the policies and measures put in place by different countries to disclose environmental information in order to enable the public to monitor impact on the environment and take measures to protect themselves against possible environmental hazards. The 1998 UNECE Convention on Access to Information, Public Participation in Decision-making and Access to Justice in Environmental Matters (Aarhus Convention) obliges States to make the most important categories of environmental information directly available to the public. The United Nations Environment Protection Agency has also developed a set of Environmental Access Guidelines to assist countries in implementing programmes and policies to improve access to environmental information.

Presentation and Discussion

Daniel Simons, Legal Counsel Campaigns and Actions, Greenpeace International, provided an overview of the current international mechanisms regulating access to environmental information. He showed that the earliest references to the right to access environmental information were made in Environmental Impact Assessments and as part of emergency preparedness strategies. The first reference to the right to access environmental information at the international level was made in 1978 by the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) followed by a more specific decision, albeit with a focus on hazardous substances. The Rio Declaration on Environment and Development (1992) was the first international recognition of the right to access environmental information, with the main focus still being on hazardous substances. This was finally broadened as part of the Aarhus Convention. To date, the Aarhus Convention remains the main guiding document with specific government obligations to broad information collection and proactive disclosure, and specified rights for requesters. The instrument is in effect a regional mechanism for Europe (with possibility for non-European states to join); however its principles have been broadly taken over by the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) in its 2010 guidelines. Further developments are expected as part of the agenda of the Rio+20 conference and there is a need to discuss whether the Aarhus Convention should be transformed into a truly global convention or if a new global convention should be developed. Several workshop participants said that the latter could lead to it becoming a weaker and less progressive instrument.

13 Available at: http://www.unep.org/GC/GCSS-XI/Documents/Declaration_and_decisions_adoptedbyGCSS-XI.pdf (Pages 8-10).
Mr. Simons asked if environmental information should be treated exclusively within RTI. Some participants said that the above distinction is often hard to make. Sometimes, in the case of Hungary for example, it makes sense to have two RTI regimes as the requester would have the option of either route – whichever would allow him or her to obtain certain information. In countries like Malaysia, where there is no RTI legislation, it would be regressive to remove the distinction, as the environmental departments are more advanced in comparison with other public bodies, in disclosing information.

The difficulties in establishing two effective regimes were highlighted by Elizabeth Dolan, Senior Investigator from the Office of the Information Commissioner in Ireland. As the right to access environmental information (AEI) was separately introduced after the adoption of the FOI Law, and there was little financial support to raise public awareness, the number of AEI applications since its introduction in 2007 has been very low, in comparison with general FOI requests. In addition, the high AEI fee of EUR 150 for appeal further discourages the public to request environment information. Aside from that, the general public is confused about where to seek information, through the general FOI mechanism, planning/development systems or from the Environmental Protection Agency. This is exacerbated by the existence of two separate public authorities. In India there are two processes for AEI and RTI, whereby AEI had a more proactive approach through public hearings organised by the Environment Minister.

Session Three: Linking Right to Information with Development

The growth of an informed citizenry demanding public services and holding their leaders to account is central to the achievement of development goals and the fight against poverty. Although the connection between access to information and good governance has well been established and documented, developmental agencies and governments seldom put in place policies and mechanisms to guarantee the disclosure of information relating to developmental programmes. The speakers for this session examined why access to public information is relevant to social and economic development and how it can be better integrated into development programmes to benefit vulnerable groups.

Presentation and Discussion

Nepomuceno A. Malaluan, Co-Convenor of the Right to Know. Right Now! Coalition, spoke about using RTI as a tool to facilitate citizen action for development, based on the broad consensus that the State has a minimum obligation to meet the most basic rights and needs of its population. Current development approaches are mainly linked to the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), which many countries are failing to meet. One root cause is the continuing failure of policies to address gross inequalities, which is closely linked to the existence of democratic, transparent and accountable public bodies. One area that requires special attention is the problem of access to information by communities directly affected by assistance programmes funded by international finance institutions (IFI) such as Asian Development Bank and the World Bank. Workshop participants agreed on the importance to lobby for disclosure policy and greater transparency of IFIs.

A community approach to using RTI for development was presented by Suchi Pande, Senior Officer of Mazdoor Kisan Shakti Sangathan (MKSS), India, which is based on the principle to transform a culture of silence to a culture of questioning. A progressive FOI law was adopted in 2005 following campaigns by MKSS and other NGOs. In the first two and a half years after the adoption of the law, two million people filed requests for information. In addition, FOI is an important element of social audit, which allows local communities to check against deliverables, and engages beneficiaries in the planning and monitoring process. Such audits institutionalise accountability and public participation. Suchi also highlighted the ‘Right to Know is the Right to Live’ campaign linked to the death of nine RTI activists in the last ten months, which emphasises the importance of information to allow people to make life-long decisions and on issues
such as education and health care. The MKSS approach combining public hearings and street theatre (known as ‘chariots of scam’ that expose corruption) has been widely showcased around the world as a good example of how RTI can empower poor communities at the grassroots level.

Gayathry Venkiteswaran, Director of the Centre for Investigative Journalism from Malaysia explained in her presentation that Malaysia has yet to adopt RTI legislation, but a draft RTI bill has been introduced in the state of Selangor. The lack of access to information has contributed to environmental disasters, such as the 2008 landslide that killed five people. Such incidents could be avoided if information on the vulnerability of the area was available to the public. A landslide took place 14 years ago in the same location. She said that the effectiveness of access to information on Environmental Impact Assessments could also be undermined by corruption and the economic interests of local government agencies.

Session Four: Using Right to Information to Combat Corruption

RTI legislations have provided the premise for investigative journalists and other watchdog bodies to expose corruption through making requests for information. Aside from that, the obligation of public bodies to proactively disclose information - especially using information and communication technology - serves as an effective deterrent to the misuse of public funds, fostering greater transparency and accountability.

Adam Foldes, Legal Officer of Transparency International in Hungary introduced four overarching elements essential for a successful anti-corruption regime: fair competition, social justice, public trust in institutions and efficient administration. Hungary has seen a number of cases whereby RTI has been an essential tool to establish such principles. For example in the area of fair competition, a RTI request led to litigation which resulted in the disclosure of a contract by the Ministry of Economy to enable fair competition. But one of the biggest challenges in using RTI to combat corruption in Hungary has been the duration of court proceedings, which take an average of one to two years.

In Vietnam, despite the government’s commitment to fight corruption, Nguyen Thi Kieu Vien, Executive Director from Towards Transparency, explained that there is a lack of progress in fulfilling the public RTI. With the stalling of the draft law on Access to Information, there are no clear disclosure guidelines and information systems, creating loopholes and opportunities for corruption. She said that there is no clear timeline when the draft law could be adopted following the election of a new National Assembly in 2011. For Vietnam, if adopted and seriously implemented, this new RTI law would be a milestone in the fight against corruption.

Sinthay Neb, Director of the Advocacy and Policies Institute (API), Cambodia said that the Cambodian government has publicly identified corruption as an obstacle to national economic development and the establishment of the rule of law and democracy. However there is a lack of political will in adopting a RTI law, despite the link between access to information and fighting corruption, especially in the area of monitoring oil and gas revenues which has increased significantly. Anti-corruption campaigns receive widespread public support, but when measures to combat corruption are raised at government level, there is often strong resistance. Given the sensitivity of the term corruption, some donors and NGOs would avoid the term in their activities, and brand their activities as support for ‘democratic governance’ instead. On the other hand, although RTI campaigns are less popular in comparison to anti-corruption ones, RTI is a less politically sensitive concept.

In Latvia RTI has limited effect on anti-corruption according to Linda Austere, a Right to Information specialist and researcher. When Latvia adopted a relatively good FOI Law in 1998 and a clear relationship was established between this Law and the State Secrecy Law, public expectations were high for the fight against corruption. The impact of RTI on corruption was however not big, largely due to the lack of an
independent and effective judiciary system. She also pointed out that transparency initiatives such as the
weekly open government meetings has instead encouraged political leaders to carrying decision-making in
informal and behind the scene meetings, which are outside the regulation of the FOI Law. This has had an
impact on the level of public trust on public bodies. It has been shown that despite the availability of access
to information, 80% of the population in Latvia think that the court system is corrupt.

Session Five: Developing an Asia-Europe RTI Network

This last session focused on deriving the key recommendations from the workshop to be included in the
Conference Statement that was presented at the ASEM8 Summit.

Key message and recommendations

1. The right of individuals to access information held by public authorities is essential for civic
engagement, holding governments accountable, to ensure sustainable development and for the fight
against poverty and corruption.

2. ASEM governments should:

   • Recognise and respect the right of the public to seek, receive and impart information by
     adopting and fully implementing comprehensive national right to information legislation based on
     international standards;

   • Accede to and extend their commitment to international treaties and conventions advancing
     the right to information, in particular the UNECE Convention on Access to Information, Public
     Participation in Decision-making and Access to Justice in Environmental Matters (Aarhus
     Convention);

   • Ensure the fullest transparency and access to information in all bilateral and multilateral
     negotiations leading to treaties and agreements;

   • Require that international institutions adopt transparency policies and in particular proactively
     provide information needed by the public, especially vulnerable groups, to hold these institutions
     accountable

3. ASEM leaders should enable and encourage civil society initiatives in promoting the right to
information and facilitate the exchange and sharing of experiences and resources across ASEM
countries to realise this right.

These recommendations were discussed along with the identification of existing RTI activities at the regional
and international level, including at the Council of Europe Group of States against Corruption (GRECO)
level, the Asian Development Bank and the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development.
Participants were keen to see more RTI advocacy with ASEAN through the ASEAN Inter-governmental
Commission for Human Rights (AICHR) and in particular within the scope of the political/security pillar in
its work plan. The discussions also covered the question of the expansion of the Aarhus Convention, the
need for access to information relating to International Financial Institutions (IFI) and trade agreements
negotiations, and the importance of strengthening RTI in the MDG process. Participants saw the workshop
as a good opportunity for RTI activists from Asia and Europe to establish contact and share RTI experiences.
Although there is currently an online FOIA Net that allows RTI practitioners from across the world to discuss
RTI issues, there is a lack of awareness among the Asian participants of such a networking channel. All workshop participants were encouraged to register with FOIA Net. It was agreed that through the mailing list created by this workshop, participants will continue the exchange of information and develop future collaborations.
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**ARTICLE 19**

[www.article19.org](http://www.article19.org)

ARTICLE 19 is a human rights organisation with a specific mandate and focus on the defence and promotion of freedom of expression and right to information worldwide. It derives its name from Article 19 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Since its establishment in 1987, ARTICLE 19 has campaigned for freedom of expression and information as a fundamental human right, which is also central to the protection of other rights and meaningful democracy. ARTICLE 19 produces legal standards relating to public broadcasting, free expression and right to information, and promotes these standards with regional and international inter-governmental organisations. Aside from producing legal and policy analyses and lobbying governments across the world to adopt legal guarantees for freedom of expression and right to information, and bring national laws in line with the best international standards, ARTICLE 19 also conducts capacity building for governments, civil society organisations, journalists and human rights defenders to promote international standards, share best practices and transfer skills.

With its headquarters in London and field offices in Senegal, Kenya, Bangladesh, Mexico, and Brazil, ARTICLE 19 works in partnership with more than 90 local partners in more than 30 countries across Europe, Africa, Asia, Latin America and the Middle East.

**Foundation of Media Alternatives (FMA)**

The Foundation for Media Alternatives (FMA) is a Non-Governmental Organisation based in the Philippines, seeking to democratise information and communication systems and resources for citizens and communities. Since its formation in 1987, FMA has sought to enhance the popularisation of development-oriented issues and campaigns through media-related interventions, social communications projects, and cultural work. Since 1997, the Foundation has focused on the area of information and communication technologies (ICTs) to enable disadvantaged communities to assert their communication rights towards progressive social transformation. It has since evolved a proactive research and advocacy agenda in the area of ICT policy and internet governance.

FMA also engages in regional and global governance spaces, and often plays a convening role in various initiatives and engagements in and for Asian civil society. It served as a focal point for Asian CSOs in the World Summit on the Information Society (WSIS) processes, and convenes regional meetings and joint projects in the area of communication rights and access to information, knowledge and culture.
Workshop 7
The EU and Asia – Inter-regionalism and Regional Integration
Co-organisers: ASEF, United Nations University Institute on Comparative Regional Integration Studies (UNU-CRIS) in Bruges (Belgium), Institute on Comparative Regional Integration Studies at Tsinghua University (Tsinghua-CRIS) in Beijing (China)

Background

Regionalisation opens an increased space for developing inter-regional relations: the European Union (EU) actively pursues an inter-regional policy as part of its ambition to act as a ‘global player’ (Söderbaum and Van Langenhove, 2007). For some scholars, ASEM can be regarded as one of the tools used by the EU to promote regional integration processes in Asia. Others see it only as a platform to cooperate between the EU and Asia.

Regional integration is a complex process that involves state actors as main drivers to promote and institutionalise the process – but it is also driven by visions of where to go. Such visions can come from different sources. Think-tanks can be identified as key players in this process as they often generate new and progressive ideas about regional integration. The successful implementation of those ideas, however, depends on how politics and civil society react to them.

Workshop objectives and participants

As the world becomes increasingly globalised and regionalised, new avenues for inter-regional relations between Europe and Asia open up. Our workshop has examined the role of civil society in inter-regional processes with a special focus on think-tanks and institutions of higher education. The following key questions were raised:

- What role can civil society play in inter-regional cooperation between the EU and Asia?
- What is the role of think-tanks in Asia-Europe relations and how can greater collaboration between them be fostered?
- How can higher education contribute to the integration in Europe and in Asia?
- What should be the main objectives of the EU and Asia within the ASEM framework?
- What concrete joint actions should the EU and Asia undertake to deal with new regional and global challenges?

The workshop brought together representatives from academia and civil society organisations, with a specific academic research interest and/or professional experience in the field of inter-regionalism and regional integration. 17 participants from Asia and Europe participated in the workshop and three sessions, each with two presenters, were held:

- Civil Society and Regional Integration in Asia and Europe;
- Higher Education and Research as a topic for inter-regional cooperation between Asia and Europe;
- Think-tanks in promoting inter-regional cooperation between Asia and Europe
Discussion on “The EU and Asia – Inter-regionalism and Regional Integration”

Discussions on inter-regional knowledge sharing focused on a wide range of topics such as:

- Knowledge gaps about one another other’s societies, integration processes and inter-regional relations
- How knowledge resides in civil society, as grassroots knowledge and in academics and think-tanks
- Accountability and legitimacy of civil society organisations
- The inclusion of trade and labour issues to promote the social dimension of inter-regional dialogue and integration
- The need to broaden ASEM by
  - Involving diverse civil society organisations
  - Placing more important role for higher education and think-tanks
  - Having more emphasis on social and labour issues

Key message and recommendations

1. Globalisation and regional integration processes in Europe and Asia as well as inter-regional cooperation are changing the nature of governance and increasingly affect the daily lives of citizens. Civil society has a key role to play in building trust in regional integration and in inter-regional and international cooperation by fostering better understanding, promoting transparency and participation, exerting a positive influence on the policies and reforms of the major developing actors.

   In this context there is room for mutual learning in Asia and Europe on how civil society organisations can be best involved in governance. ASEM should take measures to enhance such learning processes by facilitating exchanges between civil society organisations from Europe and Asia.

2. Inter-regional cooperation between Europe and Asia needs to be deepened and widened, e.g. social issues and needs to be based upon a better understanding of each other. Higher education and research are key instruments in bringing European and Asian societies closer to each other. Exchange of students, teachers and researchers must be further stimulated. ASEM should put higher education and research cooperation between Asia and Europe as a key priority.

3. Think-tanks are input actors in creating and disseminating knowledge as well. But several issues were raised about the accountability, transparency and autonomy of think-tanks. It was acknowledged that think-tanks have played an important role in promoting regional integration but it was stressed that think-tanks need to expand their capacity to study societies from an inter-regional perspective. More European think-tanks studying Asian affairs are needed; and similarly for Asian think-tanks studying European affairs. One way to obtain this is by stimulating more interaction and exchange between think-tanks in Europe and Asia. Hence, the idea was put forward to create an ASEM think-tank network.
4. Asia and Europe need more knowledge about each other and about their inter-regional relations. ASEM should therefore mobilise civil society organisations, higher education institutions and think-tanks to facilitate the creation of an ASEM knowledge community that enhances mutual understanding. Three concrete avenues for this are proposed:

- ASEM should create more space for mutual learning by facilitating exchanges between civil society organisations from Europe and Asia and by increasing civil society participation in the ASEM processes.

- ASEM should put Higher Education and Research Cooperation as one of its top priorities and take measures to stimulate long-term research cooperation between young researchers on topics of common interest (inter-regional knowledge sharing).

- ASEM should contribute to strengthening the capacity of academic research institutes and think-tanks in Europe and Asia to understand one another’s societies by facilitating exchanges, mobility and collaboration of researchers and by facilitating the set up of an ASEM network of think-tanks.
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ASEF co-organised this workshop with

United Nations University Institute on Comparative Regional Integration Studies (UNU-CRIS)
http://www.cris.unu.edu/

The UNU Institute on Comparative Regional Integration Studies (UNU-CRIS) is one of the 14 decentralised units of the United Nations University (Tokyo, Japan). Founded in 2001 and based in Bruges, UNU-CRIS specializes in the comparative study of regional integration, monitoring and assessing regional integration worldwide and in the study of interactions between regional organisations and global institutions. Its aim is to generate new and policy-relevant knowledge about new forms of governance and co-operation. UNU-CRIS is part of several European research networks: it is one of the leading partners of the FP 6 Network of Excellence on GARNET; a partner of OBREAL/EULARO, financed by DG Development; a partner of FP 6 project SSH Futures; coordinator of the European Commission’s FP 7 project on “Changing Multilateralism: the EU as a Global-regional Actor in Security and Peace (EU-GRASP)”; coordinator of the “Network on Regional Integration Studies (NETRIS)”, funded by the ACP and DG Development; and involved in two Jean Monnet projects (DG Education and Culture) on the EU and comparative regionalism. In its first eight years of existence, UNU-CRIS’ publication record consisted of: 43 books, 149 book chapters, 89 peer-reviewed journal articles, 24 policy briefs, 239 working papers.

Institute on Comparative Regional Integration Studies at Tsinghua University (Tsinghua-CRIS)
http://www.tsinghua.edu.cn

Tsinghua Institute on Comparative Regional Integration Studies (Tsinghua-CRIS) is a newly established research institute at Tsinghua University in Beijing which is collaboration between Tsinghua University and UNU-CRIS, as well as Tsinghua University and Renmin University of China. As a multi-disciplinary research institute it brings together scholars from political science, international relations, economics, sociology, law and history, working on regional integration in East Asia, comparative regional integration in Europe and East Asia, as well as inter-regional relationship between Europe and East Asia. Tsinghua-CRIS has had a strategic partnership with UNU-CRIS in Bruges since 2009, and cooperates with other Chinese and Asian universities such as Renmin University of China, Peking University, Chinese Foreign Affairs University (host University of the East Asian Think-tank Network), China University of Political Science and Law (host University of the EU-China Law School), Fudan University in Shanghai, Zhejiang University in Hangzhou, Seoul National University in South Korea, Keio University in Japan, Chulalongkorn University in Thailand.
In addition to the seven thematic workshops, the 5th Asia-Europe Editors’ Roundtable was organised in partnership with London-based Chatham House (Royal Institute of International Affairs), with support from the Federal Public Service Foreign Affairs, Belgium, and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Japan. It was held within the framework of 4th Connecting Civil Societies of Asia and Europe Conference (CCS4). As a curtain-raiser for the 8th ASEM Leaders’ Summit (ASEM8), the Roundtable provided an appropriate platform for 17 eminent Editors from Asia and Europe to participate in a focused discussion on the necessary international mechanisms and institutions for credible and effective global governance. Participants also published articles in their respective media, thus raising the visibility for Asia-Europe relations, the ASEM process, and the work of ASEF. The Roundtable also gave inputs for recommendations by CCS4 participants in “Eight Points for ASEM8”. A monograph based on the Roundtable discussions entitled “Asia and Europe Engaging for a Post-Crisis World” was jointly produced by Chatham House and ASEF.

It is available on ASEF’s website (www.asef.org).
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ASEF co-organised this workshop with

Chatham House
http://www.chathamhouse.org/

The mission of Chatham House is to be a world-leading source of independent analysis, informed debate and influential ideas on how to build a prosperous and secure world for all. Chatham House was founded in 1920 and is based in St James’ Square, London.
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The 4th Connecting Civil Societies Conference was jointly organised by the Asia-Europe Foundation and its partners of the Europe-Asia Policy Forum consortium: the European Policy Centre (EPC), the International Institute for Asian Studies (IIAS) and the Singapore Institute of International Affairs (SIIA).

The Asia-Europe Foundation (ASEF) promotes greater mutual understanding between Asia and Europe through intellectual, cultural and people-to-people exchanges. Through ASEF, civil society concerns are included as a vital component of deliberations of the Asia-Europe Meeting (ASEM)\(^*\). ASEF was established in February 1997 by the participating governments of ASEM and has since implemented over 500 projects, engaging over 15,000 direct participants as well as reaching out to a much wider audience in Asia and Europe. [www.asef.org](http://www.asef.org)

The Europe-Asia Policy Forum (EUforAsia) is designed to target relevant stakeholders in Asia-Europe affairs and policy-making with information on contemporary issues regarding EU-Asia. The briefing series is part of the EU-Asia Policy Forum that aims to enhance EU-Asia cooperation and awareness on issues of mutual interest such as sustainable development, regional integration, governance and other hot topics. Main partners are the International Institute of Asian Studies (IIAS), the Asia-Europe Foundation (ASEF), the Singapore Institute for International Affairs (SIIA) and the European Policy Centre (EPC). The Europe-Asia Policy Forum is supported by the European Union.

This project was co-financed by:

- [The Federal Public Service Foreign Affairs, Belgium](http://www.diplomatie.belgium.be)
- [European Commission](http://www.ec.europa.eu)
- [The Japanese Ministry of Foreign Affairs](http://www.mofa.go.jp)

\(^*\) ASEM now brings together 46 member states (Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Cambodia, China, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Indonesia, India, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Korea, Laos, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Malta, Mongolia, Myanmar, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Pakistan, the Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Russia, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, United Kingdom, Vietnam) plus the European Commission and the ASEAN Secretariat. [www.aseminfoboard.org](http://www.aseminfoboard.org)