

Minutes of Meeting of the Second Regional Consultation on the ASEAN Civil Society Conference / ASEAN People's Forum (ACSC/APF) 2015, 11-12 December 2015, Shah Village, Petaling Jaya, Selangor, Malaysia.

1.0	INTRODUCTION Session Chair: Jerald Joseph, Board Member of Pusat KOMAS <i>Chair of Malaysian NOC, Chair of Regional Steering Committee</i>	Notes
1.1	<p>Welcome</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The session chair welcomed all to Malaysia for the Second Regional Consultation and noted an increase in attendance from the previous meeting. • He highlighted the current human rights status in Malaysia, highlighting the continued practice of arbitrary detention without trial via the Sedition Act which is in demand by the right wing party and NGOs. • He informed the meeting that ASEAN governments will soon launch the ASEAN community, with the tagline, "People-Centred ASEAN", in November 2015. For this purpose, ASEAN has set up a taskforce at the government level to collectively define this initiative further. The meeting will discuss these parameters as part of the agenda. • The goals for this meeting is to discuss the APF document drafts 	
1.2.	<p>Important Working Dates</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The third draft of the ACSC/APF 2015 Statement to be distributed on 14th December 2014 to all CSO's in the ASEAN network • The fourth draft of the ACSC/APF 2015 Statement to be approved and endorsed by CSO's in the ASEAN network • The ASEAN Foreign Ministers' Meeting will be held on the 26th to the 28th January 2015 in Sabah. A delegation from the consultation will be sent to submit and explain the final statement. • The ASEAN People's Forum will be held on 26th and 27th April 2015, Kuala Lumpur. 	
1.3	<p>Introduction of Delegates</p> <p>The session chair introduced and confirmed the representatives and alternate representatives from the following committees.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Malaysia National Organising Committee (NOC) • Regional Steering Committee (RSC) • Programme Committee • Drafting Committee • Media Committee • Finance and Fund Raising Committee <p>He also sought an update on the names of the national and regional representatives for each committee.</p>	

	<i>Action: Delegates to confirm names of representatives and alternative representatives for each committee.</i>	
1.4	<p>Presenting the Guiding Principles, Engagement Modality and Thematic Focuses</p> <p>The session chair presented some general guidelines for the ACSC/APF 2015 guidelines:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. The guiding principles as the non-negotiable items ii. Engagement modality iii. Thematic <p>He introduced the guiding principles the non-negotiable minimum standards – a set of common values.</p> <p>1.4.1. A few interventions were made concerning these:</p> <p>Mr. Eduardo C. Tadem floated the motion to reconsider the theme “Reclaiming the ASEAN community for the people”. Since ASEAN had been an entity created and moved solely by governments rather than the people, it would not historically true to use the term “reclaim”. He proposed for a change of the theme to “Claiming the ASEAN community for the people”.</p> <p><i>The motion was tabled for a decision by the Regional Steering Committee.</i></p> <p>Mr. Salai Isaac Khen requested for the guiding principles to include peace and conflict transformation – important for nations including Myanmar, Thailand, Aceh, Thailand, Timor Leste, Philippines. The session chair clarified that the document was meant for the consultation’s internal working principles, and discussion on substantive proposals to be made to ASEAN will be discussed at the session by the Drafting Committee.</p> <p>Ms Irene Xavier pointed out that CSOs must be vigilant in their engagement by ensuring that international laws are not used to take away rights of workers and limit the trade unions, a trend which is starting in the developed world, particularly in reference to an ILO convention on contract labour.</p> <p><i>Refer Attachment, also available on website</i></p> <p>The session chair concluded with a reminder that the consultation in general intended to seek a new approach of engagement, which is by summarising the past demands of the last nine years, and undertake an evaluative, reflective process to keep government responsible.</p>	Motion for decision
2.0	<p>UPDATES FROM EACH COUNTRY’S NATIONAL PROCESSES</p> <p>Session Chair:</p>	

	Gus Miclat, Initiatives for International Dialogue Member of Regional Steering Committee	
2.1	<p>Brunei <i>as reported by Datin Hj Siti Hajar bt Pehin Hj Md Yusof, Member of Regional Steering Committee</i></p> <p>Statements have been submitted by Brunei CSOs to the relevant government agencies since APF 2013 Brunei. As usual, no official responses have been received. However, some positive developments have taken place parallel to the demands we have included in our statement, although no explicit indication was made to credit Brunei CSOs. These were:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. In line with our emphasis on youth development, representatives of youth were included in some committees related to youth. b. On health issues, we have reached the Millenium Development Goals (MDGs); health promotion being one of the top priority of the Government, which has included CSOs in its National Committee on Health Promotion. Some of the Health Committees have also included CSO representatives late. c. The Council of Women of Brunei Darussalam and the Council of Social Welfare are now represented in the National Committee on Alleviation of Poverty. 	
2.2	<p>Burma / Myanmar <i>as reported by Mr Salai Isaac Khen, Member of Drafting Committee. A written statement was provided.</i></p> <p>On behalf of the Myanmar CSO Core Group on ASEAN (MCSCGA), the following two actions were made:</p> <p>2.2.1. Follow up of the previous recommendation</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. We have tried to contact the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, but have not received any official response from them as yet. We hope to hear from them in a few months. b. National Youth Policy raised by the Myanmar Youth Forum is in process and discussion. Apart from that, we are still struggling to have a response post-AFP 2014. <p>2.2.2. Structure of CSO core group</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. The Myanmar Civil Society Organizations' Core Group on ASEAN (MCSCGA), which is composed of 17 member organisations is a representative working body of Myanmar civil societies on ASEAN issues including on ACSC/APF. MCSCGA serve as volunteers, and were the leading members of the National Organising Committee NOC for ACSC/APF 2014 Yangon. ii. MCSCGA has met for seven times after ACSC/APF 2014, the last time being the 9th December 2014. iii. The last meeting of MCSCGA discussed and approved its 	

	<p>name, role and responsibilities and structure. All agreed at the meeting to set up an independent secretariat to enhance the work of the core group. It also reaffirmed the selection of representatives and alternates for ACSC/APF 2015.</p> <p>iv. The representatives/alternates for committees for 2015.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regional Steering Committee; Aung Myo Min (Rep.)/ Dr. May Shi Sho (Alt.) • Program Committee; Thinn Nwe Soe (Rep.)/ Swe Sann Oo (Alt.) • Drafting Committee; Salai Isaac Khen (Rep.)/ Khin Ohmar (Alt.) • FCAA Follow-up Committee; Dr. May May Pyone (Chair for former RSC) <p>v. Secretariat organization for MCSCGA will be selected in the next (8th) meeting. Necessary thematic groups will also be formed and representatives/alternates will be also selected in the next meeting.</p> <p>vi. Awareness Workshop on ASEAN Commission on the Promotion and Protection of the Rights of Women and Children (ACWC) was conducted on 9th December in Yangon by inviting Ms. Maria Amihan Valles who was former chair of ACWC.</p>	
<p>2.3</p>	<p>Cambodia <i>as reported by Mr Pen Somony, Member of Regional Steering Committee</i> <i>A written statement was provided.</i></p> <p>The Cambodian Civil Society Working Group on ASEAN (CCWA) was formed after the APF/ACSC Cambodia 2012. CCWA consists of 12 core group NGO members: CVS, Silaka, CHRAC, ADHOC, NGO Forum on Cambodia, KKKHRDA, WGP, STAR Kampuchea, CamASEAN, YFP, YRDP and NGOCRC.</p> <p>These networks represent NGOs in Cambodia working in different sectors such as youth, children, women, land and natural resources, LGBT, human rights, peace building, development, etc. The core members selected Cambodian Volunteers for Society (CVS) to be Secretariat of CCWA and myself as the Secretary.</p> <p>CCWA organized a selection of Cambodian committee members to the ACSC/APF 2015 in Malaysia through election. Anyone could stand as candidates for voting. We elected the Representatives and Alternates of the Steering, Programme, Drafting and Media Committees through our voting process.</p> <p>CCWA also has a Facebook group and page to organize a sharing and dialogue on Cambodia-ASEAN. E-mail is also used as our communication method among the group. We also organize monthly rotating meetings among our core members to share and discuss Cambodia-ASEAN issues and create our action plan. CCWA also organises ASEAN Cafe every month to share and dialogue on Cambodia-ASEAN with the participation of youth and CSOs.</p>	

	<p>We also have Mrs. Chet Charya as member of FCAA and Mrs. Thida Khus as the Project Lead of FCAA who attended the FCAA yesterday here. With regard to the follow up of APF statement, we had an informal meeting with Cambodia AICHR Representative and he informed us that he has no power for decision making, directing us instead to Cambodian Human Rights Committee and Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Our group need to approach them to discuss on further progress for engagement. And next month, we will send four Cambodians together with Laos to study visit with different bodies of ASEAN in Jakarta, Indonesia as well.</p>	
<p>2.4</p>	<p>Laos as reported by Mr Cher Her.</p> <p><i>A written statement was provided.</i></p> <p>I would like to thank Dr Kaikeo who has allowed me to speak on behalf of the Laos team. Laos is currently lacking in human resources. In the past, we assigned some of the CSOs to sit in the National Laos APF committee for APF events.</p> <p>But for this year, by the assistance of the Ministry of Home Affairs (MOHA), all CSOs in Laos selected their APF committee through a democratic process conducted last September 2014.</p> <p>An update on the APF committee activities.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There was a meeting with the old and new APF committee to review APF events for the last 10 years. 2. Organize several meetings to have a talk on coming events and preparation 3. Prepare application form and selection of delegates to APF 2015 in Malaysia. 4. Preparation of abstracts to be presented at the APF11th 5. Propose development to donors 6. Prepare members to participate APF11th in Malaysia 7. Then conduct reflection workshop for CSO in Laos. 8. Conduct planning meeting with ASEAN department and MOHA 9. Organize consultation meeting with MOHA and MOFA on the result of APF11th and draft plan for APF12th in Laos 10. Draft and submits APF11th report to MOHA and MOFA 11. APF 12th process preparation and continue beyond activities <p>Notable progress of changes in Laos: The government of Laos has included CSOs to participate in Lao's revision of its constitution, strategy and policies events via a round table format; and Lao APF committee has been recognized in paper by the government of Laos (by MOHA).</p> <p>Intervention: Ms Corinna queried the position of the government to provide the mandate to CSOs to participate in the APF, as the latter is an endeavour by civil society, not government. Mr Cher Her explained that the Laos political system and understanding is such that the government and CSOs are viewed as part of the "people", and as such, the mandate given signifies a</p>	

	step forward for Laos civil society.	
2.5	<p>Malaysia <i>As reported by Jerald Joseph</i></p> <p>The Malaysian chapter convened a meeting to set up the National Organising Committee, which nominated the representatives and alternate representatives. The Committee debated and came up with 13 issues-based subcommittees: women, indigenous people, LGBT, labour, child rights, migrants / trafficking / refugee, disability, farmers and fisher folks, democracy and elections, FOE and FOI, environment, racism / religion, economics, trade and consumerism, youth and students, urban poor, corruption and accountability, education and the 2014 Myanmar Malaysia Outgoing Steering Committee Rep. The issues were chosen based on a list of concerns, each to have their own representative and alternative representatives.</p> <p>The NOC meet once a month to plan the ACSC/APF 2015.</p>	
2.6	<p>Indonesia <i>As reported by Frenia Nababah</i> <i>A written statement was provided.</i></p> <p>It is challenging for Indonesia to muster a regular national process due to the geographical challenges of gathering people from places as far as Papua and Sulawesi. Nevertheless, one was held, and we have met our high level panel representative to deliver the statement of concern about ASEAN. We are trying to gather as many organisations as possible to be involved in the national process in January, and to engage with the government more.</p> <p>Under the new administration of President Joko Widodo, Indonesian civil society will have more dialogue with the government particularly on the impacts of AEC 2015. Besides that, Indonesian civil society will follow up with the previous meetings with ASEAN, as we become increasingly aware about AEC 2015 especially as the government is focusing its attention on ASEAN matters for its national blueprints. At the grass roots level, many discussions are held to talk about AEC and this will be followed up by active CSOs in ACSC / APR as they part of national process.</p> <p>In January, Indonesian CSOs will meet the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and talk about the engagement of civil society and ASEAN – in terms of claiming the space for people in South East Asia. The focus of Indonesian CSOs is the impact of ASEAN Integration 2015 and to call for space for civil society to participate in the ASEAN decision making process.</p>	
2.7	<p>The Philippines <i>As reported by Eduardo C. Tadem</i></p> <p>Two meetings on the Philippine process were held on October and December ever since I took over the position as country representative.</p> <p>These were the things taken up:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An overarching critique of neoliberal regional integration as the framework of discussion. 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The composition of the Philippines process was clarified to comprise of 10 to 12 CSOs. However there is need to continue bringing in more organisations to expand the composition of the process. • We decided that because there are regional group representatives, they will be invited as consultants and resource persons. • APF could be clarified immediately during the meeting. Regional groups are open to do this to be present at the meetings of the process • In terms of engagement with government bodies and agencies, the most active groups are the women's groups. There was a meeting in November by the Department of Foreign Affairs, calling them to attend the meeting. This would be a way of engaging Philippines government with respect to the response on the Myanmar statement of the APR. However there was some disappointment, because the government had wanted to talk about organising the APF 2017, instead of issues. At the meeting, CSOs were informed that the theme in 2017 would be WATER, which is an acronym for Women and children, agriculture, trade, environment and rights. • In general terms, the responses of Philippine government agencies have been disappointing with not much action, concerns on actual implementation; on this note, these have been found wanting. In these meetings with ACSC/APF, the discussion must start off with critiquing neo-liberal modular regional integration. • The Philippines Process would also raise that since it has been 10 years, it is time to evaluate the 10 years of CSO engagement. Such an evaluation should lead to trying to rethink the whole process of engagement and look at alternative modules. One of the suggestions is transform of ACSC/APF as a shadow or People's ASEAN proposed for 2016, a draft of the people's charter has been done since then, but to seriously take this up. • Economic issues highlighted in statement, political issues, territorial disputes should be part of the statement, issue of the , lastly, the role of China should be including in how its been conducting ASSEAN ++ type of engagement. <p>Major discussion: reclaiming is not an appropriate term. There is nothing to reclaim. Should be claiming.</p>	
<p>2.8</p>	<p>Singapore <i>As report by Mr. Soe Min Than</i></p> <p>I am national rep for RSC 2015 and 2014. In Singapore we have a relatively smaller civil society compared to our neighbours. The process in Singapore is not as formal, an example is how I came into the process. In January 2014, I received an email asking me to sit in the Regional Steering Committee for 2014. Even at that time, everything was done only through the email; even my organisation was not included in the earlier emails. I believe the reason for this is that there are very few groups who are interested to participate in something like this. In AFP 2014, Singapore had 11 people out of 3000 over participants – 11 people representing four CSOs; that gives you an idea of how much Singaporeans follow the process.</p> <p>What we did was this time round, since I was the previous RSC. We opened up the nominations to the network of nine organisations, covering women's groups, migrant issues, political detainees, and so on. This was</p>	

	<p>done through email but the only nominee to come out of it was myself for me to be the RSC representative. No one else was interested to take up any of the committee positions. Only a few days ago, we put forward another name, to take part as program committee member. What we will do from now is to have some meetings related to the ACSC/AFP during our meetings with on the UPR process. We will try to get more people to be rep for the APF and see whether more volunteers / nominees will come in.</p> <p>One main point is to engage with our government and ASEAN processes nationally and see whether as a group we should take that up further.</p>	
<p>2.9</p>	<p>Thailand As reported by Ms. Wanun Permpibul</p> <p>There were two processes in Thailand:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Preparation for ACSC / APF 2015. In August we had a selection process within the country to come up with different committee members, submit names and nominate as different committee members, we got the members by the time we had the first consultative workshop in September. Then we go back to Thailand and we had a meeting with different people in Thailand, to follow up with what was discussed. We had different comments and questions. We had another meeting to communicate but this is in terms of the channels of communication to get the comments on the first draft of the statement and recommendation. We have some comments and recommendations 2. FCAA organised a seminar to follow up on the 2014 recommendations and statement and during that one day seminar, we invited government sectors and people to come up and answer about what they have been up to so far as well as comment on the R&S, Q&A sessions all day. Outcome is being summarised. Also we sent out a questionnaire to CSO and government to find out more. 	
<p>2.10</p>	<p>Vietnam</p> <p>Concerning the national process, before the first regional consultation in Malaysia, we sent the invitation widely to all the CSO. However, despite ample notice, not many organisations had allocated funds.</p> <p>After the first regional meeting, we circulated all the outcomes by email, and organised a meeting on the 2nd of October, 40 organisations attended. We selected reps to different committees for APF 2015. We discussed issues of interest to bring to APF and the burning issues for the statement. We discussed how to raise funds for participation. We sent questionnaires to CSO by mail to collect their interests and recommendations for the APF 2015. All recommendations by the Vietnamese CSOs have been sent to the NOC. Concerning the draft statement, once we have received it, we sent it widely to all the CSO for their comments and recommendations, and collected it, and sent it to the drafting committee. We are also setting up thematic working groups to work on, peace and security, food security, women children, climate change and so on, to prepare for the APC 2015.</p> <p>We also circulated related doc of the FCAA</p>	

2.11	<p>Timor Leste</p> <p>Member of FCCA, APF in Myanmar, I sent the statement and rec with gov. Dialogue wit Mofa specially on human rights and justice, women and children, climate change, for honestly currently we haven't do our national selection process on APF 2015, but we have planned January we will do it and we will send info.</p>	
2.12	<p>Other Comments</p> <p><i>Mary Agnes, Open Society Foundations</i> Requested for disability rights to be highlighted in reports as well.</p>	
3.0	<p>FOLLOW UP COMMITTEE OF THE ACSC / APF (FCAA)</p> <p>Session Presenters: Ms. Premrudee Daorung, Thailand. Ms. Judy Abdullah, Brunei</p>	
3.1	<p>The Task of Monitoring and Following Up on the ACSC/APF 2014</p> <p>Ms. Premrudee Daorung presented an overview of the FCAA which was set up following the ASCS/APF 2014 Myanmar, including background and rationale, principles, committee members, scope and timelines.</p> <p><i>Refer to presentation slides "The Task of Monitoring and Following Up on the ACSC/APF 2014".</i></p> <p>Ms. Judy Abdullah presented a summary of engagement and dialogue of all ASEAN civil societies with government thus far.</p> <p><i>Refer to presentation slides "FCAA Summary of Engagement".</i></p>	
3.2	<p>Interventions</p> <p>3.2.1. In terms of the National and Regional implementation of triple tasks (engagement, follow up and monitoring, documenting through narratives), whether it is possible to have the consolidated narratives by February as a more realistic timeframe.</p> <p>(Jelen C. Paclarin, Philippines)</p> <p><i>Response: Our target is to present the results of the monitoring at the ASCS / APF 2015 in April, so it will take some time to consolidate the country reports together and make an appointment with the ASEAN secretariat. As long as we can fit within that timeframe, so that we can present in time. The deadline of end of January came up, because the Committee understands that sometime in February, we will need to talk to ASEAN, and have the report out in March.</i></p> <p>3.2.2. There should be framework of how these tasks should be conducted, as well as a structure and methodology for evaluation and monitoring.</p>	

(Jelen C. Paclarin, Philippines)

Response: We have a recommendation for each stream, although there may be overlaps. The country looking at these recommendations can link to what they think is relevant that they want to ask the government. We have designed a list of questions both for the government and civil society groups, which would be relevant to all. This is the list of framework that we have been using it in Thailand.

- 3.2.3. In reference to the budget, it seems costly for delegates from countries such as Indonesia and the Philippines, as it is expensive to travel. Question of whether there are funds allocated at the national level so that CSOs can congregate to convene national meetings.

(Jelen C. Paclarin, Philippines)

Response: In terms of budget, in Thailand in our meeting on 27 November, we didn't have money. We asked for Chulalongkorn University and they paid for meeting. We have also thought of what is the best process, whether to organise a forum to raise funds. The budget that we have left for 2014, we have used for the meeting for FCAA but even so it is a small amount. We don't think they have any left for the national level.

- 3.2.4. When we are reviewing documents, are we looking only ASEAN documents. How about statements released by government, whether that should be monitored as well.

(Jelen C. Paclarin, Philippines)

Response: We have a letter that we would like to send through, attached with the TOR of FCAA which explains who we are and what we are going to do. We would be prepared to support you at the country level and working together in the months to come.

- 3.2.5. Would CSOs be able to view and comment on the consolidated report 2-3 weeks prior to submission?

(Jelen C. Paclarin, Philippines)

Response: We will try to share with everyone prior to submission, but work towards a realistic timeframe. If the ACSC/APF is in April, we recognise the need for more reviews, but there is also difficulty to match the deadlines.

(Jelen C. Paclarin, Philippines)

- 3.2.6. We are concerned that there is also the draft statement to be worked on, and the bulk of work is tremendous within the short timeframe.

Response: These are fixed deadlines, but our approach is not strict. We will work closely together on the progress of these reports and drafts.

4.0	<p>DISCUSSION ON THE DRAFT STATEMENT “RECLAIMING THE ASEAN COMMUNITY FOR THE PEOPLE ACSC/APF 2015” – CSO STATEMENT Session chaired by Ms. Wathshlah Naidu and Ms. Marjorie Pamintuan</p>	
4.1	<p>Introduction by Ms. Wathshlah Naidu</p> <p>4.1.1. Context</p> <p>The idea of a common pre-draft was adopted at the first regional consultation. The pre-drafted CSO statement is a new concept, compared to previous years where the statement is traditionally drafted and released during the ACSC/APF itself within a short timeframe; by that time, discussions and key resolutions by ASEAN officials would have taken place and been made. The statement by CSOs would have been too late to make more significant impact.</p> <p>The rationale behind a pre-summit draft is to bring forward key priorities issues affecting the people of ASEAN for discussion to the officials involved, for their deliberations and consideration at the decision-making process.</p> <p>4.1.2. Status of Statement and the Drafting Process</p> <p>In terms of the length of statement, we initially wanted a three-page document, which expanded to five-pages. The idea was to have it short and succinct, instead of an exhaustive list of items. Additionally, a pre-draft would be able to be inclusive of voices who are not represented at the ACSC/APF itself, representing broader views. The process in which this was done was to extract and narrow down the regional concerns to three broad clusters. This process was a tedious consultative process to identify our three common priorities: democratic process, government and fundamental rights and freedom; discrimination and inequality; and development justice.</p> <p>At this stage, we would not be including new issues at this point in this statement and instead, try to include concerns within the 3 broad priority issues.</p> <p>We have a second draft now based on feedback, and will receive more substantive points in this meeting. We would be circulating the third draft on the 14th December, where 4 weeks will be given for national consultation.</p> <p>In terms of the second draft, we had hoped for more comments than what we expected to receive. We did get substantive and substantial comments from APMM, CDPC, PAN-AP, national level Philippines, Laos, Indonesia, and others. When we got these, Marjorie incorporated all these into one document; we deliberated on controversial issues and tried to make sure they were relevant to all. We considered all comments and most of the issues here. However, some were too specific that we were not able to include.</p> <p>There is a concern that the statement may have weighed too much on human rights issues and less on economics, development and trade. We</p>	

	<p>acknowledge that it needs more work on the preamble section, we will try to follow up as we need the language from you.</p> <p>4.1.3. Use of Statement The statement would be used to impact the ASEAN ministerial meeting in January. We have requested for space and time to hand over the statement and explain the content.</p>	
<p>4.2</p>	<p>Review of the Second Draft by Ms. Marjorie Pamintuan, Asia-Pacific Research Network</p> <p>Ms Marjorie Pamintuan ran through the second draft, section by section, to introduce the substantive points for discussion.</p> <p><i>Refer attachment.</i></p>	
<p>4.3</p>	<p>Discussion on Statement Process</p> <p>4.3.1. We record thanks for the drafting committee for the hard work done. We have concerns about the timeline and the timing of the finalisation of the draft statement which has been set in time for the ministerial meeting in January. We feel there needs to be more time. Secondly, we are not sure if the AMM is the venue for presenting the final statement. Previously, it is the senior officials meeting for the presentation of the final statement. Foreign Ministers represent only one aspect, whereas senior officials would also include finance, investment, agricultural. This is not a matter just for foreign policy, but also various other issues. The senior officials meeting would be the proper venue for the submission, and this takes place usually a month before the summit sometime around March.</p> <p>(Eduardo Tadem representing The Philippines)</p> <p><i>Response by Ms. Wathshlath Naidu: We will try to engage at the senior officials meeting. At the first regional meeting, it was felt strongly that we must engage with the foreign ministers especially at the first AMM, and pursuant to this we have already sought to be given an official space to present the statement. This is already a process which was agreed upon, and initiatives are already in there at the AMM. As to the timeline, the deadline is just prior to the AMM. There is no room to be flexible because the decision has been adopted earlier.</i></p> <p>4.3.2. We welcome the new modality, however there are concerns we wish to raise. The process statement may not have been as inclusive as it hoped to be, as the only feedback mechanism was via email, and many CSOs lack access to emails such as indigenous people, who have better access through phones, for example. The language of the statement was also in English, and its presentation is conceptual than concrete – these concepts may not be familiar and need translating for certain groups.</p> <p>Hence we see that the statement is not a true reflection, compared to the wider consultation at the conference where all comments can</p>	

be accounted for. We seek a wider participation.

To address this issue we strongly recommend that we should not just release this statement, but we are also thinking that the ACSC/AFP should produce an outcome statement in addition, to ensure that all views are reflected. This is a uniform process, and ample time is given for us to comment.

So aside from this document, we recommend an annexe that will include the recommendations of those who attended the conference.

(Jelen C. Paclarin representing South East Asian Women's Caucus).

Response by Ms. Wathshlath Naidu:

It was decided that there would already be two annexes: a summary of statements of the past nine years sorted by priority issues; and the FCAA analysis of the 2014 process.

To address the concerns of all groups, different thematic groups can come up with their own statements and press conferences, which would be endorsed by the APF process, have the APF logo and the media committee would help to facilitate the dissemination of these statements. This is in addition to the general statement.

In terms of inclusiveness, this process should be inclusive as people attending the APF are not completely representative of the communities. CSOs here can take it upon ourselves to initiate the level of dialogue. Realistically, among the 3,000 who attend, very few actually speak. We are hoping to strengthen the process. We had certain opportunities where we could come up with different modalities and recommendations, but this option was decided and acted upon via a collective decision making process.

- 4.3.3. The statement is too long and detailed. We recommend a short document to interest government officials. The length may put some off. Also, Thai officials do not use English, and so it is hard for the network to participate, as we need the local language to share with the local network.

(Thailand delegate)

Response by Ms. Wathshlath Naidu: We agree that this draft, which has not gone through copy editing, is too long and detailed, and could be too ornate. It should be more crisp and toned down. In terms of language, we hope national groups can take the lead to have the document translated.

GUS

- 4.3.4. We record thanks for the work of the committee on the draft. I share the share the concern of the Philippine delegation. During our national committee meeting, the initiative to endorse the statement before the event is a very new idea and the concern was more of

making it feel inclusive and making the people feel that it is theirs – that is the key question to consider.

Referring to the annexe of summary of the previous 10 statements and recommendations on the burning issues, the process should be done in a democratic and transparent way for inclusivity and accountability. It would be useful for each working group to have their own minutes.

As to the content of the statement, I propose that the first part should cite the issues of the past 10 years.

(Nguyen Thi Thanh Huyen, Vietnam)

- 4.3.5. I have the same concern as Jelen. Thailand has conducted national consultation too and it really takes time. We should not redo or rephrase the whole process, as I feel that it is rushed. Because we do translation as well, the process takes longer. It is difficult to come up with a consultation within the country by January. It is a good document, but we need to consider changing the name to something else.

In terms of meetings with officials, I suggest submitting the statement to others apart from AMM, to allow the process to reach more people, and include more people. The 12th January deadline is too short.

(Delegate, Thailand)

Response by Jerald Joseph: I wish to remind that this process is to present these points to officials at the discussion stage, as a new way to effect real tangible change. That is the objective of pre-drafting and submission to Ministerial Meetings. This process doesn't stop us from issuing statements, and is not limited to foreign ministers.

So far, the NOC has emailed the minutes and the statement to the email list that we have, doing all possible to ensure that these materials get on the to the ground. Local CSOs also need to take it to the ground.

- 4.3.6. A decision must be made on whether we want an annexe during the ACSC/APF 2015 to capture recommendations from delegates there.

(Jelen C. Paclarin representing South East Asian Women's Caucus).

- 4.3.7. There may be some sectors and constituencies that may have been missed in the cross sectional – like people with disabilities, AIDS patients, stronger highlighting of gender equality.

(Malin)

Response by Ms. WN: On Intersectional gaps – we have taken note

	<p><i>of it.</i></p> <p>4.3.8. Usually the strength of the statement is the number of CSOs attending the conference, we may want to add how many were consulted. As civil society, the first meeting is usually has very broad scope of discussion. For process of accountability. We should be consulted as the people to be consulted.</p> <p><i>Response: The working method was discussed on the first consultation. If there were specific dispute by the drafting committee, it would be put to RSC, this is the process that Jerald, Yap and we should adhere to.</i></p> <p>There is no way that all issues should be included, but what we failed to do is how to use these statements of conference as a solidarity statement not just a shopping list of issues. We cannot manage to have a solidarity statement even on concrete issues. This is a learning process.</p> <p>The second thing on the drafting committee that we discuss, by having a draft is to give the respective countries to understand what are the problems in ASEAN, may not be issue in our daily activities.</p> <p>As much as possible, we initiate a discussion on the draft on the local level, and discuss with our local. The prior process of ACSC/APF has not advanced or improved, I suggest we give it this process a try.</p> <p>(Atnike Sigiro, Indonesia)</p>	
<p>4.4</p>	<p>Discussion Statement Content</p> <p>4.4.1. Title of the Statement: “Reclaiming” to be changed to “Claiming”</p> <p>In using “Reclaiming”, we are assuming that the ASEAN people were once in control. In reality, ASEAN was first representing SEA elites – it was a political project of elites. The economic aspect only came later, with ASEAN free trade. The ASEAN people were never part of this process, it was always dictated. Hence it should be “Claiming”, because it was never ours in the first place.</p> <p>(Mr Eduardo Tadem, Philippines)</p> <p><i>Response by Ms. Wath hlath Naidu: This matter to be floated to the Regional Steering Committee for a decision, as the title follows after the theme of the ASEAN Summit.</i></p> <p>4.4.2. Strengthen critique on neo liberalism.</p> <p>The critique should appear as an overarching framework of analysis, rather than used to explain the economic framework. This is because neoliberalism impinges on the political security and social cultural aspects. Hence it should have heavier and a more focused emphasis.</p>	

(Mr Eduardo Tadem, Philippines)

Response by Ms. Wathshlath Naidu: That portion was included based on input by the Philippines delegation. We request for the Philippines delegation to input a paragraph with the language for our inclusion.

4.4.3 Balance between human rights approach and economic issues

I disagree that no new issues may be included. ASEAN Summit isn't about human rights, and there is a need to bring up issues of trade and investments, especially unequal trade between countries such as Thailand, Malaysia and Singapore which dominate 72 per cent of trade. We are not addressing the all-important component which links to economic integration. We need to look at the way ASEAN is interfacing with non-ASEAN instruments such as the TPPA.

(Mr Eduardo Tadem, Philippines)

Response by Ms. Wathshlath Naidu: Tying it to development justice, trade can included. We request for the Philippines delegation to submit a paragraph with the language for our inclusion.

Bring up development justice as the first cluster, as we are looking at AEC as a focal point, and so therefore it is important that we provide a much clearer framework that the neoliberal and market-driven economy is not working. In this paper, it is problematic that it is strong in civil liberties, but in terms of the economic framework, it tends to have a slight disconnect with civil liberties. We need to tighten up on that.

In recommendations, we also need to actually not just talk about neo liberal impact on labour but also mention the social justice because we looked at the economic side and not social justice.

(Maria Chin Abdullah, Malaysia)

Response by Ms WN: Noted. It is acknowledged we need to elaborate more about social justice.

A general comment was made that point two in economic development fails to address human rights violations. What is missing is why ASEAN has failed to implement any of the things sought for, they have failed to overcome obstacle of national interest. If they cannot overcome that, there is no such thing as integration.

(Singapore)

4.4.4. Emphasis on Government Accountability

Push urgency for ASEAN and its respective governments to halt measures to impunity – a cross cutting issue across economic justice and civil liberties. We need to reiterate in Southern Thailand.

Southern Philippines, West Papua, these are serious international crimes. Rohingya is already considered pre-genocidal.

4.4.5. Role of China

We must say something about the role of China, not to fan any sino-phobic sentiment to veer away from ultra-nationalism positions. The doctrine of common heritage of natural resources must be espoused.

4.4.6. Specific Clauses

For item 6.1, is the statement shadowing the ASEAN three pillars? Can development justice be termed as “social and development justice”?

(Singapore)

Response by Ms. Washthlath Naidu: There is no link to the ASEAN three pillars. The social element is addressed within the scope of development justice. There is no need for a change.

For item 7.2c, we need to mention the human rights defenders declaration. For item 7.2.3.e we need to specify that states must ratify all core conventions.

(Singapore)

Response by Ms. Washthlath Naidu: These points are noted.

The definition of development justice should be defined when it is first introduced in 6.3 instead of in 7.2.3.

(Reileen Joy Dulay, Thailand)

Response by Ms. WN: We need to go back to APWLD recommendation on this for a clear articulation of what these terms mean.

Referring to page 3 in terms of intensifying resources, to add “seeds” based on how corporates have genetically modified food for trade. Since we have 40 per cent agro inputs, it links to other issues raised, namely environment, corporate control and development justice.

(Deeppa Ravindran, PAN-AP)

Referring to 6.3, to clarify what is meant by “integration with political security and socio-cultural pillars”. In regards to corporate social accountability framework, to mention human rights in business.

Finally, coming from the Philippines we are divided by the usage of the terms “prostitutes” and “sex workers”. Our recommendation is put slash.

(Jelen C. Paclarin, Philippines)

Response by Ms WN: Agree that we need to strengthen the language. With respect to terminology for sex workers and prostituted workers, it is a debate that it will not end, and both in context of workers rights. Their mention arises out of the context of workers' rights, in which case sex workers are more appropriate and putting a slash, given the context, would not flow.

4.4.7. Structure of Statement

The structure of the statement should be clearer, with proper headings in place. Preamble should include general information and analysis on ASEAN over the past 10 years.

(Vietnam)

Response by Ms WN: Noted on the headings and will take action.

We are not doing an analysis but a summary of the statements issues over the past 10 years by priority issues. That is in the pipeline. There is draft by Fareeza (IDEAS) now. In terms of timeframe, we are not able to do an analysis but a summary.

I suggest to move development justice up above the other clusters, it deals with the economic and trade context in ASEAN clearest. Doing so can provide context and the framework for the other clusters that follow.

(Pang Khee Teik, Malaysia)

Response by Ms WN: These 3 points are institutional concerns. We agree and acknowledge that the preamble need to be reworked, with analysis on neoliberal framework.

Strongly recommend that the preamble be shortened and that the key recommendations be summarised as bullet points, simple language that they can understand, simple language to translate easily.

(Debbie Stothard, Malaysia)

To me, the content of this paper is very important, and people agree to the idea of consolidating 9 years' worth of issues. At the same time, we do expect a deeper analysis, and recommendation based on that analysis. We have to include those who are in charge of the issues and not just the drafting committee. We should come back to that. When diferent people come back, Open government and extractive.

If we have time, we should come back to the specific issues and expand, if we have anything we come back with the wording, the group or network should be able to discuss. We need something better than just a summary.

(Delegate)

Response by Ms WN: We acknowledge it is good to strengthen the analysis and recommendations. We will discuss and explore this later.

4.4.8. New Issues

Reflecting from what I'm hearing, decisions have been taken, yet at the same time, newer people are coming in, or older people who did not attend the first consultation. There must be a balance between making inputs continue to be heard, for comments to still go on. There is already framework, so the issues can be inserted into the framework. At the end there is more alliance building, getting everyone onboard.

(Malin)

Response by Ms. WN: Yes, agreed framework, anything left out could be inserted into the framework.

Previous decisions should not be written in stone, especially what pertains to our fundamental concerns. Conflict resolution should be a cluster, and ecological justice should be a cluster. Environmental is not just on development justice. We are more than responsible enough not to have the floodgates open. These are certain issues that they are essential. I propose that the steering committee meeting take this up for decision.

(Rex)

Response by Ms WN: Agreed. We will leave it to regional steering committee and draft committee.

4.4.8.1. Peace and Security

I propose to add a cluster of peace and conflict resolution here. Without peace, no human rights are assured. Peace and security is a big thing for Myanmar, Philippines, Vietnam, Thailand.

(Vietnam)

Response by Ms WN: Including new issues would only be opening the floodgates. We can go ahead and have non-exhaustive areas, but having gone through the process where we agreed, this would be a common priority for the region. It is difficult to do it as this point. There is a need to respect the process and see how to move forward. It is almost impossible now to include new issues. We can have separate statements on different issues.

I would like to stress on the peace and security portion. I am a member of the drafting committee, but I want to raise this again because it is very important for Myanmar, Philippines,

Thailandm Aceh, and transition states such as Timor Leste. I propose the inclusion of peace and security as cluster 6.4.

(Salai Isaac, Myanmar)

Response by Ms WN: On peace and security, we note the number of requests for this to be inserted as a new cluster.

I agree with Isaac. I understand that the statement was culled by past statements. In APF Brunei, Myanmar, Cambodia, Peace and Security was a major point – I wonder why it is not included in the sifting process. Peace and human security captures not only internal conflicts but also territorial disputes. We have enough bases to reconsider the inclusion of this point. The decision should be with the assembly now to see if we want to open it up. Can we do this the democratic way. We want to relook this as a new cluster.

How were the three clusters chosen?

(Gus Micalat, Philippines)

Response by Ms. WN: Perhaps a solution is to try to reach a compromise to include peace and security within the first cluster i.e. development justice, which is cross cutting touching foreign intervention, territorial disputes linked within governance, safe and open spaces. Creating a new cluster is feared to open up the floodgates, and so is there a possibility of articulating this within the determined clusters.

Response by Mr. JJ: The clusters were determined through a facilitative process using a participative process in the first meeting. People used the framework to read new issues into it.

Response by Ms. Marjorie Pamintuan: We could include peace and security under the development justice heading for a holistic approach, because at the moment it is has a narrow approach linking to economic terms.

4.4.8.2. Climate Change

Another burning issue is climate change, food security and social protection. Our CSO has been very active in making recommendations on climate change over the last ten years, but I do not see anything here anywhere in this 6 page article.

(Vietnam)

Response by Ms. WN: On issues on climate change, food security, social protection, that is already in the statement, under the development justice component.

Response by Pang Khee Teik, Malaysia: I reiterate non-inclusion of new issues. Rather, to be parked under the current headers.

	<p>4.4.8.3. Territorial disputes We have to say something about territorial disputes. The idea of commons much fall under the common heritage of humankind, in that shouldn't be monopolise but shared by all countries in the region.</p> <p>(Mr Eduardo Tadem, Philippines)</p> <p><i>Response by Ms. Wathshlath Naidu: On new issues, as of now, it is a closed door. We have deliberated on peace security, so to be respectful of the process, we would have to stick to that decision. On territorial disputes it can be parked indefinitely until something changes. If we could tie it in in terms of exploitation of national resources, framework of development justice, there can be an articulation, but it would not be seen as a priority concern.</i></p> <p>4.4.8.4. Indigenous peoples We want to focus on the intellectual property issues and recommendations in the UNDRIP. If possible to summarise the content on OA and insert the outcome of the world conference on indigenous peoples, and bring up the area of land rights.</p> <p>(Yusry Ahon, Malaysia)</p> <p><i>Response by Ms. WN: We will incorporate the rights of indigenous peoples into the draft, particularly in development justice cluster.</i></p>	
<p>5.0</p>	<p>Outcome of Group Thematic Meetings</p> <p>Aside from the discussion at the group thematic levels, the following interventions were made:</p> <p>5.0.1. My fellow group mates from environmental groups have discussed that we recommend the environment agenda as a cluster in the statement – a fourth pillar. We will organise the workshop, and make engagements on that basis.</p> <p>(Rex)</p> <p>5.0.2. A request was made for workshops to include gender perspective as a cross cutting theme, and hope there is a good representation of women. If any group needs ideas or suggestions for speakers, may contact us as we have a lot of networks from the women caucus.</p> <p>(Ren Chung, WAO, Malaysia)</p> <p>5.0.3. In all your workshops and events, a reminder is made to extend your advocacy reach by generating content for the ACSC/APF website (http://aseanpeople.org/). There is a commitment to upload video. If there are points that people want to make, make a quick video for upload, especially if it is more expedient than writing. Think about how to project that through the website because we are trying to get as many media as possible to use the website as a way of following the issues.</p>	

(Debbie Stothard)

The group thematic meetings produced the following outcomes:

5.1. Women's rights and women's issues

A written report was provided by the group.

5.1.1. Pre-Conference Event (morning of the first day)

ASEAN's Human Rights Report Card Forum / Press Briefing

- Idea is for 11 representatives from each country (including Timor Leste) to give their scores, on pass or fail basis, on 6 priority issues:
 - i. Gender equality / anti-discrimination
 - ii. VAW
 - iii. SRHRH
 - iv. Economic empowerment
 - v. Political participation
 - vi. Migration
- Output: Report card composed of scores, analysis and recommendations
- Media briefing to be accompanied by press release
- Committed organisations are ARROW (Malyn), IWRAWAP (Sanyu), WAO (Wathsala and Ren Chung), Women's Legal and Human Rights Bureau (Jelen), NGO Gender Group (May May Pyone), CWBD and will ask SEA Women's Caucus (Jelen).

5.1.2. Request for plenary space at ACSC/APR 2015 to present this

5.1.3. All workshops should include gender issues and women's representation

5.2. Indigenous people

We suggest to have a representatives from the indigenous groups from all countries for sharing and discussion. As a host, we want to bring out the issues. We should have small workshops to highlight issues such as education and other issues. We want more creative ways of participation to attract/interest the participants so that they can attend the workshops. Some discussed if possible to find a space to dialogue with government, in their meetings. We hope that there is a press conerence and media event.

Response: The UN Special Rapportuer on Indigenous Peoples Ms. Victoria Tauli Corpuz will be here. We could ask her to have a presence in one of the indigenous oriented workshops.

5.3. LGBT

A written report was provided by the group.

5.3.1. Young LGBTI critically need supporting services from all available sectors. They need to know that there are support for them out there should their family members decide to disown them. This includes in particular the financial support.

5.3.2. Mental health is a critical and prevent problem faced by

LGBTI, especially young LGBTI. This is because of the tremendous social and economic pressure.

5.3.3. Research to point out and explain the different landscapes of SOGIE issues, particularly in the new generation, are of foremost importance. Grants and supports should be given to LGBTI persons to conduct research.

5.3.4. Marginalisation on the basis of ethnicity, impoverished conditions, conflict areas, rural areas, aggravates the discrimination and stigmatised situations of LGBTI people.

5.4. **Labour issues, Migrant, trafficking**

We purpose to organise a dialogue and workshop between the missions embassies and migrant community leaders before the ACSC/APT what we are proposing, before the ACSC/ APF.

There could be some activity on the upcoming ASEAN framework on protection for migrant workers. Also dialogue with the drafting committees who are working on the instruments for migrant worker groups to call for a minimum or living wage within ASEAN region.

A written report was provided by the group.

- We need an assessment of our engagement with ASEAN.
 - We can send out a survey of the impact of what we have done thus far.
 - In the past:
 - We have pushed for an ASEAN framework.
 - National consultations.
- Few trafficking cases are recognized by the government. We need support from ASEAN countries to support anti-human trafficking measures.
- Currently, there is no regional complaint mechanism and we should lobby for one.
 - It can be difficult to prosecute and there may be challenges even enforcing a complaint mechanism nationally.
 - Refugees and trafficked persons would have to engage country of origin (COO) and country of destination (COD) in order to file complaints and this process can be difficult.
 - This could be a long-term goal.
- We need access to the ASEAN framework.
 - It has not been circulated.
 - National lobbying can be an option. Can we speak to national governments, in particular the drafting committee.
 - There is currently no engagement for civil society.
- There should be a separate migration statement, apart from the ASEAN general statement.

- Consultations with missions *before* ACSC/APF:
 - CSOs can talk about country process with other ASEAN embassies.
 - Consultations have more feedback when they are held in the country where feedback is needed.
 - We can bring the missions together through the bar council.
 - We can consider individual dialogues with missions if we are unable to gather them in one place.
 - Sundays would be ideal since migrants are generally off then.
 - We can get migrant leaders to speak about certain issues. (Could be more effective than having a panel).

5.5. **Child rights**

Child rights issues do not stand in isolation, but together with other issues including migrants and refugees, trafficking, indigenous peoples issues, as children live among them. The voice of the children hardly ever gets heard. We request that when each thematic group discuss, to include a children component. The TPPA is going to increase child trafficking and vulnerabilities. There will be workshops at the ACSC/APF.

A written report was provided by the group.

Background:

The looming ASEAN Economic Community which will be signed in 2015 will have a great impact on the lives of children and their families. CSOs involved in the advocacy for child rights aim to call for urgent policy measures that would enhance safeguards for children. The review of the ACWC TOR and existence of the Declaration of the EVAW and EVAC are opportunities for child rights advocates to influence greater child protection measures.

Purpose:

- To inform participants about the negative impact of AEC on children's realization of their rights
- For children to share their views on AEC's impact on their rights
- To come up with a policy statement addressed to ASEAN and ACWC including national governments

Advocacy:

As children voices are never heard, it is decided to have workshop at regional level to advocate on Child Protection through addressing impact of AEC. All the thematic groups are requested to incorporate or include children in all the thematic areas especially migration, refugees, trafficking, indigenous groups children cannot be excluded or neglected as the impact on them is high.

Methodology:

Prior to the APF

- CRC Asia members would like to conduct national level consultations with children related to ASEAN issues and get their views or recommendations brought to APF through workshops.
- Awareness building among children about AEC and ASEAN and need for greater child protection
- Consultation with children on priority issues in light of AEC
- Development of children's statement to be presented during the APF
- Selection of child representatives to the APF

During the APF

- Evidence-based presentation of impact of AEC on lives of children
- Open Forum and development of statement
- Dissemination of statement to media and CSOs

Participants:

- Child rights groups and other CSOs
- ACWC and AICHR representatives

Output:

- Policy recommendations addressed to ACWC and ASEAN

5.6. **Disability issues**

There is a request for the venue to be friendly and inclusive to persons of disabilities.

5.7. **Farmer's fisher folks**

We purpose to advocate the idea of farming without pesticides, towards organic farming. We also want to encourage farmers to share knowledge with each other, so that they scale up production not only for sale but also for community sharing.

A solidarity march was sought for with the farmers as an expression of empowerment and expression of the struggle.

Response: The RSC will discuss about organising a solidarity walk.

5.8. **Democracy and elections**

We purpose to hold activities and workshops in a fun, creative and engaging way through gamification to attract more people. The message is retained, but a non-traditional method is used for the APF such as theatre, card games on democracy, art installations, etc.

	<p>5.9. Freedom of expression and freedom of information (none)</p> <p>5.10. Freedom of religion, discrimination, ethnicity The group identified the following issues:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Insulting religion as grounds for criminalisation 2. Blasphemy law 3. Protection for the religious minority groups; no recognition from the state 4. Impunity for the perpetuation of any attacks, discriminations, even mass atrocities. 5. Draft of law on religious harmony contained the provision of Blasphemy Law (Indonesia) -> Discrimination laws & regulations 6. Two ways of the violation of freedom of religion: 1. Non-state actor attacks and 2. State is doing nothing 7. Harmful practices within the implementation of religion 8. Regulation of religion 9. Force to declare the religion 10. Segregation within the religious groups 11. Right to identify for stateless people 12. Equality for the non-majority group – disprivileged the majority groups. <p>5.11. Economic trade and consumerism</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The question on the nature of the regionalism that is being sought, that the framework is to move away from a neo-liberal character towards redistributive economics, gender and social justice, environment preservation, accountability of government and corporations. Policies should also be assessed based on its implications on human rights. • A gender perspective should be incorporated into the people's blueprint, and any regional treatise such as the APEC, TPPA, RSCP. • Holding private actors accountable for human rights violations, using and demystifying RAGI principles, promoting business and human rights • Release education material on the ASEAN Blueprint to make it simple for regular people, and to raise awareness. • To address TPPA as binding and affects entire trade relations of ASEAN, where the rights of the vulnerable groups would be undermined. • The APF, to have workshops to develop networks, present alternative frameworks, and press events. <p>5.12. Youth & students</p> <p>5.13. Peace and security <i>A written report was provided by the group.</i></p> <p>There would be workshops held, looking into four topics to be included:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Internal on-going conflict including horizontal conflict and ceasefire monitoring <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Myanmar, Thailand, West Papua, Philippines 2. Post-conflict settlement including agreements monitoring <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Aceh, Mindanao, Timor Leste 3. Territorial disputes – among ASEAN countries and between 	
--	--	--

	<p>ASEAN and other countries</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Cambodia-Thailand, Malaysia-Philippines, Timor Leste – Australia, Vietnam-China, South China Sea <p>4. Security Sector Reform</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Indonesia, Myanmar 	
6.0	<p>COMMITTEE REPORTS</p> <p>Session moderated by Ms. Reileen Joy Dulay, Thailand</p>	
6.1	<p>Regional Steering Committee <i>As reported by Mr. Jerald Joseph</i></p> <p>6.1.1. Decisions Made</p> <p>6.1.1.1. Title of Statement The title of the statement shall be retained, following the theme of the ACSC / APF.</p> <p>6.1.1.2. Peace and Security Peace and security to be taken as a fourth cluster based on overwhelming feedback, and that it encompasses several other important subthemes.</p> <p>6.1.1.3. Terminology for “Rohingya” The Drafting Committee submitted this matter for the decision of the RSC. See 6.2.2. for the decision made.</p> <p>6.1.1.4. Venue The NOC / RSC will decide on the venue by the 22nd of January before the third regional consultation.</p> <p>6.2. Other Key Points</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Ministry of Foreign Affairs is interested to make the ASEAN summit ACSC / APF a high-profile affair, because of the People-Centred ASEAN approach to work on the ASEAN community. • There are possibilities of receiving funding from the Prime Minister’s Office, which is currently in the midst of being confirmed. • Reminder to post and make the processes and resources available online <p>6.3. Post-2nd Consultative Meeting Actions at National Levels</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The discussions and result will be posted live through our Facebook page by a dedicated team. We have been sharing the work regularly through meeting and emails. (Somony) • An update would be disseminated across the networks to the communities. A national consultation on 19th January will be held, to include as many people from the provinces in a big workshop in Southern Thailand. (Delegate, Thailand) • Spread a clear summary of the meeting proceedings to our communities through direct interaction with village people. (Delegate, Orang Asli group) • In January, it would be time to share all information at the district level to the level officers. (Agau, Timor Leste) • After the 2nd Regional Consultative Meeting, we will be planning for April forum. Consultations are ongoing culminating in the 25th 	

anniversary of migrants convention, where pressure will be placed for ASEAN to sign this convention. We will be planning on how to position and lobby the department of labour. (Rex)

- Core Group to meet on 23rd December to discuss issues that require immediate review and response. We will focus on migrant issues, and look into bringing Myanmar refugees to attend the conference. We request thematics to support us when we try to bring them to the ACSC/APF. (Salai Isaac, Myanmar)
- A national consultation will be conducted in January with the wider group, to see how to build on monitoring our processes in terms of the demand for ASEAN. This process of monitoring would be linked to the FCAA process. (Indonesia)
- To take it down to the ground beyond Kuala Lumpur to the villages. (Malaysia)

6.4 Other Interventions

- When addressing SOGIE issues in the forum as a separate workshop, there is a concern of whether there would be security issues due to local sensitivities. (Tao)

Response by Yap Swee Seng: Acknowledging sensitivities, to raise the issues understanding the risks involved, and to take precautionary measures. The Malaysian NOC will provide security on our side, but we don't think the risks would go very far. One way is to organise the SOGIE meetings before the APF for inputs.

Response from the floor by Mr. Pang Khee Teik: Regional SOGIE Caucus group members have been in conversation since the Jakarta APF. There was a discussion in a meeting last weekend that they will be working with APF organisers to protect each other if security becomes an issue. In terms of security, there is also a whole host of other issues we are not able to anticipate.

- General question on security is also applicable to migrant workers, particularly undocumented ones. It is imperative for the organising committee to have contingencies and look into the security of the delegates. Also to have guidelines as advice for extra security and precautionary measures, for more vulnerable delegates. (Rex)
- The event should also be sensitive to the needs of persons with disabilities, and also be environmentally friendly with low carbon footprint.
- The Malaysian Trade Union Congress has committed to organise trade unions at the APF, will get ATO groups onboard. This is so labour networks become part of the process.
- Delegates can email general comments to the general email list, and working group matters specifically to working committee members.

6.5 Estimated number of delegates for ACSC/APF

The total estimated national number, taking the minimum and maximum range into account is 240 – 402 delegates

	<p><i>Thailand – 100, Cambodia – 60-70, Indonesia – unpredictable, Singapore – 10-11, Philippines 30-40, Brunei 20, Vietnam 40-50, Laos- about 50, Burma – 20-25 plus 20-30 migrant Burma, Timor Leste 5-6.</i></p> <p>For the thematic category, there has been roughly 42 RSVPs.</p> <p><i>CRC Asia – 2, Asia Floor Wage Campaign – 5-6, Euro – 10, AIPP, 10, Action Asia – 5.</i></p>	
<p>6.2</p>	<p>Regional Drafting Committee <i>As reported by Richard Gadit</i></p> <p>6.2.1. Decisions made at the Committee level</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We have moved development justice as the first part of the discussion. • On the preamble, we will receive the language to incorporate the neo-liberal and market driven framework critique as the over-arching framework. • As for environment and climate change, we would retain it as part of the development justice cluster. <p>6.2.2. Decisions brought to the RSC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As we were unable to achieve consensus on whether to add peace and security as a new cluster, we forwarded the motion to the RSC <i>Decision: The RSC decided to place the issue as the fourth cluster.</i> • During the discussion, an issue came up on whether to use the terminology of Rohingya as there are repercussions on using this terms, as the Myanmar government does not recognise them as a Myanmar ethnic group. The alternative is to refer to them as a Mulsim-minority from Northern Rakhine. This was also brought before the RSC for decision. <i>Decision: The RSC decided to retain the term of Rohingya, on the basis that the term is how the community defines itself.</i> • The changing of the title of the statement touches the theme of the ACSC/APF itself, the item was brought to the RSC. <i>Decision: The RSC decided to retain the original title</i> <p>6.2.3. Important Dates</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The third draft to be disseminated on 14th December 2014. • Deadline for comments as 14th January 2015. Delegates advised to circulate the draft widely among networks. • The fourth draft should be ready by 18th January for adoption and endorsement. • The statement to be adopted on 23rd January at the third regional consultation. 	
<p>6.3</p>	<p>Regional Programme Committee <i>As presented by Ms. Maria Chin Abdullah</i></p> <p><i>Refer to document Media Committee Plan for APF 2015 (Draft 2) for activities planned and scheduling.</i></p> <p>6.3.1. Key points made on the objectives of the programme:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Intentionally to make it a platform for lobbying, hence to try to bring government to the APF for discourse. 	

- Also to strengthen and sharpen CSOs and how we can move forward in 2015 onwards, building solidarity and enhancing networking.
- There would be these key thematics:
 - Development justice / human development and justice
 - Labour / employment
 - Business and human rights
 - Agriculture / aquaculture
 - Democratic process
 - Child rights
 - Education
 - Civil and political rights
 - Freedom of assembly
 - Internet and youth democracy
 - Governance and elections
 - Discrimination and equality
 - SOGIE
 - Minorities
 - Persons with disabilities
 - Women empowerment
 - Peace and equality
 - Health
 - Food security
 - Conflict resolution

6.3.2. Interventions

- Whether the walk / parade / march by the farmer / fisherfolk / indigenous peoples can take place on the first day during the registration after the exposure trip, and welcomed by the rest of the delegation as a symbol of solidarity, and a ceremonial event. (Delegate)

It is important to have the exposure time at the start of the forum, I propose the march to be on the first day as we need to be visible. We will try to add pressure for Jokowi to come and carry this idea in our national consultation. (Delegate, Indonesia)

- For the high-level panel discussion, wish to voice reservation for he Philippines President due to his reputation as participating in corruption. Hope to secure the time of Jokowi to get good examples for the region.

Response from the floor, Mr. Gus Miclat: The keynote should be a session where we hold government leaders accountable, regardless of whether he is Jokowi or otherwise. It is also a space to receive response to our proposals, and be persuasive with proposals

- Seeking clarification whether the open space will be plenary or workshop style.

Response by Ms. MA: From the Committee discussion the outputs and recommendations will be put in open space for discussion, if the workshop groups wish to continue with the discussion. The space is also for others who were not able to cover their specific issues at the

	<p><i>APF, and the open spaces provide that space. There was no plenary planned for output and recommendations.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In terms of venue, seeking for disabilities-friendly location with accessible toilets. As there would be 45 workshops going on, hopefully all 45 workshops wheelchair-accessible, as some of us are interested in other issues outside of disability issues. 	
<p>6.4</p>	<p>Media Committee <i>As presented by Mr. Ren Chung, Malaysia</i></p> <p><i>Refer to document Media Committee Plan for APF 2015 (Draft 2) for activities planned and scheduling.</i></p> <p>6.4.1. Key Points</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It was reiterated the APF will have a media centre for the media to obtain schedule of activities. The committee would need resource people from each country – local translators, networks – to allow for the press to be reached. A request was made for more volunteers in the media committee. The committee plans to facilitate the release of videos on thematic issues of ASEAN issues. Start discussion what kinds of stories to champion. (Mr. Pang Khee Teik) <p>Interventions: How is the coordination at the national levels, how can information be channelled to the media team? <i>Response: There should a person from each country sitting in the committee as the focal point to disseminate information.</i></p>	
<p>6.5</p>	<p>Fundraising and Finance Committee <i>As presented by Yap Swee Seng, Malaysia.</i></p> <p><i>Refer to document on budget.</i></p> <p>6.5.1. Key points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The budget is based on an estimate of 1,000 participants, 700 from Malaysia, 300 other countries and covers a grand total of expenditures out of 3 regional consultative meetings, 4 national workshops, RSC meetings at the ASEAN retreat if invited, media public expenses and the production of the conference report; as well as APF itself in April. A full time person will support the committees. The budget represents the target amount that is needed to be collectively raised at national / CSO level, and is not a budget that is committed to be raised by the NOC for distribution. <p>6.5.2. Interventions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Civicus World Alliance for Citizen Participation (Mr Tor Hodenfield – tor.hodenfieldn@civicus.org) is open to receive application for fundings from grassroots sectors. 	

	<p><i>Response: The budget presented can be used as a reference for writing funding proposals, with the details of pricing within.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The concern of the workshop fee of USD200 as being too costly, and whether a range of fees from USD100-200 can be considering, especially for organisations working on the ground <p><i>Response: The fee was also discussed at the regional consultation meeting and the decision was to adopt USD200 as it was reasonable. If there is sufficient funding, the fee can be reduced or waived.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A question was raised on whether the workshops can be done outside the venue to lower costs. <p><i>Response: Yes that is possible.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A query was made as to the “per diem” item and what it covers. <i>Response: The per diem covers dinner especially those travelling into Kuala Lumpur.</i> • A question on whether the venue has been confirmed <i>Response: There are several options under consideration – the Selangor Chinese Assembly Hall and the PJ Local Council Hall and Meeting rooms. Another possibility will be private universities in the Petaling Jaya area. A venue will be announced in January.</i> • Whether there would be special pricing for students, refugees, etc. <i>Response: If a waiver is required and requested, it will be considered.</i> 	
6.6	<p>FCAA Committee</p> <p><i>Refer to Item 3.0.</i></p>	
7.0	<p>SPECIAL THEMATIC DISCUSSION The realisation of ASEAN Community and what it means to the people in the region?</p> <p>7.1 Presentation on ASEAN Community <i>As presented by Mr. Yap Swee Seng</i></p> <p><i>Refer attachment on the ASEAN Community</i></p> <p>7.2. Discussion on ASEAN Community <i>Moderated by Wanun Permpibul</i></p> <p>In a meeting in Bali, a few government agencies reported glowing reports, where – 60-80 per cent of targets have been achieved. Although the government is saying that 2015 is the starting part of integration, it has already 60-80 per cent level achievement of the targets.</p> <p>Cambodia, Indonesia have liberalised along the lines of trade and liberalisation. Despite trade unions being touted to be highly successful in</p>	

	<p>Cambodia, it remains one of the poorest regions in South East Asia.</p> <p>In terms of movement of skilled workers and migrants, the skilled migrants have liberalised 5-10 occupations to be mobile – dentistry, engineering, architect as a few. The problem is that unskilled migrants comprise 90 per cent of the market and they are not able to be free. Trade unions lack cohesion and are segmented and inconsistent.</p> <p>A key question is why ASEAN is seen as promoting neo-liberal trade agreements, as AEC does not promote human rights, as the 3rd pillar. The blueprints are conflicting with each other.</p> <p>(Rex)</p> <p>During the midterm review at the consultative process, 82 per cent of all the socio-cultural action points in the blueprint in Thailand had been achieved, and that has raised a debate as the action points are very comprehensive and detailed covering education, health, social protection.</p> <p>When the report was submitted, we were trying to argue in terms of how it was evaluated. Even though we have been through the stakeholder consultation process too. This is only the midterm review, and looking at how it is assessed, the full review may turn out to be 100 per cent.</p> <p>The question is whether we have we achieved anything concrete at all in reality, or are the objective and the goals too ambitious. Perhaps the governments placed a very ambitious goal, so that something slightly lower could be achieved. Would this be overly ambitious and do we lack sincere implementation and action. Is it realistic that we are achieving prosperity, equitable, equity, poverty to half, by next year?</p> <p>(Ms. Wanun Permpibul, Thailand)</p> <p>Based on the way the statistics are going, we have not achieved equality and poverty reduction. Although ASEAN is the 7th largest economy with high economic growth rates, high levels of inequality are going up; there occurs high economic growth rate, but high poverty.</p> <p>In Philippines for example, the rate of people surviving below 2USD is high. This agenda ASEAN community is a government agenda, we can see that a lot of elements focus on the AEC is destructive, benefiting corporations and the elite and not the people. Should the way government views “success” be addressed at the ASEAN Community, or should we redirect the discourse to see how the people define as people’s ASEAN integration?</p> <p>(Marjorie, Philippines)</p> <p>There is a need for concerns to focus on free movement of unskilled workers. Labour groups undermine protections, debating how to deal with that. In relation to the pillars, ASEAN has presented on the environment, we should have a coherent focus on agenda setting. We need to define what is the people’s ASEAN and the parameters. As ACSC, my concern is the positions in the appendices may be quite old, as a lot of the strategies have evolved. When we meet in 2015, we should look at reviewing our</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>strategies in relation to the positions we have on the environment, on the TPPA, mobility of skilled and unskilled labour.</p> <p>(Rex)</p> <p>I experienced a situation in ASEAN at a special counter in immigration, where the group of children that I was taking along was not questioned or stopped, but allowed to pass free. Is it such free movement for children too from country to country? If this can happen in 2015 when we go for 1ASEAN concept, what is going to happen with the child trafficking situation?</p> <p>(Delegate, Children's Thematic Group)</p> <p>Irene: The problem in discussing this is that we may be a minority voice with very different views from the governments of the day particularly in terms of principles held. We even have problems with how certain trade unions think and function. The majority of civil society groups are actually aligned with the government, so I see the difficulty in discussing this.</p> <p>(Irene Xavier, Malaysia)</p> <p>I suggest working with government to come up with goals, targets and indicators so that they can be held more accountable, to have a report card instead of broad motherhood statements. The percentages of progress should be based on a report card of indicators, which we can produce.</p> <p>(Lin Mui Kang, Malaysia)</p> <p>Government should take suggestions and recommendations that are concrete and measurable. The reality is that government does not get involved with the civil society in the drafting process.</p> <p>We need to be very concrete in how we engage. Last September we engaged with the AICHR, we provided a development justice model as the means of implementation and indicators and how the five pillars can be taken by the government. Like Cambodia, we want to explore more about development justice.</p> <p>(Reileen, Thailand)</p>	
<p>8.0</p>	<p>Any Other Business</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The third regional meeting will be held on 23rd and 24th January 2015, further information on the logistics will be sent out before Christmas 2014. • Brochures by the Malaysian government are available for pick-up. • List of non-Malaysian and Malaysian delegates are available to delegates. • 	
<p>9.0</p>	<p>The meeting closed on 12 September 2014 at 4.00pm.</p>	

