



12th Inter-Parliamentary Forum on Security Sector Governance in Southeast Asia

Workshop Report

**“Security Sector Reform and Peace Processes in Southeast Asia:
What Role for Parliaments?”**

**22-23 November 2014
Manila, Philippines**

Executive Summary

The 12th Inter-Parliamentary Forum on Security Sector Governance in Southeast Asia (IPF-SSG) in Manila, Philippines focused on the role of parliaments in Security Sector Reform (SSR) and peace processes in the region. Participants from Cambodia, Indonesia, Malaysia, Myanmar, Thailand and the Philippines included members and staff of parliament, the security sector, academia, think tanks and civil society.

The exchange of experiences and lessons learned generated by the presentations and the moderated dialogue among the participants revealed the following:

- **Peace processes and SSR** are mutually reinforcing and non-linear processes that need to be specifically adapted to the local conflict-affected area and are impacted by the level of economic development and democratization and by the regime type.
- **The role of parliament** in peace processes and SSR also varies depending on the national context and is important because parliament represents the wider public. In most Southeast Asian countries, **there is a potential for parliament to become more engaged in peace processes and SSR** through:
 - Building capacity and expertise on security issues and peace processes
 - Providing staff training on peace processes and SSR
 - Informing public about peace processes and SSR
 - Debating and enacting legislation on SSR and peace agreements
 - Supervising and conducting oversight of budget in SSR and peace processes
 - Endorsing peace processes and representing concerns of citizens
 - Holding government accountable to peace agreement provisions
- **Key lessons from regional peace processes and SSR** can enhance the sustainability and effectiveness of both processes in the long-run:
 - Trust-building between the stakeholders
 - National and local ownership
 - Inclusion of a wide range of stakeholders and segments of society
 - Implementation as the end goal of peace processes and SSR
 - Formation of a comprehensive and holistic peace process and SSR agenda
 - Management of stakeholder and community expectations
- **The role of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN)** in regional peace processes is limited but there is potential for ASEAN to be involved through **taking advantage of the institutional mandates of existing ASEAN organizations with regard to conflict and peace issues.**

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Why does SSR Matter for Peace Processes?	2
SSR in the Context of Peace Processes in Southeast Asia	3
<i>Peace Processes and SSR</i>	3
<i>Role of Parliament</i>	4
<i>Stakeholders in SSR and Peace Processes</i>	5
<i>External Support to Peace Processes and SSR</i>	5
<i>Importance of a Comprehensive Approach</i>	6
<i>Peace Dividends</i>	7
<i>Normalization</i>	7
ASEAN and Peace Processes in Southeast Asia	7
Recent Developments in SSR in Southeast Asia	8
Closing Session: Wrap-up and Way Ahead	9
Annex: Table of IPF-SSG Workshops	10

Introduction



Mario Aguja (IPF-SSG), Marc Saxer (FES) and Hans Born (DCAF) opening the 12th IPF-SSG in Manila.

The 12th IPF-SSG workshop took place from 22-23 November 2014 in Manila, Philippines and focused on the role of parliaments in Security Sector Reform (SSR) and peace process in Southeast Asia. Many of the most comprehensive transformations in security sector governance (SSG) have taken place in conflict-affected states and within the framework of peace processes. Creating a security sector that guarantees security for all members of the population on an equal basis is often a central concern in preventing a relapse into internal conflict and is often a requirement written into peace agreements or at least firmly embedded in less formal agreements.

What is the security sector?

It includes all structures, institutions and personnel responsible for the provision, management and oversight of security. This pertains to core security forces such as the armed forces, police, border guards and intelligence services, as well as management and oversight bodies, such as relevant government ministries, parliament, civil society organizations and the media. Judicial institutions and non-statutory security forces are also important.

Peace processes in Southeast Asia are in varying stages of development, which is why this workshop was an important opportunity to exchange lessons learned and challenges in the region. The Forum greatly benefited from the participation of six Southeast Asian countries (Cambodia, Indonesia, Malaysia, Myanmar, Thailand and the Philippines) and welcomed Myanmar for the first time. The objectives of this workshop were to discuss the relevance of SSR for peace processes, to explore linkages between SSR and peace processes, and to examine entry points and strategies for addressing and embedding SSR in peace processes.

Security Sector Reform (SSR) seeks to enhance security sector governance within a country and thus includes all efforts to reform or reshape the security sector so that security can be provided effectively and efficiently within a framework of civilian, democratic governance, the rule of law and respect for human rights.

It was emphasized during the introduction that peace processes and SSR should be considered as mutually reinforcing processes and that both are dependent on each other for their successful implementation in the long-run. Taking into account that the role and power of parliament varies from state-to-state depending on the national context, this workshop should be seen as a platform for open dialogue not only between the representatives and stakeholders of the various Southeast Asian countries but also within the individual country delegations.

Furthermore, it was underlined that no single model exists to solve the challenges associated with peace processes and that

there is no one-fits-all formula for governing the security sector. Yet, democratic governments share a core set of common values focused on protecting human security instead of regime survival and promoting human rights, the rule of law and the democratic control of the security sector.

Security sector governance refers to the formal and informal structures and processes of security provision, management and oversight within a country. Understood in normative terms, it implies the principles of good governance and refers to the effective and efficient provision of security within a framework of democratic governance, the rule of law and respect for human rights. Good security governance includes both state and human security and therefore adopts a broader overview than traditional approaches to security.

In this regard, parliaments can play important roles during peace processes and SSR. For instance, parliaments need to translate peace agreements into law or even into the constitution and supervise the budget.

Key Parliamentary Functions during SSR and Peace Processes:

- **Lawmaking** with regard to the legal framework for the security sector and the peace process
- **Oversight** of the implementation of peace process
- **Reviewing public expenditures** of the security sector included in the peace process

However, involvement of parliament can be constrained due to a number of impeding factors. Parliaments are often excluded in peace negotiations to preserve the confidentiality of the peace process. A lack

of sufficient resources and expertise can also impede parliament's role, as well as the fact that parliaments are dictated by session times and are not always in session during the different phases of a peace process. Lastly, some stakeholders in the peace process may question the legitimacy of parliament by claiming it is closely linked to the ruling government.

Why does SSR Matter for Peace Processes?

By presenting a broad overview of the security sector, SSR and peacebuilding, it was noted that peace processes are characterized as multi-dimensional, long-term and non-linear and can offer entry-points for SSR within the conflict-affected country. They involve security, politics, the economy, and society, and require the establishment of new institutional arrangements and mind-sets.

Even though mediators and stakeholders in peace processes often neglect discussing SSR, addressing SSR during peace negotiations can positively impact peace processes. Agreement on difficult issues such as SSR can engage stakeholders in an honest discussion, can help to build confidence among the negotiating parties, and can thereby support the sustainability of the peace process in the long-run.

Just as SSR and democratization are mutually reinforcing mechanisms, SSR and peace processes benefit from each other's inclusion. The incorporation of SSR during the peace process, instead of following the signature and implementation of the peace agreement, can be viewed as an opening to achieving concrete SSR commitments and for receiving accountability for

implementing SSR after the completion of the initial peace process.

SSR in the Peace Process Phases

1. Pre-negotiation activities

- Understand factors driving need for SSR
- Understand what role SSR should play in peace process
- Reduce sensitivity to SSR

2. Negotiation activities

- Generate support and future commitment for SSR
- Ensure inclusive approach through consultations and national dialogue

3. Drafting a conclusion following negotiations

- Clarify key issues and benefits of SSR reflected in agreement
- Consider financial sustainability of SSR

4. Implementation

- Consider how to support implementation of SSR

participants first met within their country delegations to assess whether integration of SSR and peace processes should and has taken place within their respective countries and then exchanged their national experiences in a “world-café” style round-table rotation.

Current State of Peace Processes in Southeast Asia:

Philippines: Outcome unknown

- Many peace negotiations with different groups and with different levels of integration of SSR

Indonesia: Completed in Aceh

Cambodia: Incomplete

- Stability but SSR needs to be implemented

Myanmar: Beginning stages

- Process of negotiating peace agreements

Thailand: Stalled

- Need to re-start peace process

SSR in the Context of Peace Processes in Southeast Asia



Albrecht Schnabel (DCAF) moderates the first panel and dialogue among participants.

The discussion on SSR and peace processes in Southeast Asia featured presentations by experts from several participating countries and two plenary sessions in which

Peace Processes and SSR

Overall, the lively debates of the two interactive sessions confirmed that peace processes and SSR are interlinked and mutually reinforcing. Approaches to SSR and peace processes vary greatly depending on the national context and peace processes in Southeast Asia do not automatically include SSR.

Key Lessons from Peace Processes in Southeast Asia:

- Building trust between stakeholders
- National and local ownership
- Generating political will
- Engaging civil society
- Implementation as end goal
- All-inclusive of society
- As comprehensive as possible
- Recognizing that setbacks occur
- Reforms required at national level
- Dealing with splinter groups
- Managing expectations

Addressing SSR and other security-related issues such as demobilization, disarmament and reintegration (DDR) in conflict-affected areas of Southeast Asia requires the negotiating parties to adapt reforms to the local context in each conflict. Furthermore, the differences in regional peace processes indicate that the level of democratization, as well as the broader political process, and development impact the pace and success of peace negotiations and SSR.

For example, the experience of Indonesia demonstrates that broader national political reforms can facilitate both peace processes and SSR. Similarly, changes in the political landscape in Myanmar have supported the beginning stages of peace processes with the various armed groups in the country with the goal of a national ceasefire agreement. During the interactive exchange of experiences, a participant from Malaysia argued that political reforms are needed in the country in order to begin discussing SSR.

Since SSR and peace processes can both experience setbacks and peace processes might need to be negotiated multiple times, it was highlighted that longstanding peace processes can be solved over time and that the stakeholders should focus on the small victories to be gained.

Role of Parliament

Parliamentary involvement in peace processes is also impacted by domestic conditions, and, as a result, the role of parliamentarians differs greatly from country-to-country depending on the political system and the level of development.



Participants engage in a “world-café” style conversation and exchange experiences.

The overarching lesson from the evaluation of parliamentary roles was that incorporating parliament serves as a way to include the general public in the peace process and reforms and to ensure that the population’s concerns are heard.

Examples of Parliamentary Involvement in the Peace Process in Southeast Asia:

- Oversight and budgeting (Indonesia)
- Drafting and implementing law on peace agreement (Indonesia)
- Legislating peace agreement (Philippines)
- Committees tasked with peace processes (limited in Thailand)

Even though parliaments have been involved in some of the peace processes in Southeast Asia, such as in the case of Aceh in Indonesia, their roles remain hypothetical in many of the governments under examination. In the case of Thailand, due to the military coup d’état, the parliament is facing a challenging political environment that even complicates carrying out its most basic functions.

Moreover, security issues are not necessarily on the agenda of some parliaments in Southeast Asia, such as in

Thailand and in Malaysia, which means some parliaments lack any expertise in the area and have little power to discuss security matters. Nevertheless, the majority of participants expressed their aspirations for greater parliamentary engagement in peace processes and SSR while acknowledging that it is often limited.

Most parliamentary roles appear to be concentrated in the last two phases of the peace process, during the drafting of an agreement following negotiations and the implementation. Yet, it was suggested that parliament could strengthen its presence in the first two phases of the peace process by enhancing parliament's general awareness of security issues and by building capacity and expertise in the areas of peace negotiations and SSR.

Recommendations for Parliamentary Engagement in Peace Processes and SSR

- Increase awareness on security issues and peace processes
- Build capacity and expertise on peace processes and SSR
- Provide training for members of parliament and their staffers
- Inform the public about peace processes and SSR
- Debate and enact legislation on SSR and peace agreements
- Supervise and conduct oversight of budget
- Endorse peace agreements
- Convey needs and concerns of constituents during negotiations
- Coordinate between branches of government

Stakeholders in SSR and Peace Processes

A major factor in the sustainability and drive of SSR and peace processes is the inclusion and consultation of a wide range of stakeholders and segments of society.

The involvement of civil society, for example, is considered as a driving factor behind SSR initiatives in the Philippines because civil society actors persistently pushed for a new SSR agenda. Conversely, it was identified in the Cambodian presentation that civil society engagement is missing in the country and that it could be beneficial for the peace process and SSR.

Ensuring that all segments of society are represented in peace processes is also crucial. This point was illustrated in the discussions on Thailand and Timor-Leste. For example, the Thai case demonstrated that the elite approach to the peace process in Southern Thailand marginalized the majority of the population in the South. Rather than recognizing the various backgrounds of the Thai populace, especially those living in the South, the government wanted to create one "Thai" identity, alienating citizens in the South and acting as a spoiler to the peace process.

External Support to Peace Processes and SSR

The presentation of the Philippines illustrated that SSR and the national peace processes can be negotiated and implemented through a locally-owned approach, but the general discussion revealed that this is not always the case in Southeast Asian countries. Several of the participating countries received external support, ranging from individual countries assuming monitoring roles to major international interventions.

In particular, United Nations (UN) peacekeeping missions in Cambodia and Timor-Leste did not result in lasting peace and in a substantial improvement in overall

security. The representatives of Cambodia argued that the Paris Peace Agreement (PAA) and the United Nations Transitional Authority in Cambodia (UNTAC) did not bring ultimate peace and security to the country. UNTAC failed to effectively implement crucial provisions of the PAA related to the demobilization of armed groups.

It was also pointed out that the UN Transitional Administration in East Timor (UNTAET) mishandled the state-building process and implementation of SSR in the country. As a result, external support does not necessarily result in comprehensive and holistic SSR and a permanent solution to the peace process in the country.

Nonetheless, external support can have some positive results, such as the free and fair elections conducted under the supervision of UNTAC in Cambodia, and can benefit from the failed and succeeded lessons learned in cases such as Cambodia and Timor-Leste. Moreover, external support proved helpful in the case of the Philippines and Indonesia where the international community monitored and supported local peace processes.

Suggestions for External Support to Peace Processes and SSR:

- Monitoring role (ASEAN, UN, EU, individual countries)
- Needs to be a support to the national process
- Should be all-inclusive of society
- Needs to deal with how to implement peace agreements
- Should include comprehensive and holistic SSR

Importance of a Comprehensive Approach

Many of the peace processes and SSR in Southeast Asia lack a comprehensive and holistic approach that could present communities and stakeholders with clear overarching goals and practical implementation measures.

The Cambodian participants argued that disconnected reforms within different security sector institutions have contributed to a minimalist SSR agenda that could benefit from a holistic approach linking individual reforms. Similarly, a delegate from Thailand noted that there need to be more comprehensive reforms related to the security sector on a national level rather than just in the conflict-affected region of the South.



Each country presented their national peace processes following the moderated dialogue.

This would mean writing a national “roadmap” such as a National Security Strategy (NSS), as was suggested by some Philippine participants, or formulating a White Paper, as argued by Malaysian participants. Such a strategy could help leaders within the government and the armed groups, as well as the general public, to understand how the transition and SSR can be implemented in practice.

Peace Dividends

The importance of visible peace dividends, which could be articulated in a comprehensive approach to SSR and peace processes, was also mentioned throughout the dialogue. Cost calculations during war and peace are different. Money spent on conflict-affected areas can be invested in other governmental sectors following the peace process. For example, this was the case in Indonesia where the government was able to re-direct resources from the conflict in Aceh to education.

Thus, investments in SSR and peace processes can benefit the whole population over the long-run and not just to those living in conflict-affected regions of Southeast Asia. In order to achieve peace dividends, though, the economics of peace need to be taken into consideration during the SSR and peace processes. This involves determining the length and comprehensiveness of the process, the commitment of leaders, required resources and the acceptance of the general community.

Normalization



Participants engage in a “world-café” style conversation and exchange experiences.

A vital component of negotiating and implementing peace processes, including

SSR, in Southeast Asia was identified as “normalization”. This requires post-agreement vigilance in order to ensure that the community returns to a level of normalization and sustains the peace.

According to the participants, normalization involves dealing with potential spoilers, such as splinter groups, through social, economic and political integration, transitional justice mechanisms, economic development, DDR and SSR. In the case of the Philippines, this consisted of transforming the armed groups in the conflict-affected areas into political organizations.

Failing to address potential spoilers and to establish a process of normalization within the affected communities can hamper the improvement of the security situation in the area. This was the experience of Timor-Leste where there was no comprehensive SSR agenda and no plan of how to re-integrate the ex-fighters. Thus, SSR should be considered a vital component of any normalization process after a conflict.

ASEAN and Peace Processes in

Southeast Asia

The role of ASEAN is currently rather limited in the context of internal peace processes and SSR in Southeast Asia, especially considering that ASEAN is only in the beginning stages of formation. Several of the presenters pointed out that the norms enshrined in the ASEAN Charter are at odds with conceiving a role for ASEAN in regional SSR and peace efforts: the principles of non-interference in internal affairs and respect for the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of all members.

It would be more accurate to talk about the absence of ASEAN than the role of ASEAN and that ASEAN should not be expected to become involved in regional SSR and peace processes because it will not interfere in domestic politics. Instead, individual ASEAN member states have played a role in national peace processes on a bilateral level, as in the case of the Philippines where Malaysia and Indonesia were both involved.

Despite these constraints, there is potential for ASEAN to be involved in regional SSR and peace processes and that the current state could change in the future through taking advantage of the institutional mandates of ASEAN organizations with regard to peace and conflict issues and SSR over the long-term.

How to involve ASEAN in Peace Processes?

- Looking at institutional mandates and finding openings of ASEAN
- Monitoring and facilitating national peace processes and SSR
- Establishing third-party mediation
- Forming decommissioning bodies
- Communicating with stakeholders of peace processes and SSR
- Involving ASEAN Inter-Parliamentary Assembly (AIPA)
- Involving ASEAN Inter-Governmental Commission on Human Rights
- Involving ASEAN Institute for Peace and Reconciliation
- Furthering UN-ASEAN discussions
- Addressing SSR and peace processes on a regional level

Finally, it was also indicated that ASEAN could have a role in expanding regional parliamentary engagement with SSR and peace processes. The ASEAN Inter-Parliamentary Assembly (AIPA) could potentially be a tool for ASEAN to

encourage regional parliaments to focus their attention on security issues such as SSR and peace processes in their home-countries.

Recent Developments in SSR in Southeast Asia



Mario Aguja (IPF-SSG) chairs the last session of the Forum.

Recent developments in SSR in Southeast Asia vary greatly among the participating countries and have experienced setbacks in some of the participating countries, demonstrating that SSR is not necessarily a linear process similar to the peace process. Democratization was seen as a major enabling factor for SSR but it was emphasized that there is always an opportunity to engage in SSG and SSR by finding an entry-point, such as evolving public institutions towards democratic civilian control.

The environments for engagement in SSR are challenging in Malaysia, where parliament has very limited power over the security sector and where there is no space for civil society at the moment, and in Thailand, where the political state has stalled any efforts to reform the security sector due to the 2014 coup. In Indonesia, SSG needs to be re-assessed due to setbacks

in parliamentary work, despite the fact that the country has gone through both democratization and SSR.

In the Philippines, SSG is currently being addressed through the transformation road maps for good governance of security sector actors by creating an internal peace and security plan for the military. The progress of the transformation is being monitored through several layers of oversight and assessments.

The experience of the Philippines additionally highlighted that SSR is not a well-known concept outside of the security sector and that discussions on security usually refer to human rights. Consequently, it is vital to mainstream SSR outside of the security sector or even just outside of the military.

Closing Session: Wrap-up and Way Ahead

The 12th IPF-SSG workshop demonstrated that there is substantial scope for parliaments to engage in peace processes and that there is evidence that a number of parliaments are positively contributing to peace processes in Southeast Asia. In cases where parliaments have not participated in the peace process, the workshop outlined that there are entry-points and opportunities for parliamentarians to engage in peace processes and SSR.

As new conflicts can emerge throughout the region, governments need to be ready to deal with these new challenges. It was emphasized that it is key to find common platforms among Southeast Asian countries

and common ground within their national governments. This could lead to a multi-stakeholder dialogue process on a national level, which has been the case in Cambodia, Thailand and the Philippines as a result of the IPF-SSG.

Proposed Topics for Future IPF-SSG Workshops

- Strengthening regional cooperation through ASEAN
- Human trafficking
- Terrorism and counter-terrorism
- Maritime security issues (piracy, shipping, illegal activities)
- Comparative parliamentary roles
- Parliamentary staff training
- Private security
- Intelligence sharing
- Strengthening parliamentary oversight
- Criminal justice reforms
- Parliamentary capacity-building
- Engaging constituents on topics

Following the discussion on the topics of concern in the context of SSG and the role of parliaments in Southeast Asia, the organizers from FES and DCAF thanked the participants of Cambodia, Indonesia, Malaysia, Myanmar, Thailand and the Philippines for their very active and insightful exchange of experiences and lessons learned in the region.

Annex: Table of IPF-SSG Workshops

Title of Event	Date	Venue
1 st IPF-SSG Workshop on Parliamentary Accountability and Security Sector Governance in Southeast Asia	7-10 Feb 2006	Siem Reap, Cambodia
2 nd IPF-SSG Workshop on Strengthening the Role of ASEAN Parliaments in Security Policy Review	10-11 Mar 2007	Manila, Philippines
3 rd IPF-SSG Workshop on National Security Policy Reviews in ASEAN member States: A Parliamentary Perspective	23-25 Nov 2007	Denpasar, Bali/Indonesia
4 th IPF-SSG Workshop Defence Budgeting in ASEAN Member States: Parliamentary Perspectives	23-24 May 2008	Phuket, Thailand
5 th IPF-SSG Workshop on Defence Procurement in Southeast Asia: Parliamentary Perspectives	12-13 Oct 2008	Phnom Penh, Cambodia
6 th IPF-SSG Workshop on Police Governance in Southeast Asia: What Role for Parliament?	29-30 May 2009	Kota Kinabalu, Malaysia
7 th IPF-SSG Workshop on Police Reform in Southeast Asia: What role for Parliament?	13-14 Nov 2009	Davao City, Philippines
8 th IPF-SSG Workshop on Towards a Political-Security Community in Southeast Asia: What Role for Parliaments?	19-20 June 2010	Jakarta, Indonesia
9 th IPF-SSG Workshop on Justice Reform in Southeast Asian Countries: What Role for Parliamentarians?	17-18 Sept 2011	Phnom Pen, Cambodia
10 th IPF-SSG Workshop on Learning from National Approaches to Security Sector Governance in Southeast Asia	6-7 Oct 2012	Manila, Philippines
11 th IPF-SSG Workshop on Security Sector Reform and Democratization in Southeast Asia: What Role for the Parliaments?	15-16 June 2013	Bangkok, Thailand
12 th IPF-SSG Workshop on Security Sector Reform and Peace Processes in Southeast Asia: What Role for Parliaments?	22-23 Nov 2014	Manila, Philippines



The Inter-Parliamentary Forum on Security Sector Governance in Southeast Asia (IPF-SSG) aims to promote ongoing dialogue and exchange of good practices among members of parliament in Southeast Asian countries. The Forum aims to enhance civilian oversight and national parliamentary involvement in security sector governance and features regular workshops, publications, its own website, as well as activities of national caucuses in participating countries. Participants include parliamentarians and staffers, as well as government officials and members of security forces, academic experts and civil society representatives from several Southeast Asian countries. The IPF-SSG is supported by the Friedrich-Ebert Foundation (FES) and the Geneva Centre for the Democratic Control of Armed Forces (DCAF). For further information on the Forum see: www.ipf-ssg-sea.net



The Friedrich Ebert Stiftung (FES) was founded in 1925 as a political legacy of Germany's first democratically elected president, Friedrich Ebert. The Office for Regional Cooperation in Asia focuses on reinforcing social justice as a key factor for inclusive growth and as a core element of political processes in Asia. It cooperates with its partners aiming at strengthening democratic governance and incorporating features of social justice in political and economic processes. The Foundation actively supports dialogue platforms and stakeholder processes for trade unions and civil society organizations related to the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) and the Asia-Europe Meeting (ASEM). FES works with partners from political parties, parliaments and ministries, trade unions, non-governmental and media organizations, as well as academics and political think tanks. www.fes-asia.org



DCAF is an international foundation established in 2000 on the initiative of the Swiss Confederation as the 'Geneva Centre for the Democratic Control of Armed Forces'. DCAF contributes to enhancing security sector governance through security sector reform. The Centre's work to support effective, efficient security sectors which are accountable to the state and its citizens is underpinned by the acknowledgement that security, development and the rule of law are essential preconditions for sustainable peace. DCAF is guided by the principles of neutrality, impartiality, gender sensitivity, and local ownership as the basis for supporting legitimate, sustainable reform processes. www.dcaf.ch