

**CSCAP SINGAPORE PROPOSAL FOR
A CSCAP RETREAT TO REVIEW THE REGIONAL SECURITY ORDER
AND ARCHITECTURE (EARLY MARCH 2017, SINGAPORE)**

The regional security order and architecture we reviewed at our Retreat in Kuala Lumpur on 30-31 March 2016, with CSCAP Australia's support, is on the cusp of possibly major changes. Incoming US President Donald Trump has in his campaign pronouncements indicated possible major shifts in US strategies and policies towards US allies in both Europe and in the Asia Pacific.

It may be necessary for CSCAP to convene another Retreat after the new US Administration assumes office on 20 January 2017. This will enable CSCAP to review again the evolving regional security order and architecture as we attempt to make sense of how the Trump administration views the Asia-Pacific and our place in Trump's vision of "making the US great again". CSCAP may need to rethink its place and role as a Track-2 network in a new regional security order emerging out of the prevailing bipolar regional security order between a US "rebalance" to the Asia-Pacific and China's proposals for a "new type of great power relationship" (*xinxing daguo guanxi*) and a "New Asian security concept" (*xinde yazhou anquanguan*). What will be the relevance and future of the multilateral institutions we have nurtured, in particular, the ARF, the EAS or the ADMM-Plus, and especially the centrality of ASEAN in the regional security order?

As part of its commitment to a stable and predictable regional security order and architecture in which ASEAN is central, CSCAP Singapore is prepared to host another Retreat in early March 2017 in Singapore to discuss these issues of an evolving Asia-Pacific security order. As with past Retreats and other CSCAP Study Group meetings, CSCAP Singapore will provide two nights' accommodation for one designated representative from each CSCAP Member Country and local hospitality. CSCAP Singapore hopes that participants can fund their own travel to Singapore. The issues we can discuss at the Retreat include:

1. Where is the Asia-Pacific in Trump's vision of America's international relations to "make America great again"?
2. What is Trump's approach to dealing with America's international relations? Is it a continuation or extension of what we are concluding is a "transactional" approach to politics?
3. What is the future of the essentially bipolar world and its strategies of balancing, hedging and bandwagoning which the small states and "middle powers" have been practising for the past decade?
4. Can there be a Sino-American condominium that defines and accepts each other's geo-political sphere of influence?
5. Will there be a revision or replacement of the US' bilateral alliance system?
6. Will there be a gradual predominance of an "Asia for Asians" security order led by China and supported by a growing number of ASEAN member states?

CSCAP Singapore looks forward to welcoming you to Singapore next year.

CSCAP Retreat on Track One Relations

On 29-31 March 2016, CSCAP held a Retreat at Cyberlodge, Kuala Lumpur, to carry out a comprehensive analysis of how the organization can best position itself in the region's evolving security architecture.

The meeting included representatives from most CSCAP member committees. Also, a number of key officials from Malaysia, Australia, Thailand, Laos and Brunei participated.

The meeting involved reports from each participating committee on exactly how that committee operates, including how it positions CSCAP with respect to Track I officials and Track I operations. This was a helpful exercise, reminding committees of the various models that had emerged and of particular activities that could be adapted to their own circumstances.

The meeting assessed the strengths of CSCAP; then considered the way Track I security architecture has developed; and then discussed how CSCAP could best be positioned with respect to the new architecture.

Strengths:

CSCAP was established in 1993 and has evolved alongside the official multilateral processes that ASEAN has pioneered, notably the ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF).

CSCAP has developed a valuable skill set. The organization has established a wide range of working relations with national and regional Track I officials. Its own members possess essential analytical and policy expertise in the security area; and member committees have fostered relations with researchers in universities and think tanks - researchers who can be recruited for CSCAP's Study Groups and conferences. In a sense CSCAP has taken on a brokering role, working between governments and the wider research community. CSCAP helps to focus regional research capacities on issues of priority interest for Track I.

CSCAP has a multi-perspective capacity - a capacity for identifying the underlying differences between regional countries in the way they approach key issues and disputes. The organization has also demonstrated the capacity for transnational analyses that reaches beyond individual country approaches.

CSCAP's continuous association with the ARF has given the organization valuable experience with Track I, and with ASEAN's institutional operations.

CSCAP also offers a form of institutional umbrella for cooperative ventures between two or more individual member committees. Study Groups themselves can promote such cooperation - but there have also been examples of useful bilateral or trilateral cooperation within CSCAP that is not designed to lead to a formal CSCAP decision.

Developments in Track I regional security architecture:

In its early years, the ASEAN Regional Forum was the only official regional security institution with which CSCAP could aspire to cooperate. In the last two decades, APEC has taken on certain security tasks, as has the ASEAN Plus Three, and then a number of new institutions with security as a primary or particular focus were initiated - the Shanghai Cooperation Organisation, the East Asian Summit, ADMM and ADMM-Plus, the Expanded Maritime Forum, and the Conference on Interaction and Confidence-building in Asia (CICA).

There are also a number of new Track 2 and Track 1.5 security dialogues. These include NADI, NEATS, ARF EEP, and EAF.

At this stage there are no Track 2 organizations officially linked to either the East Asia Summit or ADMM-Plus.

How can CSCAP be best positioned to contribute to current Track 1 institutions/processes?

Some answers proposed at the meeting were obvious enough, and had been discussed at earlier times in the organization - others were introduced for the first time, or given a new or enhanced importance in the Retreat deliberations.

CSCAP must continue to strengthen itself, sharpen the relevance of its output, and make the official institutions more aware of its capacities. These tasks must be addressed both by the organization and its individual member committees. This must involve reviewing website publicity and evaluating how effectively CSCAP is projected to relevant sectors of government and the community.

All member committees need to work on their expertise base, making sure key specialists are recruited for CSCAP research initiatives.

All member committees need to prioritize the development of close relations with their national governments, and especially their foreign and defense ministry and other national security establishments, to help ensure that CSCAP is aware of government priorities on the one hand, and that relevant government officials are aware of CSCAP's capacities on the other.

It is essential that CSCAP engage new generation specialists in CSCAP projects. Some member committees are doing this effectively, and others can learn from their experience and methods.

It is a positive development that many member committees have serving officials as members. This should be strongly encouraged as one strategy for strengthening CSCAP's dialogue with Track I, and sensitivity to Track 1 priorities.

Careful attention needs to be paid to the selection of topics for CSCAP conferences and Study Groups. The CSCAP website might call for suggestions, but also the views of national governments and the ASEAN Secretariat should be sought. Proposals for new CSCAP projects ought in many cases to be put forward in a way that cites key sentences from official Track I reports and statements that indicate Track I priorities.

All ASEAN countries should be members of CSCAP. This means bringing in Laos and Myanmar.

The different membership of CSCAP on the one hand and the EAS in the other, can be a problem. For certain sensitive issues arising in the EAS or ADMM-Plus, CSCAP might consider initiating projects which do not include member committees from non-EAS countries.

Attention needs to be given to the prior notification of, as well as timing of, CSCAP meetings to facilitate enhanced Track I/Track 2 cooperation, including the participation of Track 1 officials in CSCAP meetings, and CSCAP observers at official meetings as appropriate. ***(Add other initiatives)***

CSCAP Leadership and member committees (where relevant) ought to lobby to get an acknowledgement of the de-facto 25-year partnership between Track 1 and Track 2 dedicated to strengthening security in the Asia Pacific region in the EAS Chairman's statement. With respect to the future, the Track 1 and Track 2 communities could look to an authorized CSCAP dialogue with the Secretariat on EAS outcomes and outlook. Such a dialogue would help CSCAP to target its own activities and those of the wider research community in member states.

It would be a great advantage to have an EAS- and/or ADMM+-related official attend CSCAP meetings.

With regard to relations with NADI and NEATS, CSCAP co-chairs might be encouraged to meet with both organizations and explore possible value and scope of information-sharing and collaboration between Track 2 bodies.

The 45th Steering Committee Meeting of CSCAP (June, 2016 – Kuala Lumpur) considered the findings of the Retreat and endorsed these proposals for action at both the individual committee level and the Council's Secretariat.

CSCAP Co-Chairs
Ralph Cossa
Rastam Mohd Isa

Attachment 1 - Original invitation letter
Attachment 2 - Notes on Retreat by the CSCAP Secretariat

Attach 1: Terms of Reference - Retreat on CSCAP Relations with Track One.

Invitation to CSCAP Committees-

As you know, the Co-Chairs of CSCAP have been discussing the merits and feasibility of making our organization more useful to the East Asia Summit (EAS), as well as the ARF. This issue emerged quite naturally from the 2014 Study Group (Memo 26 on Regional Security Architecture) that assessed the implications of the thicker network of multilateral processes seeking to address the region's security challenges, notably, the addition of the EAS and the ASEAN Defence Ministers Meeting Plus (ADMM Plus). That Study Group attached particular importance to developing the authority and effectiveness of the East Asia Summit.

There has been an expression of interest in holding a Retreat with the aim of formulating a roadmap that could lead towards a special relationship between CSCAP and the EAS. AusCSCAP has been able to secure funding to assist in holding such a Retreat. We would anticipate a 1.5 to 2 day meeting, ideally in March 2016. Kuala Lumpur suggests itself as a cost-effective location.

We envisage the Retreat addressing the following topics:

- An assessment of the EAS and its likely future development;
- A review of CSCAP's (and its member committees') current relations with Track 1 bodies, including how these relationships evolved;
- Identifying the essential characteristics of a constructive relationship between CSCAP and the EAS;
- An assessment of how CSCAP might need to change in terms of capacity and functions in order to contribute more effectively to EAS outcomes;
- How might the planning of Study Groups (topics, meeting arrangements, membership) be affected by this objective;
- How might the Conference and other CSCAP meetings (including timing) be affected;
- what can be done to make CSCAP's communication with both the EAS and the ARF more effective;
- Will CSCAP need to enhance its broker role, developing stronger relations with specialists outside CSCAP's normal expertise base.

Participants at the meeting would need to include:

- CSCAP core members - those people, for instance, who met in Bali under Jusuf Wanandi's hospitality in February, 2014;
- One or two reps. from the Network of Defence and Security Institutes;
- Track 1 people who can help develop the roadmap - e.g. from Malaysia, Laos, Thailand, Australia, Indonesia, and others?
- Any non-CSCAP specialist who we believe might provide valuable perspectives.

We would value your comments on this proposal, including on dates in March 2016 that would allow your own participation.

Attach 2: DRAFT NOTES

**COUNCIL FOR SECURITY COOPERATION IN THE ASIA PACIFIC (CSCAP)
CSCAP RETREAT ON TRACK ONE RELATIONS
Cyberview Resort & Spa, Cyberjaya, Selangor, Malaysia
29-31 March 2016**

PRESENT

CSCAP Co-Chair

Ralph Cossa (US CSCAP)

ASEAN Member Committees

Garry Ibrahim (CSCAP Brunei)
Pou Sothirak (CSCAP Cambodia)
Wiryono Sastrohandoyo (CSCAP Indonesia)
Azizan bin Md Delin (CSCAP Malaysia)
Astanah Abdul Aziz (CSCAP Malaysia)
Steven Wong (CSCAP Malaysia)
Elina Noor (CSCAP Malaysia)
Bunn Nagara (CSCAP Malaysia)
Stephen Leong (CSCAP Malaysia)
Maria Carmina Acuna (CSCAP Philippines)
Kwa Chong Guan (CSCAP Singapore)
Jesse Caemmerer (CSCAP Singapore)
Suchit Bunbongkarn (CSCAP Thailand)
Patreya Wattanasin (CSCAP Thailand)
Tran Viet Thai (CSCAP Vietnam)

Non-ASEAN Member Committees

Anthony Milner (AusCSCAP)
Ron Huisken (AusCSCAP)
Philip Kerr (AusCSCAP)
Yang Yi (CSCAP China)
Gudrun Wacker (CSCAP EU)
Leela Ponappa (CSCAP India)
Tsutomu Kikuchi (CSCAP Japan)
Frank Wilson (CSCAP NZ)
Han In-taek (CSCAP Korea)
Alexander Ivanov (CSCAP Russia)
Georgy Toloraya (CSCAP Russia)
Carl Baker (US CSCAP)

Others

Lattana Thavonsouk (IFA Laos)

CSCAP Secretariat

Woo Hon Weng (CSCAP Malaysia)

DISCUSSION AND PROPOSALS

1. CSCAP's Relevance as a Track Two Process

1.1 Distinctive Role and Expertise

- CSCAP by design is transnational and multilateral by adopting the concept of cooperative security, which stresses the inclusion of all regional security stakeholders in dialogues.

- CSCAP performs an early warning function in pre-conflict prevention. By flagging up issues of common concern, CSCAP alerts Track One to potential threats at an early stage to prevent tensions from escalating into crises.
 - CSCAP is recognized for its effectiveness and value for dialogue and confidence building on security issues in terms of cross-fertilization of ideas for policy recommendations and policy-making.
- CSCAP comprises both the non-government through think-tanks and government through officials who may participate in their personal capacities which is crucial in helping Track Two understand official positions.
 - CSCAP participants maintain their intellectual independence and make policy recommendations on the basis of their expertise; they are generally well-versed about but not confined to official/governmental positions.

1.2 Extensive Network of Institutions and Individuals

- CSCAP comprises of 20 Member Committees which includes almost all the major countries in the Asia Pacific region and also includes the European Union (EU).
- CSCAP participants and lead institutions have a cross-cutting membership and affiliations at the level of Tracks 1.0, 1.5 and 2.0.
 - All CSCAP Member Committees have a certain degree of formal and informal linkage with Track 1.0 of their respective countries.
 - Overlap exists between CSCAP and the Track 1.5 ARF Eminent and Expert Persons (ARF EEPs) as some personalities within CSCAP Member Committees are EEP.
 - ASEAN-ISIS with the exception of IFA Laos and Myanmar ISIS formed the ASEAN Member Committees of CSCAP.
 - The Secretariat for the Network of ASEAN Defence and Security Institutions (NADI), which supports the ADMM process, is manned by CSCAP Singapore's lead institution, RSIS.
 - The lead institution of some CSCAP Member Committees is also in other Track 2.0 processes such as NEAT (ISIS Malaysia and BDIPSS), PECC, (ISIS Malaysia, CSIS, JIIA, and CIIS), and CAEC (CSIS).
- CSCAP network broad reach enable its function as an interagency forum which can pull together official personalities and opinions more rapidly surmounting Track 1.0 bureaucratic obstacles.

1.3 Formal Recognition of Track Record

- CSCAP has a track record since 1993 as one of the pioneers of Track 2.0 diplomacy in the Asia Pacific region which received the recognition of Track 1.0 the ARF for its work:
- ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF)
 - The ARF Concept Paper on Preventive Diplomacy (PD) benefited from CSCAP's work on the subject, including its draft Working Definition and Statement of Principles of Preventive Diplomacy.
 - CSCAP Memo No.11 on Human Trafficking was considered by the ARF Foreign Ministers during the 15th ARF in Singapore in July 2008.
 - CSCAP Memo No.14 Guidelines for Managing Trade of Strategic Goods is currently used by the ARF to drive its effort in creating a standardized legislation on export controls for countries in the region.
 - The ARF ISG/ISM agenda has consistently included CSCAP whose representatives are regularly invited to brief the ARF ISG/ISM and to provide inputs into current ARF priorities.
 - The ARF ISG/ISM has regularly requested CSCAP Study Groups Co-Chairs to hold back-to-back meetings whenever their subject matters coincide to support Track 1.0.
 - The ARF ISG/ISM is willing to share its documents with CSCAP indicates a high degree of confidence in their relationship with CSCAP.
 - The ARF SOM has sent representatives to the CSCAP SCM to share the agenda and priorities of the Chair for that particular year.
 - The ARF Chairman's Statement and Summary Report of the ARF ISG/ISM Co-Chairs formally acknowledged the role of CSCAP.

2. CSCAP's Challenges in Track One Engagement

2.1 Complex Regional Landscape

- The rise of other ASEAN-centered Track 1.0 processes since the ARF in 1994 such as APT, ADMM, and EAS with their Track 2.0 counterpart e.g. NEAT for APT and NADI for ADMM necessitate the repositioning of CSCAP to remain as the nexus connecting these emerging developments.

2.2 Limitations in CSCAP-ARF Relations

- The increased use of Track 1.5 such as the ARF's Expert and Eminent Persons (EEPs) whose alternatives perspectives on issues are considered useful by the ARF.
- The extent of acceptance by the ARF towards the recommendations of CSCAP varies depending on the agenda of the Chair/Co-Chairs of the ARF ISG, ISM, and SOM.
- Lack of formal mechanisms to evaluate the usefulness of CSCAP memos on various security issues presented to the ARF. The ARF ISG, ISM, and SOM noted CSCAP positions with no feedback with the exception in the field of CBMs and PD, and NPD.
- The CSCAP Co-Chairs' attendance at the ARF SOM to report on CSCAP findings at a higher level. This was previously done in 2009 when Thailand was the ARF SOM Chair but has not been repeated.
- The periodic absence of the ARF SOM representative at the SCM to brief CSCAP due to prior commitments may lead to the impression that the ARF is not interested in engaging CSCAP.
- Lack of ample advance notice on dates of the ARF ISG/ISM can lead to difficulties for CSCAP to successfully plan and convene a back-to-back meeting with the ARF. The bunching of three back-to-back meetings by ARF and CSCAP in April 2016 strained CSCAP administratively.
- The ARF is perceived as a talk shop discussing certain issues for years without making significant progress leading to its non-reference in enhancing the role of the EAS Chair in the Kuala Lumpur Declaration of the EAS which mentioned ASEAN Plus Three and ADMM Plus.

2.3 Limitations of CSCAP

- Non-parallel membership precludes a formal institutional linkage between CSCAP and certain Track One processes such as the EAS. The EU, Canada, DPRK, and Mongolia are represented in CSCAP but not in EAS.
- Succession planning in managing the issue of generational shift to groom future Track Two practitioners.
- Expanding the base of CSCAP expertise by drawing on the contributions from non-CSCAP members as resource persons.
- Member Committees in smaller states lack the high profile to effectively engage Track One in comparison to their counterparts in larger states, leading to neglect of certain issues of concern to small states.
- CSCAP Memorandums based on consensus and the need for implementable actions often leads to the watering down of recommendations based on the lowest common denominator.

3 CSCAP's Strategy for Enhancing Ties with Track One

3.1 Convocation and Publication Activities

- CSCAP Steering Committee Meeting (SCM)
 - Member Committees whose country is the current or incoming ARF SOM Chair should assist the CSCAP Co-Chairs and the Secretariat in securing the Chair's attendance for at least one SCM per year.
- CSCAP General Conference (GC)
 - Member Committees should coordinate with their respective Foreign Ministries to secure high profile Track One officials as headliners to raise the profile of CSCAP.
 - The GC should be held back-to-back with the EAS to facilitate the convenient participation of Track One officials from both inside and outside the region.
 - The Foreign Ministry of the host Member Committee should lobby for state visits coinciding with the GC to increase the opportunity of securing high profile Track One speakers.
 - CSCAP Thailand the host of the 11th CSCAP GC 2017 and the Thai Foreign Ministry should coordinate to secure keynote speakers from the Incoming ARF Chairs 2017 Philippines, and 2018 Singapore.

- **CSCAP Study Groups**
 - Study Groups Co-Chairs should provide advance notice for Study Group meetings as participants with government affiliation are unable to confirm their attendance immediately due to the need to secure funding and approval from their respective institutions.
 - Study Groups Co-Chairs should exercise their prerogative to bring non-CSCAP members into Study Groups. Participants from Laos, Myanmar or other non-CSCAP members could be invited to attend and contribute in various Study Groups' meetings.
 - Public outreach via dissemination of Study Groups' reports, papers and PPTs to researchers in academia, NGOs, and think-tanks. The increased references to and citations of CSCAP works will act as a lever for policy debate on the incorporation of CSCAP recommendations.

- **CSCAP Memorandum**
 - Policy recommendations based on consensus should adopt the standard of highest common denominator.
 - The principle of including minority opinions and diverse viewpoints should be practised in CSCAP memorandum.
 - Providing alternative perspectives such as the pros and cons on the recommendations should be considered.

- **CSCAP Regional Security Outlook (CRSO)**
 - The CRSO should continue to be circulated to the relevant Track One stakeholders within the foreign and defence ministries.

3.2 Track One Linkage of CSCAP Member Committees

- All CSCAP Member Committees should consider the following steps as ways of increasing their linkage with Track 1.0:
 - Holding annual or biannual meeting for their respective CSCAP Member Committee.
 - Deepen links to foreign and defence ministries by inviting the participation of Track One officials' responsible for ASEAN-centred processes in their personal capacities.
 - Converting Track 2.0 to Track 1.5 by inviting Track One participants in their official capacities instead of personal capacities.
 - Involve the next generation of security professionals in Track Two activities to help prepare CSCAP for the future e.g. the Pacific Forum CSIS Young Leaders Programme.
 - Compile a Directory of Experts to identify potential participants to be inducted into the CSCAP process as Track One increasingly focuses on operational and specific issues.
 - Promote bilateral and minilateral initiatives between Member Committees as a channel for unofficial communications on sensitive issues and during times of heightened tensions e.g. the annual CIIS-JIIA Dialogue between CSCAP China and CSCAP Japan.
 - Support back-to-back meetings of CSCAP in conjunction with Track One events hosted by their respective governments to generate a higher profile for Member Committees especially those in smaller states.

3.3 CSCAP Engagement with Track 1.0

- **ASEAN Secretariat and Secretary-General**
 - Forge closer linkage with the ASEAN Secretariat which acts as the coordinator for all ASEAN-centred processes such as the ARF, ADMM Plus, APT, and EAS.
 - Continuing dialogue between ASEAN Secretary-General with CSCAP Co-Chairs' and Representatives by building upon the initial meeting held on 13 February 2014 in Jakarta, Indonesia.

- **ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF)**
 - Align the topic and agendas of Study Groups more closely with one of the Inter-Sessional Meetings (ISMs) and try to address their Work Plan priorities, including back-to-back meetings with ARF ISG/ISM meetings whenever possible.
 - Increased profile at the SOM level with regularized invitation for CSCAP to report on its findings. This matter was discussed generally at the ARF ISG on CBMs and PD in Brussels, Belgium, 7-9 April 2014.

- The provision of ample advance notice on the dates of the ARF ISG/ISM to enable CSCAP to successfully plan and convene a back-to-back meeting with the ARF.
- ASEAN Defence Ministerial Meeting (ADMM) / ADMM Plus
 - Consult with NADI, the Track Two counterpart of ADMM on efforts to transcend the silo mentality between the Ministry of Defence, the stakeholder of the ADMM Plus, and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the stakeholder of the ARF.
- ASEAN Plus Three (APT)
 - Collaboration with NEAT, the Track Two counterpart of APT to exploit the synergy between the ARF and APT processes with the same stakeholder in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.
- East Asia Summit (EAS)
 - CSCAP should aim to secure a mention in the Chairman’s Statement of the EAS. This is best accomplished through Member Committees’ respective Foreign Ministries through the distribution of quality CSCAP analysis and policy recommendations.
 - CSCAP can play an important role in contributing to the EAS by undertaking studies on critical issues relevant to the EAS such as with the publication of CSCAP Memo No.26 – Towards an Effective Regional Security Architecture for the Asia Pacific.
 - A critical issue for CSCAP’s consideration is a study on the Establishment of the Code of Conduct (COC) in the South China Sea, which was mentioned in the Chairman’s Statement of the 10th EAS.
- Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC)
 - CSCAP would only provide inputs whenever the topics of its Study Groups coincide with the priority of APEC such as in the area of strategic trade management and/or energy security.
 - CSCAP Memo No. 14 Guidelines for Managing Trade of Strategic Goods was used at the APEC Conference on Facilitating Trade in a Secure Trading Environment in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia on 28-29 October 2013 to discuss strategic trade management, and its representative moderated the session on legal and regulatory framework related to licensing procedures and practices.
- Asia-Europe Meeting (ASEM)
 - Coordination with CSCAP EU and CSCAP Mongolia on the possibility of presenting the CSCAP General Conference 2015 Report and relevant CSCAP Memos to the ASEM SOM, 12-14 July 2016 and ASEM Summit, 15-16 July 2016, in Ulaanbaatar, Mongolia.

3.4 CSCAP Engagement with Track 1.5

- ARF Experts and Eminent Persons (ARF EEPs)
 - Better coordination and a close working relationship between CSCAP and ARF EEPs to avoid redundancy and duplication of work in support of the Track 1.0 process such as in Preventive Diplomacy and Maritime Security by feeding CSCAP works in those areas into the EEPs.

3.5 CSCAP Engagement with Track 2.0

- ASEAN ISIS
 - Expanding CSCAP membership to Myanmar ISIS and IFA Laos, the two remaining non-CSCAP ASEAN-ISIS members when they are ready in accordance with past SCM decisions.
 - Endorsing Myanmar ISIS application to join CSCAP as CSCAP Myanmar. The ARF SOM Chair 2014 Myanmar had sent a representative from Myanmar ISIS to the 41st CSCAP SCM, 5 June 2014 to share the agenda and priorities of the Chair for that particular year.
 - Encouraging IFA Laos to join CSCAP when it is ready while in the interim including the participation of IFA Laos and ARF SOM Chair 2016 Laos in the activities of CSCAP and its Member Committees.
 - At the 43rd Meeting of AusCSCAP in Canberra on 16 October 2015, the Deputy Director-General of IFA Laos, Dr. Lattana Thavonesouk was invited for the discussion on CSCAP and Track Two Engagement with the Emerging Regional Security Architecture in Asia.
- Network of ASEAN Defence and Security Institutions (NADI)

- CSCAP participants are welcome to attend NADI meetings and will be invited in their personal capacities.
- Network of East Asian Think-Tanks (NEAT)
 - CSCAP and NEAT collaboration should focus on the political economy of security issues in providing recommendations to the APT based on the priorities of the APT Cooperation Work Plan 2013-2017.

Inputs from CSCAP China on the *Record of CSCAP Retreat on Track One Relations*

CSCAP China supports the discussion on enhancing our relations with the Track I, and ARF in particular, as what CSCAP has been doing over previous years. We also support that CSCAP should strengthen itself and make more contribution to the regional security and peace by the following approaches:

(1) Individual member committee should promote their national committee capacity building by involving more security specialists, as well as Track I people, enhancing the relationship with respective national governments and especially diplomats and defense officers, encouraging dialogues with the Track I and providing more valued and workable policy recommendations to policy makers etc.

(2) CSCAP, as a whole, should assist the individual member committees, especially the small and new member committees, to increase their voices at home, support them to have more activities under the framework of CSCAP, and the CSCAP (Finance Committee) should consider to offer preferential policy and have some concrete actions to support the small and new member committees for their active participation in CSCAP activities and uplift their profiles in their respective countries.

(3) CSCAP should continue to increase the quality of the MOU and Report of CSCAP Study Group, Report of the General Conference, the CRSO and expand its references and citations in the region. The MOU should be based on consensus of all the member committees in principle, so that it can be regarded as more constructive viewpoints to the ARF officials and Track I policy makers in our region.

(4) Where there is ability, there is position. Facing the complicated security challenges, if we wish to make this organization, CSCAP, more useful to the regional security, the priority should be focused on the capacity building and making ourselves stronger by concrete steps. We are not saying that it is too ambitious to seek the relations with the EAS and other regional Track I organization, however, we do think it is more important to enhance our existing ties with the ARF, and to accommodate all the concerns of our member committees at present.

Therefore, it is suggested that the CSCAP Secretariat circulate the *Record of CSCAP Retreat on Track One Relations* and the *Notes on Retreat by CSCAP Secretariat* to all the member committees for further intensive deliberation, consideration, inputs and suggestions. CSCAP China is looking forward to discussions on the matter in our next SCM in Japan.