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The 10th General Conference of the Council for Security Cooperation in the Asia Pacific (CSCAP) was successfully convened in Ulaanbaatar, Mongolia from 21 to 23 October 2015. It was the first time that the General Conference was held in Mongolia. Institute for Strategic Studies, National Security Council of Mongolia (CSCAP Mongolia) hosted the conference. CSCAP China, the Asia Foundation and CSCAP Steering Committee have provided financial and technical assistance to CSCAP Mongolia.

The conference has drawn significant attention from policymakers, scholars, experts and media members of diplomatic corps in Ulaanbaatar as well as young scholars from the Pacific Forum Young Leaders Program, with more than 150 representatives from 20 countries. Moreover, Director of Institute for Strategic Studies of Mongolia Dr. Ganbat and CSCAP Co-Chair Tan Sri Rastam Mohd Isa opened the conference, while Vice Chairman and Member of the State Great Hural Mr. Gonchigdorj Radnaasumberel delivered keynote speech. Among other officials, Mrs. Meloney Lindberg, country representative of the Asia Foundation gave luncheon speech, Member of Parliament Mrs. Batchimeg Migiddorj and Ambassador Zhang Yuanyaun, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, China delivered dinner speech.

The theme of the conference was “Confidence Building in the Asia Pacific: The Security Architecture of the 21st Century”, designed for participants to share their insights and expertise on the topics as follows:

1. Challenges and Postures in the Asia Pacific
2. Necessity of an Institutional Framework in the Asia Pacific
3. Energy Security in the Region
4. Asian Regional Cooperation on Humanitarian Assistance and Disaster Relief
5. Maritime Cooperation
6. Moving from Confidence Building Measures to Preventive Diplomacy
Dr. Damba Ganbat opened the conference by expressing his gratitude to Mr. Gonchigdorj, Royal Highness Prince Norodom Sirivudh and guests, academics and scholars for coming to Mongolia and participating in this conference. He noted that there is a need for a wide range of policy instruments to address regional security concerns in complex situation in Asia Pacific region. Mongolia sees the CSCAP as an important dialogue mechanism to generate ideas to resolve a wide range of regional problems, since the CSCAP provides a means for scholars, experts and officials in their private capacities to discuss political and security issues and challenges the region is facing. As Mongolia recognizes ASEAN as a key structure, Mongolia developed friendly relations of all-round cooperation with ASEAN member states and ASEAN-centered regional cooperation mechanism. In this respect, signaling its commitment to engagement in Southeast Asia, Mongolia became a member of ASEAN Regional Forum in 1998 and acceded to the ASEAN’s Treaty of Amity and Cooperation Southeast Asia in 2005.

Tan Sri Rastam Mohd Isa started his remarks by appreciation to CSCAP Mongolia for warm welcome and gracious hospitality and further expressed his hope CSCAP Mongolia would be more active in CSCAP. He highlighted the importance of greater cooperation and coordination in managing environmental pollution, scarcity of natural resources among states, the private sector and civil society. Moreover, there is increasing need for smaller state to adapt and respond
to the competition-cooperation dynamic that characterizes major power relations and their interaction to existing multilateral security frameworks. As a Track Two, non-official organization, CSCAP has traditionally engaged with the ARF on current and trending matters of regional security through consultations, meetings, and publications and he stressed that CSCAP should able to support ARF in preventing and countering violent extremism. He emphasized CSCAP’s contribution for preventive diplomacy, energy security, non-proliferation and disarmament, and the regional security architecture analysis and useful policy recommendations through submission of Study Group memoranda and participation in ARF Inter-Sessional Meetings (ISMs) and Inter-Sessional Groups (ISGs). ASEAN Chair and Chair of ARF is crucial for close cooperation between CSCAP and Track One mechanisms. In addition, CSCAP has been able to work closely with current chair Malaysia, look forward to a similar working relationship with the incoming chair Laos. He mentioned that Kuala Lumpur summit should provide the impetus for CSCAP to closely examine the various possibilities as CSCAP’s linkage on relevant issues of the EAS, ADMM Plus and other mechanisms. Within ASEAN Community and the vision for ASEAN post 2015 would be declared, it would be helpful for CSCAP to study the ASEAN declaration and related documents to have useful views and furthermore it could help CSCAP to determine its future direction in line with the evolving regional architecture.

---

KEYNOTE ADDRESS

Mr. Gonchigdorj Radnaasumberel

Vice Chairman of the State Great Khural of Mongolia

Chairman Gonchigdorj pointed the necessity of interconnectivity, security cooperation, synergy of international organizations and the need for states to work together. Although Mongolia joined CSCAP in 1996, Mongolia mostly voiced its opinions in the Nonproliferation and Disarmament Study Group. Therefore, Mongolia aims to increase its participation. Chairman Gonchigdorj highlighted this year marks 25th anniversary of Mongolia’s first democratic election and the establishment of a permanently functioning parliament. Having pursued an independent, peaceful, open and multi-pillar foreign policy, Mongolia is working to contribute to the establishment of a security mechanism in our region. Furthermore, Mongolian regional policy is formulated both in following paragraph of National Security Concept of Mongolia and revised.
Foreign Policy concept of 2011. Mongolia wants to keep its territory, its region void of any nuclear weapons. In 2012, Mongolia’s Nuclear Weapon Free Status was signed by P5 of the UNSC, a joint declaration to respect Mongolian status and under no circumstances be exceeded. With this in mind, the Parliament of Mongolia decreed that Mongolia’s Nuclear Weapon Free Status will enter a new stage in its evolution in July of 2015.

- Mongolia proposed the “Ulaanbaatar Dialogue on Northeast Asian Security”, an initiative aims to build and strengthen trust, mutual understanding and cooperation through dialogue on Track 1.5 and Track 2. It has great potential to play an integral part in security cooperation in this region and he believes that the initiative can be linked to other similar ideas.

- Furthermore, to guarantee equal participation of all Asian states and to strengthen their independence, sovereignty and sustainable development, Mongolia has started the “Forum of Asia”. This initiative took form due to the need of a comprehensive mechanism that has all Asian countries as participants.

- Moreover, Mongolia hosted the 20th annual meeting of the Asia Pacific Forum (APF) of National Human Rights Institutions in 2015. National Human Rights Commission of Mongolia is a full-fledged member of the APF and has been chairing the APF since August, 2015.

- In 2012 the Parliament of Mongolia joined the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly as its newest and with that its 57th member. In 2015, Mongolia hosted the OSCE PA’s Autumn session in Ulaanbaatar. More than 300 participants from 47 nations and 19 participants from 13 international organizations took part in the meeting. By organizing the Parliamentary Assembly’s session in Mongolia, we aim to promote dialogue and through that peace and stability in our region. He hopes that this is our contribution to international security.

- Moreover, having the unique geography of bridging Asia to Europe, Mongolia looks to play a part in connecting these two continents. In this spirit, Mongolia will host the 11th ASEM meeting in Ulaanbaatar in July of 2016.

He believes that the need and value of CSCAP is inceasing in this critical time, which its ability to look at issues from a comprehensive, scientific and unbiased point of view is increased
dramatically. He concludes his remarks by extending his gratitude to the Institute for Strategic Studies for taking initiative to organize the 10th General Conference.

SESSION ONE

CHALLENGES AND POSTURES IN THE ASIA PACIFIC

Chair: Ambassador Bold Ravdan, Mongolia

Capt. Sebastian Martin

Research Fellow, Centre Head for Maritime Security and Diplomacy, Malaysia

Capt. Sebastian Martin started his talk by outlining the common challenges in maritime security. He continued by addressing the possible new approaches to manage the problem. Captain Martin talked about the experience of resolving piracy and other issues in the Gulf Aden. By formulating a code of conduct nations build confidence. Furthermore, nations working together on the military to military level, it can further foster confidence. As Capt. Martin explained, just by working together and increasing the number of patrols, the cooperating parties could significantly decrease the number of incidents. He elaborated on public private partnership. Private security offers mitigation whereas national armed forces can react to crises. This symbiosis of private and national security has decreased the number of incidents arising from piracy to nearly zero in the Gulf of Aden. Capt. Martin, also talked about the staging points of piracy. He explained, that 2/3 of piracy related activity is carried out on land and only 1/3 is the actual act of pirating. Therefore, he stressed the need to fight piracy not only on water but also on land. Information sharing among police, coast guard and customs also leads to further confidence building. As Capt. Martin points out, the police know the gangs, the coast guard the routes and customs the entry points. By effectively working together, not only is confidence bolstered but incidents are also decreased. Another point Capt. Martin makes is the nature of maritime crime. Where piracy is usually financially motivated, maritime terrorism is political in nature. In order to make a political statement, they attack critical infrastructure like ports and offshore installations. He continued to urge for cooperation and practical steps of implementation. One such avenue is simulation exercises to foster cooperation and confidence.
Ambassador Su Ge
President, China Institute of International Studies

Ambassador Su Ge shared his three observations. First that peace and development remain to be a general theme in our world, second that the world has become politically multipolar and economic development has become globalized and thirdly, that large scale wars have become highly unlikely as unconventional security concerns are on a rise. Ambassador Su Ge explains that the world has shifted from a post-Cold War bi-polar system to a multi-polar world. He points out that in this new world it has become rather difficult to identify friend from foe. As economic interests of nations have achieved a new level of significance the zero-sum game model has been replaced by a win-win model of economic inter-dependence. However, this brings economic security to the forefront of strategic thinking. Culture, through soft power has also become a significant factor of national security. Unconventional security concerns such as global warming, transnational crime disease and more have become a new challenge. New technology, especially internet has become a powerful tool and factor in international relations and the stability of a nation.

Ambassador Su Ge points out that China believes in peace and development. In this regard, China has initiated a new type of Great Power relations to reflect the changing landscape of international and fosters good neighborly relations in the region. China advocates the resumption of the Six Party Talks and the resolution of North Korea’s nuclear issue. China suggested a new approach to deal with the concern in the South China Sea. China also offers the One belt one road initiative to the world. He finishes with China’s proposal of a Shared, Comprehensive, Cooperative and Sustainable security concept for the region that is open inclusive and cooperative.

Mr. James A. Kelly
President Emeritus, Pacific Forum, CSIS, USA

Mr. Kelly started his talk about the current problems and issues we are facing today and how they came to be. He spoke of the need of many to seek a new global equilibrium. From Europe’s debt and currency problems, to economic difficulties emerging nations are facing, to oil prices being too high or too low are just some of the destabilizing factors that the world, our region and to an extent China is facing.
The security of the Asia-Pacific region is looking up. In the long run prospects seem rather good. Regional institutions such as CSCAP have helped build confidence. Nevertheless, many dangers linger. Mostly old internal conflicts in Myanmar, Philippines, and Pakistan Uighurs/Tibetan are a problem but pose no significant danger of spreading beyond borders. Terrorism remains an issue. In this region terrorism appears in many forms. This may be affected by conditions and movements in the Middle East. The nuclear weapons program of the DPRK is an obvious security concern. An armistice has been in effect for 62 years, yet there is still no formal treaty between the USA and the DPRK. The South China Sea Maritime issues involve many countries and their many interests. This complicated problem is a difficult but should not be exaggerated. The Law of the Sea is an important tool. Pollution, infectious disease, climate change, and an aging demographic are larger issues of our region. These and others are the difficult challenges. Lowered tensions in the Asia-Pacific permit progress on these. We must keep this in mind.

To summarize and conclude, the Asia-Pacific, despite problems, has sound mechanisms to manage them. No country has an interest in its neighbors failing or severely troubled. This is what can be called “win-win,” and can be a basis for further reducing tensions.

Ambassador Gunn Kim

**Director-General, North Korea Nuclear Affairs, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Korea**

Ambassador Kim started his talk by noting what experts call the ‘Asia Paradox’ phenomenon, a gap between high degree of economic interdependence and lack of security cooperation. He pointed out that Northeast Asia is the only region in the world without any mechanism to address security concerns. Amb. Kim continues to say that the absence of a regional cooperation mechanism showed the complexity of the political issues in Northeast Asia. From historic and territorial issues to WMDs and a potential arms race to non-traditional challenges like climate change, humanitarian crisis and infectious diseases, the region has a wide spectrum of challenges it faces.

The Northeast Asia Peace and Cooperation Initiative (NAPCI) seeks to begin accumulating interactions on soft issues such as environment, disaster relief and nuclear safety so that these interactions gradually develop into habits of cooperation. Eventually, these habits can be nurtured into the building of trust, which in due course of time, will help usher in peace and
cooperation in Northeast Asia Amb. Kim explained ROK's Trustpolitik, gradual process of building trust and how this will eventually lead to development of inter-Korean relations and consolidation of peace. Regarding the North Korean nuclear issue, Amb. Kim introduced that the ROK government, with other Six-Party Talks partners, has repeatedly invited North Korea to 'exploratory talks,' which is without any preconditions, to deliver the five-parties' shared view and listen to North Korea's thinking, and expressed a willingness to continue efforts to engage in dialogue. With North Korea, he also underlined that North Korea should accept the reality that no country in the world would recognize it as a nuclear-weapon state. He concludes by saying that ROK and the US, along with the international community, stand ready to offer a brighter future to North Korea, if North Korea demonstrates a genuine willingness to abide by its international obligations and commitments.

**Jochen Prantl**

*Director, Asia-Pacific College of Diplomacy, Australian National University*

Mr. Prantl started his presentation by stating that the creation and fate of a new regional security order in the Asia Pacific needs to be understood within the wider context of the shifting global balance of power. He continued by pointing out that the maintenance of Asia’s peace and stability hinges on the transition from a US primacy to an order that accommodates the rise of China. The global order the came to be after the Cold War is challenged by China. However, US primacy is deeply entrenched in the Asia Pacific and will not easily fade, despite the global restructuring of power. In an attempt to realign its defense strategy so that it meets the new realities, the US has started its Rebalance to the Asia-Pacific. This creates the following realities. First, the US reassures its allies in the region, second, Asian countries do not seem to be satisfied with a China centric regional order, and third, the Rebalance will lead to frictions between the US and China.

With this as a background Mr. Prantl produces the following five principles for a regional order in the Asia-Pacific.

1. Great power management trumps institutional design
2. Institutional form follows function
3. Multilateral pluralism trumps monism
4. Contestation is part and parcel of collective action
5. Power needs to be matched by accountability

Mr. Prantl concludes by saying that adherence to the above mentioned principles will help preserve stability in our region.

Mr. Song Il Hyok
Deputy Director General, Institute for Disarmament and Peace, DPR Korea

Northeast Asia is becoming the world’s strategic center and because of this attracts the interest of all great powers. In the bigger region of Asia-Pacific we can see China, Russia and the United States try to achieve primacy through establishing economic integrations. From AIIB to TPP to the Russian Eurasian Union all great powers see the economic value of this region. At the same time, countries like Japan and South Korea are increasing their military presence in order to deter the strategic rise of China. All of this is happening around the Korean Peninsula. The Korean Peninsula has been caught in the middle of all these tectonic changes. If things go badly World War 3 will start from this region, so it is up to our smart and forward looking thinking to make this region into a zone of peace and prosperity. A priority is to resolve the hostile relations between the nations of region and the relation between the DPRK and the US. We must move from an armistice treaty to a peace treaty. The hostility that is around our country is not our choice but rather the result of the US’s 70 yearlong hostile policy towards us. Many researchers agree that the US forces currently present in our region far exceeds any threat that we can possible pose.

The DPRK has offered to discuss peace with the United States since the 70s. If the United States is serious about peace they need to show it. The DPRK is ready to talk peace.
Dr. Michael Reiterer  

Senior Advisor, European External Action Service, EU

Dr. Reiterer began his talk by pointing out that in he can see a cooperative approach to security, especially non-traditional security in Asia. However, he continues by saying that the time has come to move from talk to action.

As a possible venue for integration and dialogue he points out the Asia Europe Meeting or ASEM. Mongolia will host the 10th ASEM on the 20th anniversary of its creation. ASEM, as Dr. Reiterer explains, is a dialogue of equal partners without any hierarchy. In the first years of its inception there was a taboo on discussing developmental issues as this would lead to a hierarchy among developed and not so developed states.

ASEM provides a comprehensive approach to international security and offers an integrated model for cooperation. Currently, there are three pillars of focus for ASEM, namely, political, economic and people to people. Dr. Reiterer notes that it might be of merit to add a military level of cooperation to the ASEM dialogue.

He concludes his talk by offering some possibilities for the furthering of international dialogue. As he points out Pluralism is one possible way. In the rather well functioning context of ASEM nations will find solutions to problems using the existing frameworks that fits the best. Another possibility is Regime and eventually Institution building with the models of ASEAN and APEC in mind. Through this approach there will be a concentration of discussions on the problem solving capacity of organizations.

Ambassador Barry Desker  

Distinguished Fellow, S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies, Singapore

The Asia-Pacific region will face numerous challenges such as maritime and territorial disputes, international crime and terrorism to name a few, in the near future. In addition, China’s rise and the United States’ rebalance to the Asia-Pacific will lead to a strategic rivalry between the two
states. Therefore the need for regional cooperation is ever more important. Regional Institutions are the best tool we have for cooperative dialogue.

Amb. Desker’s key point, as he pointed it out, is that the Asia-Pacific has ‘Overlapping but relevant institutions’. The currently existing institutions are all relevant and should work together and under no circumstances should be defensive.

The ASEAN Regional Forum or ARF started as a process but evolved into a framework that gave birth to two important institutions. The first is ASEAN+3. This framework includes the ASEAN countries plus China, Japan and the ROK. This is an exclusive regionalism approach that China prefers, which coincidentally limits the US’ involvement. However, because of the lack of the US’ involvement and contribution ASEAN+3 can be detrimental to the stability and security of the Asia-Pacific region. The second framework is the East Asian Summit. The EAS includes the ASEAN+3 countries in addition to Australia, New Zealand, India, Russia and the United States. This framework offers an inclusive and outward looking approach to regionalism. APEC was born out of this organization. APEC is vital in trade facilitation and economic integration.

Amb. Desker concludes by saying that overlapping frameworks promote a broader Asia-Pacific Dialogue and should not be seen as rivals.

**Professor Park Jae Jeok**

*Assistant Professor, Hankuk University of Foreign Studies, Korea*

Prof. Park started his presentation by explaining the three dimensions of South Korea’s Mini-lateralism. The first is the Context of the US led alliances. The Trilateral Security Dialogue between the US, Japan and the ROK is seen by the United States as an important stepping stone to a multi-lateral security framework in the future. Although this is security cooperation, China sees it as defense cooperation with an aim to contain them. Furthermore, because of the historic animosity between Japan and South Korea, further problems are generated. The US also works in with Australia and the Philippines, its two other allies in the region.

The second is mini-lateral linkage with China. It is very important for South Korea to involve both the United States and China in a mini-lateral linkage to discuss security. However, China think that this framework will address North Korea’s Nuclear issue. China is not opposed to the issue, but doesn’t want to have a separate framework outside of the Six Party Talks. The third is
the ROK’s NAPCI initiative. By dealing with non-traditional security issues such as nuclear safety and cyber security we hope to involve the regional states and establish an institutional framework. We hope that Japan’s East Asia community, Australia’s Asia-Pacific community and Mongolia’s Ulaanbaatar Dialogue will cooperate with NAPCI. To sum up, South Korea pursues tri-lateral cooperation with Japan and the US, as well as China and the US and aims to foster NAPCI.

Mr. Dorjsuren Nanjin
Head of Center for China and East Asian Studies, Institute for Strategic Studies, Mongolia

Northeast Asia is a region where the past is still very relevant. Some of the underlying causes for tension and conflict in the sub-region is due to what happened in the past and how the involved countries interpret it. In addition to history, other challenges make Northeast Asia very volatile, where one stray bullet can cause a full-scale armed conflict. Therefore, the need for dialogue, mitigation and resolution is very important.

Mr. Dorjsuren explains that Mongolia having good relations with all Northeast Asian states including ROK and DPRK and being geographically located in a favorable area is the best fit for a venue for discussion. The Ulaanbaatar Dialogue on Northeast Asian security is the manifestation of Mongolia’s will to foster peace and security in our region.

The Ulaanbaatar Dialogue does not want to compete with the Six Party Talks, rather Mr. Dorjsuren believes that the Ulaanbaatar Dialogue can be complimentary to the goals of the SPT. The very nature of the Ulaanbaatar Dialogue is different to other existing frameworks. The UBD is a Track 1.5 event where government officials in their official capacity and scholars and researchers gather to share and discuss their views and opinions. He concludes by stressing the need for dialogue and cooperation in the region.
Dr. Gotov began his talk by outlining the vulnerability of Mongolia’s economy, which is highly dependent on the export of mining products, specifically coal. It can be seen from the growth for 2011 has reached 17.3% and dropped to 7.8% in 2014. However, Mongolia would face fiscal difficulties due to lower growth in coal demand in China in nearest future. In order to decrease the vulnerability, it is essential to increase the number of buyers. Moreover, improving transport access to seaports or gateway is one of the key factors to enhancing Mongolia’s foreign trade competitiveness. Given the poor condition of the roads, the high cost of air transport, and the limited range of the waterways, the railway has had little competition in freight transport from other modes. He reviewed possible future impacts on economic projects such as Tavan Tolgoi (TT) coal, Nariin Sukhait (NS) coal, Oyu Tolgoi (OT) copper and potential Ovoot coal mine projects. The coal deposits at Tavan Tolgoi and Nariin Sukhait are known to be particular significant. He noted that Northeast Asia demand for coking coal would be 168 million tons in 2020. This is 5 times bigger than amount of processed coal in Tavan Tolgoi. Based on field surveys and interviews, Dr. Gotov presented following conclusions and recommendations:

- As Khuut-Bichigt (BCP) is the shortest railway route to Chinese seaports, a market study should be undertaken which develops detailed traffic forecasts by different commodities and origin-destination (O-D) pairs.
- Due to environmental considerations on both sides of the border, however, it is recommended that this bridge is only used for ecotourism and environmental protection related activities and all the other freight traffic should be carried through another route to be developed further north, away from the Nomrog SPA.
- Even though significant mineral resources exist in the Eastern Area of Mongolia, it will be very difficult to attract private sector investors without building the basic transportation and other required infrastructure. With the exception of some mega-projects, such as the
Tavantolgoi (coal mine with proven reserves of 6 billion tons of coking coal) and Oyu Tolgoi
(copper and gold mine) Project, it is very unlikely that mining companies will assist in the
required transportation infrastructure investment in the Eastern region of Mongolia.

- Main constraints and problems limiting the use of the transport corridors are inadequate
development of the infrastructure, especially missing rail and paved road sections along the
Corridors. Also we need to reach suitable technical decisions to solve potential negative
impacts on environment.

- If the constraints were lift up, traffic would be increased to great extent. Particularly, tourism
and border trade between Mongolia and PRC would be much increased along the Road
Corridor and freight traffic of coal, coking coal, copper concentrate and iron ore to PRC and
further to ROK and Japan would be increased enormously along the Rail Corridor.

- Investment Programs are required to missing infrastructure links, namely: Construction of
railways Choibalsan- Khuut - Bichgt; and construction of raved road between Baruun Urt
and Bichigt; Upgrading Rail section between Choibalsan and Ereentsav including
replacement of existing wooden sleepers with concrete ones, introducing modern
signalization system and electrification, and Conduct feasibility studies, design and
construction Railway section between Khuut and Sumber (Nomrog) BCP.

---

**Ambassador Talmiz Ahmad**

*Former Ambassador to Saudi Arabia and the UAE, India*

H.E. Amb. Talmiz Ahmad discussed the current state of global energy need and focus on how
the U.S. and China are leading. He points out the following scenarios:

1. In the coming two decades the global need for energy will increase threefold. However, the
needs of developing economies like India and China will increase by 60%. By 2020 China
will be the world’s largest consumer of petroleum, whereas India will lead the world in coal
consumption.

2. Even by 2035, coal, petroleum and gas will still make up around 80% of energy in the world.

3. If petroleum consumption of North American countries and Brazil increase in the next
decade, OPEC will continue to be a big player by 2020.

As the speaker points out there will be an inter-play between a series of separate but over-lapping
competitions: between OPEC and non-OPEC producers; between conventional and non-
conventional fuels, between fossil fuels and renewables, and between coal and gas. Thus these competitions will be influenced by: the global economic scenario, particularly the growth prospects of the major consumers - China, the USA, India, Japan, ROK, etc; the extent of global and regional commitment to climate change concerns, and the application of technology in promoting fuel-efficient and green transport, clean coal, safe nuclear power, and commercially viable renewables.

Dr. Otgonsuren Buyankhishig,
Researcher for Central for China and East Asian Studies, Institute for Strategic Studies, Mongolia

Given the topic of “Mongolia-China-Russian economic corridor infrastructure cooperation”, Dr.Otgonsure has focused on the challenges for infrastructure cooperation, how countries are working toward this and the future ahead. The economic corridor is the shortest route from Asia to Europe for transporting passengers and goods through the territory of Mongolia. Despite there are challenges of the differences such as investment, railroad capacity, gauge track and economic level, each countries are coordinating their national socio-economic policy. She expressed her view by saying that in order to establish economic corridor, infrastructure sector must be developed and railroad must be connected initially. Dr.Otgonsuren suggested that the countries should establish trilateral joint working mechanism that deal with railroad, infrastructure cooperation. In this regard, three countries can immediately solve the issues so that it improves economic corridor cooperation.
Dr. Kuyoun Chung

Research Fellow, Korea Institute for National Unification, Republic of Korea

Dr. Chung started her presentation by talking about the sources of risk in Asia Pacific region has diversified and generated unpredictable trajectories of disaster escalation. She mentioned that man-made disasters such as economic crisis, civil conflicts, wars and refugee crisis generate consequences. Although two global initiatives, Hyogo and Sendai framework for action hugely contributed to form framework for disaster reduction, but there are issues have not been addressed such as region-specific threats, regional multilateral dialogue for HA/DR, regional link between HA/DR and development cooperation and regional strategic assistance. In this respect, South Korea’s strategy lies upon the linkage between HA/DR and development cooperation; education in empowerment and capacity building; participation to ADMM plus disaster relief exercise. She also introduced the NAPCI, an initiative of Park Geun-hye administration that aims to build trust, lay foundation for sustainable peace and encourage engagement within the region. As one of NAPCI focus for non-traditional security issues, disaster relief HA/DR have emerged as an area, which NAPCI can be applied due to absence of regional mechanisms, deals with disaster relief. Given the context, she suggested that by sharing information, standardization on disaster relief would not only facilitate the dialogue in Northeast Asia, but also it will deliver an effort for humanitarian assistance.

Professor Tsutomu Kikuchi

Adjunct Fellow, Japan Institute of International Affairs, Japan

Prof. Kikuchi pointed that Asia Pacific region is prone to natural disasters and risk of natural disaster such as earthquake, tsunami and typhoon is much higher than other regions. Thus it is utmost important to strengthen the ‘self help’ response capabilities through bilateral and multilateral cooperation. Japan has engaged in relief missions, provided training programs and conducted joint exercises to promote capacity building efforts. Japan also has been actively engaged in the HA/DR missions overseas.
He continued his presentation by talking about Prime Minister Abe administration’s ‘Proactive contribution to Peace’ policy and ‘Sendai Corporation Initiative for disaster risk reduction’.

Mr. Allen Delos Reyes  
Senior Research Associate, Institute for Strategic and Development Studies, the Philippines

Based on the case of Typhoon Haiyan, Mr. Reyes emphasized the important lessons that we should be learned from the strongest tropical cyclone at landfall in 2013. He pointed out that the typhoon had winds speeds of 235 kph, it has left 6,300 people dead, injured 23,869 persons and damaged 489,163 houses. Furthermore, ASEAN countries have provided almost 7 Million USD aid. No matter how massive, successful efforts at humanitarian assistance and disaster relief are also contingent on domestic politics Setting-up of accountability mechanisms regarding foreign aid at the regional level could also be explored. Sea Lanes of Communication (SLOCs) can be used for cooperation rather than divisiveness during disaster response and humanitarian assistance.

Mr. Garry Ibrahim  
Deputy Director, Brunei Darussalam Institute of Policy and Strategic Studies

Mr. Ibrahim noted that the Asia-Pacific region remains the most natural disaster-prone area. According the UN statistics in 2014, 41% of all natural disasters have happened in Asia Pacific region for the past decade. Despite main economic growth drivers and increased connectivity, the region witnessed man-made disasters including the loss of Malaysian Airlines MH370 and massive explosion in Tianjin, China. Cooperation on humanitarian assistance and disaster relief can significantly contribute to build mutual trust and confidence to address these challenge. It is an area not only unites countries together for common endeavor, but also it brings military, civilian, non-governmental stakeholders as well as other actors together under common objectives. Countries has convened regional disaster relief exercises such as Brunei hosted ADMM-Plus Humanitarian assistance and Disaster relief in 2013 and Malaysia, China co-chaired ARF Disaster Relief Exercise in 2015. However, there are numerous mechanisms and processes for disaster relief, there should be a deliberate move to coordinate these efforts. Lastly, he provided the following proposals: to expand membership of ADMM Plus countries under
direct communications and to establish hotlines of communications between foreign ministries on maritime emergencies as well as cooperation on search and rescue.
SESSION FIVE
MARITIME COOPERATION

Chair: Mr. John Brandon Senior Director Regional Cooperation Programs and Associate Director The Asia Foundation, USA

Mr. Tetsuo Kotani
Senior Fellow, Japan Institute of International Affairs, Japan

Initially, Mr. Kotani explained the following reasons behind Maritime tension in Asia.

- There is little trust among the regional countries.
- There is no consensus on the legal bases for maritime boundaries in Asia.
- Although there is a San Francisco Peace treaty (1951) and the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, so called “Constitution of the oceans”, but countries interpret both treaties differently.
- The countries that are not party to the San Francisco Peace treaty, do not bound by its provisions. Some countries object the status that has being written in the treaty.
- The decline in US leadership in maintaining order and the emergence of China and India have prompted some coastal countries to seek to change the status quo.
- Some countries do not have the concept of the rule of law.

Consequently, he underlined how Japan is actively maintaining “open and stable seas” approach in accordance with international law and rules. For example, Prime Minister Shinzo Abe proposed “three principles for the rule of law” to clarify claims, to avoid use of force and to settle disputes by peaceful means. In order to avoid miscalculation and control escalation, there is a need to establish crisis management, enhance Maritime domain awareness (MDA) and confidence building in the region. He suggested that Japan and China should establish a code of conduct in the maritime and air domains after agreeing on maritime/air communication mechanism between authorities. In these regards, Japan can conduct maritime surveillance in the South China Sea and elsewhere to develop more accurate situational awareness in Asia.

Vice Admiral Anup Singh
Former Commander-in-Chief, Eastern Naval Command, India

Vice Admiral Singh touched the important role of maritime cooperation in the Asia Pacific region. The most of the global maritime trade passes through this region and it has led to
establishment of new trade routes. For example, about quarter of all oil carried by sea passes through the Strait of Malacca. Despite having tremendous cooperation opportunities in the Asia Pacific region, but it also increases the probability for new challenges such as terrorism, pirates and the narcotics trade. The maritime terrorism not only restrains national economy and but also it creates psychological stress for the countries safety. He stressed that there is an urgent need to formulate a new regimes for seas and advance the level of port security and usage as well as create the framework for land-locked countries to use seaports. If maritime transportation in the Asia-Pacific is not secured, it will threaten existing economic trade relations. However, India has been trying to maintain good relations among neighbor countries, the tension still exist with some neighbors. But the question arises how to create successful maritime cooperation, he provided further examples as International Maritime Boundary Lines (IMBL), information-gathering center in Singapore and exchange of information within CSCAP.

Dr. Nguyen Nam Duong
Deputy Director General, Institute for Foreign Policy and Strategic Studies, Diplomatic Academy of Vietnam, Vietnam

Dr. Duong’s presentation focused on construction of maritime security in the Asia Pacific region. He acknowledges that the most important factor for maintaining security is the order. Dr. Duong hopes that a new order will arise in the near future, however, he points out the terminology and definition should be clear. Owing to the capabilities of International organizations are limited, thus it is important to strengthen their mandate, expand their scope and eventually create new mechanisms. He also hopes that China and ASEAN will able to reach a more realistic agreement on cooperation. Furthermore, it is important to use the ASEAN+ format to foster dialogue and cooperation among analysts and scholars. The rivalry of great powers increases the chance of conflict in the region. The continuation of ASEAN’s unity is a central piece of regional security.

Ms. Yan Yan
Deputy Director of International Department, National Institute for South China Sea Studies, People’s Republic of China

In her presentation, Ms. Yan focused more on legal regime for joint development resources in overlapping claim sea areas sets out by UNCLOS and international law, then reviewed state
practice in the South China Sea, identified the challenges and finally she suggested possible ways forward. She said that the Chinese government has continuously pointed out to resolve the issues in the South China Sea. According to Chinese scientist estimation, there are 5 sedimentary basins in the northern part of the South China Sea, while there are 8 sedimentary basins in the Spratly area. Ms. Yan agrees on the importance of developing the capabilities of regional mechanisms. She further explained the initiative by Chinese leader Deng Xiaoping “shelving the disputes”, that applies to the disputes over maritime jurisdiction. Ms. Yan noted that many scholars give limited explanation on joint development concept. She argues that in spite of UNCLOS injected new responsibility to existing institutions and created new institutions, but it is questionable whether UNCLOS is an enduring normative framework. China and Vietnam concluded both maritime boundary agreement in 2000 and a Joint Marine Seismic Understanding (JMSU) in 2005. In conclusion, she acknowledges the challenges remain in joint development such as lack of trust, no consensus, domestic politics and lack of specification of duty for states to enter joint development. Finally, she proposed that establishing bilateral fisheries agreement and conducting joint seismic survey would serve as the starting point.

Ambassador Pou Sothirak  
Executive Director, The Cambodian Institute for Cooperation and Peace, Cambodia

First, creating trust will increases mutual understanding and decreases tension and conflict. Second, it has great potential for combating maritime crime using ASEAN’s framework. Countries are required to seek new ways of cooperation avoiding confrontation. It is important to use diplomatic efforts such as strengthen social, cultural, and economic relations. In other words, it is possible to implement preventive diplomacy through expanding cooperation channels, disaster assistance and rescue mission. Undoubtedly, Asia Pacific has great importance for economic, political and security. But instability, confrontation between great powers and crime are inevitable. Hence, there is a need to create an effective mechanism to deal with disputes, maintain power balance and prevent crimes. ASEAN-led mechanism can play greater role in maritime cooperation. Because it can contribute the region to settle disputes and crisis by establishing open, wide, transparent maritime security order and promoting common interest. However, common understanding and coordination are needed in the Asia Pacific region.
Countries are required to understand the international situation and significance of maritime cooperation correctly and must reach consensus before formulate their national law.

Mr. Paul Sinclair
Regional Security Fellow, Centre for Strategic Studies, New Zealand

As Mr. Sinclair recalled the need to strengthen maritime cooperation in the face of growing array of challenges from the 9th CSCAP General Conference, he highlighted the important progress that has been made since the conference. For example, the drills are being held within the Code of Unplanned Encounters at Sea (CUES) and China and United States have concluded a MOU on rules of behavior for safe military encounters at sea and in the air. Notably, maritime communication system between Japan and China, hotline among foreign ministries between China and ASEAN are worth to be mentioned. Finally, ADMM plus has been active in promoting cooperation between the navies of member countries. Therefore, it is important to establish secure common grounds on strategic risks, to enhance information channels. The use of merchant vessels by criminal enterprises to support the irregular movement of people such as maritime terrorism, unreported fishing, and robbery at sea, under-sea communication cables, all in their forms create risks to regional security.
SESSION SIX
MOVING FROM CONFIDENCE BUILDING MEASURES TO PREVENTIVE DIPLOMACY

Chair: HRH Prince Norodom Sirivudh Founder and Chair, The Cambodian Institute for Cooperation and Peace

Mr. Mashbat Otgonbayar
Advisor, Institute for Strategic Studies, Mongolia

Mr. Mashbat expressed his views on Mongolia’s policy on permanent neutrality and further explained why Mongolia pursues this policy and finally what Mongolia can offer to region. The negative factors in the Asia-Pacific region outweigh the positive and there is lingering uncertainty among middle and great powers. Since small powers do not have the capacity to affect great powers, their survival is adaptation and balance. Maintaining balance between two neighbors and the third neighbors is very important for Mongolia. Thus, Mongolia can serve as a platform for dialogue and a neutral zone for settling disputes. Given the advantages, Mongolia does not have any disputes with other countries. In fact, Mongolia has been trying to make contribution for settling disputes within the region, and it can be seen from the initiative by President Elbegdorj “Ulaanbaatar Dialogue on Northeast Asian”. It is a trust-building measure. Currently, there are ongoing discussions and negotiations on permanent neutrality initiative, about whether it can be legalized, whether it can be persisted during war, whether the timing is right and result. He concluded that Mongolia not only can maintain its reputation for democracy and economic achievements, but Mongolia also has an opportunity to provide dialogue with the status of permanent neutrality.

Dr. Suchit Bunbongkarn
Chairman, CSCAP Thailand, Thailand

Dr. Bunbongkarn briefly introduced the three stages of peace settlement of regional conflict, it consists of foster confidence-building measures (CBMs) followed by developing preventive diplomacy (PD) and finally conflict resolution. It has been said that ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF) is ready to enter the stage of PD after fostering CBM for 20 years. Based on the review of CBMs of ARF, Dr. Bunbongkarn offered some recommendations to strengthen ASEAN capacities and role in ARF as follows:
Firstly, ASEAN capacities on conflict prevention and PD are relies on member state’s political, economic and social aspects.

Secondly, there must be strong political will and commitment of the ASEAN leaders in the area of peace and stability.

Thirdly, ASEAN has to strike a balance between regional or ASEAN’s interest and national interest. Moreover, ASEAN has to perform a delicate balance between major powers.

Fourthly, the people and civil society’s participation in the processes of security, peace and stability should be encouraged.

Lastly, If the principle of non-interference can be modified, ASEAN may become more relevant and capable of handling the conflict more effectively.

In conclusion, moving from CBM to PD, the countries in the Asia Pacific should be ready to pull necessary resources to make PD work and ASEAN must strengthen its capacities.

---

**Dr. Victor Sumsky**

*Director, ASEAN Centre, MGIMO University of Moscow, Russia*

Dr. Sumsky began his talk by raising question about whether Preventive Diplomacy has built trust in the region or not. Based on recent incidents, it seems trust has decreased conversely. While we are trying to create multipolar world, instead the world has become unipolar. In this regard, he has never heard that CSCAP raises this issue while CSCAP’s mission lies on creating multipolar world. The question is whether CSCAP is ready to fulfill it or spread information the least. Due to global issues are correlated, we cannot neglect the Ukrainian crisis and this issue is very much part of Asia Pacific region. Dr. Sumsky agrees that Preventive Diplomacy should be developed to resolve conflicts, but we have to change the attitude towards problems.

---

**Dr. Eva Pejsova**

*Senior Analyst, European Union Institute for Security Studies*

Dr. Perjsova focused her presentation the definition and the implementation challenges of Preventive Diplomacy (PD). She provided the definition of PD as peaceful resolution of conflicts from the UN Charter. Due to the principle of non-interference in internal affairs based on the respect for state’s independence, it is difficult to be flexible in some disputed issues. Having
reached common understanding on strategic issues and set the right priorities are crucial. However, Europe is often viewed as the great example of PD, but there have been two wars recently. While there are various mechanisms can be used to implement PD, it is worth to pay attention to promote flexibility and engage other players. She reminds that the methods work for some regions are not necessary work for others. In conclusion, Dr. Perjsova said that in order to resolve security issues, countries must tackle their economic concerns as well. She then suggested that sometimes sport activities could help resolve problems.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Ralph Cossa began his closing remarks by congratulating Mongolian people for remarkable progress have made and CSCAP Mongolia for the accomplishments on the conference. He hopes CSCAP can maintain connections with their government; provide more recommendations for government and it’s up to government accept or not.

In his closing remarks, Dr. Ganbat Damba pointed the importance of closer cooperation at all levels of the region. He expressed his hope for future collaboration and policy recommendations from the General Conference will particularly regarded by decision makers in the future. Dr. Ganbat further noted that significance of participants’ contribution to ensure to ensure and enhance peace and security in the Asia-Pacific region. Finally he extended his gratitude to the Asia Foundation and the CSCAP China for their assistance.

Unlike any other countries in the region, Mongolia maintains good relations with all regional countries, including both DPRK and ROK. Thus, Mongolia firmly believes that Ulaanbaatar has provided an important forum for better understanding within the region which countries are able understand each other’s values and beliefs.