



REPORT

7th Workshop of the Inter-Parliamentary Forum on Security Sector Governance (IPF-SSG) in Southeast Asia

Reforming the Police in Southeast Asia: What Role for Parliament?



in cooperation with the Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung (FES) and the Geneva Centre for the Democratic Control of Armed Forces (DCAF)

13-14 November 2009
Davao City, Philippines

REPORT

1. Background: The IPF-SSG

The Inter-Parliamentary Forum on Security Sector Governance (IPF-SSG) in Southeast Asia aims to promote ongoing dialogue between Southeast Asian parliamentarians, with the intention of increasing civilian oversight and national parliamentary involvement in security sector governance. Supported by the German Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung (FES) and the Geneva Centre for the Democratic Control of Armed Forces (DCAF), the Forum features dialogue, publications and workshops. Its work is guided by a steering committee consisting of members of parliament from several ASEAN member countries. The Forum's seventh workshop, held 13-14 November 2009 at Davao City, Philippines, was attended by members of parliament and their staff, representatives of the police, security institutions and civil society as well as international experts. It followed the previous workshop, held May 2010 in Kota Kinabalu, which dealt with the issue of police governance.

2. Plenary Session: What is Police Reform?

This first session of the conference aimed at putting police reform into context in order to get a better understanding of the dynamics and modalities and to explore the opportunities and limits for parliaments to play a meaningful role in reform processes. Two experts from the Geneva Centre for the Democratic Control of Armed Forces and from the Hungarian Ministry of Interior introduced the topic of police reform from academic and practical perspectives respectively.

Police reform is considered a key pillar of security sector reform. It describes the transformation or change of a police organisation with the aim of strengthening professionalism, accountability, effectiveness, and respect for human rights within the police service. Any reform of the police must take into consideration the public security needs and expectations that the structure and operations of the police are intended to meet.

3. Moderated Dialogue: Problems & Challenges of Police Reform

The moderated dialogue gave an overview of police reform in different countries across Southeast Asia. In interview-style country-specific dialogues, representatives of the police services, civil society and academia answered questions posed by the moderators. The dialogues illustrated that despite geographic, social, political and economic differences among the countries of the region, police institutions in Southeast Asia face common problems and challenges that require continuous improvement in policing. During the workshop, various key challenges for police reform in Southeast Asian countries were discussed by the participants, including the following:

- Political interference in policing
- Discrepancies between law and the reality of policing
- Poor accountability mechanisms
- Structural weaknesses and inefficiency within the police
- Different mindsets between new and old generations
- Corruption

4. Purposes of Police Reform

Group discussions were based on a World Cafe^{*} model and focussed on the following three questions over three separate rounds:

- 1) What should the purpose/s of police reform be?
- 2) How can parliament's involvement in police reform in your country be improved?
- 3) What lessons have you learnt from other countries?

Presentation of the results of the discussion on the purpose/s of police reform showed that reforms are meant to address challenges in policing and that a reform process can have more than one purpose, depending on the particular context. Making police services more operationally effective, accountable and respectful of human rights are major goals of police reforms. From the perspectives of the different stakeholders across the region, the purposes of police reform are:

- To provide better services to the public and to communities
- To improve crime prevention, investigation and control
- To reduce corruption and abuse of power (depoliticisation)
- To democratise the police and parliamentary oversight
- To foster accountability and transparency of the police (both internally and externally)
- To promote principles of legality, necessity and proportionality
- To strengthen the rule of law
- To lay the groundwork for economic development
- To enhance the living conditions of police employees
- To guarantee the police of their protection for their service
- To gain confidence from the public

* The World Cafe is a group interaction method focused on conversations. The environment is set up like a cafe, with paper-covered tables on which ideas are to be written down. The World Cafe at this conference saw people sitting six to eight to a table, holding three successive conversational rounds, each lasting 20-30 minutes. At the end of each round, one person remained at each table as the 'cafe host', while the others went to separate tables. 'Cafe hosts' welcomed newcomers to their tables and shared the essence of that table's conversation so far before starting the next round. In order to yield more precise and concrete discussion results, the first and last rounds consisted of mixed country groups at each table, while the second round consisted only of country-specific groups.

5. Improving Parliaments' Involvement in Police Reform

During the second round of group discussions, stakeholders from individual countries focussed on the question of improving the role of parliaments in police reform processes and came up with the following country-specific recommendations:

Cambodia:

- Increase the number of parliamentary committee hearings including police and civil society representatives
- Enact laws to ensure the effectiveness of police performance
- Improve public access and ability to lodge complaints about police misconduct
- Ensure special allocations for police reform within the budget for national security
- Be more active in overseeing police performance through investigation

Indonesia:

- Support a budget increase for the police
- Revise the existing police law
- Foster stronger, more robust oversight of the police
- Impress upon MPs the importance of public opinion
- Empower the national police commission (KOMMPOLNAS/POLKOM)
- Ensure police independence (i.e. ensure there is no interference from parliament on matters of police competency and authority)
- Formulate a multi-year road-map for police reform
- Place responsibility for police affairs under ministerial authority
- Empower provincial district parliaments to oversee the police
- Establish local police commissions

Malaysia:

- Establish a "bureau" to look into the welfare of police personnel
- Set up channels between MPs and the police to review whether the recommendations of the Royal Police Commission are implemented
- Establish a select committee within parliament to oversee the police
- MPs to play a more active role in moving towards community policing
- MPs to investigate and represent grievances on behalf of police personnel (e.g. housing, working conditions, salary, logistics)

Philippines:

- End political interference in operational police matters
- Improve understanding of police reform
- Involve media and civil society
- Build civil society consensus to pursue a legislative agenda for police reform
- Institutionalise effective linkages between the five pillars of the criminal justice system

- Conduct policy research
- Organise an informal multi-sectoral working group to strengthen police reform and SSR
- Identify and support reform objectives within parliament

Thailand:

- Professionalise the police
- Work towards objective, timely and non-biased handling of cases
- Clarify definitions relating to regulations and regulatory bodies

6. Lessons Learnt from Regional Experiences

Police reform processes in Southeast Asia vary across the region in terms of duration and substance. During the third round of discussions, police experts and officials from different countries highlighted the processes of police reform in their own countries focussing on achievements and challenges:

The Cambodian national police do not have a concrete strategic plan for police reform. So far, reform measures have focused on capacity building for police personnel. In 2009, a five-year plan was adopted and could be used as a foundation to formulate a subsequent police reform strategy.

In Indonesia, a process of police reform has continued over the past 10 years. The disassociation from the military, the civilianisation of the police and the strengthening of public oversight of police activities are among the achievements of this reform process. However, Indonesian police still suffer as a result of the prevalence of military culture within the police.

In 2004, the Malaysian government tasked a special commission to review weaknesses within the Malaysian police force and make proposals for modernisation. While the commission has formulated an array of recommendations, the government has only implemented those pertaining to facilities, equipment and infrastructure. Many of the substantive governance-related recommendations regarding accountability, human rights and external oversight mechanisms are yet to be acted on.

In the Philippines, police reform has mainly been focused on raising the educational level of police personnel and the police administration has also instituted a stricter policy on promotions. However, perennial budget constraints for the police force and corruption related in the use of meagre resources are areas of in need of urgent reform.

Thailand has attempted to reform its police service four times since 1997. Police reform has found support among key policy makers within the Royal Thai Police Office (RTPO). However, the weaknesses of these processes lie in the centralised police system and its large headquarters. Although the RTPO had attempted to reorganise the police, this was

considered a formidable task and has yet to be realised. The main obstacle to police reform is the instability of the government.

7. Country-specific Recommendations

During the this session, stakeholders from individual countries were asked to discuss key points of interest pertaining to police reform in their countries and jointly elaborate recommendations that are SMART - Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic and Timely. The following table gives an overview of the recommendations:

<p>Thailand</p> <p><i>Discussants:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Senate member - Police official - Government official - CSO representative - Academic 	<p>1. <i>Establish an advocacy group on police reform</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Group to be composed of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Senate, ministry of justice and human rights representatives - NGOs, police, academia, media representatives - Convenor: Human Development Foundation • Timeline: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - First meeting: establish terms of reference - 2nd week of December 2009 - Group launch - 2nd/3rd week of February 2010 • Activities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Review past reforms - Identify objectives - Propose draft legislation to parliament - October 2010 <p>Gain support from FES Thailand and technical support from other funding agencies</p>
<p>Philippines</p> <p><i>Discussants:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - MP - Police officials - CSO representatives - Academic - Media 	<p>1. <i>Review and nationalise existing laws/ use lessons-learned from past reviews</i></p> <p>2. <i>Involve media and civil society in police reform</i></p> <p>3. <i>Strengthen congressional oversight functions</i></p> <p>4. <i>Conduct policy research and create linkages among the five pillars of the criminal justice system (law enforcement, prosecution, the court system, the community, corrections)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Form a multi-sectoral group composed of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Police - Supporters from within the legislature - Civil society (i.e. IPD Ateneo legal group, Institute for Development Studies - NCPAG, AIM-center for DEV, CAAC, ISA)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify convenor/core-group: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - PMO-PNP - Congressional Committee on Public Safety and Order (i.e. Risa Hontiveros, Cong Antoruino, Etta Rosales) - CAAC-SSR Study group. • Raise funds to establish a secretariat <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Staff, especially for the convenor group • Timeline: Under next Administration. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - PMO to gather all existing laws - January-March 2010 - Ateneo, UP, DLSCI: Law interns to help in initial review - March-May 2010 - Convene group after elections - June 2010 - Secure support of candidates and ensure non-partisan support base
<p>Malaysia</p> <p><i>Discussants:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - MPs - Police official - CSO representatives 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>MPs should play a more active role in community policing</i> 2. <i>Improve police resources, logistics, salaries, working and living conditions</i> 3. <i>Increase transparency and open consultation</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Police department: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Form a liaison committee and oversee the parliamentary plan - Contribute ideas and manpower to monitor success of the plan • MPs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Promote police reform among other MPs - end of November 2009 - Form a '6-man Team' (6 MPs) to draft a joint action plan to be implemented at the end of January 2010 (or December 2009) - Communicate and coordinate with Home Minister on joint action plan - December 2009 - Draft standard operating procedures- January 2010 - Begin phased implementation in selected areas - Conduct review after one year
<p>Indonesia</p> <p><i>Discussants:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - MPs - Parliamentary staff - Police officials - CSO representatives 	<p><i>Parliament to:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>Revise or draft new legislation governing the police</i> 2. <i>Evaluate the performance of the police annually to decrease human rights violations and corruption</i> 3. <i>Defend the independence of the police</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Activities:

<p>- <i>Academic</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Identify potential problems - Establish an action plan - Set objectives - Institutional, culture, national first year legislation program <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timeline: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 3 years • Who to integrate in the reform process: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Parliament (committee III.) - Community stakeholders - Police • Resources required: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Budget - Expertise - Legal platform • Support required from: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Political actors - Stakeholders (within the police) - Media - Academia - NGOs
<p>Cambodia</p> <p><i>Discussants:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>MPs</i> - <i>Parliamentary staff</i> - <i>Police officials</i> - <i>CSO representatives</i> 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>Accelerate the passing of the police law.</i> 2. <i>Parliament to organize a hearing with the police, CSO and the public</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Police law <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provide access for the public to issue complaints - Include provisions in the police code for the establishment of a police board and an independent police disciplinary commission - Parliamentary committee to coordinate with the ministry of interior - Chair of committee to discuss personally with the minister - Donor(s) to be kept informed and to provide assistance - Target year: 2010 (December) - Conduct regular meetings, investigations and public hearings • Public hearing on police reform including civil society and the public <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consult with ministry of interior on organising the workshop. - Chair of committee and LEAP (Legislative Assistant Project) to provide information

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Secure support from UNDP and FES - Target year: Early 2010 (before April)
<p>Vietnam</p> <p><i>Discussants:</i></p> <p><i>Parliamentary Staff</i></p>	<p>1. <i>How to improve communication between parliament, the public and police</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parliament: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Create a website to gather public opinions, suggestions and complaints related to the police - MPs to meet the public (i.e. monthly) - Parliamentary committee mandated to supervise police stations and meet with high ranking police officers - Request support (resources and expertise) in order to improve parliamentary capacity to exercise effective oversight • People: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Laws need to be enforced - The public needs to voice its concerns about the police to the parliament - MPs need to respond to public requests and concerns - Police need to communicate effectively with the public - Seek drafting of new police law

8. Excursion: Private Security

The second day of the workshop, traditionally reserved for discussions on specific topics relevant for security sector governance in Southeast Asia, focused on the role of private security actors (in the broader context of security privatisation) and on the importance of security sector governance for peace processes. The situation in the southern part of the Philippines, where the workshop took place, provided a natural focus for the discussion.

Although the characteristics of security privatisation in Southeast Asian countries appear to be highly variable throughout the region, some commonalities do exist. First of all, the private security industry is booming. The bottom-up demand for private security guards by individuals or commercial entities is on the rise, especially due to the rise in threats to personal security stemming from insurgencies and terrorist activities. Secondly, across the region, a hybrid form of semi-private/semi-public actors has emerged being neither exclusively private nor exclusively public but instead displaying characteristics of both. An example is the Civilian Armed Force Geographical Units (CAFGU), established by the Philippine government to enhance the strength of the official security agencies. The CAFGU are active auxiliaries under the operational control of regular military and police forces, but can also serve as security guards for private entities. To ensure that such hybrid security actors serve only the public interest, they need to be overseen by controlling bodies. In the Philippines all private security agencies are overseen by the Security Agencies and Guards Supervision Division (SAGSD) of the National Police. The SAGSD issues operational licenses, supervises and investigates security posts, and provides training to private security actors.

Another step in enhancing the strength of the official security agencies has been taken in Davao City, where the 7th workshop of the IPF-SSG took place. As in most parts of south Philippines (Mindanao region), Davao City also faces security threats from the on-going insurgencies and the Muslim separatist movement. Following a bomb attack in 2003, Davao City established the counter-terrorism unit “Task Force Davao”, which is affiliated with the National Philippine Army. The participants of the conference visited the headquarters of the 400-500 people strong unit whose duty is to support the law enforcement and fight terrorism.

-End-

PROGRAM

THURSDAY, 12 NOVEMBER 2009

Interface with the Mindanao Constituents of the Philippine SSR Study Group

Informal Meeting of the IPF-SSG Steering Committee

FRIDAY, 13 NOVEMBER 2009

Welcome and Introduction

Djoko Susilo

Chairman, IPF-SSG, former Member of Parliament, Indonesia

Mario “Mayong” Aguja

Secretary, IPF-SSG, former Member of the House of Representatives, Philippines

Stefanie Elies

Director, FES Regional Office for Cooperation in Asia, Singapore

Heiner Hänggi

Assistant Director and Head of Research, DCAF, Switzerland

Plenary Session 1: Police Reform: Sharing International Experience

Chair:

Teresita “Ging” Quintos Deles

Managing Trustee, INCITEGov; Chair, Philippine SSR Study Group, Philippines

Presentations by:

Hans Born

Senior Fellow, Research Division, DCAF, Switzerland

Joszeif Boda

Director, International Training Centre, Ministry of Justice and Law Enforcement, Hungary

Discussion

Moderated Dialogue: Police Reform Experience in Southeast Asia

Chair:

Stefanie Elies

Director of FES Regional Office for Co-operation in Asia, Singapore

Police Reform in Thailand

Moderator:

Al Muzammil Yusuf

Member of Parliament, Indonesia

Panelists:

Thaveesak Tuchinda

Police Major General, Commander, Office attached to the Commissioner General, Royal Thai Police (RTP), and Advisor to several Committees of Parliament

Srisombat Chokprajakchat

Assist. Professor, Faculty of Social Sciences and Humanities, Mahidol University, Bangkok

Police Reform in the Philippines

Moderator:

Johari Bin Abdul

Member of Parliament, Malaysia

Panelists:

Lina C Sarmiento

Police Chief Superintendent of the Philippines National Police, Director, Police Security and Protection Group, Philippines

Teresita Ang See

Executive Chairperson, People's Law Enforcement Board, Philippines

Discussion

Police Reform in Malaysia

Moderator:

Son Chhay

Member of Parliament, Cambodia

Panelists:

Tan Chong Jin

Assistant Commissioner of Police, Malaysia

Yap Heng Lung

Coordinator, Police Accountability Section, Suaram, Malaysia

Police Reform in Indonesia

Moderator:

Prasong Nurack

Member of Senate, Thailand

Panelists:

Ronny Lihawa

Police Mayor General, Secretary, National Police Commission, Indonesia

Muradi

Lecturer, Padjajaran University, Bandung, Indonesia

Police Reform in Cambodia

Moderator:

Mayong Aguja

Former Member of House of Representatives, Philippines

Panelists:

Sar Moline

Police Major General, Vice President of Police Academy of Cambodia, Ministry of Interior, Cambodia

Sok Sam Oeun

Executive Director, Cambodian Defenders Project, Cambodia

Discussion

World Café: What Role for Parliaments in Police Reform?

Facilitator:

Janice Lua

Co-Founder, Facilitators Network Singapore

SATURDAY, 14 NOVEMBER 2009

Open Space Technology: Police Reform and the Role of Parliament

Facilitator:

Janice Lua

Co-Founder Facilitators Network Singapore

Plenary Session 2: Privatisation of Security in Southeast Asia

Moderator:

Heiner Hänggi

Assistant Director and Head of Research, DCAF, Switzerland

Presentations by:

Herman Kraft

Executive Director, Institute for Strategic and Development Studies, Philippines

Patrick Patino

Chairperson, Board of Trustees, Institute for Popular Democracy, Philippines

Danilo U Gairan

Police Chief Super Intendant, SAGS, Philippines

Adolf Borje

Commodore, Security Consultant to the Davao Mayor, Philippines

Discussion

Closing Session: Wrap up and the Way Ahead

Moderator:

Mario “Mayong” Aguja

Secretary of IPF-SSG, former Member of the House of Representatives, Philippines

Exposure Programme: Private Security Actors in the Philippines: Visit of the Davao Task Force

SUNDAY, 15 NOVEMBER 2009

Review and Planning Meeting of the IPF-SSG Steering Committee

DIRECTORY OF PARTICIPANTS

PARTICIPANTS

1. **Hon. Mr. Johari bin Abdul**, Member of Parliament, Malaysia
2. **Maj. Medel Aguilar**, Davao City, Philippines
3. **Hon. Mr. An Sum**, Member of Parliament, Vice-Chairman, Commission on Interior and National Defence, Cambodia
4. **Ms. Teresita Ang See**, Executive Chairperson, People's Law Enforcement Board, Spokesperson, Citizens Action Against Crime, Philippines
5. **Mr. Ramon Apolinario**, DCPO SSupt., Davao City, Philippines
6. **Mr. Leo Avilar**, Councillor, Davao City, Philippines
7. **Mr. Bacalzo**, Director, Directorate for Investigation and Detective Management, Philippine National Police, Philippines
8. **Mr. Cesar Hawthorne Binag**, Police Senior Superintendent, Chief of Staff, Program Management Office, Philippine National Police, Philippines
9. **Dr. Jozsef Boda**, Director, International Training Centre, Hungary
10. **Commo. Adolf Borje**, Davao City, Philippines
11. **Ms. Teresita "Ging" Quintos Deles**, Managing Trustee, International Center on Innovation, Transformation and Excellence in Governance, Philippines
12. **Dr. Muhadjir Effendy**, Rector, Malang Muhammadiyah University, Indonesia
13. **Ms. Camela Fonbuena**, Journalist, Newsbreak, Philippines
14. **Mr. Danilo U Gairan**, Police Chief Superintendent, Chief, Security Agencies and Guards Supervision Division, Philippine National Police, Philippines
15. **Mr. Moin Uddin Haider**, National Public Safety Commission, Pakistan
16. **Mr. Begi Hersutanto**, Defense Advisor, Parliament, Indonesia
17. **Mr. Somchai Homlaor**, Executive Director, Asian Institute for Human Rights, Thailand
18. **Mr. Huoy Tongkin**, Assistant to the Chairman of the Fourth Commission of the National Assembly, Cambodia
19. **Mr. La Ode Husen**, National Police Commission, Indonesia
20. **Dr. Herman Joseph Kraft**, Executive Director, Institute for Strategic and Development Studies, Philippines
21. **Col. Oscar Lactao**, Davao City, Philippines
22. **Mr. Ronny Lihawa**, Secretariat, National Police Commission, Indonesia
23. **Lt. Gen. Dr. Perapong Manakit**, Deputy Director, Security Studies Center,

Office of the National Security Council, Thailand

24. **Hon. Mr. M. Manogaran**, Member of Parliament, Malaysia
25. **Gen. Sar Moline**, Vice President, Police Academy of Cambodia, Cambodia
26. **Mr. Muradi**, Ph.D Student, Flinders University Australia, Lecturer at Padjajaran University, Bandung, Indonesia
27. **Mr. Pham Ngoc Hai**, Vice-Director, National Defence and Security Department, Parliamentary Office of Committee on Defence and Security, Vietnam
28. **Hon. Mr. Prasong Nurack**, Senator, Thailand
29. **Mr. Patrick Patino**, Chairperson, Board of Trustees, Institute for Popular Democracy, Philippines
30. **Mr. Nguyen Tho Luan**, Expert, Foreign Affairs Department, Office of National Assembly, Vietnam
31. **Hon. Mr. Guntur Sasono**, Member of Parliament, Indonesia
32. **Mr. Sok Sam Oeun**, Executive Director, Cambodian Defenders Project, Cambodia
33. **Hon. Mr. Sao Rany**, Member of Parliament, Commission on Interior, and National Defence, Cambodia
34. **Pol. Chief Supt. Ms. Lina Castillo Sarmiento**, Director Police Security and Protection Group, Philippines
35. **Hon. Mr. Son Chhay**, Member of Parliament, Cambodia
36. **Mr. Pupung Suharis**, Former Member of Parliament, Indonesia
37. **Mr. Tan Chong Jin**, Assistant Commissioner, Royal Malaysian Police, Malaysia
38. **Hon. Mr. Tjatur Sapto Edy**, Member of Parliament, Indonesia
39. **Pol. Maj. Gen. Mr. Thaveesak Tuchinda**, Commander, Office attached to the Commissioner General, Royal Thai Police and Advisor to the Committee on Police Affaires, House of Representatives, Thailand
40. **Mr. Yap Heng Lung**, Campaign Coordinator, Police Accountability Section, Malaysia
41. **Hon. Mr. Almuzammil Yusuf**, Member of Parliament, Indonesia
42. **Hon. Mr. Joey Zubiri**, Member of House of Representatives, Philippines

FACILITATOR

- 43. Ms. Janice Lua**, Co-Founder, Facilitators Network, Singapore

ORGANIZERS

- 44. Dr. Mario “Mayong” Aguja**, Secretary, IPF-SSG, Former Member of House of Representatives, Lecturer, Department of Sociology, Mindanao State University, Philippines
- 45. Dr. Hans Born**, Senior Fellow, Geneva Center for the Democratic Control of Armed Forces, Switzerland
- 46. Ms. Rakchanok Chatjuthamard**, Program Officer, Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung, Thailand
- 47. Dr. Stefanie Elies**, Director, Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung, Office for Regional Cooperation in Asia, Singapore
- 48. Mr. Sebastian Göllner**, Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung, Office for Regional Cooperation in Asia, Singapore
- 49. Prof. Heiner Hänggi**, Assistant Director and Head of Research, Geneva Centre for the Democratic Control of Armed Forces, Switzerland
- 50. Mr. Mirko Herberg**, Director, Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung, Philippines
- 51. Ms. Pham Huong Giang**, Program Manager, Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung, Office for Regional Cooperation in Asia, Singapore
- 52. Mr. Djoko Susilo**, Chairman, IPF-SSG, Former Member of Parliament, Indonesia
- 53. Mr. Sherry E. Vicente**, Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung, Philippines

THE ORGANIZERS



The **Inter-Parliamentary Forum on Security Sector Governance (IPF-SSG) in Southeast Asia** aims to promote ongoing dialogue between Southeast Asian parliamentarians, with the intention of increasing civilian oversight, public accountability and national parliamentary involvement in security sector governance. The Forum features dialogue, publications and workshops which elaborate on systemic and current affairs issues related to parliamentary oversight of the security sector in Southeast Asia. Participants include members of parliament, parliamentary staffers, government and security sector officials, academic experts and civil society representatives from Cambodia, Indonesia, Malaysia, Philippines, Singapore and Thailand; as well as representatives of the ASEAN Secretariat and international experts. Supported by the Geneva Centre for the Democratic Control (DCAF) and the Friedrich Ebert Stiftung's (FES) Singapore-based Regional Office for Co-operation in Asia, the Forum is led by a Steering Committee, consisting of members of parliament of the each of the aforementioned countries.

The goals of the IPF-SSG in Southeast Asia are:

- ❖ To promote the parliamentary dimension of security sector governance in Southeast Asia;
- ❖ To promote an improved understanding of the role that parliaments can play in security sector governance;
- ❖ To foster a regional dialogue on the role of parliaments in security sector governance and to encourage regional confidence-building through greater parliamentary involvement in SSG.

www.ipf-ssg-sea.net



Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung (FES) Regional Office for Cooperation in Asia

The Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung (FES) was founded in 1925 as a political legacy of Germany's first democratically elected president, Friedrich Ebert. Since the beginning of the foundation's work in South, Southeast and East Asia the focus has been the promotion of democracy and the strengthening of the social dimension of economic development. In the past few years, the international dialogue within Asia as well as between Asia and Europe, and the issue of crisis prevention have gained important stakes in the work of the foundation. In its work the foundation co-operates with a number of governmental institutions, trade unions, political parties, social movements, NGOs, media and scientific institutions, as well as international organizations.

The role of the Regional Office for Cooperation in Asia based in Singapore is to support the social dimension of Southeast and East Asian cooperation and integration, the Asia-Europe dialogue and partnership activities in the ASEAN member states Cambodia and Laos where there are no FES offices. The office's activities include dialogue programmes, international and regional conferences (e.g. on economic and social policy, regional integration and comprehensive security), Asia-Europe exchanges, research, as well as programmes with trade unions.

www.fes-asia.org



The **Geneva Centre for the Democratic Control of Armed Forces (DCAF)** is one of the world's leading institutions in the areas of security sector reform (SSR) and security sector governance (SSG). DCAF provides in-country advisory support and practical assistance programmes, develops and promotes appropriate democratic norms at the international and national levels, advocates good practices and makes policy recommendations to ensure effective democratic governance of the security sector.

DCAF was established in 2000 by the Swiss government. DCAF is an international foundation with 50 Member States. DCAF's main divisions are Research, Operations and Special Programmes. The staff numbers over 70 employees from more than 30 countries. DCAF's head office is located in Geneva, Switzerland.

www.dcaf.ch