

2015 ASEAN SOCIO-CULTURAL COMMUNITY (ASCC) SCORECARD



one vision
one identity
one community



2015 ASEAN SOCIO-CULTURAL COMMUNITY (ASCC) SCORECARD

The ASEAN Secretariat
Jakarta

The Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) was established on 8 August 1967. The Member States of the Association are Brunei Darussalam, Cambodia, Indonesia, Lao PDR, Malaysia, Myanmar, Philippines, Singapore, Thailand and Viet Nam.
The ASEAN Secretariat is based in Jakarta, Indonesia.

For inquiries, contact:
The ASEAN Secretariat
Community Relations Division (CoRD)
70A Jalan Sisingamangaraja
Jakarta 12110
Indonesia
Phone : (62 21) 724-3372, 726-2991
Fax : (62 21) 739-8234, 724-3504
E-mail : public@asean.org

Catalogue-in-Publication Data

2015 ASEAN Socio-Cultural Community (ASCC) Scorecard
Jakarta, ASEAN Secretariat: March 2016

360.0959
ASEAN – Scorecard
Social community – Cultural Community - Evaluation

ISBN 978-602-0980-84-3

ASEAN: A Community of Opportunities

The text of this publication may be freely quoted or reprinted, provided proper acknowledgement is given and a copy containing the reprinted material is sent to the Community Relations Division (CoRD) of the ASEAN Secretariat, Jakarta

General information on ASEAN appears online at the ASEAN Website: www.asean.org

Copyright Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) 2016.
All rights reserved.

Table of Contents

PREFACE	1
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	5
A. HUMAN DEVELOPMENT	7
A1. Advancing and Prioritising Education	7
A2. Investing in Human Resource Development	7
A3. Promotion of Decent Work	8
A4. Promoting Information and Communication Technology (ICT)	9
A5. Facilitating Access to Applied Science and Technology (S&T)	9
A6. Strengthening Entrepreneurship Skills for Women, Youth, Elderly and Persons with Disabilities	11
A7. Building Civil Service Capability	12
B. SOCIAL WELFARE AND PROTECTION	15
B1. Poverty Alleviation	15
B2. Social Safety Nets and Protection from the Negative Impacts of Integration and Globalization	16
B3. Enhancing Food Security and Safety	16
B4. Access to Healthcare and Promotion of Healthy Lifestyles	17
B5. Improving Capability to Control Communicable Diseases	21
B6. Ensuring a Drug-Free ASEAN	23
B7. Building Disaster-Resilient Nations and Safer Communities	23
C. SOCIAL JUSTICE AND RIGHTS	25
C1. Protection and Promotion of the Rights and Welfare of Women, Children, the Elderly and Persons with Disabilities	25
C2. Protection and Promotion of the Rights of Migrant Workers	27
C3. Promoting Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR)	30

D. ENSURING ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY	33
D1. Addressing Global Environmental Issues	33
D2. Managing and Preventing Transboundary Environmental Pollution	34
D3. Promoting Sustainable Development through Environmental Education and Public Participation	36
D4. Promoting Environmentally Sound Technology (EST)	37
D5. Promoting Quality Living Standards in ASEAN Cities/Urban Areas	38
D6. Harmonising Environmental Policies and Databases	39
D7. Promoting the Sustainable Use of Coastal and Marine Environment	40
D8. Promoting Sustainable Management of Natural Resources and Biodiversity	40
D9. Promoting the Sustainability of Freshwater Resources	42
D10. Responding to Climate Change and Addressing Its Impacts	42
E. BUILDING ASEAN IDENTITY	45
E1. Promotion of ASEAN Awareness and a Sense of Community	46
E2. Preservation and Promotion of ASEAN Cultural Heritage	49
E3. Promotion of Cultural Creativity and Industry	51
E4. Engagement with the Community	51

FOREWORD

On behalf of the Senior Officials' Committee for the ASCC (SOCA) Leaders, I would like to take this opportunity to express my deepest appreciation to S.Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS) and ASEAN Secretariat for their contribution in developing the ASCC Scorecard report. Indeed, the ASCC Scorecard report is a self-assessment tool to measure and reflect the ASCC's achievements, opportunities and vision for the ASEAN Community from 2009 – 2015, as set by the ASEAN Leaders in 2009.

Thus, this report indeed serves as the maximum amplitude of the ASCC's achievements that provide a 'face' to the 100% action lines achieved and the ASCC Blueprint addressed. I strongly believe that this report will contribute further to ASEAN in continuing efforts to realise the objectives, targets and outcomes of the ASEAN Community Building in year 2025.

Finally, I would like to congratulate all those who have been involved in developing, compiling and producing this report successfully, particularly the ASEAN Secretariat. I am positive that the data and information provided by this report will be used widely by ASEAN Member States as a primary source and a tool to assess and monitor the regional and national goals as well as policies alongside with ASEAN's international obligations in the future.

Dr. Ong Hong Peng

Secretary-General

Ministry of Tourism and Culture Malaysia



PREFACE

The ASEAN Heads of State/Government (ASEAN Leaders) have pledged in 2009 to achieve the ASEAN Community by 2015. The primary means of achieving the 2015 ASEAN Community is through the Road Map for an ASEAN Community 2015, which consists of the three Community – Socio-Cultural, Economic, and Political-Security – Blueprints, and the Initiative for ASEAN Integration (IAI) Work Plan 2.

Invariably in everyone's mind is whether the ASEAN Community 2015 will be achieved, and if so how well it has performed, and what tangible impacts has it made to the people of ASEAN, who are the main beneficiaries of the socio-cultural pillar.

This 2015 ASEAN Socio-Cultural Community (ASCC) Scorecard informs how far the socio-cultural pillar of the ASEAN Community 2015 has been achieved in terms of the goals, strategic objectives and targets set by the ASEAN Leaders in 2009.

The ASCC Scorecard represents a self-assessment by ASEAN, but is firmly rooted in quantitative and qualitative indicators, data, and information. As the end of the year 2015 approaches, and a series of high-level meetings including the ASEAN Summit in November 2015 is to be held, the ASCC Scorecard presents an opportunity for ASEAN to articulate, factually, its achievements, challenges, opportunities, and vision for its post-2015 agenda based on past experiences and lessons learned.

The Scorecard assessment, variously also known as the results/impact-based, key performance index, or management by objective assessments, aims to measure and monitor the goals, strategies, targets agreed upon. The ASCC Blueprint 2009-2015 covers 7 Characteristics or broad thematic clusters - A: Human Development; B: Social Welfare and Protection; C: Social Justice and Rights; D: Ensuring Environmental Sustainability; E: Building the ASEAN Identity; and F) Narrowing the Development Gap (NDG). Each of the Characteristics contains related Elements or sectoral areas totalling 32. These Elements further contains a total of 339 Actions or programs/activities.

The ASCC Scorecard assessed the achievement of the Goals in each of the Characteristics (with the exception of F: NDG), the Strategic Objective in each of the

31 Elements, and the targets/outcomes specified in the Actions. These assessments collectively aimed to provide an over-view of reaching the primary goal of the 2015 ASEAN Socio-Cultural Community *“to contribute to realizing an ASEAN Community that is people-centred and socially responsible with a view to achieving enduring solidarity and unity among the nations and peoples of ASEAN by forging a common identity and building a caring and sharing society which is inclusive and harmonious where the well-being, livelihood, and welfare of the peoples are enhanced.”*

The development of the ASCC Scorecard is based on a robust conceptual, methodological and analytical framework as discussed in the chapter on “Development of the ASCC Scorecard”. It should be noted that the Scorecard assessment is a distinct but complementary process of the implementation monitoring system of programs and projects which the ASEAN Secretariat undertakes annually based on the ASCC Blueprint Actions.

The achievement of goals, strategic objectives, targets/outcomes were assessed through a total of 208 indicators as determined by the ASEAN sectoral bodies as most appropriate, consisting of 136 quantitative indicators and 72 qualitative indicators. Data and information from each of the indicators were sourced firstly from ASEAN sources as supplied by the ASEAN Member States (AMS), and secondly from reputable international sources. The Scorecard assessment is basically a “state of affairs reporting” as of the reference year 2015, and does not include deeper cross-sectoral analysis or reasoning of the state of affairs, as this is subject to further specific analytical research and assumptions. It is therefore hoped the 2015 ASCC Scorecard will spur such informed academic and policy-relevant research work on ASEAN. Quantitative information brings objectivity, simplicity, and focus to public and intellectual discourses.

The compilation and analysis of the data and information was done in close consultation with the ASEAN Secretariat officials who have provided much of the data and information sourced from AMS and also provided guidance and verified the analysis contained herein.

The ASCC Scorecard is published in two volumes: the Main Report and the Executive Summary. The Executive Summary is primarily for public consumption, for ASEAN to communicate and send out key messages to the public on the achievement of the ASCC 2015, and for the general public to have a comprehensive overview of what ASCC 2015 is all about and how they can benefit and contribute.

The Main Report is an internal working document for ASEAN to further work on the indicator sets, methodologies, data and information as a basis for the future Monitoring and Evaluation system for the next phase of ASEAN Community building 2016-2025. Of immediate value is its contribution to informed programming of the ASEAN Agenda 2016-2025 in terms of meaningful and achievable quantitative goals, objectives, targets and outcomes benchmarked on past and current state of affairs.

Certainly there are data and information gaps as highlighted in the section on challenges and limitations in the study. Considering that this is the first comprehensive attempt to compile so much information covering all the sectors in the socio-cultural pillar, this is indeed a commendable achievement.

It is hoped that ASEAN will further work consistently in enhancing the Scorecard system as the data and information are indeed useful national tools to monitor progress and development. It is also hoped that eventually AMS will be able to generate as much primary data sources with robust methodologies specific to the region, rather than depending on secondary sources from international organizations. AMS could use these primary sources of data to not only assess national goals and policies, but also to contribute to the assessment of their international obligations such as the forthcoming UN Sustainable Development Goals.

Thank you.

Dr. Raman Letchumanan

Senior Fellow, RSIS

Lead Researcher/Team Coordinator



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The ASCC Scorecard is composed of 208 agreed and approved indicators. The following table summarises the number of indicators, both quantitative and qualitative that are included in the ASCC Scorecard.

ASCC Characteristic	Quantitative	Qualitative	Total
Human Development	34	5	39
Social Welfare and Protection	68	16	84
Social Justice and Rights	8	3	11
Ensuring Environmental Sustainability	16	12	28
Building ASEAN Identity	10	0	10
Total	136	72	208

Across all indicators in the ASCC Scorecard, the following methodological and analytical issues were predominant:

- Lack of agreed indicators by ASCC sectoral bodies for some of the strategic objectives of the ASCC Blueprint, thus leading to a more qualitative assessment and descriptive analysis of the status of ASCC with regard to these objectives.
- Lack of complete set of data for all AMS, and data corresponding to different years for each indicator makes it difficult to make sensible assessment of the region's collective performance.
- Insufficient data due to lack of updating and verification of data by AMS (as required by the ASEAN Secretariat), even though updated data is publicly available from UN and other reputable databases.
- Trend analysis could not be made as comparable data is not available for the reference years 2009 (baseline) and 2015 (year of reporting).
- Lack of most recent data (majority of data sets are only up to 2012), thus the Scorecard assessment may not be representative of the actual state of affairs as of 2015. Ideally a lag of one year from the reference year 2015 would be appropriate.
- Inconsistencies in data format reported and verified by AMS, thus assessing progress from 2009 to 2015 is similarly not feasible, unless amended by

the researchers to conform to the agreed reporting format to allow for comparison.

- Lack of details and clarification on some indicators in terms of its definition, methodology, or the rationale for adopting the indicator.

A. HUMAN DEVELOPMENT

1. There are 39 indicators to measure whether ASEAN has progressed in view of the objective on human development (A) to “enhance the well-being and livelihood of the peoples of ASEAN by providing them with equitable access to human development opportunities by promoting and investing in education and life-long learning, human resource training and capacity building, encourage innovation and entrepreneurship, promote the use of English language, ICT and applied science and technology in socio-economic development activities.”

A1. Advancing and Prioritising Education

2. In terms of advancing and prioritising education (A1), the strategic objective under the ASCC Blueprint is to “ensure the integration of education priorities into ASEAN’s development agenda and creating a knowledge based society; achieving universal access to primary education; promoting early child care and development; and enhancing awareness of ASEAN to youth through education and activities to build an ASEAN identity based on friendship and cooperation.” In view of this objective, a total of nine indicators were agreed upon and adopted for the Scorecard. However, incomplete data hindered the assessment of progress in terms of educational qualifications. In terms of adult literacy and youth literacy as well as student-to-teacher ratio, ASEAN Member States (AMS) have shown significant improvements. Adult and youth literacy (both male and female) rates are mostly within the range of 90 to 100 percent.

A2. Investing in Human Resource Development

3. The strategic objective of A2, ‘Investing in human resource development’ is to “enhance and improve the capacity of ASEAN human resource through strategic programmes and develop a qualified, competent and well-prepared ASEAN labour force” as stated in the ASCC Blueprint. A total of ten indicators have been adopted to assess the labour force in ASEAN. All the ASEAN

Member States have shown significant improvements, in net enrolment rates at the primary level. In the areas of net enrolment rates in secondary and tertiary levels, most of the member states have made progress although greater progress is desirable. In terms of economically active population, rates vary among AMS, showing a range of moderate increase to significant increase in the number of economically active population that have completed primary, secondary and tertiary education. Similarly, a number of the AMS with available data, vary in labour productivity, a few showing a significant increase while most showed a moderate to significant decline. Educational attainment (or education qualifications) is also considered to assess the state of the labour force but due to lack of comparable data, an assessment is not possible.

4. All the ASEAN Member States have shown significant improvements, in net enrolment rates at the primary level. Here some of the AMS that have outpaced the others, in terms of improvements are highlighted. In 2011, Singapore reported an admirable 100 percent enrolment rate. The Philippines also reported a big improvement, as its rate moved from 89.43 in 2009 to 92.21 in 2011. Lao PDR's enrolment rates increased from 91.61 in 2009 to 95.2 in 2012. In the areas of net enrolment rates in secondary education, the member states have made progress although greater progress is desirable. Lao PDR, Myanmar and Thailand have the potential to gain further ground in secondary education. Tertiary education rates are relatively high for Malaysia and Thailand. Cambodia and Laos have shown some improvements but still have some way to go. In the case of tertiary education, Brunei, Indonesia and Thailand outperform the other AMS. Cambodia and Laos on the other hand, have shown some improvements but still have quite a way to go.

A3. Promotion of Decent Work

5. For A3, 'Promotion of Decent Work', a total of six indicators have been adopted. The objective of this strategy, as stated in the ASCC Blueprint is "incorporating decent work principles in ASEAN work culture, safety and health at work place and ensuring that the promotion of entrepreneurship becomes an integral part of ASEAN's employment policy to achieve a forward-looking employment strategy." The overall status of decent work in ASEAN presents a much improved picture. Majority of the AMS have seen improvements in the employment to population ratio for people above 15 years of age. This means that more people in the region are participating in the workforce compared to the past. The unemployment rate in most of the countries has also decreased.

Majority of the AMS have seen improvements in the proportion of workers that work excessive hours. Looking at low pay rate, complete data is not available for the AMS, making a comprehensive analysis challenging. However, it is important to note that a majority of the AMS have a legislated national minimum wage. On the other hand, majority of the AMS have not achieved the desired progress in terms of occupational injury rate (lost work days). For a majority of the AMS, the days lost due to occupational injury have increased significantly. Data on union density rates vary among AMS and proper assessment is not feasible given the available data.

A4. Promoting Information and Communication Technology (ICT)

6. The strategic objective of promoting information and communication technology (ICT) is to implement human resource development programme which will facilitate the implementation of regional ICT initiatives. The sectoral body did not set any indicators to measure the impacts of the promotion of ICT.

A5. Facilitating Access to Applied Science and Technology (S&T)

7. The strategic objective of facilitating access to applied Science and Technology (S&T) is to develop policies and mechanisms to support active cooperation in research, science and technology development, technology transfers and commercialisation and establishment of strong networks of scientific and technological institutions with the active participation of private sector and other relevant organisations. Eight indicators, four quantitative and four qualitative indicators were approved for A5. The first indicator to measure the access to applied (S&T) is the presence of national S&T plans, S&T laws and other national policy pronouncements, and innovation system framework, policies and strategies. In most AMS, S&T policy and development strategy are part of the broader national development plans. Dedicated S&T policies are then formulated accordingly. S&T priority areas significantly differ across countries although common priority areas are ICT, renewable energy (or clean) technology and biotechnology.

8. The second indicator is the availability of S&T infrastructure. By and large, all AMS already have the necessary platform to build its S&T capacity on. S&T development is coordinated at the ministerial level in most countries. In all AMS, S&T research and development are performed by various actors including ministerial and non-ministerial R&D institutes (RDIs), universities, and private non-profit institutions. Furthermore, in the Study on State of S&T Report in ASEAN (S&T Report) published in 2012, there are a few ways of presenting the numbers of R&D personnel and researchers, such as based on 'headcount' or 'headcount per million inhabitants'. The data obtained from the UNESCO Institute for Statistics (UIS) are yet to be verified by AMS but if the UIS data can be used, then the Philippines, Singapore and Thailand had increased number in R&D personnel in the past 10 years, whereas the number of researchers and R&D personnel in Malaysia grew significantly between 2009 and 2011.

9. In terms of funding, with the exception of Singapore, most AMS allocate less than one percent of GDP on R&D. Government is the main R&D funder in Brunei, Indonesia, and Viet Nam whereas in Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore, and Thailand, business enterprises provide the highest share for R&D activities. Private non-profit institutions contribute the highest share of R&D funding in Cambodia. In Lao PDR, most funding comes from abroad. Data collection on the numbers of patent application and patent granted is ambiguous because there is no uniform reporting unit used in the S&T Report. An alternative data source is the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO). For the purpose of analysis, data from (World Intellectual Property Organization) WIPO is considered. It shows that between 2009 and 2013, the number of patent application by both residents and foreigners has gone up in Cambodia, Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore, Thailand, and Viet Nam. WIPO data also shows that in a majority of AMS, the number of patents granted to residents have gone down while patents granted to foreigners increased. Similarly, the reporting of the number of internationally peer-reviewed publications in the S&T Report does not follow a standardised format. An alternative data source is the UNESCO Science Report 2010 which reported an increase in the number of internationally-reviewed publications in Indonesia, Malaysia, Singapore and Thailand in 2008. In terms of the number of citations of S&T publications, AMS reported within different time frames and thus comparable datasets are not available.

10. Various interpretations were made with regard to areas of strength reported in the S&T Report. Based on the S&T Report, areas of strength in Southeast

Asia fall within the broader categories of agriculture, engineering/technology/electronics, and biology/medical sciences. AMS' capability in developing human resources for S&T is evidenced in a number of universities offering science-related subjects across countries. The S&T Report however provides scarce information relating to the average number of graduates in master and doctoral levels per degree program for each university during the last five years.

11. In terms of the sectoral share of the GDP, between 2010 and 2014, industry and services are contributing bigger share in most AMS' GDP. In Myanmar, agriculture is the top contributor of GDP. Industry is the top contributor of GDP in Brunei Darussalam and Indonesia. Between 2010 and 2014, the share of industry in Brunei's GDP dropped at about seven percent, whereas services share increased by about the same percentage. In Indonesia, the share of agriculture, industry and services in GDP did not change much between 2010 and 2014. Services topped the GDP contributor list in Cambodia, Lao PDR, Malaysia, the Philippines, and Singapore. Between 2010 and 2014, the share of industry and services in Lao's GDP increased to 32.2 percent and 44.1 percent respectively. In Malaysia, the share of services went up to 56 percent and the share of industry went down to 34.7 percent. During the same period, the composition of GDP contributors was generally unchanged in Cambodia, the Philippines, and Singapore. In Thailand and Viet Nam in 2010, the share of industry and services to GDP was almost equal at about 40 percent. In 2014, the share of services went up to 55.8 percent and 44 percent in Thailand and Viet Nam respectively, and the share of industry went down to 32.6 percent and 38.1 percent respectively.

A6. Strengthening Entrepreneurship Skills for Women, Youth, Elderly and Persons with Disabilities

12. For A6 'Strengthening entrepreneurship skills for women, youth, elderly and persons with disabilities', a total of three indicators have been adopted. The strategic objective of this indicator as mentioned in the ASCC Blueprint is as follows: "increasing the participation of women, youth, elderly, persons with disabilities, vulnerable and marginalised groups in the productive workforce by enhancing their entrepreneurial skills, particularly to improve their social well-being and contribute towards national development and regional economic integration."

13. The first indicator is 'employment to population ratio of women'. The employment-to-population ratio is the proportion of a country's working-age population that is employed (ILO). Majority of the ASEAN Member States have seen improvements with regards to this indicator, with the exception of Myanmar. Indonesia and Malaysia have outpaced the other AMS with the highest improvement rates of above 10 percent. The second indicator is 'youth unemployment rate'. Youth unemployment rate has generally decreased in a majority of the AMS.
14. In terms of the third indicator, availability of policies to support the development of entrepreneurship skills for women, youth, elderly and persons with disabilities, AMS have differing priorities. There are a number of national legislations/mechanisms among the ASEAN Member States that support entrepreneurship skills for these groups. Indonesia, Malaysia, Thailand, Singapore and Viet Nam have distinctive policies and mechanisms in terms of supporting entrepreneurship skills for women. On the other hand, Brunei Darussalam, the Philippines and Singapore have dedicated policies to promote the development of entrepreneurship skills for the youth. Some ASEAN Member States are very active in promoting entrepreneurship skills for the elderly, however this area has the potential for improvement. Cambodia, Lao PDR, Thailand, the Philippines and Viet Nam have specific programmes and policies for the promotion of entrepreneurship skills for the elderly and persons with disabilities.

A7. Building Civil Service Capability

15. ASEAN has adopted three Worldwide Governance Indicators (i.e. Government Effectiveness, Regulatory Authority, and Control of Corruption) to assess the extent of civil service capabilities of ASEAN Member States in line with the strategic objective of establishing an effective, efficient, transparent, responsive and accountable civil service systems through increased capacity-building, enhancement of public human resource competencies among ASEAN bureaucracies, and increased collaboration among ASEAN Member States as outlined in the ASCC Blueprint.
16. Across all three adopted indicators, a majority of ASEAN Member States have shown improvements. From 2009 to 2012, the perception of government effectiveness increased from a range of 14 to 45 to a range of 21 to 45 in Cambodia, Lao PDR and Viet Nam. On the other hand, perception of government

effectiveness ranged from 46 to 99 in Brunei Darussalam, Indonesia, Malaysia, Philippines, Singapore and Thailand in 2009. Perception of government effectiveness decreased in some of these countries given a slight drop in the lower range of 44 to 99 in 2012. There is a general increase in perception of regulatory quality among AMS from 2009 to 2012. In 2009, regulatory quality in Cambodia, Lao PDR and Viet Nam ranged from 14 to 35. In 2012, Cambodia, Lao PDR and Viet Nam showed an increase from 2009 with a range of 22 to 39. For Brunei Darussalam, Indonesia, Malaysia, Philippines, Singapore and Thailand, the range was from 43 to 98. In 2012, this increased to a range of 43 to 100. There is also a general increase in perception of control of corruption among the AMS on the lower range albeit there are minor decreases among AMS in the upper range. Perception of control of corruption ranged from 9 to 98 in 2009 while it ranged from 14 to 97 in 2012.



B. SOCIAL WELFARE AND PROTECTION

17. There are 84 indicators to measure whether ASEAN has progressed in view of the objective on social welfare and protection (B) to “enhance the well-being and livelihood of the peoples of ASEAN through alleviating poverty, ensuring social welfare and protection, building a safe, secure and drug-free environment, enhancing disaster resilience and addressing health development concerns.”

B1. Poverty Alleviation

18. B1, ‘Poverty Alleviation’ has two important indicators to measure the progress of the AMS. The strategic objective of B1, as mentioned in the ASCC Blueprint is “to fully address socio-economic disparities and poverty that persists across ASEAN Member States including achieving the MDG goal of eradicating extreme poverty and hunger”.
19. AMS have made significant progress in reducing the percentage of people living under the international poverty line PPP \$ 1.25 a day. Within the period of twenty years, the levels of poverty in ASEAN has fallen from extreme poverty to moderate poverty. According to the ASEAN/UNDP MDGs Assessment Report (2015), the proportion of people living in conditions of extreme poverty (less than one dollar per day) has declined from one in two persons, to one in eight persons in the region. However, these achievements are not the same across all ASEAN Member States. Another indicator is income inequality measured through the Gini Coefficient. The variation of the coefficient is between 0 and 1, where 0 shows total equality and 1 shows complete inequality. Among AMS with available data, income inequality varies and a proper assessment of the region’s range in terms of income inequality is not feasible.
20. However, these achievements are not the same across all ASEAN Member States. According to the most recently available statistics, Lao PDR, Viet Nam, Myanmar and Indonesia have outpaced the other AMS and witnessed a significant decrease in the percentage of population living under the

international poverty line. On the other hand, Cambodia and the Philippines have great room for improvement in this area.

B2. Social Safety Nets and Protection from the Negative Impacts of Integration and Globalization

21. As part of the ASCC Blueprint, ASEAN Member States have committed themselves to enhancing the wellbeing and livelihood of the peoples of ASEAN through multiple avenues including ensuring social welfare and protection. ASEAN has adopted two indicators (HDI Index and availability of legislations, policies, and programmes on social protection for women, children, elderly and persons with disabilities) to assess the strategic objective of ensuring that all ASEAN peoples are provided with social welfare and protection from possible negative impacts of globalization and integration by improving the quality, coverage and sustainability of social protection and increasing the capacity of social risk management.

22. All ASEAN Member States have shown marked improvement in the Human Development Index, as indicated by the increase in scores across the board. AMS's HDI scores range from low to very high human development categories. A majority (six out of the ten) of the AMS fall into the medium band of human development while three AMS fall into the very high to high human development category. Similarly, all AMS have enacted legislations, policies, and programmes on social protection against the negative impacts of integration and globalisation for specific groups (i.e. women, children, elderly, and persons with disabilities). According to AMS validated data, Indonesia, Malaysia, Singapore, Thailand and Viet Nam have specific legislations for all vulnerable groups while the rest of the AMS have social protection policies for at least one vulnerable group.

B3. Enhancing Food Security and Safety

23. As part of the ASCC Blueprint, ASEAN Member States have committed themselves to addressing health development concerns. ASEAN has adopted two indicators to assess whether it has achieved the strategic objective of ensuring adequate access to food at all times for all ASEAN peoples and ensuring food safety in ASEAN Member States. One of the indicators for B3 is

the proportion of activities completed in the ASEAN Food Safety Improvement Plan (AFSIP II) under the Strategic Framework on Health Development 2010-2015. AFSIP II addresses the issue of access to food and food safety. It was later agreed during consultation meetings at the ASEAN Secretariat, that being based on a programme and a work plan, this indicator fits in the Implementation Monitoring system of the ASCC Blueprint and not the Scorecard. The other indicator, the consolidated incidence of food-borne illnesses (i.e. dysentery, acute diarrhea, typhoid, hepatitis, food poisoning), there were only five reporting AMS. All of the five reporting AMS have reported lowered incidence rates for most food-borne illnesses, except Hepatitis. In Brunei Darussalam, Malaysia, and the Philippines, incidence rates for Hepatitis have increased.

B4. Access to Healthcare and Promotion of Healthy Lifestyles

24. The ASEAN Socio-Cultural Community Blueprint outlines the health issues for cooperation among AMS which is detailed under Characteristic B: Social Welfare and Protection. In order to assess the progress in achieving the strategic objective to ensure access to adequate and affordable healthcare medical services and medicine, and promote healthy lifestyles for the peoples of ASEAN under B4, a total of 32 indicators were adapted and are grouped under the following focus areas: (a) maternal and child health (MDG 4 and MDG 5); (b) increase access to health services for ASEAN people; (c) promote ASEAN healthy lifestyle further grouped into non-communicable diseases, tobacco control and mental health; (d) traditional medicine; and (e) pharmaceutical development.

25. There are nine indicators for maternal and child health corresponding to MDG 4 and 5 in the ASEAN Scorecard. MDG 4 on reducing child mortality targets reducing by two-thirds, between 1990 and 2015, the under-five mortality rate. Among the reporting AMS, Brunei Darussalam, Malaysia and Singapore have relatively low under-five mortality rates from 2009. The rest of the AMS consistently reported more than 20 deaths per 1,000 live births from 2009 to 2015. By 2015, Thailand also reported low levels of under-five mortality. However, Lao PDR and Myanmar still reported more than 50 deaths in 2015. On the other hand, Cambodia has managed to decrease under-five mortality to less than 40 deaths by 2015. In terms of infant mortality, Singapore, Malaysia and Brunei Darussalam have relatively lower infant mortality rates than the global average (less than 10 deaths per 1,000 live births) since 2009. However,

Lao PDR, Myanmar, Cambodia and Indonesia still have above the global infant mortality rate with more than 30 deaths per 1,000 live births. Notwithstanding, Cambodia and Lao PDR had managed to relatively decrease infant mortality rates from 2009 to 2015. The Philippines has maintained less than 30 deaths per 1,000 live births while Thailand had maintained less than 15 deaths per 1,000 live births from 2009 to 2015. Viet Nam had substantial progress in lowering infant mortality rate from 2009 to 2015, and had less than 20 deaths per 1,000 live births by 2015, lower than the global infant mortality rate.

26. There is also progress in terms of immunization rates. All AMS have reported more than 80% coverage of 1-yr olds immunised against measles, near the global average rate of 84% in 2013. Brunei Darussalam, Malaysia, Singapore, Thailand and Viet Nam had vaccinated about 95% of their 1-yr olds. Lao PDR had the most significant progress in increasing immunization rates from 59% in 2009 to 82% in 2015. Indonesia had less substantive progress but managed to vaccinate more than 80% of infants by 2015.
27. In terms of maternal health in ASEAN, maternal mortality rates in Cambodia, Indonesia, Lao PDR, Myanmar and the Philippines range from 150 to 350 deaths per 100,000 live births. On the other hand, Brunei Darussalam, Malaysia, Singapore, Thailand and Viet Nam have managed to lower deaths to about 50 per 100,000 live births. The maternal mortality ratio in ASEAN is within the global average of 210 per 100,000 live births in 2013 (from 380 maternal deaths in 1990). Maternal mortality statistics are related to another indicator, the proportion of births attended by skilled birth attendants and health professional. Cambodia, Myanmar and the Philippines still have a low proportion of attended births (from 40 to 80 percent) but these AMS have managed to reach the average global rate of 71 percent attended births. Indonesia has managed to cover more than 80% but has not reached coverage as Brunei Darussalam, Malaysia, Singapore and Viet Nam with a range of 90 to 100% in attended births.
28. Part of MDG 5 is to achieve universal access to reproductive health. Among the indicators used is contraceptive prevalence rate. Among the AMS with verified data for 2009 and 2012, only Cambodia and Indonesia reported a minor increase in contraceptive use while the Philippines and Viet Nam reported a minor decrease in contraceptive use. Related to contraceptive use is unmet need for family planning. Unmet need for family planning worldwide was only reduced by 3%, from 15% in 1990 to 12 % in 2015. Only Indonesia and the Philippines has verified data on these indicators and both countries

reported a slight decrease (1 to 3 percent) in unmet needs for family planning. As part of the MDG 5 target to achieve universal access to reproductive health, adolescent birth rates (aged 15 to 19) needs to be reduced. Among the reporting AMS, Thailand is still above the global rate of 51 births per 1,000 live births while Singapore has surpassed the global average at 4.8 births per 1,000 live births among adolescent girls in 2012. This also corresponds to the low birth rate in Singapore. Brunei and Malaysia reported less than 20 births while Indonesia reported more than 40 per 1,000 live births. Similarly, antenatal coverage is critical for reproductive health. This indicator refers two data sets for each AMS. One refers to the percentage of women aged 15 to 49 with a live birth given in a time period that received antenatal care four or more times. The other refers to the percentage of women aged 15 to 49 with a live birth given in a time period that received antenatal care at least once during their pregnancy. In ASEAN, Brunei Darussalam reported 100% coverage with a minimum of four visits as early as 2009 while Indonesia and Viet Nam reported more than 80% coverage (with the WHO minimum of four visits), while the rest of the reporting AMS ranges from 50% to 80% for the minimum four visits. In terms of a minimum of one visit, most AMS have more than 90% coverage except for Myanmar with less than 75% coverage. For the indicator, unmet need for family planning (spacing and limiting), the data available for 2009 to 2015 is limited to Indonesia, Lao PDR, the Philippines, Thailand and Viet Nam. These AMS, except for Thailand, have been able to slightly reduce the unmet need for family planning.

29. Under the focus area of promoting healthy lifestyles, there are seven indicators in the Scorecard on NCDs, seven indicators on tobacco control and three indicators on mental health. Among the AMS with available data on the indicator, mortality rates from cardiovascular diseases (CVDs), rates in Indonesia reached up to around 650 per 100,000 population while Brunei, Singapore and Thailand reported mortality rates from CVDs and cancer ranging from around 70 to 120 per 100,000 population. Related to the rise of NCDs are the increasing prevalence of risk factors (that correspond to one indicator each) such as diabetes, obesity, physical inactivity and raised blood pressure. Among AMS, Malaysia has the highest diabetes prevalence followed by Singapore. The rest of the AMS have reported less than 10% prevalence with Cambodia reporting less than 5%. There is lack of disaggregated data according to gender thus trend analysis according to gender is not possible at this point. On the other hand, obesity is most prevalent in Brunei Darussalam, followed by Malaysia and Indonesia. The rest of the AMS reported less than 10% with Myanmar reporting the lowest obesity prevalence. In terms of raised

blood pressure, Malaysia reported the highest prevalence of raised blood pressure at almost 40 percent, an increase from its baseline data. The rest of the AMS reported a range of 15 to 25 percent prevalence, with Indonesia reporting a decrease while Myanmar reported an increase from their baseline prevalence on raised blood pressure. Due to lack of available data for 2015, assessment of the prevalence of lack of physical inactivity and percentage of women screened for cervical cancer is not possible. On one hand, baseline data shows a range of 11 to 60 percent of physical inactivity among AMS. On the other hand, baseline data suggests that more women are screened for cervical cancer in Malaysia, Singapore and Thailand. The rest of the AMS reported less than 1 percent coverage of women screened for cervical cancer.

30. On tobacco control, among the AMS, only Brunei Darussalam, Indonesia, Lao PDR, Singapore, Thailand and Viet Nam have available data on smoking prevalence among adults for 2015. Brunei, Indonesia, Singapore and Viet Nam reported slight increases in adult smoking prevalence from 2009 while Lao PDR, Malaysia and Thailand reported slight decreases in smoking prevalence from 2009. In terms of taxes, all AMS have imposed taxes on tobacco ranging from 16 to 71 percent tobacco tax to retail price. In terms of tobacco control policy, All AMS have smoke-free policies. However, only Brunei Darussalam, Indonesia, Malaysia, Singapore, Thailand and Viet Nam have pictorial health warnings on cigarette packaging. All of the AMS also have policies on banning on tobacco advertising, promotion and sponsorship except for Indonesia. By 2015, all AMS have designated tobacco control units and human resources or national coordinating mechanism for tobacco control. Brunei Darussalam, Indonesia, Malaysia, Singapore and Thailand have designated national coordinating mechanisms and tobacco control units since 2009. By 2014, Cambodia, Lao PDR, Myanmar, the Philippines and Viet Nam have established their own tobacco control units and national coordinating mechanisms. All AMS have a sustainable funding mechanism for tobacco control, except for Cambodia and Myanmar.
31. In terms of mental health, it is observably not a high priority for most AMS if individual country funding and human resources are considered. All AMS have mental health budgets that are less than 1% compared to their GDPs. On reporting mental health budget, mental health budget includes (1) budget allocated for hospitals (Mental hospitals and other hospitals); (2) budget allocated for community based care; and (3) budget allocated for public health and other promotion activities. Among the reporting AMS, only Singapore and Thailand allot more than 3% of their respective health budgets to mental

health. The Philippines allots at least 3% of its annual health budget to mental health while Indonesia, Lao PDR and Malaysia allot less than 1% of its health budget. In terms of psychosis treatment rate in health facilities, only Brunei Darussalam, Thailand and Viet Nam have reported treatment of more than 50% of patients diagnosed with psychosis in 2009 and 2015. Indonesia, Lao PDR, Malaysia, Myanmar and Singapore still reported treatment of less than 10% of patients diagnosed with psychosis in 2009 and 2015. Cambodia, Lao PDR and the Philippines still lack data on psychosis treatment rate. The available validated data from AMS on suicide rates are not consistent (some reported in percentage and some reported in mortality per 100,000 population) and not sufficient to give insight for analysis on the progress of AMS. As an alternative, data from the WHO is used. Using WHO data, there was an increase in deaths caused by suicide in Brunei Darussalam, the Philippines, Singapore, and Thailand. On the other hand, there was a significant decrease of deaths caused by suicide in Viet Nam.

32. In relation to promoting traditional medicine, among the six reporting AMS, Malaysia, Thailand and Viet Nam have substantially increased the number of public health centres and hospitals with integrated traditional medicine services from 2009 to 2015. The rest of the reporting AMS have at least maintained the number of such health facilities with integrated traditional medicine services.
33. In terms of pharmaceutical development, most countries have national medicine policies in place with implementation plans in place or being developed by 2012. By 2014, all AMS have legal provisions on permitting inspections of facilities where pharmaceutical activities are performed and on requiring manufacturers, wholesalers, distributors, and dispensers to be licensed. However, in terms of rational use of medicines, in most of the AMS, antibiotics are still dispensed over-the-counter without prescription except for Brunei, Malaysia and Singapore. This poses a threat to an increased rates of antibiotic resistance among ASEAN's population. Nevertheless, in terms of increasing access to medicine, all AMS have essential medicine lists updated in the last five years.

B5. Improving Capability to Control Communicable Diseases

34. Under B5, improving capability to control communicable disease stated in the ASCC Blueprint, the core objective is to enhance regional preparedness

and capacity through integrated approaches to prevention, surveillance and timely response to communicable and emerging infectious diseases. The three indicators on emerging infectious diseases (malaria incidence rate, rabies incidence rate and dengue case fatality rate) are proxy indicators. They were chosen as indicators to indicate the priority infectious diseases among AMS that are included in the MDGs, particularly MDG 6 to combat HIV/AIDS, malaria and other diseases. In addition, three indicators on HIV prevalence and access to treatment are also included.

35. Part of MDG 6, a target was set to halve by 2015 and begin to reverse the incidence of malaria and other major diseases. Using datasets from the WHO Malaria Report 2014 and various health ministries, there was significant increase in malaria cases per 1,000 population in Lao PDR but significant decrease in Cambodia, Malaysia, Myanmar, Philippines, and Viet Nam. Brunei Darussalam has been malaria free since 1987 while reported cases in Singapore are all imported. In terms of rabies which is endemic in ASEAN, Brunei Darussalam, Malaysia and Singapore are rabies-free among AMS. Because of data inconsistencies, trend analysis and comparison of incidence rates among the seven reporting AMS from 2009 and 2015 is not possible. Among the AMS with available data from 2009 to 2015, the Philippines, Thailand and Viet Nam reported decreases in rabies incidence. In terms of dengue which is also endemic in the region, dengue-related deaths vary among AMS, with rates reported on the increase in Cambodia, Indonesia, Myanmar and Viet Nam from 2009 to 2012 (as 2015 data) while there was reported decrease in deaths in Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore and Thailand in the same period.

36. MDG 6 also targets halting and reversing the spread of HIV/AIDS by 2015 as well as achieving universal access to treatment for HIV/AIDS for all those who need it by 2010. Globally, an estimated 0.8% of adults aged 15-49 years are living with HIV in 2013. HIV prevalence in ASEAN remains below 1 percent. HIV prevalence among AMS range from 0.01 to 0.7 percent. From 2009 to 2012, Indonesia, Malaysia, Philippines and Singapore reported a slight increase in HIV prevalence while Cambodia, Myanmar and Thailand reported a decrease. In terms of HIV prevalence among most-at-risk populations (MARPs), there was an increase in percentage among men having sex with men (MSM) across AMS from 2009 to 2012. However, there was an over-all decrease of HIV prevalence among sex workers and injecting drug users among the MARPs. In terms of treatment, AMS with available data on adults and children receiving

antiretroviral therapy treatment (ARV) vary in coverage, ranging from around 40 to 100 percent coverage. There is still less coverage among adults ranging from 38 to 77 percent for those AMS with disaggregated data particularly in Cambodia, Indonesia, Malaysia, Myanmar, Thailand and Viet Nam).

B6. Ensuring a Drug-Free ASEAN

37. The core objective under this strategy is to reduce significantly, the overall prevalence of illicit drug abuse in the general population, in particular students, youth and those in high-risk and vulnerable groups through preventive measures and by increasing access to treatment, rehabilitation and aftercare services to ensure full re-integration into society as well as through enhanced partnership between the public and private sectors and civil society organisations. There are no ASCC and APSC indicators agreed upon for this objective. However, in terms of policy or legislation related to drug control, all AMS have national legislation on drugs. Supply reduction is a priority of all AMS however all AMS implement a balanced approach in policy in terms of harm reduction and supply reduction. The details of implementation however may vary and the priorities and approach in terms of enforcement of laws and policies may differ.

B7. Building Disaster-Resilient Nations and Safer Communities

38. ASEAN has achieved great strides in building disaster-resilient nations and safer communities. It is the first to ratify a regional legally-binding agreement on disaster management and emergency response. The ASEAN Agreement on Disaster Management and Emergency Response (AADMER) encompasses the full spectrum of prevention and mitigation, risk assessment, early warning and monitoring, preparedness and response, and recovery and rehabilitation as well as instilling disaster risk reduction. Signed on 26 July 2005 and entered into force on 24 December 2009, AADMER affirms ASEAN's commitment to the Hyogo Framework of Action (HFA) and provides a 'proactive regional framework for cooperation, coordination, technical assistance and resource mobilization in all aspects of disaster management.' The indicators and data used in this Scorecard aims to measure the outcome of implementing ASCC Blueprint's strategic objective under B7 Building disaster-resilient nations and safer communities which aims to: 'strengthen effective mechanisms

and capabilities to prevent and reduce disaster losses in lives, and in social, economic and environmental assets of ASEAN Member States and to jointly respond to disaster emergencies through concerted national efforts and intensified regional and international cooperation.

39. According to the latest report of ASEAN's progress for the period 2011 to 2013 under the Hyogo Framework of Action, ASEAN scored an average of 3.65 for the 14 sub-regional indicators. As a region, ASEAN scored a range of 3.25 to 4 on average in terms of governance and institutional arrangements (priority 1), risk identification and early warning (priority 2), knowledge and education (priority 3), underlying risk (priority 4) and preparedness and response (priority 5). Concurrently, national HFA reports were submitted by all AMS for the 2007-2009 and 2009-2011 review process. Data from these reports are considered as 2009 baseline data for the Scorecard. However, as of writing, only five AMS - Indonesia, Lao PDR, Philippines, Thailand and Viet Nam – have submitted 2013-2015 national progress reports. On average, all the five AMS that submitted their Final HFA Progress reports showed considerable progress for all five priority actions.

40. Pandemic preparedness and response (PPR) is also part of the action lines under B7 of the ASCC Blueprint. It is directed to 'promote multi-sectoral coordination and planning on Pandemic Preparedness and Response at the regional level including the development of a regional Multi-Sectoral Pandemic Preparedness and Response Plan.' Only three AMS - Malaysia, Singapore and Thailand have reported to the ASEAN Secretariat on PPR sectoral plan development. On the other hand, only four AMS – Malaysia, Singapore, Thailand and Viet Nam – have reported on having "conducted multi-sectoral simulation exercises." The same four AMS reported on the "number of guidelines or policies on PPR that have been developed." Data on other indicators for PPR are still incomplete pending the completion of the ASEAN PPR work plan.

C. SOCIAL JUSTICE AND RIGHTS

C1. Protection and Promotion of the Rights and Welfare of Women, Children, the Elderly and Persons with Disabilities

41. C1, 'Protection and promotion of the rights and welfare of women, children, the elderly and persons with disabilities' has five indicators to assess the performance of states in the achievement of the strategic objective to "safeguard the interests and rights as well as provide equal opportunities, and raise the quality of life and standard of living, for women, children, the elderly, and persons with disabilities." In terms of the Human Development Index, the first indicator for C1, All ASEAN Member States have shown marked improvement in the Human Development Index. Most Member States (six) fall into the Medium band of human development. Three ASEAN Member States fall into the Very High – High human development categories. Only Myanmar falls into the Low human development category although its score nears the cut-off for the Medium human development band.

42. The second indicator under C1 is gender parity index. The GPI at the primary level of enrolment is quite healthy for almost all the ASEAN Member States (AMS). The latest data available for Brunei, Indonesia and the Philippines shows the GPI to be slightly greater than 1. A GPI of greater than 1, can imply in some cases that males are at a disadvantage when it comes to enrolment rates. The GPI for Singapore and Myanmar is exactly 1. The GPI for Malaysia for the year 2011 was 0.49, and highlights the need for further improvements in this area. At the level of secondary enrolment, some of the AMS show improvements. However, they have the potential to progress much more. The latest data available for Brunei, Myanmar, Viet Nam and Thailand indicates a GPI slightly greater than 1. Indonesia and Singapore have a GPI of exactly 1. The latest GPI of Lao PDR is 0.85 and that of Malaysia is 0.50. However, it is the tertiary level of enrolment that is a greater cause for concern with respect to gender parity. Singapore, Brunei Darussalam, Thailand and Viet Nam have GPIs greater than 1. However the latest available GPI for Cambodia, Lao PDR and Malaysia is 0.62, 0.74 and 0.65 respectively. The latest GPI for Indonesia

is 0.87. The figures for some of the AMS indicate that there is a need to provide even greater support to encourage females to enrol in educational institutions at the tertiary level.

43. The second sub-indicator used as part of holistically measuring progress towards MDG-3 is 'share of women in wage employment in the non-agricultural sector'. Here, the data reveals a mixed bag of results. While, for a few AMS the share of women's employment in non-agricultural sectors has increased; many of the AMS have shown a reverse trend. In the case of Cambodia, the share has increased from 52.1 in 2009 to 55.7 in 2011. Singapore's share has increased from 45.4 in 2009 to 46.4 in 2011. The rates have remained about the same for Thailand and the Philippines over a period of time. However, the rates for Brunei and Indonesia have witnessed slight decreases. The largest decrease in share is visible from Malaysian data, with a decrease from 39.1 percent in 2009 to 36.5 percent in 2011. The 'number (or percentage) of seats held by women in the national parliament' is the third sub-indicator for MDG 3: Promote gender equality and empower women. The proportion of seats held by women in the national parliament has increased in general from 2009 to 2012 in Indonesia, the Philippines and Thailand but relatively decreased in Singapore and has remained the same in Laos PDR. However, despite these improvements the proportion of women in national parliament needs greater improvement. Overall, the latest data indicates a low-level of participation among women in politics in the ASEAN Member States.
44. Furthermore on gender inequality, gender inequality index baseline data is not available for most of the AMS. Latest data available from Singapore shows a very healthy GII of 0.101. The GII for Malaysia, Thailand and Viet Nam is also on the lower end of the spectrum at 0.256, 0.36 and 0.299 respectively. The Philippines has seen an improvement in GII, from 0.623 in 2010 to 0.418 in 2012. GII for Indonesia and Myanmar is on the higher side at 0.494 and 0.483 respectively. In terms of policy, most of the ASEAN Member States have enacted a number of legislations, policies, and programmes on social protection against the negative impacts of integration and globalisation for the identified groups (i.e. women, children, elderly, and persons with disabilities). Most of Myanmar's social protection is focused on children, whereas the Philippines has more social protection assistance initiatives for women.
45. As of 14 August 2015, all the AMS have ratified the Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW) and the Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC). Nine AMS have ratified

the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD). Brunei Darussalam is a signatory to the CRPD.

C2. Protection and Promotion of the Rights of Migrant Workers

46. The strategic objective of protecting and promoting the rights of migrant workers is to ensure fair and comprehensive migration policies and adequate protection for all migrant workers in accordance with the laws, regulations and policies of respective ASEAN Member States as well as to work towards the realisation of the ASEAN Declaration on the Protection and Promotion of the Rights of Migrant Workers.

47. Statistical data on the flow of migrant workers exist in all AMS. In most AMS, the number of migrant workers has increased since 2009. Based on the available data, there were more foreign managers, professionals, technicians and associate professionals, and service and sales workers in Brunei between 2009 and 2010. In Cambodia, the number of incoming and outgoing migrant workers increased between 2009 and 2013. There were more foreign workers in virtually all professions. Similarly in Indonesia, the number of incoming and outgoing migrant workers increased between 2009 and 2013. There was a notable increase in the number of foreign managers, professionals, and service and sales workers during that period. In Lao PDR between 2009 and 2011, the number of outgoing migrant workers increased by 1.5 times, while the number of total migrant workers in the country increased by almost sixty percent. The total number of migrant workers in Malaysia jumped by eighty percent between 2009 and 2013. While the number of migrant workers in Myanmar increased between 2009 and 2013, the number of outgoing migrant workers swelled by almost 13 times in the same period. In the Philippines between 2009 and 2013, the number of outgoing migrant workers doubled. Between 2009 and 2012, there were more foreign administrative, executive and managers, service workers and shops and sales workers, trade and related workers, and plan and machine operators and assemblers in the Philippines. In Singapore between 2009 and 2014, the total number of migrant workers increased by almost thirty percent. In Thailand, the number of migrant workers dropped by thirteen percent between 2009 and 2014. The number of foreign technicians and associate professionals, service and sales workers, skilled agricultural, forestry and fishery workers, craft and related traders workers, and elementary occupations notably decreased between 2009 and 2013. In Viet Nam between

2009 and 2013, the numbers of outgoing and incoming workers increased. Between 2009 and 2011, the number of foreign workers in Viet Nam increased across all professions. Four out of ten AMS do not classify migrant workers based on the identified occupational areas.

48. There were close to four times as many male migrant workers to female migrant workers in Brunei in 2009 and 2011. In Cambodia, female migrant workers outnumbered male migrant workers in 2009, but male migrant workers outnumbered female migrant workers in the subsequent years up to 2013. Similarly in Indonesia, the number of outgoing female migrant workers was higher than outgoing male workers in 2009, but the figure reversed from 2011 to 2013. In Lao PDR, the number of outgoing male migrant workers was higher than outgoing female workers in 2001 and 2011, and during the same period there were about ten times as many incoming male migrant workers compared to incoming female migrant workers. Myanmar's outgoing male workers significantly outnumbered outgoing female workers, with the figure stood at five times higher for outgoing male workers in 2013. In Thailand, the ratio of male to female migrant workers increased from 1.3 to 1.61 in 2010 and 2013 respectively. In Viet Nam, however, an opposite trend was observed with the ratio of male to female migrant workers decreased from 2.32 to 1.77 in 2009 and 2013 respectively.
49. In Brunei, the highest numbers of migrant workers were in the age groups of 25-29 and 30-34. The figures stood unchanged at about 20 percent for each group in 2009 and 2013. In Cambodia, about sixty percent of migrant workers were in the age group of 30-44, and the percentage remained the same in 2009 and 2013. In Viet Nam in 2009 and 2013, about seventy percent of migrant workers were in the age group of 30-50, and the number of migrant workers in the age group of above 50 years' old increased from 16 percent in 2009 to 19 percent in 2011.
50. About 50 percent of migrant workers in Brunei originated from Indonesia, with migrant workers from the Philippines and Malaysia counted about 20 percent of the total migrant workers each. In Cambodia, the number of Filipino, Malaysian, and Thai migrant workers dropped from 36 percent to 20 percent, 25 percent to 12 percent, and 20 percent to 18 percent respectively between 2009 and 2011, while the number of Viet Nameese migrant workers increased from 5 percent to 43 percent during the same period. In Indonesia, the number of Malaysian migrant workers doubled from 35 percent to 70 percent between 2009 and 2013 while the numbers of Filipino and Thai migrant workers went

down from 20 percent to 1 percent, and 28 percent to 5 percent respectively. In Lao PDR, Thai migrant workers made up of 80 percent and 70 percent of the total migrant workers in 2009 and 2011.

51. Destination countries remained largely unchanged between 2009 and 2013. Top three destinations of Malaysian migrant workers were Indonesia, Myanmar and Viet Nam. Filipino migrant workers' and Burmese migrant workers' top three destination countries were Malaysia, Indonesia, and Singapore. Thai migrant workers mostly went to their neighbouring countries of Myanmar, Cambodia, and Lao PDR, while migrant workers from Viet Nam mostly went to the Philippines, Thailand and Malaysia.
52. The policies, legislations and/or mechanisms for the protection and promotion of the rights of migrant workers come in different forms including, among others, government order, ministerial regulation, law, agreement, contract, memorandum of understanding, and handbook. For sending countries, these instruments regulate sustainable alternatives to migration of workers, recruitment agency, pre-departure orientation and skills training repatriation and reintegration programme, mechanism to eliminate recruitment malpractices, and extend help to nationals in need of consular assistance. For receiving countries, these are meant to inform migrant workers to comply with the medical examination requirements (prior departure and while working in the receiving country), possess basic knowledge on social and cultural, access to information, legal protection and access to justice, and consular assistance.
53. As a receiving country, Brunei already has policies for legal protection and access to justice, and consular assistance, but it is yet to have policies for social and cultural information programmes. Singapore and Malaysia, on the other hand, already have policies for social and cultural information programmes, access to information, training and education, legal protection and access to justice, and consular assistance in place. Malaysia's policies for social and cultural information programmes, however, are available only for countries having MOU with Malaysia.
54. As sending countries, Indonesia, Myanmar, and Viet Nam already have policies for sustainable alternatives to migration of workers, regulated recruitment agency, pre-departure orientation and skills training, repatriation and reintegration programme, mechanism to eliminate recruitment malpractices, and extend help to nationals who are in need of consular assistance. Cambodia, on the other hand, is yet to have any of these policies, while Lao PDR only has

policies for pre-departure orientation and skills training and repatriation and reintegration programme.

55. As both sending and receiving country, the Philippines have all the policies for sending countries in place, but it is yet to have policies for social and cultural information programmes, and access to information, training and education for incoming foreign migrant workers. Similarly in Thailand, it already has most policies for sending countries except policies for repatriation and reintegration programme. As a receiving country, it is yet to have policies for consular assistance.
56. Registered/approved migrant worker employment recruitment agencies are available in all AMS. With the exception of Indonesia, the Philippines, and Thailand, the number of registered/approved migrant worker employment recruitment agencies in all other AMS has increased since 2009.

C3. Promoting Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR)

57. As outlined in the ASCC Blueprint, ASEAN hopes to promote corporate social responsibility (CSR) within ASEAN in line with the strategic objective of ensuring that CSR is incorporated in the corporate agenda and to contribute towards sustainable socio-economic development in ASEAN Member States. However, there is no agreed indicator for promoting corporate social responsibility.
58. As a cross-sectoral objective, CSR is also a component of the ASEAN Intergovernmental Commission on Human Rights (AICHR)'s Work Plan. A baseline study on the nexus between business and human rights was published in 2014 under the purview of the AICHR. Part of its rationale is to support policy development in line with the strategic objective under C3 of the ASCC Blueprint. It also aimed to serve as the foundation for the establishment of a common framework to accelerate the promotion of CSR and human rights in the region. The study noted the diversity of CSR development among the AMS especially when membership in the ASEAN CSR Network and the number of signatories to the ten principles of the UN Global Compact are considered. Across AMS, there are 618 signatories (in various sectors) to the UN Global Compact.
59. The task of promoting CSR within ASEAN comes under the auspices of the ASEAN Foundation via the ASEAN CSR Network. ASEAN Leaders established

the ASEAN Foundation in 1997 to help bring about shared prosperity and a sustainable future for all ASEAN Member States. The ASEAN CSR Network was incorporated on 8 December 2010 in Singapore and launched on 11 January 2011. The Network serves as a regional network of CSR networks. They serve as a platform for networking, exchange of best practices and the facilitation of peer discussions at the regional level. The Network also serves as a repository of ASEAN knowledge on CSR through case studies and conduct. The Network is also a capacity builder and a CSR advocate.

60. Thus far, the ASEAN CSR Network has participated at the regional UN Global Compact Meeting. Exploratory meetings with representatives from foreign embassies and business networks have been held to discuss the possibilities for joint collaboration to promote CSR in the region. In 2010, the Network drafted a policy statement on CSR outlining how the business sector member countries of the Network would take account of the economic, social and environmental impact in the way they operate. In 2011, 2012, and 2013, the Network implemented and participated in a number of activities including a regional conference in Jakarta, and several CSR-themed international and regional workshops and seminars.



D. ENSURING ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY

61. ASEAN works towards achieving sustainable development as well as promoting clean and green environment by protecting the natural resource base for economic and social development including the sustainable management and conservation of soil, water, mineral, energy, biodiversity, forest, coastal and marine resources as well as the improvement in water and air quality for the ASEAN region. ASEAN aimed to actively participate in global efforts towards addressing global environmental challenges, including climate change and the ozone layer protection, as well as developing and adapting environmentally-sound technology for development needs and environmental sustainability. Overall, there are 28 indicators to assess the progress on ensuring environmental sustainability. Environmental Performance Index (EPI) is used as the overall indicator to monitor the progress of implementation of Characteristic D (Ensuring Environmental Sustainability) of the ASCC Blueprint. EPI gives scores to countries based on performance indicators tracked across policy categories that cover policy objectives of both environmental public health and ecosystem vitality. AMS' EPI scores in 2010 and 2012 reflect good and well-maintained environmental health and ecosystem vitality, with AMS' average EPI score of 57.95 in 2010, 56.63 excluding Lao PDR in 2012, and 49.02 in 2014. The Trend EPI shows overall positive improvements with an average AMS' Trend EPI score of 6.54. In the past ten years, the change in EPI was at a positive 3.23. In 2012, while Brunei Darussalam receives a Trend EPI score of -1.3, it received one of the highest EPI Score among AMS. Thailand was ranked one of the Top 10 Trend Index Performers (10th) among 132 countries in 2012. In 2014, Singapore's EPI improved dramatically to 81.78 from 56.36 in 2012, placing it at number 4 of global EPI ranking.

D1. Addressing Global Environmental Issues

62. The strategic objective of D1 is to effectively address global environmental issues without impinging on competitiveness, or social and economic development based on the principle of equity, flexibility, effectiveness, and

common but differentiated responsibility, respective capabilities as well as reflecting on different social and economic conditions.

63. ASEAN continues to be actively engaged in addressing global environmental issues and have shown full commitment to major multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs). Most AMS except Lao PDR and Myanmar have either ratified or acceded to the Basel Convention on Transboundary Movement of Hazardous Wastes. Most AMS except Brunei Darussalam and Malaysia have also either ratified or acceded to the Stockholm Convention, while all AMS have ratified or acceded to the Vienna Convention for the Protection of the Ozone Layer (Vienna Convention) and the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer (Montreal Protocol). AMS continue to comply with Basel Convention procedures for transboundary movement of hazardous wastes, as reflected by the increasing number of such movements done according to the Convention procedures. Accordingly, the cases of illegal transboundary movement of hazardous wastes decreased in number or almost none in several AMS. The first ten Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) targeted by the Stockholm Convention have been banned or severely restricted in AMS for years, resulting in zero consumption for the period under review. In line with their commitment to phase-out or minimize the use of ozone-depleting chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs) under the Montreal Protocol, all AMS have also drastically reduced their consumption to less than 1,000 tonnes per year since 2006 from as high as 9,000 tonnes per year in 1995, and to zero by 2010.

D2. Managing and Preventing Transboundary Environmental Pollution

64. The strategic objective of managing and preventing transboundary environmental pollution is to implement measures and enhance international and regional cooperation to combat transboundary environmental pollution, including haze pollution, transboundary movement of hazardous wastes through, among others, capacity building, enhancing public awareness, strengthening law enforcement, promoting environmentally sustainable practices as well as implement the ASEAN Agreement on Transboundary Haze Pollution.
65. The Governments of the ten ASEAN Member Countries signed the ASEAN Agreement on Transboundary Haze Pollution on 10 June 2002 in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia. The Agreement is the first regional arrangement in the world

that binds a group of contiguous states to tackle transboundary haze pollution resulting from land and forest fires. It has also been considered as a global role model for the tackling of transboundary issues. The Agreement requires the Parties to the Agreement to, among others, cooperate in developing and implementing measures to prevent, monitor, and mitigate transboundary haze pollution by controlling sources of land and/or forest fires, development of monitoring, assessment and early warning systems, exchange of information and technology, and the provision of mutual assistance.

66. In general, the ASEAN region has seen an improved air quality status in 2012 as compared to 2009, which is illustrated by the number of days with good air quality compared to moderate and unhealthy air quality. Air quality standards and monitoring programmes in the ASEAN region have been established reasonably well. AMS share data on PM10 (particulate matter of less than 10 micron) for regular reporting by the ASEAN Specialised Meteorological Centre (ASMC), which enables monitoring of the dispersion and impact of transboundary smoke haze in the region, in addition to reporting on the number of hotspots and weather outlook.
67. In early 2010, the southern ASEAN region experienced an increase in hotspots as compared to the same period in 2009, and later in the year experienced a brief dry spell and increase in hotspots. The northern ASEAN region experienced severe forest fires and transboundary haze pollution during the dry season in the first quarter in 3 consecutive years (2010 to 2012), mostly caused by slash-and-burn activities. In the first quarter of 2012, PM10 concentrations exceeded national standards and reached unhealthy levels especially in some districts of northern Thailand. In 2014, the number of hotspot counts across countries generally dropped with the exception of Cambodia, Malaysia, and the Philippines.
68. The Sub-regional Ministerial Steering Committee on Transboundary Haze Pollution in the Mekong Sub-region (MSC Mekong – comprising Cambodia, Lao PDR, Myanmar, Thailand and Viet Nam) in 2009 set sub-regional targets for hotspot count reduction and air quality. The first sub-regional target -to reduce cumulative hotspot counts not exceeding 75,000 hotspots based on 2008 data- to be achieved by 2011, has almost been met. The MSC Mekong countries agreed to work towards achieving the second sub-regional target of hotspot reduction - reducing cumulative hotspot count not exceeding 50,000 hotspots based on 2006 data- to be achieved by 2015. The cumulative hotspot counts in the MSC Mekong amounted to 99,160 in 2014.

69. ASEAN continues to implement concrete on-the-ground activities to address land and forest fires in the region, which include implementation of the ASEAN Peatland Management Strategy (2006-2020) to promote sustainable use of peatlands and alternative livelihoods, while preventing land and forest fires as peatlands are a major source of smoke haze in the region.

D3. Promoting Sustainable Development through Environmental Education and Public Participation

70. The strategic objective of promoting sustainable development through environmental education and public participation is to establish a clean and green ASEAN, rich in cultural traditions where the values and practices of the people are in accordance with the rhythm and harmony of nature, with citizens who are environmentally literate, imbued with the environmental ethic, and willing and capable to ensure the sustainable development of the region through environmental education and public participation efforts.
71. Most AMS have ongoing national eco-schools programmes / awards. At the regional level, ASEAN has also published the ASEAN Guidelines on Eco-schools, which serves as a reference and regional standard for environmentally friendly model schools in the region.
72. AMS are very active in implementing an extensive and increasing number and variety of environmental awareness activities, which are organised and participated by various stakeholders such as governments, private companies, universities, NGOs, civil society and youths. The activities include, among others, environment-related day / month celebrations, publication of environment-related resource materials, tree planting, 3R (reduce, reuse, recycle) and cleaning campaigns.
73. All AMS have incorporated environmental education (EE) elements into the formal curriculum at varying degrees at primary, secondary and tertiary levels. Some schools in Singapore and Thailand, for example, have even gone one step further by either developing an additional curriculum dedicated to environmental education or developing an entire curriculum in accordance with eco-school principles.

D4. Promoting Environmentally Sound Technology (EST)

74. The strategic objective of promoting Environmentally Sound Technology (EST) is to use environmentally sound technologies to achieve sustainable development with minimal impact on the environment.
75. Since agriculture and forestry are the foundation of the economies of many AMS, participation in certification programmes such as the Roundtable on Sustainable Palm Oil (RSPO) Certification, Sustainable Farm Certification (SFC) (Rainforest Alliance Certified Seal of Approval), and Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) Certification is vital in enhancing business competitiveness and economic profitability while maintaining environmental health and social equity of the region.
76. Recognising the benefits of such certifications to society, businesses and environment in the region, AMS have intensified their efforts to apply for and meet the standards of such certifications. There has been a significant increase in the number of RSPO-certified mills for palm oil in AMS over the recent years, from 28 mills in 2009 to 187 and 277 mills in 2013 and 2015 (as of 22 April 2015) respectively. The participation of AMS in RSPO certification has also expanded, from only Indonesia and Malaysia having RSPO-certified mills in 2009 to Cambodia, Indonesia, Malaysia and Thailand by 2013.
77. The number of Rainforest Alliance Certified Farms has also increased from 19 certified farms in 2009 to 74 in 2013. The total FSC certified forest areas and the number of FSC certifications in AMS have both more than doubled in recent years, from 1,323,781 ha (20 certifications) in 2009 to 2,442,485 ha (52 certifications) in 2013, and 3,025,595 (69 certifications) as of June 2015.
78. Six AMS have ongoing eco-labelling schemes to encourage sustainable production, i.e. Ekolabel (Indonesia), SIRIM Eco-labelling Scheme (Malaysia), Green Choice Seal of Approval and National Eco-labelling Programme – Green Choice Philippines (NELP-GCP) (Philippines), Mandatory Energy Labelling Scheme (MELS) and Water Efficiency Labelling Scheme (WLS) (Singapore), Thai Green Label and Green Production (Thailand) and Viet Nam Green Label (Viet Nam).

79. The management of waste is a key challenge for AMS. In 2012 and 2015, the total municipal waste of AMS has slightly increased compared to that in 2009 as a result of increasing population and urbanisation.
80. AMS are intensifying efforts to strengthen their policy and legal frameworks for the management of waste. Some AMS have formulated new and specific legislations to govern the management of municipal solid waste and industrial waste, apart from their existing environmental regulations. Most AMS have also embarked on nation-wide awareness campaigns to gain public acceptance and participation in 3R (reduce, reuse, recycle).

D5. Promoting Quality Living Standards in ASEAN Cities/ Urban Areas

81. The strategic objective of promoting quality living in ASEAN cities/urban areas is to ensure cities/urban areas in ASEAN are environmentally sustainable, while meeting the social and economic needs of the people.
82. ASEAN has initiated the ASEAN Environmentally Sustainable City (ESC) Award programme to showcase and promote exemplary efforts, and will work on initiatives such as low carbon society, compact cities, eco-cities and environmentally sustainable transport.
83. The third ASEAN ESC Award Programme was held at the side lines of the 15th Informal ASEAN Ministerial Meeting on Environment (IAMME) in Vientiane on 30 October 2014. The 2nd Certificates of Recognition for Clean Air, Clean Water, and Clean Land were awarded to ten cities in ASEAN. The number of awardees has increased since the previous award programme in 2011 and it indicates greater awareness and efforts for sustainable living in more cities in ASEAN.
84. ASEAN continues to promote its efforts in urban environmental management as indicated by the number of cities receiving positive ratings from external organisations in recognition of cities' achievements / efforts in urban living.

D6. Harmonising Environmental Policies and Databases

85. The strategic objective of harmonising environmental policies and databases is to promote feasible efforts to harmonise on a step-by-step basis environmental policies and databases, taking into account the national circumstances of Member States, to support the integration of the environmental, social, and economic goals of the region.
86. AMS have taken an active part in several regional agreements/instruments on environment in the region, e.g. the ASEAN Agreement on Transboundary Haze Pollution (AATHP), ASEAN Heritage Parks (AHP) Programme, Partnership in the Environmental Management for the Seas of East Asia (PEMSEA), the Coordinating Body on the Seas of East Asia (COBSEA), Coral Triangle Initiative on Coral Reefs, Fisheries, and Food Security (CTI-CFF), Sulu-Sulawesi Marine Eco-region (SSME), Mekong River Commission (MRC), Brunei Darussalam-Indonesia-Malaysia-Philippines East Asia Growth Area (BIMP-EAGA).
87. A number of environmental indicators have been harmonised across AMS in 2009, i.e. Key Indicators for Clean Air, Clean Land and Clean Water, ASEAN Marine Water Quality Criteria, ASEAN Criteria for Marine Heritage Areas, Criteria for Nomination of ASEAN Heritage Parks, and Millennium Development Goals (MDG) Indicators on Ensuring Environmental Sustainability. In 2012, ASEAN has adopted new criteria for Recognition of Eco-schools. These harmonized environmental indicators are expected to guide ASEAN towards the establishment of harmonized quantitative information databases, both at national and regional levels.
88. At the national level, several AMS publish national environment reports regularly. At the regional level, ASEAN publishes its State of the Environment Report (SoER) once every three years. The Report, among others, showcases the status of environmental performance and state of natural resources, highlights emerging challenges and policy responses, and serves to inform and invite collaboration for regional cooperation in ASEAN. The first ASEAN SoER was published in 1997. The second and third SoER were published in 2000 and 2006 respectively, while in 2002 a special issue of the SoER was published as the ASEAN Report to the World Summit on Sustainable Development, held in Johannesburg, South Africa. The Fourth ASEAN State of the Environment Report was launched by the Ministers during the 11th AMME in October 2009.

D7. Promoting the Sustainable Use of Coastal and Marine Environment

89. The strategic objective of promoting the sustainable use of coastal and marine environment is to ensure ASEAN's coastal and marine environment are sustainably managed; representative ecosystems, pristine areas and species are protected; economic activities are sustainably managed; and public awareness of the coastal and marine environment instilled.

90. As of 2012, three (3) Marine Protected Areas from Myanmar (Lampi Marine National Park) and Thailand (Tarutao National Park and Ao Phang-Nga - Mu Koh Surin- Mu Koh Similan National Park) are listed as ASEAN Heritage Parks. As of October 2014, Tubbatha Reef National Park in the Philippines was added to the list, making the total number of marine protected areas listed as ASEAN Heritage Parks to four (4).

91. Most AMS have integrated coastal management strategies in place to promote sustainable management of their coastal and marine resources. At the regional level, ASEAN has published the ASEAN Marine Water Quality Management Guidelines and Monitoring Manual to provide guidance on a set of common approaches and methodologies that address marine water quality issues in ASEAN, including recommended methods for the implementation of marine water quality monitoring programmes.

D8. Promoting Sustainable Management of Natural Resources and Biodiversity

92. The strategic objective of promoting sustainable management of natural resources and biodiversity is to ensure ASEAN's rich biological diversity is conserved and sustainably managed toward enhancing social, economic and environmental well-being.

93. The extent of protected areas in AMS such as Cambodia and Thailand is more than 20 percent of their land area, while in Brunei Darussalam, Indonesia, Lao PDR, and the Philippines it is over 10 percent each. The positive trend towards increase of protected areas coverage among AMS between 2009 and 2015 reflects the continuous efforts to contribute to the achievement of the 2010

Convention of Biological Diversity (CBD) target to protect at least 10 percent of the world's major forest types and other ecologically significant habitats.

94. The ASEAN region has a total of 35 ASEAN Heritage Parks (AHPs) in 2014, an increase from 31 and 27 AHPs in 2012 and 2009. The AHP Programme serves as a regional network of national protected areas of high conservation importance preserving a complete spectrum of representative ecosystem to generate greater awareness, pride, appreciation, enjoyment, and conservation of ASEAN's rich natural heritage. AHPs are distributed as follows: Brunei Darussalam – 1; Cambodia – 2; Indonesia – 3; Lao PDR – 1; Malaysia – 3; Myanmar – 7; Philippines – 7; Singapore – 2; Thailand – 4; and Viet Nam – 5. The ASEAN Centre for Biodiversity (ACB) serves as the Secretariat of the ASEAN Heritage Parks Program.
95. In recent times AMS have accorded priority in protecting major ecosystems and habitats through regional initiatives focusing on large, biologically rich and critical ecosystems. Biodiversity corridors covering transboundary protected areas, particularly in conserving the remaining large rainforest areas, have been launched and initiated.
96. A wide variation exists on the status of biosafety regulations in the ASEAN region. Some countries have operational regulations, while others have yet to put in place relevant regulations. Cambodia, Indonesia, Malaysia and the Philippines have regulations and operational systems on biosafety in place; Thailand does not have legislation specifically for biosafety but is included in other relevant sectoral regulations. Viet Nam's biosafety regulations are still under development, and Lao PDR and Myanmar have yet to initiate drafting of biosafety regulations. The ASEAN harmonized guidelines on risk assessment of agriculture-related GMOs was adopted in 1999, being the first step in the region's efforts to keep at par with global developments in agricultural biotechnology.
97. Efforts to establish a national clearing-house mechanism for effective information services to facilitate the implementation of national biodiversity strategies and action plans has been further strengthened through the support of the ASEAN Centre for Biodiversity (ACB).

D9. Promoting the Sustainability of Freshwater Resources

98. The strategic objective of promoting the sustainability of fresh water resources is to ensure equitable accessibility and sufficient water quantity of acceptable quality to meet the needs of the people of ASEAN.
99. In 2006, the ASEAN region had about 86 percent of its population using improved water sources, which is about the same as the world average. With the advancement of technologies and rise in concern for human health, many AMS have placed strong emphasis on the need to improve drinking water sources. In 2012, 100 percent of the population in Brunei Darussalam, Singapore, and Thailand had access to improved water sources while in Malaysia and the Philippines, the figure is around 90 percent. In 2015, further improvements are observed in Cambodia, Indonesia Lao PDR, Malaysia, and the Philippines. Particularly in Indonesia, the percentage increased from 44 percent in 2012 to 87 percent in 2015.
100. In terms of improved sanitation facilities, Cambodia, Lao PDR, Philippines, Thailand and Viet Nam have made great progress in 2012 compared to 2006. In 2006, the regional average was about 74 percent, which is above the world average of 60 percent. These developments are on track to achieve the United Nations' Millennium Development Goal (MDG) target of universal access to safe drinking water and basic sanitation by 2015. In 2015, the regional average was 77.2 percent, which was a 2.1percent increase from the average value in 2012.

D10. Responding to Climate Change and Addressing Its Impacts

101. The strategic objective of responding to climate change and addressing its impacts is to enhance regional and international cooperation to address the issue of climate change and its impacts on socio-economic development, health and the environment, in ASEAN Member States through implementation of mitigation and adaptation measures, based on the principles of equity, flexibility, effectiveness, common but differentiated responsibilities, respective capabilities, as well as reflecting on different social and economic conditions.

102. ASEAN has played its active and leadership role in addressing climate change in the global community. All AMS have ratified/acceded to both the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and the Kyoto Protocol, whose ultimate objective is to achieve “stabilization of greenhouse gas concentrations in the atmosphere at a level that would prevent dangerous anthropogenic interference with the climate system.”
103. Since GHG emission is a global measure in the context of climate change, and Parties to the UNFCCC are required to submit GHG inventory data (1994 and 2000) in their National Communications based on standardised reporting requirements under the UNFCCC, GHG emission in 1994 and 2000 is used as baseline and mid-term indicators respectively for D10. The data was collected from the initial and second National Communications submitted by ASEAN countries to UNFCCC. For uniformity, the data used is the net GHG emission in Gigagram CO₂ equivalent (including both emission and removal of GHGs). Because of differences in reporting years and methodologies, however, these data are not generally considered comparable across countries. Indonesia, Lao PDR, Singapore, and Viet Nam showed an increase in their GHG emissions, but Malaysia showed significant GHG emission reductions. Malaysia, in particular, has cut its GHG emission from 75,597 Gigagram CO₂ equivalent in 1994 to -26,796 Gigagram CO₂ equivalent in 2000, making it a net sink country together with Cambodia and Myanmar.
104. ASEAN is committed to play a proactive role in addressing climate change issues, as reflected in the Leaders’ Statements on Climate Change at their 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011 Summits. ASEAN have also been responding to climate change by focusing on the implementation of relevant actions in the ASEAN Socio-Cultural Community (ASCC) Blueprint 2009-2015 and the Action Plan on Joint Response to Climate Change.



E. BUILDING ASEAN IDENTITY

105. As outlined in the ASCC Blueprint, the ASEAN identity is the basis of Southeast Asia's regional interests. It is our collective personality, norms, values and beliefs as well as aspirations as one ASEAN community. ASEAN aims to mainstream and promote greater awareness and common values in the spirit of unity in diversity at all levels of society. To this end, there are four elements (i.e. E1 to E4), each with its own strategic objective, within this characteristic.
106. There are ten agreed indicators for E as shown in the table below. However, the data reported by AMS to the ASEAN Secretariat is not enough to assess the progress from 2009 to 2015. Data tables for the indicators are not available for these indicators as less than five AMS reported on these indicators.

Elements	Indicators
E1	Government expenditure on cultural and information activities to promote ASEAN Awareness year by year
	Number of ASEAN activities involved in culture and information conducted year by year
	Number of participants involved in culture and information conducted year by year
	Number of programmes or news items or stories produced per year for ATN and AiA as the key platforms to promote ASEAN identity
E2	Number of nationally designated cultural heritage sites and visitors thereto
	Number of activities and participants involved related to ASEAN instruments/ mechanisms on cultural heritage
	Government expenditure on conservation and preservation on cultural heritage year by year
E3	Number of ASEAN activities and participants involved related to cultural creativity and industry
	Number of intra-ASEAN support networks on cultural industries and participants involved in each network
E4	Number of activities on volunteers programme with focus on assisting communities conducted per year

E1. Promotion of ASEAN Awareness and a Sense of Community

107. The strategic objective of Section E1, Promotion of ASEAN Awareness and a Sense of Community, is to create a sense of belonging, consolidate unity in diversity and enhance deeper mutual understanding among ASEAN Member States about their cultures, history, religions, and civilizations.

108. ASEAN adopted the ASCC Communication Plan in April 2010, which aims to enhance public awareness, thereby generate public support and participation. The Plan has supported efforts on ensuring that the region will feel the impact and benefit of an ASEAN Community that is people-centred and socially responsible. The ASCC Communication Plan pursued its objectives by enhancing ASEAN's inherent resource and strength found in its diverse and rich cultural heritage and traditions, its people, and especially the youth. Several programs and activities were developed in light of this direction, which included ASEAN Cultural Festivals, ASCC for Students, ASEAN Social and Culture Channel Programs, ASCC in Sight Media Program, etc.

109. Even before the ASCC Communication Plan, collective efforts to enhance ASEAN awareness and understanding were started since 2000 following the adoption of the Memorandum of Understanding among the ASEAN Ministers Responsible for Information (AMRI) on the National Communication Plans to Promote ASEAN Awareness and Understanding in October 2000, in Ha Noi, at the 6th Conference of AMRI. In light of that, various projects and activities have been initiated and are being implemented under the national communication plans, and the socio-cultural aspects in the ASCC Communication Plan.

110. To further raise ASEAN awareness and deliver an overarching message about ASEAN, covering all aspects of society be it political security, economic or socio-cultural matters, the ASEAN Communication Master Plan (ACMP) was adopted in October 2014. In addition to the National Communication Plan and ASCC Communication Plan, the ACMP aims to have multi-faceted programmes through various public outreach activities. The ACMP underscores the message that an integrated ASEAN Community will promote shared and equal opportunities for ASEAN's stakeholders, and ASEAN brings new opportunities to the people of ASEAN and the broader global community.

111. With all three communication plans, at both national and regional level, ASEAN has adopted a holistic approach to engage and deliver ASEAN's message to our people. For example, AMS have been using a series of media platforms such as print, broadcast and multimedia materials to produce and disseminate information about ASEAN. This includes, amongst others, ASEAN in Action (for radio), ASEAN Television News Programmes, media exchanges, editors' dialogue, ASEAN Quiz, exchange of media personnel, social media such as Facebook and Twitter, ASCC media clip, and working towards a comprehensive ASEAN Virtual Learning Resource Centre (AVLRC) website. Through such initiatives, ASEAN has facilitated the exchange and sharing of media content, information and expertise to support a robust information and media sector wherein the peoples of ASEAN have more access to information, better understand about the peoples in ASEAN, their lifestyles, culture and aspirations of the wider ASEAN community.
112. Efforts have also been made to promote ASEAN awareness amongst the youth. The ASEAN Youth Volunteers' Programme (AYVP) and the ASEAN Young Professionals Volunteer Corps (AYPVC) are concrete initiatives engaging young people at different levels to serve our community and strengthen our bonds. These programs have different focuses, e.g. environment and culture heritage, amongst others. Youth focused programs have also been implemented by other organisations, such as the Southeast Asian Ministers of Education Organisation (SEAMEO), and these have expanded their reach to local communities and have thus helped to sustain ASEAN identity-building amongst the youth.
113. The ASEAN Awareness and Attitudes – A Ten Nation Survey was conducted by the Institute of Southeast Asian Studies in collaboration with the ASEAN Foundation in 2014. This survey updated the findings of the 2007 survey. The 2014 survey measured (1) attitudes towards ASEAN, (2) knowledge about the region and the Association, (3) orientation towards the region and countries, (4) sources of information about the region, and (5) aspirations for integration and action. The 2014 survey added questions to gauge: (1) how the students across the region think about ASEAN and its members and; (2) students' perceptions of similarity and difference amongst ASEAN countries. A total of 4,623 undergraduate students from the ten ASEAN Member States took part in the survey. The average respondent's age was 20.5 years old. Amongst the findings, most countries displayed ASEAN-positive attitudes. Over 80% agreed with the statement "I feel I am a citizen of ASEAN" compared with over 75% in the 2007 survey. The survey results demonstrated an overall increase

in the awareness and knowledge of ASEAN and students seemed to consider themselves “citizens” of ASEAN. Stronger ASEAN-enthusiasm is observed in Cambodia, Lao PDR, Myanmar and Viet Nam. Objective knowledge of ASEAN improved in 2014, with greater recognition of the ASEAN flag. In 2014, the most salient countries in ASEAN among the respondents are Thailand and Malaysia while the most familiar to all respondents are Thailand and Singapore. From 2007 to 2014, respondents shifted from economic cooperation as the most important aspect of regional integration to tourism. Political cooperation is still considered the least important aspect of integration.

114. The Surveys on ASEAN Community Building Effort 2012 commissioned by ASEAN, with funding from the Japan-ASEAN Integration Fund, focused on the perception of the business sector, civil society organisations and the general public on ASEAN community-building initiatives. The survey suggests that while 76% of the general public respondents lack a basic understanding of ASEAN, 81% is familiar with the ASEAN name. The survey also concludes that businesses and the general public perceive ASEAN integration as having positive impacts on ASEAN, with the latter believing that ASEAN will help bring peace and security throughout the region. The survey also provides insights on the sources of information and communication channels for promoting ASEAN. Traditional mass media (such as TV and newspapers) remain effective to both businesses and the general public. Meanwhile, the internet is regarded as important in connecting with the ASEAN people, especially in getting their feedback on certain issues. The study confirms that familiarity with ASEAN is generally prevalent but it also poses a challenge on deepening the public’s understanding of ASEAN.
115. To inculcate a deeper sense of belonging to ASEAN, other initiatives are being implemented such as educational platforms for our people to learn more about ASEAN and to develop bonds amongst other peoples through sports. The ASEAN Curriculum Sourcebook was developed as a toolkit for teachers to incorporate ASEAN themes into classes in all subject areas in primary and secondary schools, while ASEAN-level sporting events (e.g. SEA Games) are promoted in the media. Some national libraries and national museums have set up ASEAN Corners, and in 2015, Thailand opened the ASEAN Cultural Centre in Bangkok.
116. Many regular culture and art activities were implemented to highlight the richness and diverse cultures in ASEAN. Such initiatives as the ASEAN Ancient Cities Network, ASEAN Youth Camp, ASEAN Festival of Arts and the ASEAN

City of Culture have reaffirmed ASEAN's continued efforts to foster greater awareness of the cultural heritage of the region and supported joint programs for the appreciation of cultural diversity and the people's common values. For example, the ASEAN City of Culture initiative was launched to strengthen ASEAN identity and promote people-to-people engagement. The 1st ASEAN City of Culture (2010-2011) were Manila, Cebu and Clark (Pampanga province) in the Philippines. The 2nd ASEAN City of Culture (2012-2013) was Singapore. The 3rd ASEAN City of Culture (2014-2015) is Hue City in Viet Nam. The City of Culture initiative has helped raise the profile of some of ASEAN's culturally thriving cities through cultural exchanges with AMS, and the implementation of high visibility art and cultural festivals (e.g. literature, film, music, puppetry, etc.).

117. Through the support of, and partnership with, key institutions, raising ASEAN awareness has become a shared effort. The ASEAN Foundation, established on 15 December 1997, has contributed to the building of the ASEAN identity. The ASEAN Foundation was given two objectives: (1) to promote greater awareness of ASEAN, and greater interaction among the peoples of ASEAN as well as their wider participation in ASEAN's activities, and (2) to contribute to the evolution of a development cooperation strategy. To help achieve the objective of E1, the ASEAN Foundation, aside from supporting ASEAN projects, has continued to enhance the promotion of ASEAN awareness through various media such as digital media, exhibitions, and accommodating visits to the ASEAN Foundation Secretariat from diplomatic officials, journalists, and students. Educational institutions and other organisations have also contributed to engagement in arts and culture with the wider community. In 2015, the ASEAN-Japan Arts Colleges Network was established. Non-government organisations such as the ASEAN Puppetry Association, ASEAN Traditional Textile Arts Community, AirAsia Foundation and SEAMEO, amongst others, have helped reinforce ASEAN identity-building through their activities. Through the partnership with ASEAN's Dialogue Partners, the youth have been engaged in various cultural exchanges aiming to foster inter-cultural understanding.

E2. Preservation and Promotion of ASEAN Cultural Heritage

118. The strategic objective of Section E2, Preservation and Promotion of ASEAN Cultural Heritage, is to promote the conservation and preservation of ASEAN cultural heritage to ensure its continuity and to enhance people's awareness

and understanding of the unique history of the region and the cultural similarities and differences between and among ASEAN Member States as well as to protect the distinctiveness of ASEAN cultural heritage as a whole.

119. ASEAN now has over twenty UNESCO-listed world cultural heritage sites. The sites are diverse – from ancient cities to places of worship to centres of trade – thus, showing the distinct character of the region as a place in constant cultural flux and dynamism. Many more cultural sites are being documented and some are being processed for UNESCO enlistment. ASEAN has promoted these sites of historical importance not only as markers of the peoples’ achievements through the ages, but also to highlight the many cultural similarities and the shared histories of the member states.
120. One of the key documents that serves as one of the frameworks for implementing E2 is the ASEAN Declaration on Cultural Heritage of 2000, which reaffirms the AMS’s commitment to protect, preserve and promote all types of cultural heritage (tangible and intangible). Through the document, AMS also expressed their resolve to cooperate towards the protection of cultural heritage, preserve and sustain living traditions, document intellectual heritage, encourage and support the preservation of outstanding “popular” traditions and undertake cultural education for cultural awareness and literacy.
121. Programmes to develop the professional competence of cultural heritage managers have been implemented to support E2. These include, amongst others, a three-day workshop on the Prevention of Illicit Transfer and Illegal Trafficking on Cultural Properties in ASEAN Region in 2009, Conference on the Future of Preservation in 2014 and several other workshops that looked at best practices on cultural policies and cultural preservation. Capacity building initiatives have also been developed to focus on preservation techniques for cultural artefacts and museum curatorship. There have been efforts to preserve and develop traditional handicraft techniques and traditions. ASEAN and its related agencies have undertaken projects to nurture talents and promote interactions among ASEAN scholars, artists, and practitioners to help preserve and promote ASEAN cultural diversity.
122. There have been continued efforts to develop the skills and knowledge of ASEAN’s heritage managers and professionals through the sharing of expertise and best practices in ancient cities preservation and management as well as techniques on document preservation (e.g. palm leaf preservation and filigranology) and digital documentation.

123. To transmit the knowledge and skills on heritage preservation and management, one of the key projects has been ASEAN Youth Heritage Leaders: The Development of ASEAN Youth Heritage Leaders through Volunteerism and Community Engagement, implemented in 2014. After the programme, the ASEAN Youth Heritage Leaders are expected to apply the knowledge gained and to implement similar projects in their respective countries.

E3. Promotion of Cultural Creativity and Industry

124. The strategic objective of E3. Promotion of Cultural Creativity and Industry is to enhance ASEAN identity and togetherness through cultural creativity and the promotion of and cooperation in the cultural industries. Both the Declaration on ASEAN Unity in Cultural Diversity: Towards Strengthening the ASEAN Community of 2011 and the Hue Declaration on Culture for ASEAN Community's Sustainable Development of 2014 recognise the importance of cultural creativity and industries in cultural preservation and education as well as promoting livelihood in communities. The Hue Declaration, in particular, emphasises local culture as a potential source of innovation and creativity, thus, ASEAN has to encourage the creation of opportunities for people to interpret and develop cultural products and expressions.
125. To achieve this objective, ASEAN promoted the development of cultural industry resources by facilitating collaborations and networking between and among small and medium-sized cultural enterprises (SMCEs). ASEAN has organised the following relevant programmes: Forum on SMCEs, ASEAN Traditional Woven Splendor, Seminar-Workshop on Smart Partnership in the Business of SMCEs, ASEAN Performance Arts Mart, Improving the Current Status of ASEAN Mastercraft Designers, and Regional Forum on Creative Industry Mapping. These events helped enhance the capacity of national institutions to manage and develop cultural industries and support livelihood generation and the commercialisation of local cultural products and services for domestic and international markets.

E4. Engagement with the Community

126. The strategic objective of Section E4. Engagement with the Community is to inculcate an ASEAN identity and build a people-oriented ASEAN where people

are at the centre of community building, through the participation of all sectors of society.

127. The ASEAN Committee on Culture and Information (ASEAN COCI) initiated its flagship project supporting the restoration efforts of sites hit by typhoon Haiyan and the earthquake in the Visayas Islands in the Philippines in 2014. ASEAN COCI, in partnership with National Commission for Culture and the Arts of the Philippines, provided a grant to 20 Schools of Living Traditions damaged by the typhoon and for the restoration of the Sta. Monica Church in Panay, Capiz Province. This contributes to ASEAN-wide support for the Philippines' on-going recovery and rehabilitation efforts in the affected regions.
128. ASEAN has also actively promoted people-to-people engagement, fostered the contribution of culture and arts to the development of local communities, and enhanced the image of local communities in the eyes of their own people. For example, ASEAN was titled and featured at the ASEAN International Film Festival and Awards in Kuching, Manila World Premieres Film Festival in Manila, George Town Festival in Penang, etc.
129. Other collaborative efforts with sub-regional organisations, academia, local governments, the private sector, civil society organisations, non-government organisations, and foundations are being pursued to build strong links, raise our profile and make ASEAN relevant to our people, thereby providing more opportunities for the community. ASEAN has identified a number of action plans to further its engagement with community such as working with ASEAN-affiliated non-governmental organizations, convening the annual ASEAN Social Forum and the ASEAN Civil Society Conference, and supporting youth to participate in humanitarian missions.



ASEAN: A Community of Opportunities

 ASEAN

 @ASEAN

 www.asean.org