



Report of Proceedings

The Inaugural ASEAN Ministerial Workshop

Navigating the Headwinds of Change

25 – 26 April 2017
Sunway University

By Clarissa Ai Ling Lee

Contents

Executive Summary -----	2
Country Cases -----	6
I. <i>Malaysia</i> -----	6
II. <i>Indonesia</i> -----	7
III. <i>Lao PDR</i> -----	7
IV. <i>The Philippines</i> -----	8
V. <i>Vietnam</i> -----	9
VI. <i>Thailand</i> -----	10
VII. <i>Singapore</i> -----	10
VIII. <i>Australia</i> -----	11
Critical Areas Requiring Further Work -----	12
I. <i>Private-Public Collaboration</i> -----	12
II. <i>Economic inequities and gender inequality</i> -----	12
III. <i>Behaviour Modification</i> -----	13
IV. <i>Data</i> -----	13
Appendix 1: Integrated Summary of Jeffrey D Sachs’s Lectures at the ASEAN Ministers workshop, April 25, 2017. -----	14
Appendix 2: List of Participants -----	18

Executive Summary

The launch of the Sustainable Development Goals on September 25, 2015 coincided with the onset of new phases in the national developmental plans of a number of the ASEAN countries represented at the workshop, specifically Malaysia, Indonesia, Vietnam, the Philippines, Thailand and Laos PDR. These countries have seen varying degrees of successes in their adoption of the eight Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) as determined by the conditions of their social economies at the time of the MDGs' adoption. However, the MDGs were criticized for being too unambitious, silo-like, and top-down to the extent of neglecting other stakeholders such as the private sector, civil society, and academia.

Most of these states adopted a separate roadmap for the implementation of SDGs in addition to their national developmental plans, with the exception of the Philippines, which has incorporated its roadmap into its main national development plans. However, each of the countries cherry-picked from the 169 targets as not all were deemed feasible for implementation due to the varying capacity of these countries, their priority areas and geopolitical conditions. Moreover, each state has its own interpretation of how well the aspirational timeline of Agenda 2030 could synchronise with their national needs, as well as what the SDGs, their targets and indicators could mean for their governments.

The ministerial representatives of the ASEAN countries in attendance acknowledged that better communication and collaboration among the different agencies and ministries are required for better planning and implementation of projects and initiatives that could ensure that no one is left behind, particularly in areas that had languished during the period of the implementation of the MDGs. More developed countries such as Australia, as part of their geopolitical strategy and foreign policy, had contributed to fulfilling the MDGs across a segment of the most under-developed and impoverished regions of the ASEAN countries, and will continue their support through the SDGs at domestic and international scales. However, the present time sees the need of a different approach to tackling SDGs, compared to the MDGs, as the technologies of communication and information and the technological savvy of the current generation have evolved considerably since the turn of the twenty-first century.

The ministerial representatives shared several consensuses on major improvements to be made, which are:

1. To ensure all developmental programmes are inclusive and able to tackle growing inequities, with consideration also for gender equality.
2. To eradicate the many faces of poverty found in their communities.
3. To reconsider the extant healthcare infrastructures and delivery systems.
4. To intensify the development of human capital through improved educational quality and rigour.
5. To strengthen infrastructures for improving interconnectivity between communities and supporting sustainable economic activities.
6. To move away from economic systems dependent on demand for raw natural resources and commodities, and towards value added services that are environmentally friendly and sustainable.

The proceedings from the workshop point to the keenness of the ASEAN governments, even the most impoverished, to embrace the SDGs as they realise how much the sustainability of their governance and satisfaction of their constituencies are dependent on their ability to meet these goals. What is to come is the need for long-term research and continuous innovation and improvement in the design of projects aimed at meeting the targets of the SDGs, especially considering the unique needs of ASEAN countries with their different levels of development.

What is to come is the need for long-term research and continuous innovation and improvement in the design of projects aimed at meeting the targets of the SDGs, especially considering the unique needs of ASEAN countries with their different levels of development.

As the drafting of roadmaps and national masterplans for incorporation into the respective international developmental plans have been taking place at the uppermost level, the discussion at the workshop has not ventured much beyond descriptions of priority areas and types of programmes that could be implemented, or previous accomplishments under the MDGs. In going beyond the foundation laid in the workshop, there is a need to consider the mechanisms and processes required to make the carrying out of such projects feasible. Moreover, the cost versus benefits of the projects over the

short and long-term, including less tangible benefits, have to be considered in assessing the impact of these projects on their intended beneficiaries.

The ministerial representatives and other participants voiced their concerns over the capacity of governments to budget for programmes mooted under their respective SDG roadmaps, and/or national agendas. Questions were raised on how to make the administration of the SDGs more inclusive of various stakeholders, many of whom would like to be included in future deliberations of their national developmental programme agendas.

In having to look for sources of financing, expertise and help in meeting performance metrics, governments are turning to the private sector as partners. Nevertheless, government-private collaboration should not be a blanket consideration for every developing state. Much depends on the level of maturity of the private sector in the respective countries, as well as the relationships between the governments and corporations. Multi-national corporations that benefit from resource extraction in the least developed countries should be encouraged to do more for the profits they have reaped, but without jeopardizing the sovereignty of the source nations.

In having to look for sources of financing, expertise and help in meeting performance metrics, governments are turning to the private sector as partners. Nevertheless, government-private collaboration should not be a blanket consideration for every developing state.

The workshop saw the convening of experts from other sectors such as think-tanks, academia, and policy consultancies. Due to logistical constraints, most were from Malaysia. Most presentations were policy-centric, although in the mix were also case scenarios from industry and scholarly research, all with social and technological implications. The topics covered were biodiversity, renewable energy resources, urbanization, healthcare, clean water, gender equality, poverty, sanitation, and education. While there was a discernible general aspiration for achieving the goals of Agenda 2030, a number of the workshop presenters were cautiously optimistic about their respective nations' ability to meet the targets.

The workshop represents a very serious attempt, not only of raising consciousness within the ASEAN context, but at promoting regional and global thinking in the pursuit of the SDGs. Moreover, changes have to happen at every level, from the physical to the

psychological, in order for sustainability projects to withstand initial resistance and succeed. In its identification of issues to be tackled, it was the aspiration of the workshop to pave the way forward when it comes to translating the idealism of the SDGs into addressing everyday challenges.

Changes have to happen at every level, from the physical to the psychological, in order for sustainability projects to withstand initial resistance and succeed.

Country Cases

Across the board, the driving motive for ASEAN governments is the development of people centric initiatives for increased inclusivity. Therefore, the greatest challenge is in balancing between the material needs of burgeoning populations and the conservation of environment and its resources. While seven of the ASEAN states were represented during the meeting, three more ASEAN states were not present, namely Brunei, Cambodia, and Myanmar. Australia was present to discuss their role in Southeast Asia, especially as a developmental partner and donor state.

I. Malaysia

“Pursuing Green Growth for Sustainability and Resilience” makes up the fourth strategic thrust of the Eleventh Malaysian Plan for accelerating Malaysia’s socio-economic development. Malaysia is undertaking Agenda 2030 in three phases: 2016 to 2020; 2020 to 2025; and 2025 to 2030; and has already built in the first phase into the Eleventh Malaysia Plan. One of the largest challenges for the government is the management of short-term demands with longer-term ones. Malaysia pours a lot of resources into disaster mitigation, the improvement of water quality and the accessibility and management of the nation’s forested areas.

There were discussions concerning the rejuvenation of rivers; how to harness wetlands and urban lakes in sustainable development; and how to make sense of the current direction towards decarbonisation. Malaysia also intends to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions by 45% by 2030 from the 2005 emission levels, as promised by the present Prime Minister during the 2015 United Nations Climate Change Conference (COP 21). In addition, the state is faced with effects of extreme weather conditions, as the cycle of its wet and dry seasons have altered considerably, with a widening gap between areas of high and low rainfall as coastal areas are facing the constant risk of floods.

Attempts at managing the prerequisites of green growth while also catering to the needs of widespread urbanisation could lead to the development of short-term measures that could compromise long-term sustainability planning. One problem area is transportation: the government is continuing to expand the public transport infrastructure. At the same time, more highways are still being built in urban areas. How

this will affect the behaviour of commuters, as well as impact GHG reduction and green growth needs more looking into.

Malaysia's educational institutions are also developing programmes, such as the Living Labs in University of Malaya, to provide the research required for the implementation of national sustainability goals.

II. Indonesia

As the largest ASEAN country, Indonesia has an enormous burden to shoulder in achieving the SDGs. Interestingly, Indonesia had reported achieving 18 targets and 67 indicators across 8 SDGs over the MDG period. Nonetheless, Indonesia is very aware and frank about the challenges it faces in its attempts to deal with problems such as pit-burning and deforestation; CO2 emission levels, access to water and sanitation facilities; and lacklustre economic performance. There are still marked inter-district and inter-province achievement gaps; the lack of integrated data and inconsistency of measurements between provinces and districts bear upon the ability to plan for, and implement, the required development.

The new government instituted in 2014, a year before the SDGs were launched, brought a window of opportunity for mainstreaming the SDGs into the nation's developmental plans that were being drawn up at the time. The immediate goals for Indonesia will be narrowing their inter-district and inter-province achievement gaps and narrowing the disparity between the Javanese and the other ethnic groups in their share of the economic pie. In addition, before Indonesia can consider the possibility of providing its people with drinkable tap water, it should first strive to ensure clean water for all.

III. Lao PDR

Lao PDR is among the least developed of the ASEAN countries, due to it being both landlocked and lacking in connectivity among its various provinces. The advantage of being landlocked, however, is that, unlike its neighbours, it does not face risks of floods due to rising sea levels. At the same time, being less developed means that the country can chart a path of sustainable development that does not repeat the mistakes of its neighbours. To do so, it would need the support of the international community, not merely to finance its developmental plans, but also to up-skill its people so that they can make meaningful contributions in their communities.

Unlike the other ASEAN countries, Lao PDR has an additional SDG (an 18th SDG), which is the removal of unexploded ordnances (UXOs) or unexploded landmines that are scattered throughout one-third of its territory. The clearing of UXOs is one of the primary goals of the nation to allow for development to take place, since the presence of the UXOs renders a large proportion of its land unusable. The country will be integrating SDGs into its eighth five-year plan of 2016-2020. The Foreign Ministry, as the main liaison between the state and the rest of the world in all matters of international interest, is coordinating the local integration of the SDGs.

Lao PDR considers itself to be one of the beneficiaries of China's One Belt One Road (OBOR) initiative, which will open access to Laos PDR and broaden its market at an unprecedented scale. For its people to fully realise the benefits this can bring, improving educational access and attainment is being given top priority. However, Laos PDR will need to prepare itself for the consequence of its economy opening up to ensure that national interests and state sovereignty are not undermined.

IV. The Philippines

The Philippines takes the position of ensuring that, in any aspect of economic development, social wellbeing is always safeguarded. While the government may regulate the pace of the development, one major obstacle to implementing the necessary reforms involves the moderation of current development plans for longer-term benefits, and convincing people to stay the course to see these benefits materialise. Unfortunately, because government office-holders have term limits (both at the national and local levels), priority is often given to shorter-term results. This problem is expected to be mitigated with the integration of Agenda 2030 into the Philippines' national development plan for strategizing the aspirations and directions for the next twenty-five years.

Four major developmental goals for the Philippines are: becoming a prosperous country with a predominantly middle-class population; becoming a smart and innovative nation; building a safe society operating on mutual trust; and having a population that lives longer and healthier lives.

Health remains of the biggest concerns for the Philippines: the nation has gone from having among the highest life expectancy rates in the region to having among the lowest. Poverty, natural disasters and increasing child and maternal mortality rates have all

contributed to this decline. The poorest Filipinos still have inadequate access to proper sanitation facilities and clean water; and live in very small dense spaces. These create the conditions for diseases to breed, most of which could have otherwise been prevented. The cost of healthcare has also skyrocketed, as healthcare delivery and financing have become fragmented due to the decentralization of the healthcare system. Poorly-resourced local governments have to shoulder the burden of providing healthcare in their districts and provinces, and the minimum standards of healthcare are often not met.

V. Vietnam

Vietnam has seen an overall success in its attainment of the MDGs, save for certain areas such as HIV/AIDS prevention, infant mortality rates, and CO2 emissions. The government sees its achievement of the SDGs more as a fulfilment of its regional commitment rather than an international commitment. It had already adopted a 10-year Sustainable Development Strategy since 2011 for the 2011-2020 period.

Vietnam prides itself in making great strides in improving educational attainment. However, it admits that access to tertiary education is still low, with only 20% of its population having attained some form of tertiary-level education; and even then, the quality of education at that level is deemed unsatisfactory.

In the area of economic growth, Vietnam has recorded two decades of stable and equitable growth, albeit still a long way from achieving the SDGs. Moreover, the country is currently burdened with severe debt that could spell financial trouble in the near future. An over-reliance on labour intensive economic activities and overdependence on natural resources, such as mining activities, renders Vietnam's current economic growth unsustainable. Vietnam is also currently over-reliant on fossil fuels, with little investment made in other energy sources.

While poverty has gone down significantly in Vietnam, the poverty rate among ethnic minorities is still high, surpassing that of the national average. Vietnam is now moving in the direction of assessing poverty beyond the metric of income, and by including non-income factors such as socio-cultural status, access to infrastructure and access to information. Vietnam has a national action plan that will integrate all 17 SDGs, but will focus only on 115 targets that are seen as most reflective of its domestic challenges.

VI. Thailand

Thailand has affirmed its own sustainable development goals since the 1980s, and these were formally articulated for the first time in the Eighth Social and Economic Development Plan between 1997 and 2001. Under the leadership of both its last and present kings, Thailand has taken it upon itself to produce a holistic approach to sustainable development, ensuring that growth comes as much from the development of strong and positive humanistic values as from socio-economic aspects.

Thailand's sufficiency economy philosophy (SEP), introduced by the late King Bhumibol Adulyadej in the 1970s, came to prominence during the 1997 economic crisis. Since then, self-sufficiency was seen as imperative in the national sustainable development agenda, and Thailand has adopted concepts of moderation and balance in its development plans as a source of resilience in the face of risks and external threats. The sufficiency economy philosophy advocates making people active participants in their own welfare. It also supports the twenty-three work principles introduced by King Bhumibol, which are essentially about effective responses during situations of crisis. The SEP is also seen to be in accordance with the SDGs and can serve as an approach in achieving the SDG's. The National Committee for Sustainable Development (CSD) is Thailand's main and highest mechanism responsible for the country's sustainable development including Agenda 2030.

VII. Singapore

Singapore is the most developed of the ASEAN countries, and has met virtually all of the MDGs prior to the launch of the SDGs. Even so, the country still faces issues pertaining to various measures of socio-economic inequality, including gender inequality, although poverty has long been eradicated. While healthcare in Singapore is of high quality, it is nonetheless expensive, especially for those afflicted with certain illnesses or require certain medical procedures. Although Singapore is committed to developing as a sustainable city-state, a question that frequently arises is one of how its current top-down approach to governance, as opposed to consultative, can be sustainable over the long term.

Another major challenge comes from Singapore's heavy dependence on foreign labour, in both the skilled and unskilled categories, and its bearing on domestic productivity. Moreover, Singapore has a rapidly aging population, more so than the rest of its ASEAN

neighbours, stemming from falling birth-rates and longer life expectancy. With the expectation that one in four of its citizens will be aged over 65 by 2030, this would heavily tax the healthcare system and other social services.

VIII. Australia

Australia's commitment to aiding Southeast Asia in attaining their developmental goals is a combination of geopolitical strategy; and its desire to bring to Southeast Asia Australia's model of integrating the MDGs, and now the SDGs, into its national agenda. Australia looks to pass on some of its own national strategies and resources to be applied, with modifications, to suit the local circumstances of its beneficiaries.

Australia uses its developmental partnerships with emerging economies as a form of knowledge diplomacy and geopolitical leverage. Through these partnerships, Australia is able to advance innovative practices at a global scale while building regional collaborations. The country thus commits to the fulfilment of SDG 17, which is "Partnerships for the Goals."

The recipients of developmental aid, on the other hand, stand to benefit from knowledge and technology transfer, which will enhance their own human capital. While official development assistance in monetary form has been shrinking over the years, making recipient nations more self-reliant, they still depend on aid in the form of expertise and other non-monetary contributions. For Australia, such aid is in response to demand from the recipient governments, and Australia oversees about 200 development projects abroad at any one point in time. Notable projects include the Rice Research Centre in the Philippines; improved educational access for the children from the Autonomous Region of Muslim Mindanao; a centre of excellence in prosthetics in Cambodia; and the building of the Kalam Bridge in Vietnam for improved connectivity to the hinterland.

Notwithstanding Australia's advances in many areas, it has its own domestic issues to contend with, such as gender violence, with 1 in 3 women exposed to physical violence; and 1 in 5 to sexual violence; the continuous marginalization and disenfranchisement of its indigenous communities; and the slow process of effecting behaviour modification of its people in areas of energy and water consumption.

Critical Areas Requiring Further Work

Presentations during the plenary and parallel sessions and the final dialogue session with workshop participants, uncovered the following four critical areas that require attention.

I. Public-Private Collaboration

The first is the imperative for the private and public sectors to work together toward the achievement of the SDGs. A notable effort in this direction is by the Pulau Banding Foundation, a research centre that draws support from the government, NGOs and private corporations towards environmental conservation and the preservation of biodiversity. While the private sector is typically censured for the rapid depletion of biodiversity due to over-logging, over-mining, the clearing of forested lands for cash crop plantations, the destruction of aquifers, and the production of pollutants; it can also be argued that such damage is exacerbated by national policies. Governments too rely on the receipts from natural resources, and it has therefore been suggested that ASEAN countries dependent on the extraction of raw materials as their primary source of income include also the cost element for managing the impact of that extraction. There is tremendous opportunity for the public and private sectors to collaborate to reposition present economic strategies, with the help of research centres, to transition from over dependence on natural resource extraction to more sustainable models.

II. Economic inequities and gender inequality

The second critical area is that of on improving inclusivity and ensuring that no one is left behind. There are several community-centred projects throughout the ASEAN countries focussed on elevating the participation of women and girls in education and skilled work; dealing with gender violence; improving the quality of life of the disabled; and improving access to health, sanitation, and clean water. Another important area concerns how the inadequacies in educational quality and access has led not just to inequalities between countries, but also inequalities within national boundaries.

While the least developed of the ASEAN countries rely on the support of their more developed neighbours, including Australia, what is needed is a concerted effort by the ASEAN countries to address inequalities on their own turf and to do it with their own resources as much as is possible. In some areas or countries, this could indicate

complete system overhauls and long-term behaviour or attitude modification. For all countries, there is the need to evaluate how present economic activities and practices are contributing towards growing inequality.

III. Behaviour Modification

The third critical area considers the crucial function of behaviour modification in achieving sustainable development goals. There are no concrete efforts at the moment to incorporate behaviour modification into sustainable development plans. Yet given the centrality of issues like climate change, there is the need for such efforts that can alter the responses of the present generation while educating future generations in parallel.

Behaviour modification should not only be considered at the level of the individual, but also at that level of governance. A major obstacle to the long-term success of sustainability projects is most governments are more concerned with securing their regimes than in long-term, well-rounded development beyond their terms in power. This could see governments reacting to the demands of the people to uphold the status quo, in contradiction to commitments made to meeting the SDGs.

IV. Data

Finally, the fourth area is that of how data inadequacies have prevented a number of ASEAN countries from carrying out effective implementation and co-ordination of developmental plans. With the exception of Singapore, there is a gap in the development and maintenance of easily accessible informational databases. Social scientists from Lao PDR and Vietnam were specific about this problem in the allocation of resources and the designing of their economic and infrastructural developmental strategies. In the case of Lao PDR with its vast hinterlands, the greatest challenge is in overcoming communicational and informational isolation. Indonesia and the Philippines have problems of fragmentation in their delivery systems stemming from the lack of efficient communication and coordination between the central and the local governments. In Malaysia, attempts at decarbonisation appear to be stymied by a lack of reliable, consistent and coherent data that presents the actual state of environmental pollution and sources of such pollution. What is critically needed is a concerted effort in developing open data infrastructures, although this could pose a major challenge to the least developed and least connected countries.

Appendix 1: Integrated Summary of Jeffrey D Sachs's Lectures at the ASEAN Ministers workshop, April 25, 2017.

Sustainable Development as Moonshot of the Twenty-first Century

Sustainability as a programme of social justice, multidisciplinary science and technological R&D, and bio-social improvements is a synthesis of productive thinking, deliberations, and conversations that could only emerge when common ground is established, despite different priorities and competencies. Jeffrey D Sachs, Columbia University Professor of Economics and Chairman of the Jeffrey Sachs Center on Sustainable Development at Sunway University, worked to set the tone for engagement with a diverse group of stakeholders; which comprised regional leaders, experts, and various public and private sector stakeholders; through his two lectures that bookended the first day of the ASEAN Ministers workshop held at Sunway University between 25 and 26 March 2017.

An engaging speaker who helped design the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), while also contributing substantially to the development of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), Sachs used his time at the podium to cultivate the impetus for sustainable development in ASEAN. He reminded the workshop participants during his first lecture that their job is to take all that they have learned from the presentations of findings, milestones, obstacles and objectives to brainstorm actionable plans that will focus on the most pressing issues affecting the region while remaining aware of the bigger global picture. At the end of the day, the ultimate aim of the workshop is to produce more solid policies through better project design and implementation, therefore bringing about improvement in revenue generation needed for economic and financial sustainability.

During his two lectures, Sachs was careful to connect the universal ideals of the SDGs with the harsh yet hopeful geopolitical realities within the contemporary landscape of the world at large, with particular attention to ASEAN. His first lecture threw down a gauntlet at the workshop's participants to identify regional obstacles and problems standing in the way of accomplishing the SDGs, and to think collaboratively regarding how each layer of national interest and concern could converge into addressing transnational issues of poverty, public health, urbanization, indigenous innovations, human capital development, climate change, and sustainable energy technologies.

Given ASEAN's great potential as important region in many respects, attention has to be paid to the up-skilling of its relatively young population, in preparation for a shift in demographics by the next century, to support the emergence of new social structures, technologies, and socio-economic demands. New strategies are required for upping the region's innovation capability (Singapore appears to be doing well in this respect) and level of educational attainment. The rapid changes stemming from climate change (of natural and anthropogenic origins) and other anthropogenic effects have caused irreversible negative impact on the existing biodiversity; increased the occurrences and the magnitude of impact from natural disasters; led to the recurrences of previously suppressed diseases; and brought about growing inequities that have galvanized social unrest.

Sachs alluded to the need for control in human avariciousness that allow for the continuance of harmful activities such as extreme deforestation and the over-development of land in the name of domestic economic needs. However, one might question whether, in the case of over-investment in oil palm (an example which Sachs brought up in both lectures), factors other than national interests are at stake.

With the aid of demographic statistics and various geopolitical/ biospheric indicators, Sachs reminded the workshop participants that these stark figures require urgent consideration, especially from those charged with the governance of national and regional resources. To hone in on the urgency of global warming, Sachs discussed the impact of hydrometeorological disasters causing major flooding and the submergence of a number of coastal regions, both of developed and developing regions. The sea-level rise projections for the next hundred years; as modelled by mathematicians, hydrographers, atmospheric scientists, oceanographers and engineers specializing in hydraulic and marine systems; demonstrate how many coastal regions of the world, including ASEAN, will end up underwater by 2100, if not sooner. They are charting the impact of varying degrees of water rise (between 6 to 10 meters) over the next few decades, projecting the impact of land loss, and identifying the areas expected to be most severely affected. Malaysia has produced its own projection, through its National Institute of Hydraulics Research (NAHRIM), showing that much of the coastal areas of West Malaysia will be submerged by 2100.

Sachs acknowledged that ASEAN could not go it alone and require the backing and co-operation from its Northeast Asian neighbours. One such regional co-operative is the One Road, One Belt project initiated by China. However, Sachs was quick to remind the

participants that more concerted and pro-active involvement is needed from ASEAN so that they are not merely reliant on their East Asian neighbours to take the lead, but will also assert valuable contributions in their own right. He pointed to the need of planning and visionary thinking when tackling difficult challenges that are without precedence; as a source of motivation, he presented the case of John F Kennedy's awe-inspiring speech that had paved the way for a programme that put the first person on the moon, at a time when the technology available was fairly primitive (especially in terms of computational capability and power); the budget available at that time could be considered as pocket-change compared to budgets of current science and technology programmes. Sachs used the example of Kennedy's vision as an equivalent to homerun for sustainable development, the moonshot of the present generation.

To counteract the utilitarianism and Whiggish progressivism that underscore past and present unsustainable practices, Sachs highlighted the importance of ethical practices in informing developmental plans. Sustainability goals and projects should incorporate values of pro-sociality, co-operation, and action to counter the greed, conflict, and indifference that have driven the world to a breaking point, especially in light of today's political inclinations. These ethical values are also to be considered in relation to how one might tackle the four major trends driving the globalization movements of the twenty-first century.

The first is the eclipsing of North America (and possibly that of the Euro-Atlantic world) as geopolitical shifts lead to a decline in the world GDP shares of the Euro-Atlantic worlds and the ascendancy of Asia.

The second concerns the nine planetary boundaries and how we have exceeded the threshold of several Earth systems that produced, and continue to produce, irreversible losses, severe depletions of natural resources, acidification, and increasing levels of toxicity.¹

The third entails demographic changes in all the world regions as the outcome of declining birth rates and the inversion of a population pyramid (with a top-heavy aging population), causing the median age to shift towards the mid-forties.

¹ See <http://www.stockholmresilience.org/research/planetary-boundaries/planetary-boundaries/about-the-research/the-nine-planetary-boundaries.html> for more detailed explanation of what these nine planetary boundary systems entail.

Sachs spoke of how one could present child mortality rates in impoverished regions through pro-social actions involving the deployment of financial aid and resources to improve health access; the cost of such measures is much less than the daily defence expenditure of a certain superpower. The fourth represents disruptive informational revolution centred around the integration of high-level science and technological knowledge systems and innovative practices at transnational and indigenous levels to serve the cause of social-justice and peace, as well as to tackle the problems elaborated in the nine planetary boundaries system.

The resources needed to improve the quality of life for all is much less (in the range of 1 to 2% of the Gross World Product or GWP) than what had gone into the creation of global violence and inequities (which take up to 13% of the GWP). Re-channelling the resources into upscaling the quality of life for all, including that of the most impoverished regions, will bring about greater planetary resiliency to the benefit of all.

Appendix 2: List of Participants

Prof. Jeffrey D. Sachs

Chairman, Jeffrey Sachs Center on Sustainable Development, Sunway University

Director, UN Sustainable Development Solutions Network

Professor of Economics, Columbia University

Prof. Woo Wing Thye

Director, Jeffrey Sachs Center on Sustainable Development, Sunway University

Professor of Economics, University of California, Davis

Datuk Seri Abdul Rahman bin Dahlan

Minister in charge of the Economic Planning Unit (EPU), Malaysia

Prof. Bambang Brodjonegoro

Minister of National Development Planning, Indonesia

Mr. Saleumxay Kommasith

Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lao PDR

Undersecretary Rosemarie G. Edillon

Undersecretary of the National Development Office for Policy and Planning, National

Economic and Development Authority, Philippines

Prof. Mari Pangestu

Former Minister of Tourism and Creative Economy

Professor of Economy and Business, Universitas Indonesia

Dato Dr Abdul Rashid Abdul Malik

CEO, Pulau Banding Foundation

Prof. John Thwaites

Co-Chair SDSN Leadership Council & Chair Monash Sustainable Development Institute,

Australia

Prof. Sumiani Yusoff

Dean, Sustainability Science Research Cluster, Universiti Malaya

Prof. Andrew Walker

President and Pro Vice-Chancellor, Monash University Malaysia

Prof. Phouphet Kyophilavong

Vice-Dean of Economics at the National University of Lao

Prof. Gamini Herath

Professor of Economics, School of Business, Monash University Malaysia

Prof. Noraini Tamin

*IPBES (Intergovernmental science-policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services)
Expert of Land Degradation and Restoration*

Prof. Leong Choon Heng

Deputy Director, Jeffrey Sachs Center on Sustainable Development, Sunway University

Dr. Foo Yin Fah

Associate Professor, School of Business, Sunway University

Prof. Wong Koi Nyen

Professor, School of Business, Sunway University

Prof. Maria Socorro Gochoco-Bautista

Professor, School of Economics, University of the Philippines

Dato' Ir. Dr. Lee Yee Cheong

*Malaysian Chairman, Governing Council, International Science Technology and Innovation
Centre for South-South Cooperation*

Tan Sri Ghauth Jasmon

Research Professor, Sunway University

Prof. Paul Hoskin

Dean, School of Science and Technology, Sunway University

Dr. Daniel Baskaran Krishnapillay

Technical Advisor, Pulau Banding Foundation

Dr. Somkiat Triratpan

Secretary to the Minister attached to the Prime Minister's Office, Thailand

Mr. Philip Green

First Assistant Secretary, South-East Asia Mainland & Regional Division, Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade, Australia

Prof. Vu Quoc Huy

Institute of Regional Sustainable Development, Vietnamese Academy of Social Sciences

Dr. Ooi Kee Beng

Deputy Director, Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, Singapore

Prof. Graeme Wilkinson

Vice-Chancellor, Sunway University

Datuk Dr Yogeesvaran Kumaraguru

Economic Planning Unit, Prime Minister's Department, Malaysia

Prof. Dato' Dr. Mazlin Bin Mokhtar

Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia

Dr. Chong Kok Boon

Sunway University

Dr. Samir Hassani

Sunway University