PRELIMINARY CONFERENCE REPORT

Social and Sustainability Science in ASEAN 2018: Agri-food Systems, Rural Sustainability and Socioeconomic Transformation

January 23-25, 2018
Chaloem Rajakumari building, Chulalongkorn University,
Bangkok, THAILAND

Tuesday, 23 January 2018

9.00 – 9.15 Opening Ceremony

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Pirongrong Ramasoota, Vice President, Chulalongkorn University, welcomed participants to the Conference which aims to put forth the promotion of agri-food systems, rural sustainability in Southeast Asia. Sustainable Development has become common at the time when complex problems need to be solved to achieve Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). Social and sustainability science contribute to interconnected multi-disciplines which can potentially address some ongoing regional issues. ASEAN policy to address problems concerning sustainable development is not adequate and effective enough to cope with existing challenges in the region. There needs to be more collaboration among related stakeholders from all sectors to work toward common goals. The Vice President underlined the role of Chulalongkorn University as a research institute working in partnership with related organizations to provide research findings and policy recommendation to governments and intergovernmental organizations on sustainable development. She expressed her gratitude to Stockholm Environment Institute (SEI), Office of Higher Education Commission (OHEC), UNESCO, Asia-Pacific Association of Agricultural Research Institutions (APAARI) and all participants wishing everyone a productive discussion.

Dr. Chadarat Singhadechakul, Assistant Secretary-General for Higher Education Commission, Ministry of Education**,** extended her thanks to all participants and Chulalongkorn University for hosting the Conference. Dr. Chadarat explained some background to the conference and efforts of ASEAN to help achieve SDGs which can be seen through other work led by Chulalongkorn University on "The ASEAN Way forward for SDGs" especially related to some sub-goals including health and risk management, urban life development, energy and agri-food systems. In the ASEAN Plus 3 framework, Thailand is taking a lead in agri-food systems while working with other partners in implementing policy designed to achieve SDGs. Dr. Chadarat stressed that in order to address all of the challenges in ASEAN, it takes efforts of all stakeholders. Policymakers, scholars, experts in natural and social science, civil society need to work together to bridge the knowledge gap and creating a knowledge sharing environment. Dr. Chadarat closed her remarks by thanking organizers, sponsors and participants and wishes the conference a productive meeting.

Mr. Niall O'Connor, Director of Stockholm Environment Institute (SEI) Asia, expressed his gratitude for being present at the conference. He further raised the challenge of sustainable development and economic development that needs to be inclusive. Impacts on environment constituted from agriculture that affects ecosystem needs be addressed. He pointed out that other socio-economic factors play a significant role in agri-food systems including the majority of females employed in the sector or human rights that requires more attention from

multiple sectors. Technology development can bring about transformation in the sector. But it is essential to look forward to include development that provides equal opportunity for all. Stockholm Environmental Institute (SEI) works with universities, government agencies and civil society to bring in more findings in order to address the future challenges in food and nutrition security. Mr. O'Connor underlined the need to strengthen partnerships among key related stakeholders. He closed his remarks by thanking Chulalongkorn University and all participants.

Dr. Sue Vize, Regional Adviser for Social and Human Sciences for Asia and the Pacific, UNESCO, Bangkok, stressed the significance of strong partnership in the sector. This conference is a step toward further collaboration that can result in transformation in the area. But how to move forward is also important because we need to put people at the center. At the university level, it is essential to equip students with skills not only knowledge and how to work with other people will also determine the level of success and change. Dr. Vize underscores the role of education which links and transcends knowledge to different areas and society as a whole. She closed her remarks by raising the question of how to address challenge and what can people do together as a network to help solve problems.

09:15 – 10:15

Prospects and Challenges for Sustainable Agri-food Systems in Southeast Asia

Keynote Prof. Dr. Yongyuth Yuthavong, Former Deputy Prime Minister, Thailand

Keynotespeech by **Prof. Dr. Yongyuth Yuthavong**, Former Deputy Prime Ministry, Thailand, started off his remarks with the satellite image of Southeast Asia and concluded that the region is green and bio-diverse. However, maintaining a sustainable and bio-diverse environment remains one of the most challenging problems of the world that needs to be solved. Climate change puts food security and agri-food system at risk while posting other direct impacts on human livelihoods. Data collected from Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) indicates that the population growth in Asia is tending to decrease while Africa's is projected to increase by 2100. Professor Yongyut raised concerns about the long term prospects of food security in different parts of the world. Crop yields are projected to decrease owing to climate change in the next decade which may lead to hunger in many parts of the world. He pointed out that the world is in trouble. And that perhaps Southeast Asia can be part of the solution because of its bio-diversity.

He further introduced the Happy Planet Index (HPI) which incorporates life satisfaction, life expectancy and ecological footprint. The index reflects the average years of happy life in a given society, nation or group of nations per unit of planetary resources consumed. It also represents the efficiency with which country converts the planet's finite resources into well-being of the citizens. The index indicates that nations in Southeast Asia do very well compared to those of other regions.

Prof. Yongyuth further pointed out that Southeast Asia has potential to do well in agri-food given the fact that the majority of population in the region is involved in agri-food sector and that the region is the world largest food producer.

He presented three pillars that make up a healthy economy. First, competitive economy is found in the free world, bringing profit to society. Second, the inclusive economy brings all groups of people in the system. It is essential for a nation to have the economy that serves everyone. In other words, people are the center of government's economic policy. Third, and lastly, green economy leads not only to growth but a sustainable economy that takes into account the significance of protecting planet earth. Agriculture produces food, energy and materials for human consumption, and it is logical to have environment conserved and protected to sustain production for human basic needs. Prof. Yongyuth then referred to Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) which ASEAN can contribute to achieving with regards to agri-food noting some steps toward those goals. Rural agriculture and sustainability should be the main focus for policymakers and related stakeholders in ASEAN. The Sufficiency Economy Principal initiated by HM King Bhumibol can be a guiding principal toward a healthy economy, society and sustainable as it emphasizes on moderation, reason and immunity against rapid change rather than profit motives. The idea is to use existing resources available in the community. The principle does not contradict with competitive economy, but in fact, it can be a complementary for any economy.

Prof. Yongyuth closed his remarks with the optimistic view that the world would be better off in the future as science, innovation, development and sustainability co-exist and point out the unfilled gaps in human development.

10.45 - 12.15 Plenary Policy Dialogue (1) Greening ASEAN Agri-Food Systems
Location: Auditorium (Room 801)

There is no agreement on definitions of "green" or "sustainable" agriculture. But many efforts over a decade or more aimed to make food production and processing systems safer for farmers, consumers and environments while improving markets for green or organic products. Sustainable Development Goal #2 is committed to "End hunger, achieve food security and improved nutrition and promote sustainable agriculture." Yet Southeast Asia is still a world leader in use of dangerous, unnecessary and banned agrochemicals, which pollute environments while endangering farmer and consumer health. Much modern industrial mono-crop agriculture also causes desertification, deforestation, drought, depleting aquifers, biodiversity loss and land degradation and may be the greatest contributor to climate change, from 20 to 30 percent or more of all greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. Agrochemical-dependent industrial farming has still not provided food or nutrition security for at least 70 million people in Southeast Asia, 11.5 % of the population. There is much we still do not understand about these issues, why problems persist and what more can done in response. This panel will reflect critically on such issues, practical challenges and opportunities for greening Southeast Asian agri-food systems.

Discussion Questions
1. What are the main obstacles, threats, barriers and practical challenges for greening Agri-food Systems in Southeast Asia?
2. What are the main policy issues that must be addressed to better enable the greening of Agri-food Systems among ASEAN Institutions and Working Groups, Member States and the Southeast Asian Region as whole?
3. What examples of best practices for greening Agri-food Systems already exist that can be improved, adapted to local circumstances and scaled up across the region?

4. How can governments, NGOs, academics, farmers and regional or international organizations better work together to green Southeast Asian Agri-food Systems? What existing or new dialogue, cooperation mechanisms exist, can be strengthened or should be established to assist?

Panelists:
2.1 Darian McBain, Thai Union, Thailand
2.2 Vichelle Roaring-Arunsuwannakorn, Asian Development Bank (ADB)
2.3 Suriyan Vichitlekarn, Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ)
2.4 Sridhar Dharmapuri, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO)
2.5 Supa Yaimuang, BioThai, Thailand
Moderator: Narumon Arunothai, Chulalongkorn University Social Research Institute (CUSRI), *Thailand*

This dialogue encouraged representatives from different sectors from private to intergovernmental agencies and civil society involved in agri-food systems to discuss challenges faced in food production and processing systems, consumer and environment agenda. The panel discussed not only major problems in the sector but also recommendations ingrained from experience and practice in different sectors.

Ms. Darian McBain, Thai Union, Thailand. Representing private sector, Ms. MaBain explained issues involving seafood industry and sustainability. Thai Union realizes that sustainable production is essential for its long term operation. The company introduced the SeaChange Program which is an integrated plan of initiatives to drive improvement of the entire global seafood industry. Program components include safe and legal labor, responsible sourcing, responsible operation and people and communities. The initiative aims to ensure that the seas are sustainable, workers are safe, legally employed and empowered, and to ensure its legal operation. Ms. McBain noted various concerns in fishing industry despite the efforts of related stakeholders.

Ms. Vichelle Roaring-Arunsuwannakorn, Asian Development Bank (ADB). Ms. Vichelle discussed macro-economic perspectives regarding agri-food production in the Greater Mekong Sub-region (GMS) and ADB support to GMS countries through the Core Agriculture Support Program Phase II (CASP II). GMS-ADB work address emerging challenges in agricultural development, particularly those concerning cross-border trade in agri-food products, climate change adaptation, and food and bioenergy security. CASP II aims at capitalizing on earlier investment and outcomes that will enhance cross-border synergies, contributing to regional cooperation. The core measures include policies, infrastructure, knowledge and innovation and marketing which ADB works to support the GMS countries to achieve its goals. Strategic alliance is strengthened through public-private dialogue, collaboration with the Private Sector Development Partners, networking for research and innovation. Other areas of collaboration include knowledge sharing through training and dialogue facilitated by ADB.

Mr. Suriyan Vichitlekarn, Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ). Mr. Suriyan opened his discussion by referring to the ASEAN Vision 2025 in a competitive, inclusive, resilient and sustainable Food, Agriculture, and Forestry sector integrated with the global economy, based on a single market and production base contributing to food and nutrition security and prosperity in the ASEAN Community and this

shall be achieved. However, he raised concerns about if ASEAN is ready to ensure the transformation of policy concerning food and agriculture. It is very important to engage all related stakeholders in the policy network including civil society, private sector, international organization, research institute and people at the community level to ensure the inclusiveness of any policy to be implemented. Mr. Suriyan also pointed out that the mindset of people toward sustainability should be changed while empowering farmer organization to cope with future challenges themselves. Mr. Suriyan underlined the need of effective sub-national implementation of policy which undermine outcomes.

Mr. Sridhar Dharmapuri, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). Mr. Sridhar underscored the efforts of FAO to mainstream food safety and agriculture in response to Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and the need to strengthen partnerships among related stakeholders. FAO uses the five interconnected principles for the transition toward sustainable food and agriculture which balance social, economic and environmental dimensions of sustainability in agriculture while providing a foothold for developing policies, strategies and regulations. The principles include improving efficiency in the use of resources, direct action to conserve, protect and enhance natural resources, agriculture that protects and improve rural livelihoods, enhanced resilience of people, communities and ecosystem, and responsible and effective governance mechanisms. FAO realizes that the only way to achieve SDGs is through partnership of all stakeholders to build effective tools for policy implementation.

Ms. Yupa Yaimuang, BioThai, Thailand. Ms. Yupa speaks as a representative from civil society organization, contributions to researches on bio-diversity, agriculture, food, farmer rights and community. BioThai works in the areas of biodiversity and agri-food with the goals of knowledge sharing with general public and to provide policy recommendations to related government agencies on resource management, economic, social and cultural development. However, sometimes policy recommendations are not taken into consideration by policymakers, making some problems even worse. Ms. Yupa pointed out that climate change is a clear threat to agriculture and people involved in the sector. Rural Thailand has changed in all dimensions over the course of decades given more access to information, education, social benefits and economic means. The change has also resulted in different ways for how farmers work and solve problems. In addition, Ms. Yupa mentioned the spiritual aspect of farming in Thailand that can also be taken into account by policymakers when designing particular policy.

Important Points from Discussion

- Main obstacles of moving toward sustainable agri-food systems include 1). lack of long term incentives for farmers, 2). lack of knowledge on environmental issues, 3). the need to create social awareness for those involved in the sector such as migrant workers, human rights issue, etc.
- Given the fact that countries have different levels of development and capacities to develop, more emphasis on the regional level (and cooperation) can help leverage efforts for development.
- People's mindset on sustainability needs to be changed while policy implementation must be more effective.
- Instant solutions and systemic solutions are all essential to the ongoing challenge. Although systemic solutions are needed for long term change, instant solutions also

help address immediate challenge. Therefore, it is important to facilitate solutions appropriate for particular circumstance and involve different aspects.

- The need of research studies is still significant to cope with climate change. It reflects the role of research institutions including university, intergovernmental specialized agencies, CSOs and other stakeholders to collaborate more extensively to translate good research findings into effective practice and practical application.

Tuesday, 23 January 2018: 13.30 – 15.00
Location: Room 802
Session 1A: Sustainable Food Production in ASEAN
Session Moderator: Chika Shinohara, Momoyama Gakuin University (St. Andrew's University), Japan
Authors and Papers:

1A.1	**Socioeconomic Transformation in South East Asia Driven by Conversion to Sustainable Agriculture: Initiative for an ASEAN+Global "Earth Trusteeship Platform"**
	Hans van Willenswaard, School for Wellbeing Studies and Research, Thailand
1A.2	**Reconciling Equity and Resilience of Food Systems in Major River Deltas of South East Asia**
	Karpouzoglou Timos, Dewulf Art Warner, Jeroen Ahmed Farhana, Wageningen University, Netherlands, Hoang Long and Van Pham Dang Tri, Can Tho University, Vietnam
1A.3	**Thailand's Community Rights Act for Karen Minorities in Protected Areas**
	Aschara Chinniyompanich, Macquarie University, Australia
1A.4	**Understanding Agrobiodiversity in Urban Market: A Comparative Study of Crop Species and Varietal Diversity in Traditional Wet Market and Supermarkets in Cau Giay District, Hanoi**
	Laxmi Lama, Stef de Haan and Jessica Raneri CIAT, Biodiversity International
1A.5	**Beyond Food: the Future of Home Gardens in Thailand**
	Pin Pravalprukskul, Stockholm Environment Institute (SEI)

Tuesday, 23 January 2018: 13.30 – 15.00
Location: Room 701
Session 1B: Discussion Forum of Plant Variety Protection Act Revising

Farmers' rights to access certain plant varieties are going to be a hot issue when the Department of Agriculture (DOA) revises the Plant Variety Protection Act by applying UPOV1991. UPOV1991 has been criticized by farmers and civil society organizations around the world, who claim that it protects the intellectual property of scientists and corporations, but ignores farmers' rights. Farmers and the civil society movement are resisting the revision due to concerns that transnational corporations will seize and monopolize local plant varieties, which are important in local food production and food security.

To support wider consider of the issues, the Chulalongkorn University Social Research Institute is hosting a public academic forum on 23 January, including presentations from key speakers such as, Witoon Liamchumroon (BIOTHAI), intellectual property law specialists,

and local farmers. The session will be an opportunity to discuss the impact and potential solutions for a Plant Variety Protection Act that considers the right of Thai farmers and food security in Thailand.

Session Organizer: Prapart Pintobtang, Chualalongkorn University Social Science Institute (CUSRI), Thailand

Panelists:

1B.1	**The Discussion of Plant Variety Protection Act in Thailand and Global**
	Witoon Lianchamroon, BioThai, Thailand
1B.2	**The Real World of Plant Variety Protection Act and Farmer**
	Boonsong Madkow, Farmer Leader, Kut Chum, Yasothon Province, Thailand
1B.3	**Farmers livelihood in Transformation**
	Prapart Pintobtang, Chulalongkorn University Social Science Institute (CUSRI), Thailand
1B.4	**Community in a Changing World**
	Kritsada Bunchai, Local Development Institute, Thailand

Tuesday, 23 January 2018: 13.30 – 15.00

Location: Room 702

Session 1C: Water (In)Security And Development In Southeast Asia: Inclusions, Exclusions And Transformation

This panel considers conflicts over access to, control over and use of water and natural resources at scales ranging from the interstate to the individual. We consider the implications of deepening market integration into resource use and governance, and how it produces exclusions for some to the benefit of others. We explore the implications of large-scale developments tied to regional economic integration both in Southeast Asia, such as large-scale dams. We also focus on the extension of market relations at a more local scale, and how this entails "intimate" processes of exclusion that contrast with the more high-profile and more overtly violent exclusions.

Session Organizer: Carl Middleton, Center for Social Development Studies, Chulalongkorn University, Thailand

Panelists:

1C.1	**Gender and the Mekong River: Inclusions and Exclusions**
	Kanokwan Manorom, Ubon Ratchathani University, Thailand
1C.2	**Intimate Water Exclusion: Processes and Politics of River Enclosure by Fish Cage Aquaculture in Northeast Thailand**
	Soimart Rungmanee , Thammasart University, Thailand
1C.3	**Rights and Rites: Community Water Resource Governance on the Salween River in Karen State, Myanmar**
	Saw John Bright, Karen Environmental and Social Action Network (KESAN), Myanmar
1C.4	**Access to Water in Hakha Town, Chin State, Myanmar: Structural Violence and the Politics of Water Insecurity**
	Carl Middleton, Chulalongkorn University, Thailand

Tuesday, 23 January 2018: 15.15 – 16.45
Location: Room 802
Session 2A: Sociology and Anthropology in the Anthropocene *(side event)*

Beginning with an historical perspective through the opening dialogue, two senior researchers, Amara Pongsapich and Chayan Vaddhana-Phuti, presented their introductory thoughts on "Sharing Visions among Knowledge Communities". The proposal to initiate ThaiSAA (Thai Sociology and Anthropological Association) was presented by Surichai Wun'gaeo. This was followed by a seminar "Anthropocene Sociology and Anthropology: In the Wave of Global Change", an intersectional and interdisciplinary roundtable talk. A closing speech "Bridging Knowledge Diversity: Unity among Local and Global" by Stewart Lockie weaved together the role of public sociology in a transitional context to discuss the ability of knowledge networks and collective effort to shape society.

Session Organizer: Surichai Wun'gaeo, Chulalongkorn University, Cholnapa Anukul, JuSNet and Sayamol Charoenratana, CUSRI, Thai Sociological and Anthropological Association (ThaiSAA), Thailand

Introduction: **Sustainability of Thai Sociological and Anthropological Collectiveness**

- Surichai Wun'gaeo, Chulalongkorn University, Thailand

Roundtable Talks: Anthropocene Sociology and Anthropology: in the Wave of Global Change

- Chol Bunnag, Thammasat University, Thailand
- Paritta Wangkiat, Thai Society of Environmental Journalist, Thailand
- Moderator: Cholnapa Anukul, JuSNet

Closing Speech: Bridging Knowledge Diversity: Unity among Local and Global Stewart Lockie, James Cook University, Australia

Tuesday, 23 January 2018: 15.15 – 16.45
Location: Room 701
Session 2B: From Produce to Products: Economies of Scope in Smallholders' Mixed Agroforestry Systems

Economies of scope are achieved when costs of production decrease as a result of increasing the number of different goods produced. In mixed farming systems, this is easily achieved through the synergies of different components of the systems that result in higher land equivalent ratios: fertilizer applied to crops also increases productivity of trees; manure produced by livestock provides fertilizer to crops; trees can improve soil fertility as well as providing timber, firewood, food, medicines and products to people; and many tree species provide shade or fodder for livestock. Further, product diversification decreases risks of production and price uncertainties. Unfortunately, sustainability of smallholders' agricultural systems is often understood as achieving economies of scale through increasing productivity per hectare, with less consumption of land, water and fertilizer, which often results in intensified mono cultural systems.

Agroforestry as a land-use system has been widely acknowledged for its potential to support the resilience of rural communities, often supporting communal rights to forest land and other natural resources, with a positive impact on climate-change mitigation and adaptation and on biodiversity. Independently and under ASEAN initiatives, some Southeast Asian nations are

mainstreaming agroforestry into national and sub-national policies and planning. Farmers, however, when presented with options for intensive mono cultural systems often switch to these because of perceived lower risk owing to a) more developed value chains that leave farmers less vulnerable to market fluctuations and reduce transaction costs; b) perceived lower labor requirements; c) access to supporting services, such as extension and advice, credit and, sometimes, climate-risk insurance. This panel explores ICRAF's work with numerous partners on these themes.

Session Organizer: ICRAF, World Agroforestry Centre

Panelists:

2B.1	**Setting the Scene: Economics of Scope in Smallholders' Agroforestry Systems**
	Anja Gassner, World Agroforestry Centre
2B.2	**Economic Returns, Resilience and Sustainability for Smallholders' Mixed Agroforestry Systems in Indonesia**
	James M. Roshetko, World Agroforestry Centre
2B.3	**Tipping the Balance for Ecosystem Services through Collective Action: the Philippine Landcare Experience**
	Delia Catacutan and Agustin Mercado Jr, World Agroforestry Centre
2B.4	**Decreasing Transaction Costs: Smallholders' Market Systems that Work for Diversified Farming Systems**
	Aulia Perdana, World Agroforestry Centre
2B.5	**Supporting the Enablers: South-To-South Learning Networks for Sharing Agro-Ecological Knowledge**
	Robert Finlayson, World Agroforestry Centre

Tuesday, 23 January 2018: 15.15 – 16.45

Location: Room 702

Session 2C: The Development Path Agroecology: Food Security for Future Generations

Towards Organic Asia (TOA) is a participatory network to advance organic agriculture and agroecology with core partners in the Mekong region and a growing network Asia-wide. The mission of TOA is "Organic Food for All". Partners will discuss challenges and progress on organic agriculture and agroecology from different countries and perspectives. This is the first of two sessions.

Session Organizer: Towards Organic Asia (TOA) Movement

Panelists:

2C.1	**Country Assessment and Policy Advocacy to Promote Agroecology. Can Participatory Action Research Generate Positive, Agroecology Based, Development Scenarios in the Context of Broader Conflict Transformation?**
	Sai Sam Kham, Metta Development Foundation, Myanmar
2C.2	**Securing Indigenous Land Rights by the Recognition of Customary Law; and the Importance of Seeds Saving for Biodiversity. Finding Appropriate Social Entrepreneurship Models for Indigenous Peoples in Viet Nam**
	Dang To Kien, CENDI/SPERI, Viet Nam
2C.3	**Comparing Wellbeing Between Organic and Chemical Farmers. Why Social Engagement Leads to More Happiness and Better Economic Benefits**
	Kaedtisak Yangyuen, Alternative Agriculture Network (AAN), Myanmar
2C.4	**The Growing TOA Young Organic Farmers' (YOF) Movement + Video Project Supported by Alisea / GRET**
	Narumon Paiboonsittikun and Kittikhun Bhukhonkha, TOA, Thailand

Wednesday, 24 January 2018
09:15– 10:15
Ensuring Rural Sustainability in ASEAN

Keynote by Prof. Dr. Koichi Ikegami.

I would like to express my thanks to Prof. Surichai Wun'gaeo and the committee for their invitation. I am proud to be here and give this keynote speech. In this speech, I will be addressing what major issues we are facing in the 21st Century as well as possible solutions of these issues. Globalization is an integral part of this; the flat world which is, in fact, an unequal world. Yet we should not forget that an alternative movement has started to take place. I will talk about two examples of fairtrade and the Creation of FEC Sufficient Territory to elaborate this. Finally, I will also speak about 'Mura' Business, a model of small business of the village, by the village and for the village.

We can draw a picture of the world's problems which include poverty, food, and environmental problems. At the center of this is the north-south problem and globalization. The north-south problem is characterized by an economic gap between rich and poor countries, capital flow from the South to the North and the unequal distribution of profit from international trade. We should also not forget the South-South Problem which is the disparity among countries of the Global South. Can poor countries ever catch up with rich countries? The economic gap is grounded on gaps in political power, information and a cultural influence. I would like to focus on two major issues casino capitalism or speculative capitalism which was clearly seen in the mortgage crisis and the subsequence financial crisis. I will come back to this issue later. Another issue that cannot be neglected is global warming and climate change. To improve the issue of global warming, we have to embrace renewable energy yet the Japanese government decided to reopen conventional energy production. There is a continuous belief in conventional development model that has a negative impact on socially vulnerable groups.

Thomas L. Friedman, has suggested the image of a flat world in which he detailed the other side of globalization. He categorizes globalization into three periods. Under Globalization 1.0, which was the period between the age of Great Discovery and 1800, nations were the holders of power and governments the main actors. In the period that followed and lasted until 2000, or Globalization 2.0, multinational companies led global integration. Now the brief history of the twenty-first century, or Globalization 3.0, has shown that mega-competition or global cooperation on a flat platform have decreased the meaning of 'border' or 'mother country', as is shown in the Panama Papers. The endless globalization of 'credit' has led to the commoditization of 'money', 'bubble economy', casino and speculative capitalism.

Yet, the world is not flat! The world is increasingly more unstable and unequal. The most severe problems are the accumulation and uneven distribution of wealth as well as the invasion of individual human rights. The world is divided into one world of the rich and one world of the poor.

An Oxfam report shows the overall results of neo-liberalism. It shows an economy of 99 %. International promises made by the World Economic Forum and the World Bank failed to reduce inequality. Since 2015, the richest 1% has owned more wealth than the rest of the

population. The wealth owned by the eight richest people is equal to that of the poorest half of the world's population. The income of the poorest 10% of people has increased by less than $3 per year between 1988 and 2011, while the income of the richest 1% has increased 182 times. In Vietnam, the earning of the richest man in a day is more than that of a poor man in 10 years. In sub-Saharan countries, the food situation as barely changed and the hunger map shows Africa as one of the places with the most hunger.

We need to ask ourselves: why does inequality remain? Neoliberal beliefs are still the mainstream of economics. These are driven by scholars such as Sacher in the UK, Leogan in the USA, Nakasone in Japan and of course, M. Freedman. This includes fundamental features of the economic theory, such as maximization of profit, the principle for optimum production, Fordism and Casino Capitalism. As a result, we have seen the transformation of corporation towards the prioritization of economic efficiency, mega-competition the overemphasis of shareholders and the diminishing traditional concept of 'good to everyone'. We have now arrived in the age of the super gap. The age of the medium class is over. Just 0.01% of world population holds wealth and power. The labor market is increasingly unstable. The consumption market is scaled down. We see the rise of egoism, narrow nationalism, and 'Trumpism': 'Firstism'.

Yet there is hope for an 'Alternative way' that can break through this sluggishness. Part of this alternative way are ideas such as fairtrade, solidarity economy, Tobin tax, food sovereignty, local food, agroecology, natural or renewable energy that lead to a FEC Sufficiency Territory. The beginning of a sharing economy and shared economy lies in the attention to Sustainability than Growth. It emphasizes solidarity rather than competition and moderation over desire. Just like the sufficient economy in Thailand. It is about happiness for all, not one winner. Not "Good only now" but "Good for Future generations"!

Fairtrade is part of this alternative way. What is fairtrade seeking? It wants to make 'Trade' fair and to realize 'Trade of Justice'. What is fair and unfair may be a controversial question. The basic appearance of fairtrade is that it supports poor and marginalized people in the Global South. On the side of consumers, fair trades increase awareness for development issues. It wants to secure the conditions for everyone to become what to want to be or to know what to want to be. Fairtrade creates a society where anyone can live as a human. In other words, it is the moral economy proposed by Adam Smith.

The basic framework of Fairtrade creates an alternative economy. It is the framework to support for producers or workers in the developing countries to improve the livelihood and living conditions by themselves. It creates opportunities for economically disadvantaged producers and provides capacity building. It is transparent and accountable. Fairtrade gives a minimum price for products. When the market price of products goes up then the fairtrade price also goes up. But if the market price goes down than the fairtrade price does not go below the minimum price. Fairtrade not only offers payment of a fair price but also gives advance payments and long-term contracts as well as premium payments for social development. Safe and healthy working condition without child labor and gender equity are as central as environmental protection. Case studies have shown that fairtrade can contribute to alleviating poverty and to strengthen rural sustainability. However, support alone is not enough. The farmers' mindset, a mindset of deep dependency, needs to change. Fairtrade can lead small-scale farmers to independence. Also, indigenous development is crucial for sustaining their community. I hope that the fairtrade will help to solve the poverty problem in

economic respects. For that to happen the fairtrade market needs to further expand. It is currently growing drastically, but the market size is not yet enough. We have to show conscious consumers how fairtrade clearly impacts producers and communities to facilitate fairtrade's further growth.

Another alternative way is the FEC(C) Subsistence Territory. The FEC(C) Subsistence Territory includes fundamental elements for a local community to survive. F stands for self-supply of food. E stands for Energy and C stands for care. In some instances, a second C for Credit and Regional Circulation is added. Some rural communities in Japan, such as Higashi Oumi City, initiate the creation of FEC Subsistence Territory. This was done through various small village businesses, including local food businesses, natural energy production, and care activities in collaboration with NPOs and the local government. The project rises to establish the elements that local communities need to survive and self-supply food, energy and care.
Yet another alternative way is the 'MURA' Business. The 'Mura' Business is a model for a Small Business of the Village, by the Village and for the Village. One product or service is offered in each locality. This product derives from the locations history, culture, grassroots demand or originality of the people involved. These businesses give priority to community's sustainability, not profit-seeking. They draw from history, regional resources, local knowledge and experience. It helps to increase human interaction in the community and information locally. The MURA business is linked to new forms of agriculture, such as serviced based agriculture or human based agriculture. The key point for Village Business is that they are a social-oriented business that do not maximize profits but maximize sustainable activities of everyone involved. Commonality is the goal of these village businesses.

Finally, we also need future and new forms of agriculture. That is a service-based agriculture. Such agriculture will be sustainable, relies on local resources and avoids over-exploitation. Moreover, it will increase the core of people involved by also including the elderly, women and disabled people in the workforce. Service-based agriculture will magnify support and cooperation. Rather than having on large company employing 100 people, 10 small companies should employ 10 people each. These variable small businesses should be in a cascading relationship with each other. We need to be more tolerant of the 'stupid' person because they have unconventional thinking. They will help us to grasp future trends. Such an agriculture can attract migrants from urban sector who again can call other migrants. Networks are important. The service-based agriculture does not need to replace the conventional commodity-based agriculture. They can coexist and even cooperate but we need to allow new forms of agriculture.

I hope that today I could show a few alternative ways that could help us address the problems our world is currently facing. Thank you for your attention.

9.45 – 10.30

Ensuring Rural Sustainability in ASEAN

Urbanization has continued apace for decades and is expected to continue this century while the sustainability of rural communities has been and remains threatened. Persistent challenges have included rising inequality between city and rural dwellers, agriculture mechanization and contract farming which can reduce decent jobs and small farm family incomes, and rural to urban migration putting further stress on the sustainability of cities. Urbanization of rural areas is also destroying many ecosystems, biodiversity and farmlands necessary to feed cities and rural communities alike. Corporate (private or state

owned enterprise) "land grabs" of rural properties cross Southeast Asia for non-agricultural development or large-scale farm exports often harm environments, while big companies take profits as many rural communities do not receive much benefit. Many larger mining or hydroelectric projects also endanger rural community livelihoods and food sources. Problematically some 70 to 80 per cent of the world's hungriest, least food secure, poorest and most vulnerable groups are still small farmers and rural wage laborers. One big picture policy dialogue challenge for this panel to discuss is: how more inclusive and sustainable rural transformation be fostered to mitigate problems associated with urban-rural inequality while better supporting small farmers with decent incomes to sustain healthy local communities.

Discussion Questions

1. What are the main obstacles, threats, barriers and practical challenges to rural sustainability in Southeast Asia?
2. What are the main policy issues that must be addressed to better support rural communities, improve farm and off-farm livelihoods, curtail out-migration and reduce urban-rural inequality?
3. What are examples of best practices for rural sustainability in already exist that can be improved, adapted to local circumstances and scaled up across the region?
4. How can governments, NGOs, academics, farmers and regional or international organizations better work together to improve rural sustainability? What cooperation mechanisms exist on rural sustainability, can be strengthened or should be established?

Dr. Sucharit Koontanakolvong – *Policy Dialogue Ensuring Rural Sustainability (Thailand Case)*. Water is one of the most important resources in both rural and urban areas alike. When looking back into the past we can see that farmers engaged in heavy farming with intensive cHelmical use. The fluctuating income from farming could not hold up to the rising cost of livings and farmers looked for other forms of income ore migrated into the city. Resources in the village are scares and many hold their land illegal. The household economy is unstable and there is a debt cycle. The rural economic becomes a burden to the urban economy. More recently, other issues have also become more important to farming communities. These include climate change, increasing age, migration and globalization. This makes it difficult for farmers to compete. To solve these problems we have several approaches, such as distributing the government budget not in accordance with an area, connecting the village to the internet so they can increase their benefits and stimulate national tourism with tax incentives. It is the goal to lift Thailand's agriculture onto the level of innovative business, or Thailand 4.0.

Prof. Helmi Helmi – *Sustainability Science and Transition Towards Rural Sustainability: Some Issues and Concepts*. The idea of sustainable development was conceived in 1987 but in 2012, it was concluded that the idea has failed and instead globalization has divided the world into unequal parts. Previously too little attention was paid to the social dimension of sustainable development. We merely focused on technocratic solutions to environmental and eco-efficiency aspects. We failed to solve poverty and inequality as has been clearly shown by Prof Koichi. We have to put more attention on local resources and acting with global support. There is a lack of synergy and organization of efforts. Scientific knowledge is not transformed into public policies. The problem is not the lack of knowledge but the lack of the ability to translate it into policies. Therefore knowledge management is very important. We

need synergy. We need to develop a new science as well: a science that communicates beyond these boundaries. Sustainability problem cannot be tackled by specific disciplines, they call for interdisciplinarity. Therefore I call for the establishment of sustainability sciences.

Dr. Daniel Ruiz de Garibay – *Ensuring Sustainable Development in ASEAN*. We should pay attention to the idea of having good policy. Unfortunately, we live in a world where policy is not good or the policy is there but was decided in a way that the people who have to work with it have not been involved. So we have to work on a way to make policies that are not only good but that involve the people who are concerned from the beginning. We believe that farmers, especially young farmers have to be involved in the policy-making process from the beginning. If we do not involve them from the beginning we are not able to know their problems and their policy options. Thus, the resulting policies are likely to fail. We want to reach a higher quality of life for the rural population. This is what we do at the World Rural Forum. The World Rural Forum is an NGO working on family farming and sustainable rural development. What is family farming? Family farming is agriculture, forestry, fisheries and pastoral and aquaculture production which is managed and operated by a family. That does largely refer to small-scale farming but because we are working internationally we cannot define what small scale is. Small-scale in Samoa may be different than in Argentina. We focus on family farming because 70 percent of the world's food is produced by family farming. It is key to fighting hunger and malnutrition. Also, 40 percent of the world's households depend on family farming. When we look at the global sustainability goals it is clear that family farming is closely related to them. We believe that family farmers are key to sustainability. We have identified two sectors of populations that we believe are actors of change: (1) Women which relates to policies of gender equity and (2) the youth. We are working right now on the *Decade of Family Farming* which will happen from 2018 to 2028.

Wednesday, 24 January 2018: 10.45 – 12.15
Location: Room 802

Session 3A: Working With Farmers to Achieve Sustainability
Session Moderator: Suthirat Kittipongvises, Environmental Research Institute, Chulalongkorn University, Thailand

Authors and Papers:

3A.1	**The Importance of Farmer Perception Towards Ecological, Social Economy and Ethical Urgency as Component of Sustainable Horticulture Practices**
	E. Euriga, S. Amanah, P. S. Asngari, A. Fatchiya, Yogyakarta, Agricultural Extension College, Ministry of Agriculture of Republic of Indonesia
3A.2	**Lake Buhi: Where Has All The Water Gone?**
	Arthur B. Estrella, Central Bicol State University of Agriculture, Phillipines
3A.3	**Land Resettlement Scheme in Malaysia: Lessons from Felda Bukit Goh, Kuantan**
	Syahaneem Binti Mohamad Zainalabidin, Institute of Agricultural and Food Policy Studies, Universiti Putra Malaysia
3A.4	**Changing Rural Livelihoods in South East Asia: Constraints and Opportunities**
	Mokbul Morshed Ahmad, Asian Institute of Technology (AIT), Thailand
3A.5	**Estimating Non-Co2 Greenhouse Gas Emissions from Field Burning of Crop Residues in the Philippines: 1990-2015**
	Jose Hermis P. Patricio, Central Mindanao University

Wednesday, 24 January 2018: 10.45 – 12.15

Location: Room 701

Session 3B: The Socioeconomic Transformation of the Agrarian Landscape in Asia: What Does the Future Hold and the Role of Education?

Over the past four decades the agrarian landscape of Asia has undergone a quiet, but at times turbulent transition that has affected the social fabric of rural communities, economies of countries and the ecological attributes associated with natural resources and their use. This transformation has invariably resulted in the emergence of more complex household structures where farm incomes are no longer the dominant source, (i.e. the emergence of a "remittance landscape"); a geriatrified farming community with youth leaving the farm for better opportunities; and women becoming the mainstay of the farm economy. This session will explore the transformation of the agrarian landscape and the social impacts, implications and future trends. This will be achieved through a keynote and three presentations that will lead into a facilitated panel discussion.

Session Organizer: Andrew Noble (Stockholm Environment Institute (SEI)) and Chantana Banpasirichote Wungaeo, (CUSRI)

Keynote Address: **The Past, Present and Future of the Smallholder in Asia**

Jonathan Rigg, Asia Research Institute and Geography Department, National University of Singapore.

Panelists*:*

3B.1	**Coops and Contract Farming: Institutional Incentive Structures that Work, and those that Don't.**
	Daniel Ray Lewis, Chulalongkorn University
3B.2	**Emerging Export-Oriented Horticulture and Intensification of Cropping Systems in Myanmar**
	Koji Kubo, Chulalongkorn University
3B.3	**Exploring the Motivation of Smallholder Farmers to Shift to More Sustainable Agricultural Production Systems in Thailand**
	Waripas Jiumpanyarach, Chulalongkorn University

Wednesday, 24 January 2018: 10.45 – 12.15

Location: Room 702

Session 3C: Can Organic Agriculture Feed Asia?

Towards Organic Asia (TOA) is a participatory network to advance organic agriculture and agroecology with core partners in the Mekong region and a growing network Asia-wide. The mission of TOA is "Organic Food for All". Partners will discuss challenges and progress on organic agriculture and agroecology from different countries and perspectives. This is the second of two sessions.

Session Organizer: Towards Organic Asia (TOA) Movement

Panelists:

3C.1	**The 100% Organic Agriculture by 2020 Policy of Bhutan and How the Newly Developed Bachelor's Degree Course in Organic Agriculture Can Contribute to this Vision**
	Tashi, Royal University of Bhutan (RUB), Bhutan
3C.2	**Major Challenges for Organic Farmers in Laos and Ways to Tackle Problems Together**

	Chanthalangsy Sisouvanh, Rural Development Agency (RDA), Laos
3C.3	**Benefits of System of Rice Intensification (SRI) and Organic Seeds Cultivation For Farmers in Cambodia from a Global Perspective**
	Sam Vitou, CEDAC, Cambodia
3C.4	**Consumer – Producer Collaboration and Social Enterprise Training for Food System Leadership: Asia-Wide Networking Towards Food Literacy and Socio-Economic Transformation. Can We Outscale Community Supported Agriculture (CSA) Towards (Larger Scale) Consumer – Producer Cooperatives?**
	Wallapa van Willenswaard, TOA, Thailand

Wednesday, 24 January 2018: 13.30 – 15.00

Location: Room 802

Session 4A: Bringing Transformational Learning and Capacity Development to Universities in APR to Enhance Agricultural Innovation Systems

Innovation in agriculture is critical for feeding the world's growing population and is fundamental to achieving the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). Yet, it has been dominated by the view that relevant knowledge is generated by research and passed on to the extension system for adoption by farmers through a linear process of technology transfer. This approach has largely failed to tackle contemporary complexity of agricultural development embedded in the interaction of socio-economic and environmental factors. Addressing these complexities requires different set of skills and mind set, multi-stakeholder interaction, as well as functional capacities (soft skills) to improve the existing processes that accelerate innovation.

In agricultural and life science schools and universities, comprehensive transformational learning and student leadership development is needed, to develop not only academic knowledge, but also intellectual, professional, physical, spiritual and emotional aspects of the students. The session will explore the transformational approach being adopted to inspire, guide and equip students with the knowledge, skills and attitudes to meet their aspirations, access resources and grow into qualified, skilled and knowledgeable graduates capable of realizing their individual potential. The topic will be explored through a keynote and three presentations that will lead into a facilitated panel discussion.

Session Organizer: Asia-Pacific Association of Agricultural Research Institutions (APAARI)

Keynote Address: Strengthening the Capacity of the Higher Education Sector through Changing the Mindsets About Capacity Development to Improve Agricultural Innovation Systems.

Ravi Khetarpal, APAARI.

Panelists:

4A.1	**Common Framework on Capacity Development for Agricultural Innovation Systems (CD For AIS**
	Martina Spisiakova, APAARI & Tropical Agriculture Platform (TAP)
4A.2	**Transformational Learning and Student Leadership Development to Achieve the SDGs.**
	Iman El-Kaffass, GFAR.
4A.3	**Soft Skills and Ethical Leadership to Prepare Graduates to Become Catalysts of Change**
	John Kennelly, GCHERA.

Wednesday, 24 January 2018: 13.30 – 15.00

Location: Room 701

Session 4B: Community Rights, Sustainable Development and Rural Land Titling

In the context of Sustainable Development and the rural world of Southeast Asia, there have been several important initiatives of very much conceptual and policy relevance. Three cases are presented to demonstrate a community movement in negotiating for community right of local people in using forest land, their strategies and challenges in advancing the concept in different political and cultural contexts.

Session Organizer: Chayan Vaddhanaphuti, Chiang Mai University and Surichai Wun'gaeo, Chulalongkorn University

Panelists:

4B.1	**Customary law based community forest land and livelihood sovereignty of highland indigenous ethnic minorities**
	Dang To Kien, CENDI/SPERI, Viet Nam
4B.2	**Ecology Knowledge and Practice in Special Space of Cultural Zone for Cultural and Community Rights in Karen Community in Northern Thailand**
	Prasert Trakansuphakon, PASD, Chiang Mai, Thailand
4B.3	**An exploration into the conceptualization and materialization of (living) cultural protected areas in Thailand**
	Narumon Arunotai, Chulalongkorn University, Thailand

Wednesday, 24 January 2018: 13.30 – 15.00

Location: Room 702

Session 4C: Rural Agriculture Transformation and Food Security: Sustainable Agriculture Justice

The face of rural communities and small towns is changing as our agricultural production systems change. Small scale farmers were lifted out of extreme poverty in the past decade. Farming systems were changed by top down policies reflecting global trends. This has impacted food producers and food consumptions. Farmers are central to achieving food security or food safety in the world. These farmers are faced with numerous problems including poverty, lack of opportunity and limited to access resources. In the midst of today's global changes, the needs of producers and consumers are also changing, so finding a way to strengthen agricultural security is essential.

Session Organizer: Sayamol Charoenratana, Chulalonglongkorn University Social Research Institute (CUSRI), Chulalongkorn University, Thailand

Panelists:

4C.1	**Bio-Diversity and Food Security Impacts Assessment of Krabi Coal Power Plant Project**
	Chainarong Sretthachau, Mahasarakham University, Thailand
4C.2	**Organic Farming: the Window for the Future Farmer**
	Tansiphorn Janhom, Chulalongkorn Universtity, Thailand
4C.3	**Drivers And Constraints of Conversion to Organic Farming in the Kingdom of Bhutan**
	Parladh Mahat, Chulalongkorn Universtity, Thailand
4C.4	**Remote Farmers in the Changing World: How to Building Sustainable Food Systems?**
	Sayamol Charoenratana, Chulalongkorn University Social Research Institute (CUSRI), Chulalongkorn Universtity, Thailand

15.00 – 16.00
Promoting Socio-Economic Transformation in ASEAN

Keynote Speech by Distinguished Professor Stewart Lockie, James Cook University, Australia

ASEAN is one of the most rapidly transforming regions in the world and I am not sure if transformation needs to be promoted. So I would like to reframe the question to what kind of transformation we want to see. What kinds of opportunities are existing? What kind of progressive transformations or what kind of destructive transformations are there? Also, we should ask who gets to decide what transformation should happen? The conclusion of today's talk would, therefore, be who can give the authority for transformation.

On the day the Paris climate agreement was signed, I got up very early in the morning to see what had happened. Climate change is without a question a huge concern even now when so many different things are going on. So I got up very early and saw that they have signed it. I felt an immediate relief. Also in 2016, we commenced the implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the 17 goals. What is more important than the goals are the changing understandings that sustainability is universal, transformative, integrated and indivisible. There is no version of sustainability that says when we get the economy working we can afford sustainability. We have to work on it all at the same time, the environment, the society, the economy. There is also no version of sustainability that works in one place. When we fence in our small area we can have sustainability. No, it is universal.

I would like to come back to the aspect of transformation. There are some things that need to change and other things need to be resilient. Every time when I cross a bridge I like the idea that it might be resilient. I like to think that buildings are resilient enough to shelter us from weather and I like to think the labor market is resilient and can give people work. There are also many relationships and things in society that need to be changed, transformed. We do not necessarily change as a response to outside aspects. But with climate change, we more and more have to change to react to this. In 2016, however, we have witnessed a resistance to change. Post-truth is part of this. If you look at surveys especially in the US we can see that the belief in climate change is dependent on political affiliation. So far in the US conservative voters show a negative relationship between education and the belief in climate change. One should think that increased education would lead people to judge based on facts and accept climate change. But in the world of the post-truth that is no longer the case. Thus, when we want to promote transformation we have to ask transformation of what? For whose benefits and according to whom?

We also have to ask what does the future hold? First, the world is going to be hungrier. With population growth, there will not be enough food for everybody. There is also a wealthier world, which will lead to more diverse and protein-rich diets. Customers are going to be choosier. There will demand safer, healthier, sustainable and also ethical food. Food is important for our identity and our community. The empowerment of consumers offers opportunities. There will also be some challenges good for agriculture. The transformation of technology will bring advancement in the digital technology and genetic science. This will fundamentally change the way agricultural products are produced and transported. Finally, we are in for a bumpier ride which includes a long list of risk profiles for agriculture. What of

cause is missing from this is any sense of power any sense of control. The sense of who is making decisions about the food chain is missing from this picture.

I would like to put some of the risk factors back in. They are existential threats to the sustainable development. We are going to experience global environmental changes and never experienced climate states that led to geopolitical tensions and localized conflicts. It is believable that conflicts will not affect Australia as much. But elsewhere where conflicts are an issue this is important and we need to be sensitive to it. About automation and acceleration of labor productivity there is a real lack of research and details about this issue. There is a lot of anxiety. I have kids and you have kids. Australia lost most of their manufacturing jobs years ago. Most people are employed in the service sector. Automation will have less impact in Australia. But, I worry that the 4th industrial revolution will affect the poorer parts of the world, such as Southeast Asia. What would happen to the Thai economy if the labor-intensive economy is affected? There is a massive underinvestment in R&D and higher education in the tropics which could help to offset some of the effects of automation. Mobility and migration again can be a result of this and lead to a number of issues too.

For my discipline, rural sociology, there is one question that is always in the background: "The agrarian question." That is the question of what will happen to the small farmer, the family farmers when industrialization arrives. I want to go back to the 4th industrial revolution. I would like to speculate that agriculture is no longer a significant part of the Australian economy. The few people who still depend on it will move on and experiment with technology to help out their business. But what about farmers in other parts of the world? We know that farmers in many places have embraced mobile phones and mobile money to increase their income and to have a secure transfer of money. That is positive. However, there are many people who are working in the agriculture that are not farmers but agricultural laborers working on plantations. It is not hard to see that plantations will replace human laborers with machines. Robots don't cost as much. They don't take breaks. I think that is the agriculture we are going to see. While this is all speculative, I do think we have to ask and continue to explore where the authority lies. Where are opportunities to distribute it further? And where are opportunities to democratize new technologies?

16.00 – 17.00
Promoting Socioeconomic Transformation in ASEAN

Socioeconomic transformation in Southeast Asia over the past half century has been closely aligned with forces of globalization and trade regimes, while international or regional organizations, governments and communities have tried to mitigate adverse effects and better support local socioeconomic development. The new ASEAN Economic Community (AEC) launched in 2015 included food, agriculture and forestry as "priority integration sectors." ASEAN is also committed to Narrowing the Development Gap (NDG) by promoting South-South Cooperation across all Member States especially among what it refers to as the CLMV (Cambodia Laos, Myanmar and Viet Nam). This could include improving agricultural development approaches as well as support for more sustainable rural policies and programs that look at rural communities in a more holistic manner, taking into account not only economic progress but well-being and sustainability of rural communities. The big picture policy dialogue challenge for this panel is to discuss how inclusive socioeconomic transformation can be fostered to mitigate problems associated globalization while supporting healthy local communities.

Discussion Questions

1. What are the main obstacles, threats, barriers and practical challenges to healthy social and economic transformation in Southeast Asia, especially through agriculture?
2. What are the main policy issues (e.g. trade regimes, or economic priorities or investments) that must be addressed to better support alternative socioeconomic models that especially favor and empower small rural communities in ASEAN Member States?
3. What are examples of best practices of healthy socioeconomic transformation that can be improved, adapted to local circumstances and scaled up across the region?
4. How can governments, NGOs, academics, farmers and regional or international organizations better work together to strengthen healthy, community-based socioeconomic economic development?

Katinka Weinberger, United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (UNESCAP). I would like to share some thoughts about opportunities we see for the agricultural sector. I would argue that the Southeast Asian agricultural sector is in the midst of enormous change. It has achieved to contribute in terms of security in the region as well as economic growth. Yes the agricultural share of the GDP has decreased. Yet it is still a very important source of income for large parts of the population. There are many changes occurring in the sector. Family farming is still responsible for rice farming but you also have an increase in industrialization of the sector often connected with Foreign Direct Investment. Also, we see a growing diversification into crops such as rubber. These dramatic changes have great impact. Any policy that will have impact on the transformation of the sector needs to take this diversity into account. Policies need to be developed that can both address small-scale farmers as well as large-scale industrialized farmers. There is also a more quiet revolution taking place that addresses first stage process. There is a lot of opportunity in to further develop these processes as well as the food safety. All of this will be supported by policies that facilitate the access to technology and food certification processes. What could we do to facilitate a more balanced approach to making such policy decisions?

Kamalinne Pinitpuvadol, United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD). We see that trade and development come together. We don't see trade as commerce or commercial. I will like to share about the issue of socio-economic transformation not so much in terms of agriculture. As Prof. Loockie has mentioned we have had already 2 years of the 17 development goals. The first one is people. We all agree that the P for people is very important. How can we make people better? How can we make people-centered transformation? How can everyone benefit from current and future economic gains? The socio-economic transformation in ASEAN countries, as everyone knows, we have a high economic growth. We have the highest growth in FDI and GDP. But apart from this growth we still have so many problems such as poverty, quality of education and gender equality. Many countries progress in terms of income but there are still many people in these countries suffering from inequality in wealth. Countries need to address the education gap that stems from lack of income. In countries with a wide gap between rich and poor, there are also many health deficiencies between the rich and the poor. The issue of gender equality is very important and achieving gender equality is also part of the goals. The aging society and the disables also have to be part of sustainable development. Finally, migration cannot be left out. In the Asia Pacific Region, millions of people are living outside their country of birth. When we talk about sustainable development all these are issues we cannot forget and have to find solutions for.

Wiput Pooncharoen, Policy Research and Development Institute Foundation (PRI), Thailand. How can we manage the transformation for those who are the policy makers? I will mention two case studies. The first one is about domestic and family violence in Bangkok. The second is about society foresight in Songkhla. One is in a rural area and one in an urban area. It is not easy to achieve transformation in the area of domestic and family violence. The outcomes we would like to see are a safe and violent free community with respectful relationships in the family. There should be services that respond to the needs of women and children. There should be an effective justice response. The last one and most important is that the perpetrators stop their violence and are held accountable. The current situation is as follows. Interventions are strategically guided by the Ministry of Social and Human Security but the implementation is by the local authorities, the Bangkok Metropolitans Administration, and health services who work under the public health authority. Social welfare and psychological services also come from health centers. Finally, school children are under the safeguard of the Ministry of Education. Just looking at this it is easy to see from far why we need a change in the management. So our transformation plan included and joined different relevant authorities and was let by teachers and nurses.

The second case is that of the aging in society. The first problem is to define the aging society. Many people talk about the people who are old already. But in reality, it is a society with multiple generations in a common system. The problem is that the future has to be well planned to have a good quality of life. This project is to plan for the future of the community. We analyze the community and came up with a model utilizing existing information for local community foresight. This analysis of existing information is made in a way that it is easy to understand. We included 4 areas. The first area is family and community relationships. Most of the young people move away to work and the old stay behind. Then they send their children back to the grandparents to look after. There are now a lot of people from Myanmar or people from the border to perform labors. The second is the quality of life and expected health care. The third is the job and work for the economy and saving as well as structure and capability for self-governance which is the fourth area we focused on. With these easy to understand areas people in the community have foresight and can plan ahead for the future.

Ladawan Kampa, Office of the National Economic and Social Development Board. We know that Thailand is an agricultural country that has exported rice and food for a long time. However, we have tried to transform for some time. In this context, we have to think about what kind of food will be suitable. There are six clusters of future food: (1) Products from sustainable production, (2) Food safety products which are free from all types of food hazard, (3) Food for urbanized changes, (4) Products for aging society, (5) Products for reducing food storage and (6) Products mitigating the impacts of climate change. In Thailand, we now have formulated a strategy for the next 20 years. We also have a national reform committee that reforms things we think are the problem of the country. The aim is to reach the Sustainable Development Goals. However, our study has found that the agricultural sector in Thailand has become less competitive compared with other members states after a few years of ASEAN. That is due to the aging society. Thai farmers are in average 55 years of age while in other member states the average age is 40.

Thursday, 25 January 2018
9.00 – 10.30
Strengthening Social and Sustainability Sciences in Higher Education, Research and Extension for Green, Climate Resilient Agri-Food Systems in ASEAN to Meet SDGs

Good evidence, technical knowledge, skills and training in higher education institutions (HEIs) and research organizations are essential to better understand and enable green, climate resilient agri-food systems in Southeast Asia. Different disciplines or fields across social and sustainability sciences can help governments to monitor progress for meeting SDGs and provide necessary expertise for designing suitable project interventions or programs. However, among the 6500 or more HEIs in Southeast Asia we do not have good knowledge or documentation of their capacities and about what they teach. Global and national agriculture research organizations, including the CGIAR and its partners have cooperated sometimes with academics, agronomists, and social or sustainability scientists from many disciplines or fields but their work is also poorly understood by academia and governments. One big picture policy dialogue challenge for this panel is to discuss what HEIs are now doing to mainstream agri-food system education and research through social and sustainability sciences, and how this can be strengthened in partnership with CGIAR, APAARI and other agriculture research organizations.

Discussion Questions

1. What are the main obstacles, threats, barriers and practical challenges to documenting and improving agriculture education, research and training in higher education institutions (HEIs) and research organizations of Southeast Asia?
2. What are the main policy issues that must be addressed to better support higher education reform and the strengthening of social and sustainability sciences in particular?
3. What best practices in higher education innovation, reform and partnerships with farmers already exist, can be improved, adapted to in local circumstances and scaled up?
4. How can governments, NGOs, academics, farmers and regional or international organizations better work together to improve HEIs and strengthen capacities for agriculture and food systems education and research in Southeast Asia?

Dr. Dindo Campilan – Mobilizing Global Science for Green Climate-Resilience agri-food Systems. We need to use global science to enhance national capacities and to reach climate resilience. One good example for that is the measurement of climate risk. Climate risk measurement is largely equated to vulnerability measurement. Vulnerability is often understood as exposure to natural disasters caused by climate change, such as hurricanes. However, pure exposure is not enough to measure vulnerability. We have to look at sensibility and the possible impact too. When a hurricane hits the US it may have less long-term consequences as when it hit Honduras. To measure sensibility we need integrated science for knowledge building and sharing. That knowledge can be used to bridging scales from frames to the landscape. This knowledge can also be used for regional action from cross-country risk. Issues such as the spread of disease cannot be tackled by one country alone but need to be addressed on a regional basis. Further, we need to monitor land use and its change to support policy and action. This monitoring should be almost real time.

Dr. Ravi Khetarpal – Practicing Sustainability Science to Support Agri-food System, Rural Sustainability and Socioeconomic Transformation in Southeast Asia. We are faced with a number of challenges towards achieving sustainable development. Part of this is that the world's economies are so diverse. There is a lot of bureaucracy that stands in our way and often the political will is missing. As for higher education institutions they are in many cases too specialized to be able to solve the problems we encounter. In terms of policy, there is a wide gap between academia and policymakers. This is to some extent also because within the educational system there is little emphasis on soft skills. When we look at examples of best practices it becomes clear that we need an extensive documentation. We also need knowledge hubs linking education with agrifood innovation. The Earth University model is particularly interesting in this regard but the uptake is still limited. We need to work together with multiple stakeholders. This is easier said than done. All stakeholders may not converge for collective action. Thus, first, we need to have a map of possible stakeholders who are willing to act together. In conclusion, social and sustainable sciences need to marry natural science. It is difficult to be simple.

Dr. Sue Vize. As I am part of UNESCO, the majority of my work is concerned with the youth and much of that with education. We have to ask what education is because everybody uses the word differently. One of the things that came up that I really like is exploration. It is about taking students on a journey but we need to give them skills to explore. From what I encounter in my work with secondary students, they are not encouraged to seek more information. Students are taught to listen and repeat. Give them skills to explore! Not expect them to have the skills! Education also has to become more interdisciplinary but universities are stuck in the faculty which makes it impossible. In particular, when it comes to education agriculture, there are many issues to overcome. Agriculture often has the lowest score for admission that shows it is not well respected. We should have respect for farmers and agriculture as a science. That can be achieved by creating engagement of the education with the community. In some programs, students have lived in the village for some time to develop empathy with and respect for farmers. The main questions remain: How can we involve the community in the development of higher education courses?

Prof. Helmi Helmi – Practicing Sustainability Science to Support Agri-food System, Rural Sustainability and Socioeconomic Transformation in Southeast Asia. We have to ask what needs to be done and how are we going to do it? What we need to do is to create synergy between practitioners, academics and policymakers. This can be achieved by creating sustainability science. The concept of sustainability science is a scientific knowledge as the basis to formulate science-based innovative solutions to the sustainable problems. It is problem-driven and solution-oriented, interdisciplinary, and integrated approach and optimizing social and human potential, maintains a continuation of benefits stream and aims at well-being for all. To do this we not only need to look for partners but also need to engage in concerted action.

Thursday, 25 January 2018: 10.45 – 12.15
Location: Room 802
Session 5A: Healthy Communities
Session Moderator: Katja Rangsivek, Burapha Universtity, Thailand
Panelists:

4A.1	**Peri-Urban Agriculture Development in Hanoi City: Food Security, Food Safety and Gender Dimensions**

	Nguyen Phuong Le, Nguyen Mau Dung, Viet Nam National University of Agriculture
4A.2	**Health Food Tradition of Asia: A Case Study from the HFTA Project**
	Eni Harmayani, Umar Santoso, Anil Kumar Anal, Santad Wichienchot, Wirote Youravon, Rajeev Bhat, Murdijati Gardjit, Universitas Gadjah Mada (UGM) Indonesia, Asian Institute of Technology (AIT) Thailand, Prince of Songkla University (PSU) Thailand, University Sains Malaysia (USM) Malaysia
4A.3	**Representations of Good and Safe Food for Consumers in Myanmar and Viet Nam and Market Opportunities for Safe and Environmentally-friendly Agricultural Products**
	Renaud Guillonnet, Isabelle Vagneron, and Pierre Ferrand, GRET and Agricultural Research Centre for International Development (CIRAD) Lao PDR
4A.4	**Division of Labor among Innovation Intermediaries in Agricultural Innovation Systems: a Case of Indonesia**
	Nobuya Fukugawa, Masahito Ambashi, Phuong Le Suhud, Tohoku University, Japan and Economic Research Institute for ASEAN and East Asia (ERIA), Indonesia
4A.5	**Innovating Farm-to-Market Road Design in Upland Production Areas of the Philippines for Rural Sustai Mokbul Nability and Socio-economic Transformation**
	Raffy M. Espiritu, Jaime I. Manuel Jr., Adriano T. Esguerra, Don Mariano Marcos Memorial State University, Bacnotan

Thursday, 25 January 2018: 10.45 – 12.15
Location: Room 701
Session 5B: *Effective Education for Greening Agri-Food Systems And Rural Sustainability*

Session Moderator: Pichaya Surapolchai, Chulalongkorn University Social Research Institute (CUSRI), Chulalongkorn Universtity, Thailand

Authors and Papers:

5A.1	**Climate Smart Field School: The Bicol Agri-Water Project's Extension Modality For Adapting To Climate Change In Rice Farming**
	Cely S. Binoya, Agnes C. Rola, Annalyn O. Agua, Sarah D. Sambajon Asia-Pacific Association of Educators in Agriculture and Environment (APEAEN): University of the Philippines at Los Banos, Central Bicol State University of Agriculture (CBSUA),: Bicol University College of Agriculture
5A.2	**Capacity Development For Agricultural Innovation – Bringing System-Wide Change In Asia-Pacific Through Building Soft Skills In Higher Education**
	Martina Spisiakova, Asia-Pacific Association of Agricultural Research Institutions (APAARI)
5A.3	**Greening Agri-Students Through Creative Pedagogies**
	Joy Membreve Jamago, Central Mindanao University, Phillipines
5A.4	**Rejuvenating Agriculture: Keeping Young Farmers in the Field**
	Daniel Ruiz de Garibay, Universitas Indonesia, Indonesia
5A.5	**Investigating in the Translating of Science**
	Cheryl Sjöström, Lund University, Sweden