

COUNCIL *on*
FOREIGN
RELATIONS

DISCUSSION PAPER

U.S.-ASEAN-ROK
Cooperation on
Nontraditional Security

Jaehyon Lee

December 2017

The Council on Foreign Relations (CFR) is an independent, nonpartisan membership organization, think tank, and publisher dedicated to being a resource for its members, government officials, business executives, journalists, educators and students, civic and religious leaders, and other interested citizens in order to help them better understand the world and the foreign policy choices facing the United States and other countries. Founded in 1921, CFR carries out its mission by maintaining a diverse membership, with special programs to promote interest and develop expertise in the next generation of foreign policy leaders; convening meetings at its headquarters in New York and in Washington, DC, and other cities where senior government officials, members of Congress, global leaders, and prominent thinkers come together with CFR members to discuss and debate major international issues; supporting a Studies Program that fosters independent research, enabling CFR scholars to produce articles, reports, and books and hold roundtables that analyze foreign policy issues and make concrete policy recommendations; publishing *Foreign Affairs*, the preeminent journal on international affairs and U.S. foreign policy; sponsoring Independent Task Forces that produce reports with both findings and policy prescriptions on the most important foreign policy topics; and providing up-to-date information and analysis about world events and American foreign policy on its website, CFR.org.

The Council on Foreign Relations takes no institutional positions on policy issues and has no affiliation with the U.S. government. All views expressed in its publications and on its website are the sole responsibility of the author or authors.

For further information about CFR or this paper, please write to the Council on Foreign Relations, 58 East 68th Street, New York, NY 10065, or call Communications at 212.434.9888. Visit CFR's website, www.cfr.org.

Copyright © 2017 by the Council on Foreign Relations® Inc.
All rights reserved.

This paper may not be reproduced in whole or in part, in any form beyond the reproduction permitted by Sections 107 and 108 of the U.S. Copyright Law Act (17 U.S.C. Sections 107 and 108) and excerpts by reviewers for the public press, without express written permission from the Council on Foreign Relations.

Introduction

Traditional security issues in the Asia-Pacific, such as tensions on the Korean Peninsula or disputes over the South China Sea, consistently attract the attention of policymakers within the region and abroad. But their consequences for ordinary people are often dwarfed by the fallout from nontraditional security (NTS) events. NTS events are defined as “those challenges that affect the survival and well-being of peoples and states that arise primarily out of nonmilitary sources, such as climate change, resource scarcity, infectious diseases, natural disasters, irregular migration, famine, people smuggling, drug trafficking and transnational crime.”¹ Other NTS topics include public health, cybersecurity, and maritime safety.

In 2015 alone, the Asia-Pacific region incurred \$45.1 billion in economic losses due to 160 natural disasters, which affected almost sixty million people and resulted in 16,046 deaths.² Since 1970, more than two million people have died and \$1.15 trillion has been lost due to natural disasters in the region.³ The 2004 Indian Ocean earthquake and tsunami alone left approximately 190,000 people dead and caused \$10 billion in economic losses.⁴

For countries in the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), the human and economic losses from NTS threats can be staggering. Cyclone Nargis, which hit Myanmar in May 2008, affected more than seven million people, leaving some eighty-five thousand dead, fifty-three thousand missing, twenty thousand injured, and eight hundred thousand homeless. \$780 million in economic losses were reported, about 3 percent of Myanmar’s gross domestic product (GDP) that year.⁵

The humanitarian and economic consequences of NTS threats have destabilizing effects on regional peace and security. Disasters’ economic and social costs consume resources that otherwise could be channeled toward economic growth and social welfare. Therefore, managing NTS threats is as important as coping with traditional security threats.

There have been bilateral and multilateral attempts at cooperation on NTS in the Asia-Pacific, but they are not enough. Trilateral cooperation among the United States, ASEAN, and South Korea (also known as the Republic of Korea, or ROK) would benefit not just the participating parties, but also the region as a whole. Such cooperation would allow South Korea to contribute to the region and is consistent with the Moon Jae-in government’s foreign policy. It would also advance the U.S.-South Korean alliance and give South Korea experience that could be used in future NTS crises in North Korea such as famines, natural disasters, or pandemics.

The United States, ASEAN, and South Korea should start by focusing on humanitarian assistance and disaster relief (HADR) and transnational crime. Natural disasters in particular have the most devastating consequences and urgently need coordinated efforts by regional countries. HADR cooperation could lead to progress on issues such as environmental protection, climate change, and public health.

NTS Threats in Southeast Asia

Concerns over NTS threats gained momentum in Southeast Asia in the late 1990s and into the 2000s. A number of high-profile events sparked concern for NTS issues: the severe haze that affected many ASEAN countries in 1997; the 2003 outbreak of severe acute respiratory syndrome (SARS); the 2004 Indian Ocean earthquake and tsunami; the 2005 spread of avian influenza; Cyclone Nargis that hit Myanmar in 2008; and severe typhoons that hit the Philippines in 2009.

ASEAN countries have established cooperative institutions in response to these threats (appendix 1). In addition, the ASEAN+3 (which includes ASEAN countries, China, Japan, and South Korea) and East Asia Summit (EAS) frameworks focus on regional NTS threats along with economic cooperation. Given ASEAN countries' sensitivities regarding traditional defense cooperation, working together on NTS issues has been an effective way to build greater security ties among nations (appendix 2).

In recent years, ASEAN has been building the ASEAN Community, which has three main pillars: the ASEAN Political Security Community (APSC), ASEAN Economic Community (AEC), and ASEAN Sociocultural Community (ASCC). The APSC and ASCC blueprints each include strong NTS components. The APSC blueprint, for example, encourages international cooperation in areas such as transnational crime, human trafficking, drug trafficking, terrorism, small arms trafficking, cybercrime, and disaster management and emergency response.⁶ The ASCC blueprint proposes an ASEAN that is safe, disaster resilient, climate adaptive, and drug free. These blueprints address humanitarian assistance and disaster relief, public health, migration, climate change, food and water security, and energy security, among other issues.⁷

Despite these promises and enthusiasm, it is unclear if the existing institutions for NTS cooperation in ASEAN are adequate and are working as intended. ASEAN cooperation is a form of "soft cooperation," meaning that the institutions are not quite rules-based and enforcement is weak. Some political scientists have pointed out that ASEAN cooperation in coping with the regional haze problem is merely a form of soft regionalism, meaning that cooperation has been informal and not legally binding.⁸ Others argue that ASEAN cooperation on environmental issues faces the same fate: impressive institutional arrangements without genuine working institutions or concrete results.⁹

U.S.-ASEAN-ROK Cooperation on NTS Issues

U.S.-ASEAN-ROK cooperation on NTS issues has the potential to boost the ASEAN-ROK partnership. Since South Korea and ASEAN formed a partnership in 1989, there have been numerous political, economic, and sociocultural areas of cooperation between the two sides. With the advent of the ASEAN+3 cooperation mechanism, the breadth and depth of bilateral cooperation has expanded. There is, nevertheless, vast room for improvement. Seoul can work together with Washington on trilateral cooperation to learn how to make ASEAN-ROK cooperation more strategic and to clarify its goals. In addition, the combined resources of the United States and South Korea would do much to address various NTS threats in Southeast Asia.

The United States and South Korea have developed a solid alliance partnership over the past years, but this has focused on more traditional security concerns, particularly those relating to North Korea.¹⁰ This partnership should expand to include NTS issues. This would contribute to the building of a comprehensive partnership between the two countries and would reduce the political burden caused by the fundamentally military nature of the alliance as it stands now.

In addition, U.S.-ASEAN-ROK cooperation on NTS could help South Korea manage issues relating to North Korea. For example, North Korea is particularly susceptible to the adverse effects of climate change due to decades of deforestation and economic mismanagement. Consequently, North Korea is vulnerable to natural disasters, and the country's poor infrastructure will only make things worse. It is not clear if the regime is prepared to handle pandemic outbreaks, and its public health system is generally of poor quality. North Korea still faces the chronic threat of famine, an NTS issue that was particularly acute in the country during the mid to late 1990s when more than three hundred thousand people starved to death.¹¹ ASEAN has experience dealing with similar situations.

If a severe NTS crisis hit North Korea, the country could receive a flood of international aid or even international intervention. Trilateral U.S.-ASEAN-ROK cooperation on NTS will provide invaluable experience for South Korea to manage such an emergency in North Korea.

Thanks to South Korea's rapid economic growth and democratic advancement, many nations expect Seoul to do more on international issues. Over the past few years, beginning with the "Global Korea" slogan and its active role in the Group of Twenty (G20), South Korea has been trying to position itself as a so-called global middle power, a country whose diplomatic power is taken seriously by other nations. Trilateral cooperation on NTS issues would help South Korea strengthen this position. However, the South Korean government does not have a clear idea about how to act as a global middle power and popular support for the concept is still weak. There is a long way to go for South Korea to become a genuine middle power. Trilateral cooperation on NTS would help Seoul move in that direction.

ASEAN-ROK Cooperation on NTS Issues

South Korea has developed ties with ASEAN countries on NTS issues as a subset of wider ASEAN-ROK relations. The period during which ASEAN countries became increasingly sensitive to NTS threats coincided with heightened South Korean enthusiasm about wider regional cooperation in East Asia. Under Kim Dae-jung's leadership, South Korea was active in the early days of ASEAN+3 cooperation. Seoul proposed major initiatives such as the East Asia Vision Group, East Asia Study Group, East Asia Forum, and others, which were instrumental for the consolidation of the ASEAN+3. South Korea's concerns soon expanded to include NTS cooperation with ASEAN countries.¹²

As indicated in the ASEAN-ROK Plan of Action 2016–2020, the two parties are working together on a number of issues. There are cooperative mechanisms on maritime safety, maritime environment protection, and search and rescue operations at sea; on antiterrorism, which includes controlling the flow of people, implementing the law, and focusing on transportation safety and financing; and on human trafficking, small arms trafficking, piracy, money laundering, drug trafficking, and cybercrime. There is also ongoing cooperation between ASEAN and South Korea on disaster management, environmental issues, and human rights, particularly focusing on protecting women and children.

South Korea also participates in various NTS cooperation mechanisms together with ASEAN under the umbrella of ASEAN+3, EAS, and the ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF). South Korea is particularly active in three fields: HADR, terrorism/transnational crime, and public health. The Republic of Korea cochaired the ARF Inter-Sessional Meeting on Disaster Relief together with Thailand from 2015 to 2017. During this time, South Korea financially supported developing an integrated information system for managing disasters via the ASEAN-ROK Cooperation Fund. South Korea also supported meetings, initiatives, and workshops against violent extremism and transnational crime such as the ASEAN workshop on criminal financing and the EAS statement against violent extremism. In 2015, South Korea led regional countries to adopt an EAS statement on raising regional awareness of public health issues and pandemics.

Since the start of the Lee Myung-bak presidency in 2008, South Korea has sought a growing role and responsibility in global and regional affairs. This period saw a steady increase in South Korea's official development assistance (ODA) budget, some of which was put toward NTS cooperation with ASEAN countries. South Korea's ODA disbursement goes to more than one hundred countries around the world, with 20 to 25 percent going directly to Southeast Asian countries.¹³

South Korea's development assistance to ASEAN countries will likely increase in coming years. This will provide momentum for ASEAN-ROK dialogue on NTS as well. South Korea's ODA has continually increased (table 1), and this is likely to continue given the strong government and public support for it.¹⁴ Furthermore, South Korea's total ODA amounts to just 0.14 percent of the country's gross national income (GNI), far below the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development's (OECD) recommendation of 0.7 percent. South Korea aims to have ODA reach 0.2 percent of its GNI by 2020.¹⁵

Table 1. South Korea's Official Development Assistance Budget

Year	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Amount, in USD millions	1,597	1,755	1,857	1,915	1,965	2,272	2,749

Source: OECD development assistance committee statistics and South Korean government's projection for 2017 and 2018.¹⁶

The South Korean government targets many of its loans and grants to be used for infrastructure development abroad. The lion's share of grants goes to public health, education, and humanitarian assistance. More than 20 percent of the grants go toward issues that are closely related to South Korea's NTS cooperation with ASEAN.

Table 2. Allocation of South Korea's Official Development Assistance in 2017

Sector	Amount in USD Millions	Percentage of Total Assistance
Transportation	331.6	14.6
Public Health	257.6	11.4
Public Administration	228.4	10.1
Education	217.5	9.6
Agriculture and Fishery	174.1	7.7
Industry and Energy	135.7	6.0
Humanitarian Assistance	135.5	6.0
Environment	36.4	1.6
Others	749.6	33.0

Source: ROK Committee for International Development Cooperation.¹⁷

Status of U.S.-ASEAN-ROK Cooperation on NTS Issues

U.S.-ASEAN-ROK cooperation on NTS issues is currently limited to just a few exceptional circumstances. For instance, the United States and South Korea are partners in the ASEAN Regional Forum Disaster Relief Exercise and they work together on the Lower Mekong Initiative. These efforts, however, are not trilateral among the United States, ASEAN, and South Korea, since each country joins as a member of the ARF or as one of many countries in each project.

Anecdotal evidence suggests that there were requests from the U.S. side to work trilaterally on NTS threats in Southeast Asia during the Barack Obama administration. As part of its pivot to Asia, the Obama administration wanted South Korea to join in strategic cooperation with the United States, Australia, India, and Japan. When the United States found that the South Korean government was dragging its feet in joining the strategic coalition, an alternative U.S. approach was to have South Korea work on NTS issues in Southeast Asia and the Asia-Pacific. On the one hand, given the history of disputes and tensions between the two countries, the South Korean government viewed working together with Japan as politically sensitive, even as part of a larger U.S.-led strategic effort. On the other hand, South Korea was afraid of potential blowback from China.

The real issue, however, was not about avoiding controversies concerning cooperation with Japan or blowback from China. The problem was that the South Korean policy community did not push the initiative enough. Experts looking at South Korea's cooperation with ASEAN and other small and medium-sized countries in the region were not well-informed about trilateral cooperation. Meanwhile, those who were closely focused on U.S. policy initiatives did not take the idea of trilateral cooperation seriously. Invariably, those who were informed about the idea conceived of ASEAN and NTS cooperation as a marginal issue and instead prioritized U.S.-ROK bilateral issues, Korean Peninsula issues, and other more traditional security concerns. In short, there was a mismatch among policymakers on the South Korean side that hindered trilateral cooperation on NTS.

Moon Jae-in and U.S.-ASEAN-ROK Trilateral Cooperation

South Korea's ODA continued to grow under the conservative governments of Lee Myung-bak and Park Geun-hye. As progressive governments tend to support South Korea's international contributions, the Moon Jae-in administration could be more proactive on forging greater cooperation with ASEAN on NTS issues.

The unifying themes of South Korean foreign policy under Moon and Foreign Minister Kang Kyung-wha include "responsibility," "multilateralism," and "values." The "Northeast Asia Plus Community of Responsibility" (NAP) is one of the Moon government's one-hundred major policy goals.¹⁸ "Responsibility" in this context means that the Republic of Korea will fulfill its duties to foster peace and prosperity in the region.

Kang was a surprising choice as foreign minister since she was not particularly close to Moon's presidential campaign or to the Minjoo Party (the Democratic Party). Her career at the United Nations raised hopes for a new direction for South Korean foreign policy focusing on multilateralism and with an emphasis on universal values, such as human rights, democracy, and rule of law. Kang is known as an expert on multilateral diplomacy.¹⁹ In addition, both Moon and Kang stress values such as human rights, good governance, democracy, and free trade.

Moon's NAP initiative puts ASEAN at the center of South Korea's foreign policy. According to a report to the presidential office prepared by the policy planning committee, NAP has three pillars: Northeast Asia, new Nordpolitik, and the New Southern Initiative (NSI), which is targeted at ASEAN and India.²⁰ The Moon government will probably allocate more resources to South Korea's economic, political, security, and sociocultural cooperation with ASEAN countries. Unlike with previous governments, the Moon government is unlikely to pressure on ASEAN countries to review their ties with North Korea. It is also probable that the Moon government will allocate more resources to address regional NTS threats through cooperation with ASEAN. This is not just an opportunity for the Moon government, but also an opportunity for meaningful U.S.-ASEAN-ROK trilateral cooperation.

The Ineffective Reverse Hub-and-Spoke System

To foster U.S.-ASEAN-ROK trilateral cooperation on NTS, the parties should fix the so-called reverse hub-and-spoke system. Today, ASEAN is the hub that receives financial and technical assistance from outside countries such as the United States, Australia, China, Japan, and South Korea. Among ASEAN countries, this reverse hub-and-spoke phenomenon is less visible. To an extent, this relationship is the natural result of official development assistance flowing from wealthy external countries to ASEAN developing countries. Often ODA and NTS cooperation in the region are used interchangeably, which is not appropriate.

This system incentivizes outside donors to compete to give assistance to ASEAN as a way of augmenting their influence, but this results in overlapping NTS cooperation systems and an ineffective utilization of resources. Moreover, this structure discourages more economically developed ASEAN countries from taking the initiative in resolving regional NTS threats and providing assistance to neighboring countries. Lastly, there is little effort to communicate among the spoke countries, without which NTS cooperation in the region cannot be effective.

A trilateral framework can make a meaningful contribution to address this structural problem. With the United States, ASEAN, and South Korea working together to relieve regional NTS threats, more developed ASEAN countries should be encouraged to provide necessary financial resources, skills, and technologies.

Cooperation on HADR and Transnational Crime

Efforts to promote humanitarian assistance and disaster relief and to fight transnational crime (TNC) are the most promising areas for trilateral NTS cooperation. There are many existing cooperative institutions on HADR in the region, although their capabilities are questionable. HADR threats have the potential to significantly damage the stability, prosperity, and well-being of the region. HADR is a good item for trilateral cooperation because of the severity of natural disasters in the region and also because cooperation on HADR could lead to cooperation on other issues.

In many cases, natural disasters such as typhoons, floods, or droughts in Southeast Asia and the Asia-Pacific are tied to climate change. When a region is devastated by a natural disaster, this is typically followed by the spread of diseases. If trilateral NTS cooperation first focuses on HADR issues, then it can easily be expanded to include climate change, environment issues, and combating communicable diseases.

Transnational crime would be an ideal issue for cooperation among the United States, ASEAN, and South Korea. This can include issues such as small arms trafficking, human trafficking, drug trafficking, money laundering, and even transnational terrorism. These are major threats to people's daily lives and are the biggest sources of national and regional instability. If trilateral cooperation can address TNC, it would enhance the quality of life in the region.

With the exception of tensions on the Korean Peninsula or in the South China Sea, TNC is the most prominent issue that undermines the peace and stability of the region. By tackling TNC, trilateral cooperation can contribute to capacity-building in the region's police and border control forces. TNC is also closely related to corruption in many countries, as crimes may be committed under the auspices of corrupt politicians or military/police forces. Tighter control over TNC has the potential to discourage potential terrorist activities by nonstate actors or state actors such as North Korea.

Recommendations

The following recommendations would enhance U.S.-ASEAN-ROK trilateral cooperation to address nontraditional security threats.

- *Focus on humanitarian assistance and disaster relief.* Natural disasters are the most serious concern in the region, resulting in disproportionate casualties and economic losses. Working on HADR issues will also pave the way for cooperation on issues such as climate change, the environment, public health, and pandemics. The United States, ASEAN, and South Korea should setup a dialogue or research project among government and nongovernment actors to survey existing HADR arrangements to avoid duplicating efforts; draw a plan of action to address regional HADR issues; and work to raise awareness of natural disaster issues in the region. Government projects can be built based on the findings of this research. The project should include not just experts on international relations and area specialists, but also experts on natural disasters and humanitarian assistance.
- *Fix the reverse hub-and-spoke system.* Economically and technically capable ASEAN countries should be donating aid instead of receiving it. Malaysia, Singapore, and Thailand could be the candidates for this shift. A title for these more advanced ASEAN countries, such as the “ASEAN Donor Club,” is needed to persuade these countries to be more proactive in taking action and making contributions. Being identified as donors is likely to elevate the prestige and reputation of these countries in the region. In addition, these selected countries are directly and indirectly affected by natural disasters; sharing their knowledge and capacity to address HADR issues abroad would enable them to build up their own domestic expertise.
- *Effectively coordinate policy among donor countries.* The United States, Australia, China, the European Union, Japan, New Zealand, and South Korea should all contribute to the aforementioned dialogue or research project or to government-to-government cooperation. These countries are individually active in NTS cooperation with ASEAN. By sharing knowledge and capacity and by coordinating their individual efforts to address regional NTS issues, a far more effective scheme to deal with NTS threats could be developed. This multilateral arrangement could start with coordination on HADR and later expand to cover other NTS threats.
- *Expand the U.S.-ROK alliance to cover cooperation on regional NTS threats.* The first step of this re-arrangement should be to assess the current state of knowledge and capacity on both sides. The United States and South Korea have to share what they have in order to address regional NTS threats. A task force can be created under the U.S.-ROK 2+2 Foreign and Defense Ministers’ Meeting and the U.S.-ROK Combined Forces Command for military-to-military efforts.
- *Create an institution to handle U.S.-ASEAN-ROK trilateral NTS cooperation.* The ASEAN Political-

Security Community Department in the ASEAN Secretariat is a promising institution that could take on this role. The United States and South Korea have to take an incremental approach. The two countries should begin by exploring trilateral cooperation with ASEAN within the ASEAN Regional Forum or East Asian Summit. If the three parties can devise an interim arrangement, then a framework for trilateral cooperation can be launched. After a few years of cooperation, this can be followed by building a permanent institution for U.S.-ASEAN-ROK trilateral NTS cooperation.

In addition, South Korea should review its NTS ties with its neighbors in the region. Particularly for HADR, military participation is unavoidable. The South Korean military has been reluctant to take on responsibilities outside of the Korean Peninsula. Since the Moon Jae-in government is emphasizing South Korea's regional contributions and responsibilities, this is a good time for the South Korean military to expand the scope of its operations and be more active in managing regional NTS threats. The Moon administration should begin a comprehensive review of the South Korean military's capacity to identify what kinds of assets are available for this purpose.

Conclusion

Nontraditional security issues in the Asia-Pacific are as important as—or more important than—traditional security issues. More people's lives are threatened and more economic losses are incurred by various NTS threats than by traditional security threats in the Asia-Pacific. Addressing NTS threats can enhance peace, stability, and prosperity in the region. Unfortunately, efforts to solve NTS issues in the region have been less than satisfactory.

The United States can use its political, military, and economic capabilities to deepen its involvement in the region to deal with NTS threats, filling a space between hard U.S. military power and soft cultural and developmental assistance power. In this area, U.S.-ASEAN-ROK trilateral cooperation could bolster efforts to counter NTS threats and open a new chapter for the U.S.-ROK alliance, which so far has been narrowly defined as an arrangement on Korean Peninsula issues.

Appendix 1. ASEAN Institutions Focused on NTS Cooperation

1. Transnational Crime (Including Trafficking)	1	ASEAN Ministerial Meeting on Transnational Crime, AMMTC
		ASEAN SOM on Transnational Crime, SOMTC
		ASEAN SOM on Drug Matters, ASOD
		ASEAN Chiefs of National Police, ASEANAPOL
		ASEAN Director General of Immigration Departments and Head of Consular Affairs Divisions of Ministries of Foreign Affairs Meeting, DGICM
	2	ASEAN Centre on Transnational Crime, ACOT
	3	ASEAN Declaration on Transnational Crime (1997)
		ASEAN Plan of Action to Combat Transnational Crime (1999)
		Treaty on Mutual Legal Assistance on Criminal Matters (2004)
		ASEAN Declaration on Joint Action to Counter Terrorism (2001)
		ASEAN Collaboration on Post Terrorist Attack
2. Disaster Management and Relief	1	ASEAN Ministerial Meeting on Disaster Management. AMMDM
		ASEAN Committee on Disaster Management, ACDM
	2	ASEAN Regional Programme on Disaster Management
		ASEAN Co-ordinating Centre for Humanitarian Assistance on Disaster Management, AHA Centre
		ASEAN Disaster Management and Emergency Relief Fund
		ASEAN Standby Arrangements for Disaster Relief and Emergency Response, ASADRER
		ASEAN Specialized Metrological Centre, ASMC
		ASEAN Earthquake Information Centre
	3	ASEAN Declaration on Mutual Assistance on Natural Disaster (1976)
		Resolution on Strengthening Emergency Relief, Rehabilitation, Reconstruction and Prevention on Aftermath of the Indian Ocean Tsunami Disaster
		ASEAN Agreement on Disaster Management and Emergency Response, AADMER (2004)

1: Intergovernmental meetings

2: Institutions established by ASEAN

3: Declarations and treaties

3. Environment	1	ASEAN Ministers Meeting on Environment, AMME
		ASEAN Senior Officers Meeting on Environment, ASOEN
		6 Working Groups
	2	ASEAN Centre for Biodiversity
		ASEAN Environmental Education Inventory Database
		ASEAN Wildlife Enforcement Network, ASEAN-Wen
	3	ASEAN Agreement on the Establishment of ASEAN Centre for Biodiversity (2005)
		Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020
4. Haze	1	Conference of the Parties to the ASEAN Agreement on Transboundary Haze Pollution, COP to AATHP
		Committee (COM) under the COP to the ASEAN Agreement on Transboundary Haze Pollution
	2	Haze Online (1999)
		Fire and Haze Disaster Simulation Exercise
	3	ASEAN Agreement on Transboundary Haze Pollution (2002)
		Regional Haze Action Plan, RHAP (1997)
5. Health and Communicable Disease	1	ASEAN Health Ministers Meeting, AHMM
		Senior Officials Meeting on Health Development
	2	ASEAN Expert Group on Communicable Disease (2003)
		Taskforces on communicable diseases
	3	Declaration of Healthy ASEAN Lifestyle (2000, 2002) and Action Plan (2002)
		Declaration on ASEAN Unity in Health Emergency (2006)
6. Human Rights	1	ASEAN Intergovernmental Commission on Human Rights
		ASEAN Commission on the Promotion and Protection of the Rights of Women and Children (ACWC)
		ASEAN Committee on Migrant Workers

1: Intergovernmental meetings

2: Institutions established by ASEAN

3: Declarations and treaties

Source: Compiled by author based on various ASEAN documents.

Appendix 2. ASEAN+3 NTS Cooperation Institutions

Transnational Crime	ASEAN Plus Three Ministerial Meeting on Transnational Crime (AMMTC+3)
	ASEAN Plus Three Senior Officials Consultation on Transnational Crime (SOMTC+3 Consultations)
	SOMTC+3 Working Group on Narcotics
	ASEAN Plus Three Work Plan on Combating Transnational Crime
Environment	ASEAN+3 Environment Ministers Meeting (ASEAN+3 EMM)
	ASEAN+3 Senior Officials Meeting on the Environment (ASEAN+3 SOME)
Health	ASEAN Plus Three Cooperation in Health
	ASEAN Plus Three Health Ministers Meeting (ASEAN+3 HMM)
	ASEAN Plus Three Senior Officials Meeting on Health (ASEAN+3 SOMH)
Disaster Management	ASEAN Committee on Disaster Management Plus Three Senior Officials Meeting (ACDM+3)

Source: Compiled by author based on various ASEAN documents.

About the Author

Jaehyon Lee is a senior fellow in the ASEAN and Oceania studies program at the Asan Institute for Policy Studies. Previously, Lee was a research fellow at the Korean Institute of Southeast Asian Studies and a visiting professor at the Korean National Diplomatic Academy's Institute of Foreign Affairs and National Security (IFANS). His recent publications include "Transnational Natural Disasters and Environmental Issues in East Asia," in *IFANS Review*, "Political Crises after Democratization in South Korea and Thailand: Comparative Perspectives of Democratic Consolidation," in *Korea Observer*, "A 2+2 for the Future: The First Korea-Australia Foreign and Defence Ministers' Meeting," and "Identifying South Korea's Regional Partners: On the Environment, Family Values, Politics and Society." Lee received his BA and MA from Yonsei University and his PhD in politics from Murdoch University in Australia.

Endnotes

1. Definition by the Consortium on Non-Traditional Security Studies in Asia (NTS-Asia), as quoted in Mely Caballero-Anthony and Alistair D. B. Cook, in “NTS Framework” in Mely Caballero-Anthony and Alistair D. B. Cook, eds. *Non-Traditional Security in Asia: Issues, Challenges and Framework for Action* (Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies. 2013). Mely Caballero-Anthony and Alistair Cook are respectively the head of Centre for Non-Traditional Security Studies and coordinator of humanitarian assistance and disaster relief Program of the S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies in Singapore and are authors of many books and articles on non-traditional security issues in the Asia Pacific.
2. UNESCAP. *Disasters in Asia and the Pacific: 2015 Year in Review*, 2015, [http://www.unescap.org/sites/default/files/2015_Year percent20in percent20Review_final_PDF_1.pdf](http://www.unescap.org/sites/default/files/2015_Year%20in%20Review_final_PDF_1.pdf).
3. UNESCAP. *Overview of Natural Disasters and their Impacts in Asia and the Pacific 1970-2014*, 2015, [http://www.unescap.org/sites/default/files/Technical percent20paper-Overview percent20of percent20natural percent20hazards percent20and percent20their percent20impacts_final.pdf](http://www.unescap.org/sites/default/files/Technical%20paper-Overview%20of%20natural%20hazards%20and%20their%20impacts_final.pdf).
4. Risk Management Solution, *Managing Tsunami Risk in the Aftermath of the 2004 Indian Ocean Earthquake and Tsunami* (New Ward: Risk Management Solutions, 2006), <http://www.rms.com/blog/2014/12/05/managing-risk-10-years-after-the-2004-indian-ocean-earthquake-and-tsunami/>.
5. Government of the Union of Myanmar, ASEAN, and United Nations. *Post-Nargis Joint Assessment*, 2008, p. 1 and p. 21, http://yan-gon.sites.unicnetwork.org/files/2013/05/post-nargis_joint_assessment_all_pages.pdf.
6. ASEAN. 2009. *ASEAN Political-Security Community Blueprint*, pp. 12-13.
7. ASEAN. 2016. *ASEAN Socio-Cultural Community Blueprint*. 2016, pp. 14-17
8. Mely Camballero-Anthony. “Challenging Change: Nontraditional Security, Democracy and Regionalism” in Donald K. Emmerson. ed. *Hard Choices: Security, Democracy and Regionalism in Southeast Asia* (Stanford: The Walter H. Shorenstein Asia-Pacific Research Center, Stanford University, 2008).
9. Lorraine Elliott, “Environmental Challenges, Policy Failure and Regional Dynamics in Southeast Asia” in Mark Beeson ed. *Contemporary Southeast Asia* (second edition) (Houndsmill: Palgrave Macmillan 2008).
10. A U.S. expert on the U.S.-ROK alliance and United States-ASEAN partnership commented on this point. Currently the U.S.-ROK alliance partnership is like a doughnut. There is a close and extensive cooperation on Korean Peninsula issues and to a lesser extent a healthy partnership on global issues. What is missing—like the hollow part of a doughnut—is a working partnership between Korea and the United States on regional issues.
11. The exact number of dead remains highly controversial. It is estimated to be anywhere from 250,000 to more than two million.
12. There is a Senior Official Meeting on Transnational Crime Plus ROK Consultation (SOMTC+ROK) as a channel for ASEAN-ROK cooperation on transnational crime. The Republic of Korea cooperates closely with ASEAN on drug control, maritime piracy, recovery of victims of human trafficking, cybercrime, and more in the area of transnational crime. There is also bilateral cooperation on newly emerging regional communicable disease such as bird flu. In the field of environmental cooperation, both South Korea and ASEAN are in the East Asia Climate Change Partnership scheme. In addition, there is ASEAN-ROK green partnership and bilateral cooperation in forest protection.
13. ASEAN-Korea Centre, *2015 ASEAN & Korea in Figures* (Seoul: ASEAN-Korea Centre, 2015).
14. According to an opinion survey done by the Korea institute for International Economic Policy in 2013, more than 94 percent of respondents were in favorable of ODA for developing countries, as noted in Korea Institute for International Economic Policy, “Opinion Survey on Korean People’s Perception of ODA,” 2014, an unpublished report.
15. ODA Korea, <http://www.odakorea.go.kr/eng/policy.AnnualImplementationPlan.do>.
16. 2017 and 2018 ODA amounts are a projection of the ROK Committee for International Development Cooperation (CIDC). The original projection in Korean won was converted to U.S. dollars using ODCD DAC’s official exchange rate of 2016. CIDC is the highest-ranking supervising agency of Korean ODA and is chaired by Prime Minister. The projected amounts are available in the International Development Cooperation Comprehensive Implementation Plan, 2018, p. 28 (in Korean), https://www.odakorea.go.kr/fileDownload.xdo?f_id=1499067172269192168139QQHCPE8AT60C55MY3L6Z. The exchange rate of ODCE DAC is available at the ODCD webpage on development finance data, <http://www.oecd.org/dac/financing-sustainable-development/development-finance-data/Exchange-rates.xls>.

-
17. Committee for International Development Cooperation, ROK. "International Development Cooperation Comprehensive Implementation Plan, 2018," p. 29 (in Korean, converted using 2016 OECD DAC official exchange rate), https://www.odako-rea.go.kr/fileDownload.xdo?f_id=1499067172269192168139QHCPE8AT60C55MY3L6Z
 18. South Korean Presidential Office Press Statement on 100 Policy Goals, http://www1.president.go.kr/news/newsList4.php?srhpercent5Bview_modepercent5D=detail&srhpercent5Bseqpercent5D=822. The Northeast Asia Plus Community of Responsibility is an unofficial translation of the Moon government's regional foreign policy initiative by this author. It is often called "Northeast Asia Community Plus." By the time of this writing, an official title for this policy initiative has not yet been decided.
 19. "New Cabinet Members and Chief Security Staff," *The Korea Times*, May 21, 2017, http://www.koreatimes.co.kr/www/nation/2017/05/356_229755.html.
 20. Joon Hyung Kim, "The Moon Administration's Multilateral Regional Diplomacy: An Initiative of Northeast Asia Plus Community of Responsibility," ROK Angle-Korea's Defense Policy. Issue 165. November 2, 2017, <http://www.kida.re.kr/cmm/viewBoardImageFile.do?idx=23519>. Kim is one of the experts who prepared the report for the presidential office.