

Symposium on APEC Connectivity Blueprint
(May 12, 2014; Qingdao, China)

How to monitor and review the progress? Experiences in ASEAN

Fukunari Kimura
Chief Economist, Economic Research Institute
for ASEAN and East Asia (ERIA)
Professor, Faculty of Economics, Keio University

1

1. APEC and ASEAN

- Distinction of binding and non-binding
 - APEC: non-binding, peer pressure (w/ smiling faces)
 - FTAs: binding, legal (w/ serious negotiations)
- ASEAN Economic Community: the ASEAN way
 - Mixture of FTAs and development agenda, binding and non-binding portions
 - Sometimes start with 10-x
 - Still achieved high-level economic integration (e.g., tariffs, ROO, single windows, investment, air transportation, ...)
 - A way to work together with development gaps
- Revival of APEC
 - Tradition of co-working among governments, business, and academics
 - To be progressive with peer pressure, a convincing conceptual framework is the key.

2

2. The nature of “blueprint”

- ASEAN Economic Community (AEC) Blueprint (2007)
 - FTA and beyond [institutional connectivity]
 - Blueprint to accelerate the process
 - Some parts are “abstract”; binding or non-binding?
 - Monitoring framework was not built-in; mid-term review tasked out to ERIA+ (2011-2012); Track 1.5 monitoring system recommended
- Comprehensive Asia Development Plan (CADP) by ERIA (2010)
 - Indicative infrastructure development plan for EAS16 (centered by ASEAN) [particularly for physical connectivity]
 - Conceptual framework, 695 proposed projects
 - Monitor projects by ERIA and report to EAS; follow-up studies (ASEAN-India connectivity, Comprehensive Myanmar Development Vision)
- Master Plan for ASEAN Connectivity (MPAC) (2010)
 - A pillar for ASEAN economic integration [institutional + physical + people-to-people connectivity]
 - Conceptual framework and illustrative projects
 - ASEAN Connectivity Coordination Committee (ACCC) monitors the progress; annual symposium by ACCC and ERIA (Track 1.5)

3

3. What to evaluate?

- Layers of evaluation
 - 1) The level of commitments
 - 2) Bureaucratic check list
 - 3) Monitor policy changes/implementation
 - 4) Actual changes/progress/improvements
 - 5) Economic outcomes
- Although AEC Blueprint started with 1)+2) by governments, 3)+4) were called for.

4

4. Who would evaluate?

- AEC Blueprint, MPAC: Track 1.5
 - Players: governments, private sector, academics
- Considerations
 - Objectivity
 - Need to work with non-governmental players
 - Information
 - Cooperation of governments essential
 - Incentives
 - Common goals

5

5. How can we make monitors/reviews useful?

- Keep momentum for achieving goals
 - Peer pressure enough?
 - Past experience in APEC
 - “ASEAN way”?
 - Blur border between binding and non-binding portions
 - Start from 10-x; rather than kink-out or opt-out, wait for catching up
- Reorganize commitments and time framework
 - Useful in working with development gaps
- Disclosure of the evaluation
 - Mid-term Review of AEC Blueprint, only for internal use for many countries except the executive summary
 - Desirable for making information open though the clearing process of the review would be cumbersome

6

6. Implications for APEC Connectivity Blueprint

- If the conceptual framework is convincing, even an indicative plan can be useful.
- To make the cost-and-benefit balance of monitoring/reviewing optimal, track 1.5 with academics-private-government would be a choice.
- The role of PSU and APEC Study Centers, working with ABAC