EAST ASIA DEMOCRACY FORUM
Strengthening Democracy in Asia
東亞民主論壇
強化 亞洲民主

東亞公民社會組織有利環境工作坊
會議手冊

主辦單位：台灣海外援助發展聯盟、臺灣民主基金會
協辦單位：國立台灣大學氣候永續學程(IPCS)
時間：2017 年 5 月 24 日(三) 9:00-17:00
　　　2017 年 5 月 25 日(四) 9:00-12:00
地點：集思台大會議中心洛克廳(台北市羅斯福路四段 85 號 B1)

議程：

2017 年 5 月 24 日

時間	內容	講者
08:30-9:00	報到	
09:00-9:20	開幕致詞: 簡介工作坊及介紹講者	王金英理事長及與會貴賓
09:20-10:30	專題演講一：公民社會組織有利環境發展脈絡與國際潮流	主持人：呂慶龍大使 講者：Mr. Henri Valot 　　　　(USAID 首席顧問，法國)
10:20-10:40	Tea Break	
10:40-12:10	專題討論一：當前東亞公民社會組織有利環境概況：鉅視結構觀點	主持人：蕭新煌博士 與談者： • Ms. Nguyen Phuong Linh 　(越南 MSD 執行長) • 陳健民博士 　(香港中文大學社會系副教授) • 蕭新煌博士 　(中央研究院社會學研究所特聘研究員)
12:10-13:10	Lunch Break	
13:10-14:20	專題演講二：公民社會組織在有利環境所扮演之角色：機會與挑戰	主持人：高小玲常務理事 講者：Ms. Tetet Lauron (CPDE 共同主席/亞太研究網絡組織主席，菲律賓)
14:20-14:40	Tea Break	
14:40-16:10	專題討論二：東亞公民社會組織與有利環境：微觀與行動者視角	主持人：洪智杰常務理事 與談者： • Akio Takayanagi 　(日本國際協力 NGO 中心政策顧問) • 洪智杰 　(台灣海外援助發展聯盟常務理事) 回應人： Ms. Tetet Lauron • (CPDE 共同主席/亞太研究網絡組織主席，菲律賓)
16:10-16:40	結論	主持人：王金英理事長

Taiwan **Aid**

Taiwan Alliance in International Development
台灣海外援助發展聯盟

2017 年 5 月 25 日

時間	內容	講者
08:30-9:00	報到	
9:00-10:30	專題討論三： 聯合國永續發展目標第 16 項（SDG 16：和平、人權與民主）對有利環境的重要性：區域及國家層次	主持人：高小玲常務理事 與談者： • Mr. Anselmo Lee （韓國亞太民主網絡組織秘書長) • Mr. Douglas Rutzen (美國國際非營利法律中心董事長兼執行長)
10:30-10:45	Tea Break	
10:45-12:15	圓桌論壇： 如何提升東亞公民社會組織有利環境：策略與行動	主持人：簡旭伸教授 （國立台灣大學地理系教授) 與談討論人: • 東北亞: 簡旭伸教授、Akio Takayanagi(日本)、Anselmo Lee(韓國) • 東南亞：Nguyen Phuong Linh(越南)、Tetet Lauron（菲律賓) • 全球：Henri Valot(法國)、Douglas Rutzen(美國)
12:15-12:30	閉幕	主持人：王金英理事長

專題演講一：
公民社會組織有利環境發展脈絡與國際潮流

主持人及講者

講者
Henri Valot
美國國際發展署首席顧問

主持人
呂慶龍大使
前駐法國大使

公民社會組織的有利環境：發展與趨勢

Henri Valot
美國國際發展署首席顧問

接下來我們將針對幾個問題進行討論：公民社會組織的有利環境，包括主要行動者和組織本身、評估公民社會有利環境的主要層面，最後將提出一些政策建議和公民社會組織行動，以促進公民社會組織有利環境。

議題發生的空間(全球)和議題解決的空間(民族國家)，兩者間日益擴大的差距，有四個不同但相互關聯的原因：效率危機、合法性危機、認同危機和平等危機。政府對於這些危機的出現無可奈何，非政府組織行為者因而成為人民需求、利益和價值觀的倡導者。

以下是世界公民參與聯盟(CIVICUS)的公民社會指標項目，對「公民社會」一詞所下的長期定義「是機構、組織與個人的領域，介於家庭、國家和市場之間，在這個領域裏，人們志願結合，以促進共同利益」。公民社會含括極大的多樣性，就成員、組織本身、組織的形成及能力程度而言。但也有另一種對全球公民社會的表現。它是由多元化媒體系統中的資訊騷動所產生的輿論運動，屬自發性的，使用橫向、自發性的溝通網絡進行臨時動員。

要定義構成公民社會有利環境的原因，有其不可否認的複雜性。一種方法是將公民社會與普遍的社會視為等同，並以更高的社會經濟發展作為有利於公民社會的最佳指標。相反做法，是以法律為考量依據，將公民社會環境視為僅由法律或監督框架組成。兩種方法都有道理。公民社會是個參與場域，顯然會受到社會經濟，以及政治、法律層面的影響。

在評估公民社會環境上，廣泛被使用的阿馬蒂亞·森(Amyarta Sen)「能力取向理論」具有重要的潛力。阿馬蒂亞·森的「能力取向理論」誕生於 1980 年代，最初是用來解決福利經濟學，是廣泛被使用的工具，用來評估個人福祉、社會安排、政策設計和社會變革策畫。

「能力取向理論」強調公民參與是健康社會的基本要素，並強調是使個人能夠實現目標的根本條件。它是比較評估的非規定性方法(例如，集體行動可以在有或無組織參與的情況下發生，並且可以有很多不同的發生形式)。並且適用於更深入的公民行動有利條件評估。通過將能力鏡片應用到對公民社會的評估，注意力將從公民社會的產生轉移到個人能夠促成集體行動的基本條件。

然後，我們可以將公民社會有利環境定義為一系列相互關聯的條件，它影響公民和公民社會組織以持續或有效態度實踐共同目標、短暫或長期參與在不同層次的政治、政府和發展過程。因此，體認到有利環境不僅包括法律，監管和政策框架，還有具體的政治/政府、經濟和社會文化因素。所以，公民社會組織有利環境綜合分析主要有四個方面：社會經濟環境、社會文化環境、治理環境和法律環境。

結論，我將提出一些政策建議。公民社會組織行動在提倡「公民社會組織有利環境」：為公民社會創造有利環境，以下幾項將是關鍵，生活的實踐、聯盟的設立、訊息的共享、協調遊說，成為跨領域、公民社會各階層間的倡議者。

專題討論一：
當前東亞公民社會組織有利環境概況：鉅視結構觀點

主持人及講者

講者
Linh Phuong Nguyen
越南環境與永續發展研究中心執行董事

陳健民
香港中文大學社會學系副教授
讓愛與和平佔領中環運動共同發起人

主持人
蕭新煌
中央研究院社會學研究所特聘研究員
總統府資政

亞洲公民社會組織有利環境之宏觀結構分析

Linh Phuong Nguyen
越南環境與永續發展研究中心執行董事

永續環境是政府、官方捐助者和其他發展行動者，包括作為捐助者的公民社會組織所造成的政治和政策背景，這將影響公民社會組織可能執行工作的方式。

公民社會組織是社會和經濟發展的重要參與者。他們促進公民參與、有效提供發展方案和行動，促進特定群體的社會賦權、實踐人權和社會轉型。然而，2017 年 4 月「世界公民參與聯盟」發表的一篇「公民空間追蹤報告」中指出，全世界 100 個國家當中，只有 26 個國家為公民社會發展提供開放的公民空間；大部分的其他國家仍是狹窄、受阻、壓制和封閉的。特別是亞洲，沒有一個國家處於開放(Open)階段，幾乎都被阻礙和壓制，只有三個國家有狹窄(Narrowed)空間，包括東亞的日本、南韓。

要了解亞洲公民社會組織的有利環境，我要先談一下亞洲公民社會組織的現況與挑戰。為了詳細介紹亞洲公民社會組織的現況，我將使用國際公民社會組織發展有效性框架，當中列出的有效公民社會最低標準，來進行有利環境的重點分析。這將有助於評估我們的有利環境，了解我們倡導有利環境工作時，遭遇的關鍵障礙為何。

另外，也可以通過權力關係分析來揭示現況，這有助於辨別階層、空間和權力形式，並分析彼此間的互動。它可以使我們能夠對任何背景或問題進行綜合權力關係分析，從而幫助我們充分探索關係和權勢，尋找潛在的倡導切入點和挑戰權力動態。為了說明分析，將會舉出幾個亞洲特定國家的案例和例子。最後會提出一些建議，幫助解決和改善公民社會組織為亞洲有利環境的宣傳工作。

中國與香港的公民社會比較

陳健民
香港中文大學社會學系副教授
讓愛與和平佔領中環運動共同發起人

我將以 CIVICUS 的公民社會指標做為框架，比較中國與香港的公民社會發展。這個框架包括公民社會的四個面向：環境、結構、價值和影響。

1. 中國
a) 環境：組織註冊、募款、與境外 NGO 合作皆受到法律限制，公民社會組織的有利環境相當不利，並且依照組織的募款來源、規模、發展生態予以不同型態的控制。
b) 結構：由於資源不穩定、志願服務的發展不健全、缺乏資助型基金會及訓練機制導致整體結構脆弱與不完善。
c) 價值：越來越能接受公民社會所提倡的價值，如自由、平等、永續性、參與、責信及透明等。
d) 影響：在提供服務、預算及其他政策形成過程中影響有限。

2. 香港
a) 環境：香港公民社會環境較複雜且多元，海外非政府組織以及基金會在香港註冊、募款或組織間合作方面只受到些微的法令限制，但人權和政治倡議團體偶爾會受到政治干預。
b) 結構: 公民社會組織所支援的學校和社會服務團體都有來自政府穩定的資金，但同樣也產生對政府過度依賴和缺乏創新等問題。倡議團體則不仰賴政府或是企業的資助，而能自由的向民眾募款，雖然他們可能不能免稅。在香港，擔任志工是社會上很常見的事。
c) 價值：諸如自由、民主、平等、永續、參與、責信、透明等是香港公民社會組織普遍接受的價值。在 1997 年香港回歸中國後，香港的公民社會組織更積極地推動平等、民主、保留傳統文化及自然環境等價值。
d) 影響：香港的公民社會組織在提供教育、社會服務及醫療服務上扮演相當重要的角色。然而，沒有民主政體為基礎，公民社會組織始終無法進入政策制定及預算審核的過程。雖有以上限制，公民社會組織仍舊積極透過社會動員、倡議團體的力量來創造更多的政治影響力及文化變革

台灣公民社會組織的轉變與現況以及國家關係：1948 年─2017 年

蕭新煌
中央研究院社會學研究所特聘研究員
總統府資政

I.1948 年台灣戒嚴以來，公民社會組織與國家關係史
1. 1948-1980 年：被禁止
2.1980 年代：行動主義的興起
3.1990 年代：民主轉型政治化與政治對立聯盟
4. 2000-2008 年：在第一政權領導過程衰微
5.2008-2016 年：在第二政權領導過程復甦
6. 2016 年至今：在第三政權領導中，要求進行公民社會組織法的改革

II.台灣公民社會組織有利環境三大典型的轉變：營造公民社會組織倡議運動
1. 從外部管制到自由集會和自制
2. 從國家監督到自律、透明和負責
3. 從倚賴國家到公共賦權和民主深化

III.台灣「倡議型公民社會組織─民主─慈善民間組織」在台灣辯證聯繫的實證
1. 倡議型公民社會組織推動民主轉型：1980 年代（為社會做了勇敢的事情）
   ─社會變革
2. 民主的背景促進了充滿活力的慈善公民社會組織：1990 年代 -（為社會做了慈善的事情）─社會穩定

專題演講二：
公民社會組織在有利環境所扮演之角色：機會與挑戰

主持人及講者

講者
Maria Teresa Lauron
公民社會組織發展有效性夥伴共同主席

主持人
高小玲
Taiwan AID 常務理事
彰化基督教醫院海外醫療中心執行長

公民社會組織在有利環境中的角色：挑戰與機會

Maria Teresa Lauron
公民社會組織發展有效性夥伴共同主席

公民社會組織為發展進程注入獨特的觀點。他們與社群的人民和條件最無距離，並且提供關鍵的聲音和經驗促進發展對話。因此，公民社會組織參與發展行動的規劃、執行、審查和後續追蹤是發展行動成功的關鍵，其結果是有意義的，並可接觸到最邊緣化的人民。

為了使公民社會組織在發展過程中做出所需的貢獻，他們必須能以獨立發展行動者的角色全然發揮。為此，有利環境的建立是必要的。

然而，久而久之，公民組織面臨重大的挑戰，限制了其參與發展進程。包括，多方利益關係人的對話空間有限、不平等的參與官方發展合作、法律和監管環境中的阻礙以及全球趨勢走向限縮的公民空間。此外，公民社會組織在完成內部可信度評估中也遇到困難；如同「伊斯坦堡原則」提及的，充分參與發展進程的道路充滿障礙。

儘管如此，加強有利環境的機會仍是有的。多方利益關係夥伴的崛起是達成有利環境最有效的途徑；如此，公民社會組織能夠以突出的行動者身分，正式參與發展進程。倘若多方利益關係夥伴要獲得具包容性的真實成果，公民社會組織必須參與在其中。

雖然公民社會組織持續提倡其公民權利和政治權利，以便能夠充分參與發展進程，但為公民社會組織創造有利環境的工作卻不單只是在公民社會組織中。所有的發展行動者必須在他們自己的工作崗位上、倡導活動中及人際關係上致力創造有利環境。

我的演說將從 CPDE 的研究中提出幾個例子，闡述以上的幾個觀點。我會提出公民社會組織以獨立發展行動者角色，參與發展進程中會遇到的挑戰，還有克服這些挑戰的機會，也就是一透過我們的工作，與其他發展行動者的一起努力。

專題討論二：
東亞公民社會組織與有利環境：微觀與行動者視角

講者
Akio Takayanagi
日本非政府組織國際合作中心（JANIC）政策顧問

回應人
Maria Teresa Lauron
公民社會組織發展有效性夥伴共同主席

主持人
洪智杰
台灣海外援助發展聯盟常務理事
至善社會福利基金會執行長

日本：逐漸限縮的公民空間

Akio Takayanagi
日本非政府組織國際合作中心（JANIC）政策顧問

日本在經濟合作發展組織成員國表現敬陪末座。不論是在直接對於公民組織的補助比例，或是間接透其所從事的合作發展比例，僅占 1.7%，但發展援助委員會成員(DAC)的總和是 17.4%；日本是經濟合作發展組織成員國(OECD-DAC)中表現最差的。儘管如此，從事國際發展的公民組織並沒有覺得有利環境惡化。

但是，如果看看日本的公民空間，我們必須說自從安倍晉三的內閣 2012 年底上台以來，日本的公民空間不斷地限縮。2012 年，執政的自民黨（LDP）修訂憲法草案，包括若干危險條款或條。例如，第二十一條保障集會和結社自由、言論自由、媒體自由和其他形式的表達，但自民黨計劃增加一條新的段落，指出「旨在損害公共利益或公共秩序，以此目的相關活動是不被允許。」

我會舉出三個例子，探討日本逐漸限縮的公民空間。一個是發生在沖繩的和平鎮壓與反美運動。特別是沖繩和平運動中心主席山城博治(Hirosji Yamashiro)在抗議名護市邊野古的新基地建造工程遭待捕，而後被拘留五個月。

第二個例子是限縮的媒體自由。 2016 年 4 月，聯合國言論自由權問題特別報告員 David Kaye 先生警告說，媒體的獨立性受到威脅。我會舉一些例子說明政府威脅媒體獨立和自由的措施。

第三個例子是「陰謀法案」（此刻撰寫本摘要時，日本議會正討論該法案）可能會縮小公民空間。

我將會討論日本和世界各地發生的事情間，存在的共同因素，以及日本特有的因素，還有日本公民社會組織在國際議題上的影響。

東亞公民社會組織和有利環境的動力：來自台灣的觀點

洪智杰
台灣海外援助發展聯盟常務理事
至善社會福利基金會執行長

公民社會組織（CSOs）的政治和政策環境可以大大影響其組織的存在、運作和影響力。台灣擁有 2400 萬人口，估計在台灣的非政府組織，從基層社區組織到慈善基金會已超過 6 萬個。

我將簡單介紹台灣的公民社會發展和及影響台灣公民社會組織有利環境的幾項立法改革，特別針對「人民團體法」修正案、「財團法人法」草案和「集會遊行法」修正案進行討論。

接著，我會討論台灣如何處理公民社會責信和透明度問題。雖然大多數公民社會組織皆遵守政府的要求和規定，但卻未被要求向公眾揭露財務報告和工作計畫，這相當需要公民社會組織的自律。因此，公民社會組織領導者的責信和透明度是很重要的，能確保組織願意遵守原則和標準。此外，由於經費申請和核銷的要求，捐款人和贊助機構在提升公民社會組織的責信和財務透明上也扮演重要角色。

最後，我將介紹外部合作夥伴和行為者，包括外國政府、跨國公司、國際非政府組織和學術界的不同做法，有助於推動台灣公民社會組織的有利環境。此外，我會提出一些建議，方便公民社會組織倡導更好的發展環境。

因此，唯有政府將民間社會組織視為真正的合作夥伴，而不是執行社會福利的承包商，才能提升公民社會組織的有利環境，並通過調整公共管理辦法來改變與公民社會組織的互動方式。在組織自律和政府監督下，公民社會組織應對捐款人和服務對象負責。此外，公民社會組織需要提高組織工作能力並與不同利益關係人對話，我也將提供建議和可能的策略供政策參考。

專題討論三：
聯合國永續發展目標第 16 項（和平、人權與民主）對有利環境的重要性：區域及國家層次

主持人及講者

講者
Anselmo Lee
韓國亞太民主網絡組織秘書長
亞洲發展聯盟共同召集人

Douglas Rutzen
美國國際非營利法律中心董事長兼執行長

主持人
高小玲
Taiwan AID 常務理事
彰化基督教醫院海外醫療中心執行長

對於增進區域和國家有利環境 永續發展目標第 16 項「和平、人權與民主」的重要性

Anselmo Lee
韓國亞太民主網絡組織秘書長
亞洲發展聯盟共同召集人

和平、公正、有效、負責和包容的組織是永續發展的核心。十多年來，幾個區域的和平與安全水平提升了。但是，在許多其他國家，特別是東亞地區仍然面臨長期的武裝和暴力衝突；太多人為著生存而掙扎，就因為所在環境制度薄弱、缺乏公平的司法管道、資訊取得不易和基本自由喪失等障礙。

17 項目標之一的第 16 項目標「促進和平且包容的社會，以落實永續發展；提供司法管道給所有人；在所有的階層建立有效的、負責的且包容的制度」，被認為是跨領域且不可或缺的支柱。就像第 17 項目標，缺少了其一，整個永續發展目標將無法成功實現。這就是它為何是五個 P 之一——社會(People)、經濟(Prosperity)、環境(Planet)、治理 (Peace)和執行(Partnership)；而經常被稱為民主政治或是 PHD(和平、人權和民主)。第 16 項目標下的 12 項細項目標主要與和平/非暴力相關，包括對兒童的暴力行為、反腐敗/透明度和資訊取得、民主和法制以及人權/公正的司法管道。

「和平、公正和包容性社會」是第 16 項目標的特質，公民社會組織在使用目標 16 實踐永續發展目標，其角色是相當重要的。為此，為公民社會組織提供有利環境以達永續發展目標需要同時擁有時與地的配合。公民社會組織需要確保基本自由的民主空間，例如目標 16.10 中強調的言論自由、集會和結社自由。一般來說，公民社會組織被期待在實踐永續發展目標中，扮演服務提供者或與其它利益關係夥伴合作的角色；同時也扮演監督角色，成為具批判及獨立的監督者，全程監督政府和其他利益關係人在實踐永續發展目標時，是否符合 UN2030 年永續發展議程的變革遠見和原則。參與永續發展目標的所有公民社會組織都需要使用目標 16 作為槓桿作用，使其無論在政策參與上、提倡有利環境和一般的民主的促進活動，影響力都得以增加。

由於永續發展目標是聯合國所有成員國所接受和實行的普遍合法議程，如聯合國人權理事會下的普遍定期審議（UPR）。有必要動員國際上對於立法和政策改革的團結和壓力，充分利用潛在的監測機制，例如聯合國高級別政治論壇的自願國家評估報告（VNR）。關於第 16 項目標的監督報告，需要所有 VNR 的整合，作為 HLPF 的永久議程，如目標 17 所述。此外，需要政府、民間社會組織和其他利益相關者為第 16 項目標集體制定更具體和相關的國家及區域指標。

2030 年議程：藉由保護公民空間以極大化發展成果的全球契機

Douglas Rutzen
美國國際非營利法律中心董事長兼執行長

2030 年議程（或稱永續發展目標 SDGs）將基本自由和公民社會夥伴關係作為發展目標，並認為「建立和平、公正和包容性社會的必要性」需透過尊重人權、及行使透明和負責的治理。議程進一步強調，如果「振興和加強全球夥伴關係」中沒有公民社會的參與，永續發展目標將無法實現。

在 SDG 的 169 項細部目標中，有 2 項目標特別體現了這些原則，分別是目標 16 之 10：「依據國家立法與國際協定，確保民眾可取得資訊，並保護基本自由。」；以及目標 17 之 17：「依據合作經驗與資源策略，鼓勵及促進政府部門、公辦民營部門、以及公民社會之間的合作。」

2030 年議程強調公民社會在發展進程的角色是重要的。我們知道，公民社會有助於實現有關營養（目標 2）、健康（目標 3）、教育（目標 4）和其他減貧服務（目標 1）的目標；婦女賦權（目標 5）；建立社區基礎設施（目標 6，7，9，11）；提供就業和經濟賦權（目標 8）；保護環境（目標 6，12，13，14，15）；政府負責（目標 16）；並確保發展觸及到偏鄉和邊緣化群體（目標 10）。

2030 年議程也強調，為了將公民社會對發展的關鍵貢獻發揮到極致，基本自由是必要的。人們可以輕鬆地組成組織、在擁有人權和負責的政府區域工作、容易取得國內外資源，並與政府、國際組織和其他團體合作。

儘管，在 2030 年議程中，表述公民社會對發展自由的重要性，並提出承諾；全球的公民空間仍持續限縮。過去五年來，已有 70 多個國家通過了限制結社、言論自由和集會自由的立法，而其他許多國家亦保持「穩定的壓迫」。因此，全世界公民社會組織在永續發展目標的貢獻上受到阻礙。

我將討論「2030 年議程」如何成為促進全球和各國公民空間的倡議工具，我也會討論如何制定強而有力的指標、製作具說服力的數據和報告、提高公民空間與發展之間的理解，以及在公民社會中實現 SDG 第 16 之 10 和第 17 之 17，以及這些議題所帶來的挑戰和契機。

圓桌論壇：
如何提升東亞公民社會組織有利環境：策略與行動

與談討論人

東北亞：
簡旭伸 (國立台灣大學地理環境資源學系教授、Taiwan AID 顧問)
Akio Takayanagi (日本非政府組織國際合作中心（JANIC）政策顧問)
Anselmo Lee (韓國亞太民主網絡組織秘書長、亞洲發展聯盟共同召集人)

東南亞：
Maria Teresa Lauron (公民社會組織發展有效性夥伴共同主席)
Linh Phuong Nguyen (越南環境與永續發展研究中心執行董事)

全球：
Henri Valot (美國國際發展署首席顧問)
Douglas Rutzen (美國國際非營利法律中心董事長兼執行長)

主持人
簡旭伸 (國立台灣大學地理環境資源學系教授、Taiwan AID 顧問)

關於 Taiwan AID

Taiwan AID 成立於 2013 年, 為台灣第一個以國際援助發展為宗旨的 NGO 平台組織, 秉持人道、公平正義、永續發展之價值, 藉由國際連結、能力建構、政策倡議及大眾教育, 致力於建立台灣從事國際人道援助與永續發展民間組織的合作。目前共有 30 名會員組織, 專業領域涵括醫療、教育、社福、緊急救援、性別、資訊等, 多元而全面, 展現本聯盟做為台灣國際發展 NGO 平台組織之特色。

國際連結
區域：日本國際協力 NGO 中心(JANIC)、香港樂施會(Oxfam HK)、亞洲發展聯盟 (ADA)、韓國國際公民社會發展組織、韓國國際協力 NGO 中心
全球：公民社會組織發展效能夥伴關係平台 (CPDE)、全球夥伴關係發展效能合作平台 (GPEDC)

工作成果
能力建構：國際研討會及會議
亞洲 NGOs 國際發展研討會、公民社會組織發展效能夥伴關係平台組織（CPDE）東北亞年會

能力建構：培力工作坊
公民社會有利環境工作坊、世界公民教育工作坊、以人權為基礎方法（HRBA）工作坊、企業參與國際發展工作坊、國際 NGO 與本地 NGO 合作推行計畫講座、緊急救援的評估測量與責信工作坊、緊急援助避難所工作坊

政策倡議：
台灣新國際合作發展概念書、聯合國永續發展目標推廣計畫

國際援助方案：尼泊爾社區災後重建計畫
社區發展中心計畫；山區醫療站整修計畫；社區型綠能示範民宿計畫

研究調查及出版：
台灣非政府組織進行海外援助現況及展望報告
Taiwan AID 會員組織能力分析報告
夠好指南：緊急救援的評估測量與責信(中文版翻譯)
環球計畫 2015-2020 策略規劃(中文版翻譯)
暹粒公民社會組織共識(中文版翻譯)

聯絡我們
地址：10574 台北市松山區民生東路四段 54 號 7 樓 708 室
電話：(02) 2719-0408 分機 239
傳真：(02) 2712-8002
官方網站：http://www.taiwanaid.org/
Email：secretariat@taiwanaid.org

Taiwan Alliance in International Development
台灣海外援助發展聯盟

Workshop on CSOs and Enabling Environment in East Asia

Handbook

Agenda

Time	Contents	Speakers
5/24 (Wed)		
08:30-9:00	Registration	
09:00-9:20	Opening Remarks: Introduction of the Workshop and Speakers	• Ms. Rebecca Wang (Chairperson, Taiwan AID) • Distinguished guests • Invited Speakers
09:20-10:30	Keynote Speech 1: Enabling Environment for Civil Society Organizations: Development and Trends	Moderator: Amb. Michel Ching-long Lu Speaker: Mr. Henri Valot (Lead Adviser Voice & Accountability Accelere Education Programme in DRC, USAID)
10:20-10:40	Tea Break	
10:40-12:10	Panel Discussion 1: Experience-sharing of Macro-structural Analysis on the Current Condition of CSO Enabling Environment in East Asia	Moderator：Dr. H.H. Michael Hsiao (Distinguished Research Fellow, Institute of Sociology, Academia Sinica) Panelists: • Ms. Nguyen Phuong Linh (Executive Director, MSD Vietnam) • Dr. Kinman Chan (Associate Professor, Dept. of Sociology, Hong Kong Chinese University) • Dr. H.H. Michael Hsiao (Distinguished Research Fellow, Institute of Sociology, Academia Sinica)
12:10-13:10	Lunch Break	
13:10-14:20	Keynote Speech 2: The Roles of Civil Society Organizations in Enabling Environment: Challenges and Opportunities	Moderator: Dr. Nina Kao (Executive Director, Taiwan AID) Speaker: Ms. Tetet Lauron (Co-Chair, CPDE/ Chairperson, APRN)
14:20-14:40	Tea Break	
14:40-16:10	Panel Discussion 2: Experience-sharing of Micro- and Actors' Perspectives on Dynamics between Civil Society Organizations and Enabling Environment in East Asia	Moderator: Mr. Jay Hung (Executive Director, Taiwan AID) Panelists: • Mr. Akio Takayanagi (Policy Adviser, JANIC) • Mr. Jay Hung (Executive Director, Taiwan AID) Discussant: • Ms. Tetet Lauron (Co-Chair, CPDE/ Chairperson, APRN)

Taiwan Aid
Taiwan Alliance in International Development
台灣海外援助發展聯盟

16:10-16:40	Conclusion	Ms. Rebecca Wang (Chairperson, Taiwan AID)
5/25 (Thu.)		
08:30-9:00	Registration	
9:00-10:30	Panel Discussion 3: The Importance of SDG 16 (Peace, Human Rights and Democracy) in advancing the Enabling Environment at Regional and National Levels	Moderator: Dr. Nina Kao (Executive Director, Taiwan AID) Panelists: • Mr. Anselmo Lee (Secretary-general, ADN) • Mr. Douglas Rutzen (President and CEO, ICNL)
10:30-10:45	Tea Break	
10:45-12:15	Roundtable Discussion: Promotion of CSO Enabling Environment in Asia: Strategy and Action	Moderator: Dr. Shiuh-shen Chien (Professor, Dept. of Geography, National Taiwan University) Discussants: • Northeast Asia: Dr. Shiuh-shen Chien, Anselmo Lee, Akio Takayanagi • Southeast Asia: Nguyen Phuong Linh, Tetet Lauron • Global: Henri Valot、Douglas Rutzen
12:15-12:30	Closing	Moderator: Ms. Rebecca Wang (Chairperson, Taiwan AID)

Keynote Speech 1:
Enabling Environment for Civil Society Organizations: Development and Trends

Speaker
Henri Valot
Lead Adviser Voice & Accountability Accelere Education Programme in DRC, USAID

Moderator
Amb. Michel Ching-long Lu
Former Representative (Ambassador) to the French Republic

Enabling Environment for Civil Society Organizations: Development and Trends

Henri Valot

Lead Adviser Voice & Accountability Accelere Education Programme in DRC, USAID

This communication will contribute to the following questions: the evolvement of discussion on CSO Enabling Environment (CSO EE), including its main actors and institutions; the key dimensions of assessing an enabling environment for CSOs and will end with some policy recommendations and CSO actions in promoting CSO Enabling Environment.

The growing gap between the space where the issues arise (global) and the space where the issues are managed (the nation-state) is at the source of four distinct, but interrelated, political crises that affect the institutions of governance: crisis of efficiency; crisis of legitimacy; crisis of identity; and crisis of equity. Because of these crises and the decreased ability of governments to mitigate them, nongovernmental actors become the advocates of the needs, interests, and values of people at large.

We use below the long-standing definition of the CIVICUS Civil Society Index project, which understands the term civil society as 'the arena, outside of the family, the state and the market, which is created by individual and collective actions, organisations and institutions to advance shared interests'. Civil society encompasses enormous diversity, in terms of membership and constituencies, in terms of organisational forms, and in terms of capacity levels. But there is also another expression of global civil society. This is the movement of public opinion, made up of turbulences of information in a diversified media system, and of the emergence of spontaneous, ad hoc mobilizations using horizontal, autonomous networks of communication.

There is undeniable complexity in defining what constitutes an enabling environment for civil society. One approach would be to equate civil society with society at large and argue that higher socio-economic development is the best indication of an enabling civil society. An opposite approach, informed by legalistic considerations, would consider civil society's environment as consisting merely of legal or regulatory frameworks. There is truth in both approaches. As civil society is the arena of participation, it evidently is affected by both socio-economic factors as well as political and legal dimensions.

The widely-used Amyarta Sen model of *capability approach* holds significant potential in the assessment of civil society's environment. Initially conceived in the 1980s as an approach to welfare economics, the capability approach is a broad normative framework for the evaluation and assessment of individual wellbeing and social arrangements, the design of policies, and proposals about societal change. The capability approach emphasises civic participation as a fundamental ingredient of a healthy society and emphasises the underlying conditions that make individuals capable of achieving their goals. It a non-prescriptive recipe for comparative assessments (e.g. collective action can take place with or without organisations and can assume many different forms) and is suitable for a deeper assessment of the enabling conditions that allow for civic action. By applying the capability lens to the assessment of civil society, the attention shifts from what civil society 'produces' to the underlying conditions that make individuals able to promote collective action.

We can then define the CSO EE as a set of inter-related conditions that impact on the capacity of citizens and civil society organisations to pursue common goals or to participate and engage, in sustained and effective manner, in different levels of political, governance and development processes. As such, this approach recognises that the enabling environment includes not only legal, regulatory and policy frameworks but also specific political/governmental, economic and socio-cultural factors. Given these considerations, a comprehensive CSO EE analysis would have 4 main dimensions: the socio-economic environment; the socio-cultural environment; the governance environment; and the legal environment.

I will then conclude with some policy recommendations and CSO actions in promoting CSO Enabling Environment: to make an enabling environment for civil society a living reality, alliance building, information sharing and coordinated lobbying and advocacy across borders and between different sections of civil society is key.

Panel Discussion 1:
Experience-sharing of Macro-structural Analysis on the Current Condition of CSO Enabling Environment in East Asia

Speakers
Linh Phuong Nguyen
Executive Director, Research Center of Management and Sustainable Development (MSD), Vietnam

Kin-man Chan
Associate Professor, Sociology, The Chinese University of Hong Kong
Co-founder, Occupy Central with Love and Peace

Moderator
Hsin-Huang Michael Hsiao
Distinguished Research Fellow, Institute of Sociology, Academia Sinica
Senior Advisor to the President of Taiwan

Macro-structural Analysis on the Current Condition of CSO Enabling Environment in Asia

Linh Phuong Nguyen
Executive Director, Research Center of Management and Sustainable Development (MSD), Vietnam

Enabling environment is the political and policy context created by governments, official donors and other development actors, including CSOs acting as donors, that affect the ways CSOs might carry out their work.

Civil Society Organisations (CSOs) are an essential actor in the social and economic development. They promote citizen participation, provide effective delivery of development programs and operations, and promote the social empowerment of particular groups toward the realisation of human rights and social transformation. However, the report of CIVICUS on "Tracking civic space" launched on April 2017 shows that among 100 countries all over the world, only 26 countries have open civic space for the development of CSOs, while almost are narrowed, obstructed, repressed and closed. Especially, in Asia, there is no country in the "Open" category, almost are obstructed and repressed, only 3 countries have "Narrowed" space including Japan and South Korea in East Asia.

To tap into the Enabling environment for CSOs in Asia, I will talk about the current conditions and challenges of CSOs in Asia. Specifically, to contextualising the current enabling environment for CSOs in Asia, I will focus on the analysis of the enabling environment in comparison with the minimum standards for effective civil society as outlined in the International Framework for CSO Development Effectiveness. This will help assess our enabling environment to identify critical barriers to our efforts for enabling environment advocacy efforts. In addition, the current situation can also be revealed through power relation analysis with the power cub which will help identifying levels, spaces and forms of power and analysing how they interact with each other. It may allow us to conduct a comprehensive power analysis of any context or issue helping us fully explore relationships and forces to find potential entry points for advocacy and ways of challenging power dynamics. To illustrate for the analysis, the cases and examples of specific country in Asia will be addressed. And finally, some suggestions will be made to address the issues and improve the advocacy efforts of CSOs for the enabling environment in Asia.

Comparing Civil Society in China and Hong Kong

Kin-man Chan
Associate Professor, Sociology, The Chinese University of Hong Kong
Co-founder, Occupy Central with Love and Peace

The presentation adopted Civicus's Civil Society Index (CSI) as a framework to compare the development of civil society in China and Hong Kong. The framework includes four dimensions of civil society: structure, environment, values and impacts.

1. China
    a) Environment: adverse environment due to legal restrictions in registration, fundraising and collaborations with overseas NGOs and foundations. "Graduated control" exercise over different kinds of NGOs according to their business nature, size and source of funding.
    b) Structure: fragile structure due to unstable supply of resources, lack of development of voluntarism, lack of grant-making foundations and training institutes.
    c) Values: growing receptive to civil society values such as freedom, equality, sustainability, participation, accountability, transparency etc.
    d) Impacts: limited impacts on service provision and budgetary and other policy-making processes.

2. Hong Kong
    a) Environment: complicated environment in terms of minimal legal restrictions in registration, fundraising and collaborations with overseas NGOs and foundation but occasional political interference to human and political rights advocacy groups.
    b) Structure: stable funding from the state to schools and social service agencies run by CSOs but also have problems in over-reliance on the state and lack of innovation. Advocacy groups don't rely on the state or corporate funding but can raise funds from public without much restriction though they may not enjoy tax-emption status. Volunteering is common.
    c) Values: values such as freedom, democracy, equality, sustainability, participation, accountability, transparency etc. are widely accepted among CSO. After the handover in 1997, values such as freedom and democracy as well cultural and environmental preservation have been actively promoted by these CSOs in the community.
    d) Impacts: CSOs play important roles in providing education, social and medical services in Hong Kong. Without democracy, however, CSOs are not duly involved in the budgetary or policy-making processes. Through social mobilization, advocacy groups occasionally created tremendous policy impacts and cultural change.

Transformation and the Current State of CSO and State Relations in Taiwan: 1948-2017

Hsin-Huang Michael Hsiao
Distinguished Research Fellow, Institute of Sociology, Academia Sinica
Senior Advisor to the President of Taiwan

I. History of CSO-State Relations since 1948 Martial Law in Taiwan
   1. 1948-1980: Suppressed
   2. 1980s: Rise of activism
   3. 1990s: Politicization for democratic transition and alliance with political oppositions
   4. 2000-2008: Decline under the first regime change
   5. 2008-2016: Resurrection under the second regime change
   6. 2016-: Call for CSO law reform under the third regime change

II. Three Paradigm Shifts of CSO Enabling Environment in Taiwan: A Creation of CSO advocacy movements
   1. From external control to free association and self-governance
   2. From state monitoring to self-discipline, transparency and accountability
   3. From state dependence to public empowerment and democratic deepening

III. A Living Proof of "Advocacy CSO-Democracy-Philanthropic CSO" dialectical links in Taiwan
   1. Advocacy CSO pushed for democratic transformation: 1980s- (having done the courageous things for the society)—social change
   2. Democratic contexts facilitated vibrant philanthropic CSO: 1990s- (having done the benevolent things for the society)—social stability

Keynote Speech 2:
The Roles of Civil Society Organizations in Enabling Environment: Challenges and Opportunities

Speaker
Maria Teresa Lauron
Co-Chair CSO Partnership for Development Effectiveness/Chairperson Asia-Pacific Research Network

Moderator
Nina Kao
Executive Director, Taiwan AID
CEO, Overseas Medical Mission Center, Changhua Christian Hospital

The Role of CSOs in Enabling Environment: Challenges and Opportunities

Maria Teresa Lauron

Co-Chair CSO Partnership for Development Effectiveness/Chairperson Asia-Pacific Research Network

CSOs bring a unique perspective to the development process. They are closest to the people and conditions in communities and bring the voices and experiences of those affected to the development dialogue. Therefore, it is critical to successful development action that CSOs participate in the planning, implementation, review, and follow-up of development actions in order to achieve outcomes that are meaningful and reach the most marginalized people.

In order for CSOs to make their necessary contribution to the development process, they must be able to operate in their full capacity as independent development actors. And for this, an enabling environment that promotes such action must be in place.

Over time, though, CSOs have faced significant challenges that have limited their participation in the development process. They include for example, limited of space for multi-stakeholder dialogue, unequal engagement in official development cooperation, hurdles in the legal and regulatory environment that limit participation, and a global trend toward shrinking civic space. Further to this, CSOs face difficulties to achieve their own, internal measures of accountability, as laid out by the Istanbul Principles, where the path to full engagement in the development process is riddled with obstacles.

However, some opportunities for strengthening an enabling environment do lay in the path. The rise of multi-stakeholder partnerships as the best way to achieve sustainable development opens the door for CSOs to officially contribute to the development process as distinct actors. It also reinforces the fact that the conditions for CSO participation must be in place if these multi-stakeholder partnerships are to be truly inclusive and deliver tangible results on the ground.

While CSOs continue to advocate for their civil and political rights in order to be able to fully participate in the development process, the work towards an enabling environment for CSOs does not rest in CSOs alone. All development actors must aim to achieve an enabling environment in their own work, in their advocacy, and with the partners they engage.

In this address I will elaborate on many of these points providing examples from research conducted by CPDE. I will lay out challenges CSOs face in participating in the development process as independent development actors and opportunities to overcome these—through our own work and working together with other development actors.

Taiwan Aid
Taiwan Alliance in International Development
台灣海外援助發展聯盟

Panel Discussion 2:
Experience-sharing of Micro- and Actors' Perspectives on Dynamics between Civil Society Organizations and Enabling Environment in East Asia

Speaker
Akio Takayanagi
Policy Advisor, Japan NGO Center for International Cooperation (JANIC) and Ferris University

Discussant
Maria Teresa Lauron
Co-Chair CSO Partnership for Development Effectiveness/Chairperson Asia-Pacific Research Network

Moderator
Jay Hung
Executive Director, Taiwan AID
CEO, Zhi-Shan Foundation Taiwan

Shrinking Civic Space in Japan

Akio Takayanagi,
Policy Advisor, Japan NGO Center for International Cooperation (JANIC) and Ferris University

Japan is the worst among the members of OECD-DAC in terms of the percentage of aid "to" and "through" CSOs, channelling only 1.7% "to" and "through" CSOs, while the figure for the DAC members in total is 17.4%. Despite this, CSOs working on international development have not felt that enabling environment has deteriorated.

But if we look at the civic space in Japan, we must say it has been shrinking and being narrowed since Shinzo Abe's Cabinet came into office in late-2012. The ruling Liberal Democratic Party (LDP)'s 2012 draft for amendment of our Constitution includes several dangerous clauses or articles. For example, while Article 21 guarantees freedom of assembly and association, speech, media and other forms of expression, LDP plans to add a new paragraph stating that "activities intended to harm the public good or public order and associations for such purposes will not be permitted."

I will look into three examples of shrinking civic space in Japan. One is the repression of peace and anti-US s movement in Okinawa. Especially, Hiroji Yamashiro, the Chair of Okinawa Peace Movement Center was detained for five months after he was arrested during protest against construction of a new base in Henoko in Nago City.

The second example is shrinking media freedom. In April 2016, United Nations Special Rapporteur on the right to freedom of opinion and expression, Mr. David Kaye warned that the independence of media is under threat. I will give some examples of government's measures that have threatened media independence and freedom.

The third example is the possibility that the "conspiracy bill" (at the time of writing this abstract, under discussion in our Parliament) might narrow civic space.

I will conclude by discussing what are the common factors between what have been happening around the world and in Japan, and what are the Japan-specific factors, and also what are the implications for Japanese CSOs working on international issues.

Dynamics between Civil Society Organizations and Enabling Environment in East Asia—Perspectives from Taiwan

Jay Hung
Executive Director, Taiwan AID
CEO, Zhi-Shan Foundation Taiwan

The political and policy contexts where Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) work can greatly affect their existence, operation and impact. With population of 2,400,000, it is estimated the numbers of NGOs in Taiwan are over 60,000, ranging from grass root community-based organizations to philanthropic foundations.

I will outline the overall civil society development and several main legal reforms which have impact on the enabling environment for civil society organizations in Taiwan. The amendment of Civil Associations Act, draft law on Nonprofit Foundations, and revision of Assembly and Parade Act will be highlighted and major changes will be reviewed.

Then I will discuss how the issue in regards with CSO accountability and transparency is placed in Taiwan context. Although most CSOs are align with management and supervision requested by the government, disclosure of financial report and work plan to the general public is not required, which increases the demand of CSO self-regulation. As a result, the commitments to accountability and transparency of leadership in CSOs are important to ensure that organizations are willing to comply with principles and standards. Moreover, donors and funding institutions also play a vital role in demanding proof and improvement of accountability and transparency as the requirement and prerequisite for grant application and reimbursement.

Later, I will touch upon different approaches external partners and actors, including governments in other countries, transnational corporations, INGOs and academics, can contribute to the advancement of CSO Enabling Environment in Taiwan. Furthermore, I will propose some recommendations which can facilitate CSOs to advocate a better environment to operate.

To conclude, the CSO Enabling Environment can flourish only if the government genuinely see CSOs as partners instead of contractors in welfare provision and change the ways to interact with CSOs through changing public management approaches. With the self-regulation and moderate governmental supervision, CSOs should be accountable for donors and people they serve. Furthermore, there is a need for CSOs to enhance the organizational capacity to work and dialogue with different stakeholders. Proposed advices and possible strategies will be given for policy reference.

Panel Discussion 3:
The Importance of SDG 16 (Peace, Human Rights and Democracy) in advancing the Enabling Environment at Regional and National Levels

Speakers
Anselmo Lee
Secretary General, Asia Democracy Network (ADN)
Co-convener of Asia Development Alliance (ADA)

Douglas Rutzen
President and CEO, International Center for Not-for-Profit Law, USA

Moderator
Nina Kao
Executive Director, Taiwan AID
CEO, Overseas Medical Mission Center, Changhua Christian Hospital

Importance of SDG 16 (Peace, Human Rights and Democracy) in advancing the Enabling Environment at Regional and National Levels

Anselmo Lee
Secretary General, Asia Democracy Network (ADN)
Co-convener of Asia Development Alliance (ADA)

Peace, justice and effective, accountable and inclusive institutions are at the core of sustainable development. Several regions have enjoyed increased and sustained levels of peace and security in recent decades. But many countries specially in East Asia still face protracted armed conflict and violence, and far too many people struggle as a result of weak institutions and the lack of access to justice, information and other fundamental freedoms.

The Goal 16 "Promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels is one of the 17 goals but considered as cross-cutting and indispensable pillar like the goal 17 without which the whole of SDGs cannot be achieved successfully. That is why It is one of 5 Ps – People, Prosperity, Planet, Peace and Partnership, and often called democratic governance or PHD (Peace, human rights and democracy). The 12 targets under the goal 16 are related to peace/non-violence including violence against children, anti-corruption/transparency and access to information, democracy and rule of law, and human rights/access to justice.

Given the nature of the goal 16 for 'peaceful, just and inclusive society', the role of CSO is crucial in implementing SDGs substantively through the goal 16. For this, better enabling environment for CSOs to contribute to SDG need to be guaranteed by the state and at the same time, CSO need to secure democratic space for fundamental freedoms such as freedom of expression, association and assembly as stressed in the Target 16.10. Generally speaking, CSOs are expected to play the role of implementing SDGs as service provider or in partnership with other stakeholders, and at the same time advocacy as watchdog to critically and independently monitor the full implementation of the SDGs by the government and other stakeholders in accordance with the transformative vision and principles of the UN 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. All CSOs engaged in SDGs need to utilize the goal 16 as a leverage to increase the impact of their policy engagement and advocacy for enabling environment or democracy promotion in general.

Since the SDG is universal and legitimate agenda accepted and practiced by all UN member states like the Universal Periodic Review (UPR) under the UN Human Rights Council, it is useful to mobilize international solidarity and pressure for legal and policy reform in the country and its potential and monitoring mechanisms need to be fully utilized such as the Voluntary National Review (VNR) of the UN High Level Political Forum (HLPF). The monitoring report on the goal 16 need to be integral part of the all VNR and need to be addressed as permanent agenda at the HLPF like the goal 17. Furthermore more specific and relevant national and regional indicators for the goal 16 need to be developed collectively by the government, CSOs and other stakeholders.

Agenda 2030: A Global Opportunity to Maximize Development Outcomes by Protecting Civic Space

Douglas Rutzen
President and CEO, International Center for Not-for-Profit Law, USA

Agenda 2030 (or the Sustainable Development Goals – SDGs) includes fundamental freedoms and civil society partnerships as development goals. It recognizes "the need to build peaceful, just and inclusive societies" by respecting human rights and exercising transparent and accountable governance. It further acknowledges that its ambitious 17 goals and 169 targets will not be achieved without a "revitalized and enhanced Global Partnership" that includes civil society.

Two targets in particular embody these principles and commit governments to promoting civic space: "Ensure public access to information and protect *fundamental freedoms*, in accordance with national legislation and international agreements." (Goal 16.10); and "Encourage and promote effective public, public-private, and *civil society partnerships*, building on the experience and resourcing strategies of partnerships." (Goal 17.17) (emphasis added)

It is significant that Agenda 2030 recognizes the role of civil society in development. We know that civil society helps achieve goals relating to nutrition (Goal 2), health (Goal 3), education (Goal 4), and other poverty-alleviating services (Goal 1); empowers women (Goal 5); builds community infrastructure (Goal 6, 7, 9, 11); provides employment and economic empowerment (Goal 8); protects the environment (Goals 6, 12, 13, 14, 15); holds governments accountable (Goal 16); and ensures that development reaches remote and marginalized groups (Goal 10).

Agenda 2030 also recognizes that fundamental freedoms are necessary to maximize civil society's critical contributions to development. People need to be able to easily form organizations; work in areas involving human rights and government accountability; access domestic and foreign resources; and partner with government, international organizations, and other entities.

Despite the recognized importance of civil society freedoms to development and the commitments made in Agenda 2030, civic space continues to decline worldwide. In the last five years, over 70 countries have adopted legislation restricting the freedoms of association, expression, and assembly, while numerous other countries remain "stably restrictive." As a result, around the world, civil society organizations are impeded in their ability to contribute to the SDGs.

During my presentation, I will discuss how Agenda 2030 can serve as an advocacy tool to promote civic space at global and national levels. I will discuss both challenges and opportunities, including developing strong indicators, generating robust data and reporting, increasing awareness of the link between civic space and development, and mobilizing civil society in all fields around Goals 16.10 and 17.17.

Roundtable Discussion:
Promotion of CSO Enabling Environment in Asia: Strategy and Action

Moderator
Dr. Shiuh-shen Chien (Professor, Dept. of Geography, National Taiwan University ; Advisor, Taiwan AID)

Discussants
- **Northeast Asia:**

Shiuh-shen Chien (Professor, Dept. of Geography, National Taiwan University ; Advisor, Taiwan AID)

Akio Takayanagi (Policy Advisor, Japan NGO Center for International Cooperation (JANIC) and Ferris University)

Anselmo Lee (Secretary General, Asia Democracy Network (ADN) ;Co-convener of Asia Development Alliance (ADA)

- **Southeast Asia:**

Maria Teresa Lauron (Co-Chair CSO Partnership for Development Effectiveness/Chairperson Asia-Pacific Research Network)

Linh Phuong Nguyen (Executive Director, Research Center of Management and Sustainable Development (MSD), Vietnam)

- **Global:**

Henri Valot (Lead Adviser Voice & Accountability Accelere Education Programme in DRC, USAID)

Douglas Rutzen (President and CEO, International Center for Not-for-Profit Law, USA)

About Taiwan AID

Established in 2013, Taiwan AID is the first platform organization dedicated to international development for Taiwan-based non-governmental organizations (NGOs). Members are involved in medical service, education, information, gender, emergency relief, community development, humanitarian assistance, and volunteer service.

Our Vision & Mission
Strengthen transparency, efficiency and cooperation among Taiwan-based NGOs involved in international humanitarian aid with the value of humanity, equality, justice, and sustainable development.

Facilitate an interaction platform for international cooperation, such as seminar; Facilitate capacity building to improve professional services; Promote concept of international development through public education; Advocate and facilitate international development policies; Establish principles, ethics and regulations of international development and assistance; Make other efforts in favor of international development.

Global Partners & Networking
Regional:
Japan NGO Center for International Cooperation (JANIC) ; Oxfam Hong Kong; Asian Development Alliance (ADA) ; Korea Civil Society Forum on International Development Cooperation (KoFID); Korea NGO Council for Overseas Development Cooperation (KCOC)

Global:
CSO Partnership for Development Effectiveness (CPDE); Global Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation (GPEDC)

Our Result
International conference
Asian NGO International Development Conference; Annual meeting of CSO Partnership for Development Effectiveness (CPDE)

Workshop
Enabling Environment workshop; World Citizen workshop; Human Rights-Based Approaches (HRBA) workshop; Private Sector & International Development workshop; NGO Collaboration workshop; Impact Measurement and Accountability workshop; Emergency Relief workshop

Policy Advocacy
Smart Diplomacy: Taiwan International Cooperation and Development; Sustainable Development Goals

Post-earthquake Reconstruction Program in Nepal
New community development center project; Renovation project of medical station in mountain area; Community homestay project

Contact Us
Address: R708, 7F, No.54, Sec.4, Ming-Sheng E. Rd., Taipei 10574, Taiwan
T +886-2-2719-0408 ext.239   Website: http://www.taiwanaid.org/
Email: secretariat@taiwanaid.org

Taiwan Aid
Taiwan Alliance in International Development
台灣海外援助發展聯盟