

# DEFENCE DIPLOMACY IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

CONFERENCE REPORT

30 November 2010  
SINGAPORE



**S. RAJARATNAM SCHOOL  
OF INTERNATIONAL STUDIES**

A Graduate School of Nanyang Technological University



# DEFENCE DIPLOMACY IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

## CONFERENCE REPORT

REPORT OF THE CONFERENCE ORGANISED BY  
THE MULTILATERALISM & REGIONALISM PROGRAMME AT THE  
S. RAJARATNAM SCHOOL OF INTERNATIONAL STUDIES (RSIS),  
NANYANG TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY, SINGAPORE

RAPPORTEURS: OLEG KOROVIN, JENNIFER SIM  
EDITOR: JOANN SAW

30 NOVEMBER 2010  
SINGAPORE

S. RAJARATNAM SCHOOL OF INTERNATIONAL STUDIES  
NANYANG TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY



# Contents

<b>Welcome Remarks</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Session 1: ADMM and ADMM Plus</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Session 2: ASEAN Chiefs of Defence Forces Informal Meeting (ACDFIM)</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Session 3: Other Cases of Defence Diplomacy in Southeast Asia</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Session 4: Great Powers and Defence Diplomacy in Southeast Asia</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Appendix A: Programme</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Appendix B: Participants</b>	<b>15</b>



## Welcome Remarks



*Mr. Kwa Chong Guan*

In his welcome remarks, **Mr. Kwa Chong Guan** highlighted that the use of “defence” and “diplomacy” together had been regarded as an anomaly for a long time. However, this is no longer the case. “Defence diplomacy” has become an important tool of a state’s foreign and security policy, a result of rising reliance and appreciation among states of multilateral avenues to discuss security issues both at the regional and international levels. He felt that Southeast Asia, where one had witnessed the strengthened institutionalisation of multilateral arrangements in the area of defence diplomacy, was an important region to test this claim. Indeed, this would be a significant development in a region that has been averse to discussing regional defence cooperation for a long time.

A range of multilateral arrangements have emerged—the ASEAN Chiefs of Army Multilateral Meeting (ACAMM), ASEAN Chiefs of Defence Forces Informal Meeting (ACDFIM) and the ASEAN Defence Ministers’ Meeting (ADMM), which was convened in 2006 and expanded to

include ASEAN’s dialogue partners in the form of ADMM Plus. All these multilateral arrangements around ASEAN have strengthened the 43-year old organisation’s central role in the regional security architecture. The challenge will be to make sense of how all these areas fit together and how they contribute to the regional security architecture.

The workshop was organised in an attempt to establish a framework for discussing defence diplomacy within both academic and policy settings: how should defence diplomacy be defined and what it means; what institutional venues exist in Southeast Asia to practise defence diplomacy and how they relevant are to policymaking; who the actors involved in regional defence diplomacy and how they choose to practise it. The effort was not to come up with definitive answers but to engage experts in what is hoped to become a long-running dialogue on a crucial element of Southeast Asian security: defence diplomacy.

## SESSION ONE

# ADMM and ADMM Plus

### Carving Out a Crucial Role for ASEAN Defence Establishments in the Evolving Regional Architecture



*Mr. Termsak Chalermpananupap*

**Mr. Termsak Chalermpananupap** emphasised that his talk was primarily aimed at giving a factual account of the developments within the ADMM, this ministerial meeting currently being the primary venue for defence establishments to participate in regional diplomacy. He started by explaining why the ADMM emerged in the first place. Although the conventional wisdom is that ASEAN avoids steps towards defence cooperation so as not to send its partners the wrong signal of it being a military bloc, the situation started to change in the past decade through various informal meetings and discussions between representatives of ASEAN defence establishments. However, within the existing arrangements concerned with security, namely the ARF, the role of these establishments was secondary. To address this problem, steps were taken to start convening the ADMM sessions.

Having gained confidence in regional dialogue and cooperation through the ADMM (started in 2006), ASEAN defence ministers felt the need to engage ASEAN dialogue partners in this initiative—through the ADMM Plus. On the subject of dialogue partners, Chalermpananupap singled out the European Union (EU) and Canada, since they are the two dialogue partners currently not part of the East Asia Summit (EAS) or ADMM Plus. Both have expressed the desire—and fulfilled the requirements—to join the EAS but their status with regard to the ADMM Plus remains

to be resolved. According to Chalermpananupap, the EU is currently not considered as a potential participant in the ADMM Plus because it is primarily an economic—not defence—grouping. But he felt that there is no reason to exclude Canada from the ADMM Plus in the future should it wished to join.

### The ADMM Plus: What's It for?

The key point **Dr. Tim Huxley's** presentation was that experts should be realistic in their expectations of the role that the ADMM can play in the regional defence architecture. He opined that the ongoing discussion regarding the ADMM was somewhat vague and removed from reality. The reality, in a nutshell, is that Asia is not particularly stable at the moment, with the shifting positions of the great powers due to China's rise and the U.S.'s declining presence in the region, and the middle powers finding themselves in a situation where they have to bolster their military defence in light of the great power dynamic and tensions with each other. Huxley emphasised that, against this backdrop, Southeast Asia had no hard institutional arrangements (such as arms control mechanisms) to prevent conflicts from escalating.

Huxley made it clear that he understood the logic behind the ADMM, which was to start with the discussion of non-controversial issues and eventually proceed to the more serious ones. However, in his assessment, it was wishful thinking, given ASEAN's track record. Huxley's main criticism of the ADMM, as it stood, was it did a lot



*Dr. Tim Huxley*

in terms of statements of process and had little to show in terms of concrete achievements. He called experts to realise that the ADMM would never be the venue to discuss defence issues at the highest level—the strategic issues between states—because this is not the ministerial mandate. At the same time, low priority issues were of little political consequence. Therefore, in Huxley’s opinion, the ADMM could only be successful if it moved to the middle ground—concrete confidence-building measures.

## **NADI’s Relevance to the ADMM**

The overarching theme of **Mr. Tan Seng Chye’s** presentation on how the Network of ASEAN Defence and Security Institutions (NADI) could be helpful to the ADMM was the fact that, unlike Western institutions, the ASEAN institutional framework was composed of multiple layers, each of them being relevant, even if they were not comprehensive, in terms of issues they addressed. In light of this crucial consideration, Tan opined that NADI’s relevance was largely explained by the fact that, being a Track 2 initiative, it could discuss issues that might be too sensitive to be brought up at the ADMM. What is particularly conducive to that is that NADI participants come in their personal capacity, and not as official representatives of their respective institutions. Therefore, NADI could be a forum to provide fresh ideas and perspectives to the ADMM, thus complementing the functions of the latter. Moreover, he believed that NADI should focus on upcoming issues rather than current ones so that its insights always remained practically relevant.

Further developing the theme of a multi-layered institutional structure, Tan agreed with Huxley on the fact

that the ADMM could not be a forum where strategic-level issues were discussed. Therefore, the ADMM (together with NADI) and ASEAN+8 were complementary levels of the existing institutional structure.

## **Discussion**

In addressing potential issues that the ADMM Plus would have to resolve, Chalermphanupap highlighted its relation to the ARF, saying it was currently unclear whether the two arrangements would be able to complement each other since there was a considerable overlap in their areas of concern. The other issue that he brought up was the fact that the ADMM Plus was only held once every three years, which brought the challenge of keeping the dialogue partners engaged and interested in regional diplomatic developments over the long time span.

Huxley further developed his view on the realistic expectations of the ADMM’s role. Replying to the question on the ADMM’s possible relevance to great powers, he opined that this would be expecting too much from the ADMM and that it could hardly succeed in this area, given that the ARF had not. In response to questions on specific defence problems and how the ADMM related to them, Huxley once again underscored that discussions had rarely resulted in concrete action to date, citing the failure to create the much talked-about tsunami warning system. On the same note, he mentioned that one of the areas where the ADMM could be quite helpful was discussing voluntary resource commitments from members to various defence issue areas, which would help the transition from discussion and good intentions to concrete action.

Two specific examples were cited of how NADI could be helpful to the ADMM. First, Tan acknowledged that at this point it was not entirely clear where the ADMM would end up in the regional defence architecture in terms of its role, and this was something that could be fruitfully discussed at the NADI level. Second, his general argument on NADI’s relevance was supported by Chalermphanupap, who cited the problem of defence ministers being used to dealing with the national scope of problems. NADI, in Chalermphanupap’s opinion, could be the forum to help broaden their framework of concern and expertise in the regional level.



*Mr. Tan Seng Chye*

## SESSION TWO

# ASEAN Chiefs of Defence Forces Informal Meeting (ACDFIM)

### Defence Diplomacy in Southeast Asia: The View from Jakarta

**Mr. Evan Laksmana's** presentation was primarily concerned with providing insights into two questions: (i) why has there been a considerable increase in defence diplomacy efforts in Southeast Asia, and (ii) why did it happen only in the past decade, and not earlier? Laksmana described the strategic situation regarding defence in Southeast Asia as characterised by the following trends: (i) most defence-issue areas were dominated by the ARF, but the influence of ASEAN as an institution was growing in that respect; (ii) non-traditional security (NTS) issues were rapidly increasing in importance; (iii) defence establishments now played a more important role in foreign policy than they used to.

Having described the backdrop, Laksmana presented his assessment of Indonesia's understanding of the current defence diplomacy dynamics. According to him, some of the key reasons behind the recent rise in defence diplomacy initiatives could be explained by a confluence of several factors. After the financial crisis of 1997, Southeast Asian states engaged in the modernisation of their militaries and, at the same time, faced a situation of a very low level of trust between regional states, making diplomatic efforts quite necessary to improve matters. Parallel to this, NTS issues on the regional scale became considerably more important and, since the military was heavily involved in them, defence diplomacy efforts were, again, most relevant. Finally, a new great power dynamic in the region has made it necessary to engage external powers via diplomacy. In relation to this, Laksmana added that, in Indonesia's view, bilateral and multilateral

defence diplomacy were two sides of the same coin: the former being primarily concerned with specific inter-state defence problems while the latter was aimed more at soft balancing of the major powers.

### Observations of Defence Diplomacy in Action

During his talk, **Mr. Eddie Lim** presented his account of a specific defence diplomacy initiative that he studied: the Heads of Defence Universities/Colleges/Institutes Meeting (ARF HDUCIM). In Lim's assessment, the most prominent characteristic of HDUCIM was that both academics and the military participated in the meetings. Furthermore, even though this initiative was explicitly concerned with defence, it was the military personnel that often got rotated, whereas participants from academia tended to remain the same, thus providing institutional continuity.

According to Lim's observations, the interest of the military in HDUCIM was primarily explained by their aim to gain knowledge and educate future military leaders. They were not there to participate in the defence diplomacy proper. In this regard, he cited ASEAN's decision made in 2008 to expand HDUCIM's mandate beyond military education, making it more relevant to broader defence diplomacy efforts.

Lim explained that the key strengths of HDUCIM were it was an important forum for defence networking and a place for open and sincere discussions of politics between both the military and academics. At the same time, he opined that HDUCIM being essentially an academic



*Mr. Evan Laksmana*



*Mr. Eddie Lim*

setting, albeit one existing within a military framework, was a source of some tension, and it remained unclear how the issue could be addressed.

## **Making Asia-Pacific Security Regionalisms Hang Together: Building Coherence and Community Out of Clutter**

**Associate Professor Tan See Seng** spoke on the problem of how multiple institutional arrangements in the Asia Pacific related to each other and “hung together”. He began by describing the recent trend of institutional proliferation in the region and the fact the political leaders seemed to be increasingly aware of the need for such arrangements to function together in some coherent manner. There are multiple obstacles to this, since some institutions overlap in their functions with others while some are in competition with each other. The key question raised was whether greater coherence was possible. And no less important was: Is it really necessary?

Tan named three major constraints in the way of regional institutions “hanging together”: (i) “regionalism-lite”—defence relations expanded, but without deep institutionalisation or strong commitments from their participants; (ii) “regionalism-elite”—Asian regionalism tended to involve only governmental elites and rarely concerned the lower levels; and (iii) “regionalism-polite”—the ASEAN Way of conducting diplomacy had become the standard in the Asia Pacific, and so few binding obligations were ever expected from states, consensus was privileged over decisiveness, non-interference remained one of the central diplomatic norms, making institutional reforms considerably slower and more difficult.

Tan emphasised that these three areas being constraints was itself a problematic notion that merited further discussion.



*Associate Professor Tan See Seng*

However, to the degree that one did see them as constraints, he proposed the following guidelines in addressing the existing issues: (i) political leaders needed greater coordination of their efforts, and institutional arrangements needed to be conceived to be complimentary; (ii) Asian regionalism should move beyond its present elitism and become participatory; (iii) diplomatic efforts should move beyond mere dialogue to practical cooperation, and stated objectives need to be regularly fulfilled.

## **Discussion**

Laksmana was asked how much attention Indonesia had planned to devote to defence diplomacy during its upcoming ASEAN chairmanship. He responded that, at this point, Indonesia’s concern was still primarily logistical and the focus was on preparing for its chairmanship, and specific policies had not been discussed in great detail yet. Laksmana was also asked why, according to some of the materials he provided during his presentation, there was a decline in defence diplomacy efforts in ASEAN in 2009 and 2010. He believed this was primarily due to the global economic crisis, which shifted everyone’s attention from defence to the economy. A secondary reason might be related to Vietnam’s chairmanship of ASEAN, which saw fewer activities in all areas—including defence—due to Vietnam’s limited internal resources.

In addressing questions regarding the nature and definition of defence diplomacy and its relation to preventive diplomacy, Lim felt that the latter was more difficult to conduct because it was more strictly institutionalised. Defence diplomacy, on the other hand, was more open and there was more freedom for discussion. Tan added that leaders disliked the terminology of preventive diplomacy because it often implied intervention. On the other hand, actual efforts in preventive diplomacy were still needed. Therefore, these efforts tended to shift under the umbrella of the defence diplomacy terminology.

In response to questions on the necessity of greater institutional coherence, Tan noted that the desire for streamlining the existing institutional structure emanated from Asian leaders. In his personal opinion, such streamlining might not be absolutely necessary. Each of the existing institutional arrangements had emerged in response to a particular need present at that moment and later tried to find a new *raison d’être* for itself, often successfully. At the same time, maintaining these institutions did not present a big problem or involve large costs. Tan, therefore, concluded that it might be acceptable that existing institutions did not all “hang together”.

## SESSION THREE

# Other Cases of Defence Diplomacy in Southeast Asia

### The Role of the FPDA in the Southeast Asian Security Architecture

**Associate Professor Ralf Emmers's** presentation asserted that the FPDA would continue to be relevant to regional defence diplomacy for years to come. Emmers explored its relevance by comparing and contrasting recent examples of defence diplomacy, namely the ADMM, ADMM Plus and Malacca Straits Patrol (MSP). He remarked that the FDPA and ADMM potentially overlapped in areas of humanitarian assistance and disaster relief but the two processes tended to mutually exclude one another. The ADMM's inception was mostly to address non-traditional security issues and humanitarian relief but the FDPA was more experienced with professional response than the ADMM in these areas because of the joint-exercises dimension. Where the ADMM Plus was concerned, it was still an embryonic programme, unlikely to overshadow the FPDA anytime soon. In contrast, the FPDA continues to be relevant to the MSP initiative because of its defence dimension. It holds a long tradition of joint exercises that the MSP cannot yet provide. Thus the FPDA fills the gap in enhancing the significance of what is ongoing in the

MSP programme.

Although the scope of collaborations of the FPDA is similar to bilateral cooperation with the United States, Singapore and Malaysia gain from the FPDA what they do not from defence ties with the United States. The FPDA views Singapore's and Malaysia's security as a common set of issues and hence caters to Singapore and Malaysia defence relations in a unique joint structure of defence cooperation. It also remains the best instrument to build confidence between the armed forces of Singapore and Malaysia. In addition, the FPDA has significance for Australia because it gives Australia another vital role in Southeast Asia, one that is independent of being the "deputy sheriff" of the United States within the region. Hence, the FPDA offers diplomatic benefit.

### The Shangri-La Dialogue: Thriving but not Surviving?

In **Dr. Brendan Taylor's** paper, he considered whether the Shangri-La Dialogue would eventually compete with the ADMM Plus or complement it. It included the examination



*From left to right: Associate Professor Ralf Emmers, Dr. Brendan Taylor, Associate Professor Joseph Liow.*

of the impressive rise of the Shangri-La Dialogue in becoming an important fixture in the landscape of Asia security and the significance of the ADMM Plus. Many have argued that the institutional overlap between the two is unproblematic and poses no negative consequences. Taylor, however, advocated the potential danger of institutional duplication. What would appear as growing cooperation might actually be a reflection of increased competition, particularly between the great powers. Despite the best intentions of the Shangri-La Dialogue and the ADMM Plus institutions to co-exist peacefully, it cannot be taken for granted that this peace will emerge by itself. He observed that a study of similar regional institutions in the past would produce precedence of how great powers had utilised overlapping institutions to counteract one another's influence in the region.

As there was potential for unbeneficial institutional competition between the Shangri-La Dialogue and ADMM Plus in the larger architecture of regional security perspective, Taylor suggested how this competition could be managed if it were to emerge. Firstly, develop a concept paper that would suggest options for a division of labour between the Shangri-La Dialogue and the ADMM Plus. Functional differentiation is gaining priority for institutional architecture to work coherently as Asia's institutional landscape gets more crowded. Secondly, better efforts could be made to initiate, perhaps even institutionalise, creative mini-lateral interactions on the sidelines of the ADMM Plus and the Shangri-La Dialogue. Mini-lateral conversations conducted under the auspices of multilateral groupings could serve as forums that discussed specific security concerns.

## Discussion

Huxley commented that two pivotal reasons should be highlighted regarding the formation of the FPDA: (i) memories of Konfrontasi were fresh and the FPDA

provided a context for defence collaboration in support of the sovereignty of Malaysia and Singapore; and (ii) the FPDA was an important channel of communication between Singapore and Malaysia on defence matters, as well as external parties that wished to see Singapore and Malaysia on good terms. From the Australian and New Zealand perspectives, the FPDA served the same purpose in times when their relations with Singapore and Malaysia were not rosy.

**Dr. Farish Noor** noted that there were several dialogues working simultaneously to address concerns but questioned if there was a consideration for the process that generated consensus during such meetings. In such a process of hegemonic consensus, crucial issues might get overlooked, for example, the rise of religious extremism was unobserved until it hit the region from 2000. His concern was how the generation of consensus could address true problems and not block out other variables that might return as bigger troubles. Additionally, **Dr. Chong Ja Ian** observed that the process of consensus making may side-step crucial problems that require attention due to political sensitivities of certain issues. He was unclear how institutions in Southeast Asia, which had a strong political preference to find consensus, could redress the crowding out of sensitive issues that really required the discussions of differences in an open manner.

A final comment was posed by **Group Capt. Brian Edwards** on the importance of defence diplomacy and how it should not be underestimated. Defence diplomacy is indispensable to Singapore and Malaysia in the form of the FPDA. It is also a powerful tool in regulating relations between Australia and Malaysia, as well as Australia and China. Today, all FPDA nations are in Afghanistan working collaboratively. The FPDA is challenging because it has to maintain a five-way relationship but the key to its success is the regular meetings that facilitate the understanding of differences, which is the essence of defence diplomacy. Even so, Australia's participation in the FPDA has nothing to do with the absence of the United States in the grouping but more to do with regional factors.

## SESSION FOUR

# Great Powers and Defence Diplomacy in Southeast Asia

## U.S. Defence Diplomacy towards Southeast Asia

**Mr. Richard Bitzinger** began by describing the objectives of U.S. defence diplomacy: (i) to build relationships that promote U.S. security interests; (ii) to develop partner and allied states' military capabilities for self-defence; (iii) to improve information exchange and intelligence sharing; (iv) to harmonise views on security challenges; and (v) to provide support for U.S. forces in the region. He went on to explain that specific requirements were essential in meeting the objectives. These included operational access, operational capacity and capability building, as well as interoperability. Intelligence and information sharing, regional confidence building, security sector reform, defence technology cooperation, international suasion and collaboration were also on the list of requirements.

Bitzinger pointed out that a vital component of U.S. defence diplomacy was the International Military Education and Training (IMET). Foreign military personnel, often funded by the United States, are permitted to attend U.S. military schools, or undergo specific military training. Other forms of training under the auspices of the Defence Department with State Department funding include International Narcotics and Law Enforcement, Global Peace Operations Initiative, Disaster Response and,



*Mr. Richard Bitzinger*

more significantly, the Combating Terrorism Fellowship Programme, which has risen in scope and now operates in some regional centres. Additionally, he highlighted that all of the forces of the U.S. military were heavily involved in joint exercises in the region. The most important joint exercise for the United States is Cobra Gold, which is now the world's largest annual multinational military exercise involving land, sea and air forces.

Bitzinger concluded that the U.S. military probably had the largest, most extensive and longest-standing forms of defence diplomacy in the world. Approaches are broad-based, ranging from hard to soft power. Defence diplomacy is definitely an important component in promoting U.S. power and influence. U.S. defence diplomacy bears a significant impact on the region as it touches almost every Southeast Asia nation in one way or another.

## China's Defence Diplomacy in Southeast Asia

**Dr. Ian Storey** stated from the outset that Chinese defence diplomacy in Southeast Asia was lesser in scope compared to that of the United States. It was also less transparent. Unsurprisingly, military security ties are less developed than economic and political relations. Close defence relationship is dependent on trust but there is an absence of high levels of trust between ASEAN and China, particularly in the countries that have territorial claims in the South China Sea. The modernisation of the People's Liberation Army's (PLA) lacks transparency, inducing mistrust in its intentions among Southeast Asian nations. There are also practical barriers in defence cooperation between Southeast Asia militaries and the PLA, such as language difficulties, interoperability and the absence of framework agreements that govern defence relations.

Nonetheless, China has been much more pro-active with defence diplomacy in Southeast Asia since 2000. The reasons are that defence diplomacy facilitates regular security dialogue with Southeast Asia; provides China with an opportunity to push its "peaceful development" message and assuage regional concerns on its rising power; and helps China gain a better understanding of Southeast Asian countries' security perspectives through these dialogues. The PLA also gains operational insights



*Dr. Ian Storey*

into Southeast Asian militaries in combined exercises while arms sales and military assistance increase China's influence in the region and, to a limited extent, generate revenue. Notably, China has also used foreign military assistance to drive a wedge between certain Southeast Asia states and the United States. Storey ended by observing that Sino-Southeast Asia defence security ties were growing, albeit incrementally. There are hurdles and limitations to overcome as building trust takes time and arms sales will remain modest until quality issues are addressed. Combined military exercises may increase but sensitivities will persist, especially with countries that have close defence relations with the United States.

## **Discussion**

Tan pointed out that 1995 seemed to be the year of many U.S. defence diplomacy projects and questioned if defence diplomacy towards Southeast Asia was a major policy for the Clinton administration, which was in power at the time. Bitzinger replied that the noticeable surge of defence diplomacy projects in 1995 was presumably

a remedy to the lack of U.S. presence in the region after the closure of Subic Base in the Philippines during the early 1990s. On mitigating anti-Americanism within local populations, permanent U.S. military presence usually maintained a low profile in Southeast Asia countries. For example, the Sembawang logistic offices in Singapore retained a small group of personnel that operated in civilian attire in a tightly controlled environment. The U.S. government has grasped that such an arrangement is the best option militarily and diplomatically in Southeast Asia, in that access but not bases support U.S. military activities in the region.

On the subject of Chinese influence, Storey said that China had leveraged its economic prominence in Southeast Asia to gain national interests on selected issues but this was not attributed to military influence at all. Still, when any country sells weapons to another, it is a given the two will be locked in future deals because arms sales influence doctrine, which is difficult to change. China had in the past also used military aid to buttress ruling regimes, such as Myanmar in the 1990s and Cambodia after 1997. Military aid provided to Cambodia was used exclusively to arm Hun Sen's personal praetorian guards.

Bitzinger ended by stating that defence lobbying did not influence the U.S. government into arms sales with Southeast Asia. Both the defence industry and the U.S. government generally hold the policy that arms sales are beneficial for the receiving country, in that it will get a well-made piece of equipment as well as working relations with the United States. He then commented that sentiments of anti-Americanism were oftentimes undeserved, irrational and driven by local political forces, even if there were cases wherein U.S. soldiers had misbehaved in their individual capacity. Nonetheless, as more efforts were made on defence diplomacy, such misconceptions might hopefully diminish.

## APPENDIX A Programme

### 29 November 2010

19.00 Welcome Dinner  
Cafébiz, Traders Hotel

### 30 November 2010

8.45–9.00 Registration

9.00–9.10 Welcome Remarks  
*Kwa Chong Guan*  
Head, External Programmes, RSIS

9.10–10.40 Session One  
**ADMM and ADMM Plus**  
Chairperson:  
*Tan See Seng (RSIS)*

*Termsak Chalermpanupap (ASEAN Secretariat)*  
**Carving Out a Crucial Role for ASEAN Defence Establishments in the Evolving Regional Architecture**

*Tim Huxley (IISS)*  
**The ADMM Plus: What's it for?**

*Tan Seng Chye (RSIS)*  
**NADI's Relevance to the ADMM 2**

10.40–11.00 Coffee break

11.00–12.30 Session Two  
**ASEAN Chiefs of Defence Forces Informal Meeting (ACDFIM)**  
Chairperson: *Ralf Emmers (RSIS)*

*Evan Laksmana (CSIS, Indonesia)*  
**Defence Diplomacy in Southeast Asia: The View from Jakarta**

*Eddie Lim (RSIS)*  
**Observations of Defence Diplomacy in Action**

*Tan See Seng (RSIS)*  
**Making Asia Pacific Security Regionalisms Hang Together: Building Coherence and Community Out of Clutter**

12.30–14.00 Lunch

14.00–15.20 Session Three  
**Other Cases of Defence Diplomacy in Southeast Asia**  
Chairperson: *Joseph Liow (RSIS)*

*Ralf Emmers (RSIS)*

**The Role of the FPDA in the Southeast Asian Security Architecture**

*Brendan Taylor (ANU)*

**The Shangri-La Dialogue: Thriving but not Surviving?**

15.20–15.40 Coffee break

15.40–17.00 Session Four  
**Great Powers and Defence Diplomacy in Southeast Asia**  
Chairperson: *Bhubhindar Singh (RSIS)*

*Richard Bitzinger (RSIS)*

**U.S. Defence Diplomacy towards Southeast Asia**

*Ian Storey (ISEAS)*

**China's Defence Diplomacy in Southeast Asia 3**

17.00 Closing remarks

19.00 Closing dinner  
Straits Kitchen, Hyatt Hotel

## APPENDIX B

# Participants

### Chairpersons/Presenters/Discussants

\*in alphabetical sequence according to last/family names

1. Mr. Richard A. BITZINGER  
Senior Fellow, S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS)  
Address: Nanyang Technological University  
Block S4, Level B3, Nanyang Avenue, Singapore 639798  
Phone: +65 6514 1904  
Fax: +65 6794 0617  
E-mail: isrbitzinger@ntu.edu.sg
2. Mr. Termsak CHALERMPALANUPAP  
Director, Political and Security Cooperation  
Directorate, ASEAN Secretariat  
Address: 70 A, Jalan Sisingamangaraja, Jakarta,  
Indonesia 12110  
Phone: +62 21 724 3372, ext 264  
Fax: +62 21 739 8234  
E-mail: termsak@asean.org
3. Associate Professor Ralf EMMERS  
Associate Professor, Coordinator of the  
Multilateralism and Regionalism Programme,  
S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS)  
Address: Nanyang Technological University  
Block S4, Level B4, Nanyang Avenue, Singapore 639798  
Phone: +65 6790 4340  
Fax: +65 6794 0617  
E-mail: isremmers@ntu.edu.sg
4. Dr. Tim HUXLEY  
Executive Director, The International Institute for  
Strategic Studies – Asia  
Address : 9 Raffles Place, #53-02 Republic Plaza,  
Singapore 048619  
E-mail: huxley@iiss.org
5. Mr. KWA Chong Guan  
Head, External Programmes, S. Rajaratnam School of  
International Studies (RSIS)  
Address: Nanyang Technological University  
Block S4, Level B4, Nanyang Avenue, Singapore  
639798  
Phone: +65 6790 6975  
Fax: +65 6794 0617  
E-mail: iscgkwa@ntu.edu.sg
6. Mr. Evan A. LAKSMANA  
Researcher, Dept. of Politics and International Relations  
Centre for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS)  
Address: The Jakarta Post Building, 3rd Floor,  
Jl. Palmerah Barat No. 142-3, DKI Jakarta, Indonesia 10270  
Phone: +62 21 5365 4601  
Fax: +62 21 5365 4607  
E-mail: evanlaksmana@gmail.com
7. Mr. Eddie LIM  
Senior Lecturer, Military Studies Branch, Centre for  
Learning and Military Education  
Address: AFPN 1457, 500 Upper Jurong Road, #01-  
07, Singapore 638364  
E-mail: eddielim@starnet.gov.sg
8. Associate Professor Joseph LIOW  
Associate Dean, S. Rajaratnam School of  
International Studies (RSIS)  
Address: Nanyang Technological University  
Block S4, Level B4, Nanyang Avenue, Singapore  
639798  
Phone: +65 6790 4908  
Fax: +65 6794 0617  
E-mail: iscyliow@ntu.edu.sg
9. Dr. Bhubhinder SINGH  
Assistant Professor, S. Rajaratnam School of  
International Studies (RSIS)  
Address: Nanyang Technological University  
Block S4, Level B4, Nanyang Avenue, Singapore  
639798  
Phone: +65 6790 6845  
Fax: +65 6794 0617  
E-mail: isbhubhinder@ntu.edu.sg
10. Dr. Ian STOREY  
Editor, Contemporary Southeast Asia, Fellow,  
Institute of Southeast Asian Studies (ISEAS)  
Address: 30 Heng Mui Keng Terrace, Pasir Panjang,  
Singapore 119614  
Phone: +65 68704507  
E-mail: ijstorey@iseas.edu.sg
11. Associate Professor TAN See Seng  
Associate Professor and Head of Research for IDSS,  
S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS)  
Address: Nanyang Technological University  
Block S4, Level B4, Nanyang Avenue, Singapore  
639798  
Phone: +65 6790 4277  
Fax: +65 6794 0617  
E-mail: issstan@ntu.edu.sg
12. Mr. TAN Seng Chye  
Senior Fellow, S. Rajaratnam School of International  
Studies (RSIS)  
Address: Nanyang Technological University  
Block S4, Level B4, Nanyang Avenue, Singapore  
639798  
Phone: +65 6790 4009  
Fax: +65 6794 0617  
E-mail: issctan@ntu.edu.sg

13. Dr. Brendan TAYLOR  
Senior Lecturer and Director of Graduate Studies,  
Strategic & Defence Studies Centre, Australian  
National University  
Address: Building #130, Australian National  
University  
Phone: +61 2 6125 9928  
Fax: +61 2 6125 9926  
E-mail: brendan.taylor@anu.edu.au

### General Participants

\*in alphabetical sequence according to last/family names

1. Dr. Farish A. NOOR  
Senior Fellow, S. Rajaratnam School of International  
Studies (RSIS)  
Address: Nanyang Technological University  
Block S4, Level B4, Nanyang Avenue, Singapore  
639798  
Phone: +65 6790 6128  
Fax: +65 6794 0617  
E-mail: isbhahmad@ntu.edu.sg
2. Mr. Syed Mohammed AD'HA ALJUNIED  
Personal Research Analyst, S. Rajaratnam School of  
International Studies (RSIS)  
Address: Nanyang Technological University  
Block S4, Level B4, Nanyang Avenue, Singapore  
639798  
Phone: +65 6592 7520  
Fax: +65 6794 0617  
E-mail: issmohammed@ntu.edu.sg
3. Mr. Adriwanto  
Research Analyst, S. Rajaratnam School of  
International Studies (RSIS)  
Address: Nanyang Technological University  
Block S4, Level B4, Nanyang Avenue, Singapore  
639798  
Phone: +65 6513 2038  
Fax: +65 6794 0617  
E-mail: isadriwanto@ntu.edu.sg
4. Mr. Anton ALBLAS  
First Secretary, Australian High Commission  
Address: 25 Napier Road, Singapore 258507  
Phone: +65 6836 4215  
Fax: +65 6733 7134  
E-mail: Anton.Alblas@dfat.gov.au
5. Mr. Mushahid ALI  
Senior Fellow, S. Rajaratnam School of International  
Studies (RSIS)  
Address: Nanyang Technological University  
Block S4, Level B4, Nanyang Avenue, Singapore  
639798  
Phone: +65 6790 6836  
Fax: +65 6794 0617  
E-mail: ismali@ntu.edu.sg

6. Mr. Oleksiy ANIKIN  
Embassy of Ukraine  
Address: 50 Raffles Place, #16-05 Singapore Land  
Tower, Singapore 048623  
E-mail: alex.anikin@yahoo.com.sg
7. Mr. Dieter BECKER  
Second Secretary, Embassy of the Federal Republic  
of Germany  
Address: 50 Raffles Place, #12-00, Singapore 048623  
Phone: +65 6533 6050  
Fax: +65 6533 1230  
E-mail: Dieter.Becker@diplo.de
8. Mr. Alexandre BESSON  
Defence Department, French Embassy  
Address: 101/103 Cluny Park Road, Singapore  
259595  
Phone: +65 8344 1642  
E-mail: besson.alexandre@gmail.com
9. H.E. Mr. Olivier CARON  
Ambassador, French Embassy  
Address: 101/103 Cluny Park Road, Singapore 259595  
Phone: +65 6880 7802  
Fax: +65 6880 7808  
E-mail: geraldine.delord@diplomatie.gouv.fr
10. Mr. Samuel CHAN  
Associate Research Fellow, S. Rajaratnam School of  
International Studies (RSIS)  
Address: Nanyang Technological University  
Block S4, Level B3, Nanyang Avenue, Singapore 639798  
Phone: +65 6513 7668  
Fax: +65 6794 0617  
E-mail: islwchan@ntu.edu.sg
11. Mr. CHANG Kim Sai  
Branch Head, Ministry of Defence  
Phone: +65 6427 0502  
E-mail: ckimsai@starnet.gov.sg
12. Associate Professor Alan CHONG  
Associate Professor, S. Rajaratnam School of  
International Studies (RSIS)  
Address: Nanyang Technological University  
Block S4, Level B3, Nanyang Avenue, Singapore  
639798  
Phone: +65 6514 1906  
Fax: +65 6794 0617  
E-mail: iscschong@ntu.edu.sg
13. Dr. CHONG Ja Ian  
Assistant Professor, Department of Political Science,  
National University of Singapore  
Address: AS 1, 11 Arts Link, #04-35, Singapore  
117570  
Phone: +65 6516 5092  
Fax: +65 6779 6815  
E-mail: polcji@nus.edu.sg

14. Ms. Amanda CHUA  
Ministry of Defence  
E-mail: amanda.chua@gmail.com
15. Group Capt. Clive COOMBES  
Defence Adviser, British High Commission  
Address: 100 Tanglin Road, Singapore 247919  
Phone: +65 6424 4227  
Fax: +65 6424 4230  
E-mail: clive.coombes@fco.gov.uk
16. Ms. Anne Marie DOHERTY  
E-mail: anne-marie.doherty@ec.europa.eu
17. Group Capt. Brian EDWARDS  
Australian High Commission  
Address: 25 Napier Road, Singapore 258507  
E-mail: brian.edwards@dfat.gov.au
18. Nadine FAROUQ  
E-mail: nadinexf@gmail.com
19. Mr. GOH Kong Yong  
Senior Officer, Ministry of Defence  
Address: 303 Gombak Drive, #01-52, Singapore 669645  
Phone: +65 6424 1648 (Ms Lim Cheng Siew)  
Fax: +65 6471 5038  
E-mail: LIM\_Cheng\_Siew@starnet.gov.sg
20. Ms. Cheryl HAN SiYing  
Department of History, National University of Singapore  
Address: NUS, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences  
11 Arts Link, AS1 05 – 27, Singapore 117570  
Phone: +65 9825 3377  
E-mail: csyhan@gmail.com
21. Mr. Stefan HANSEN  
International Liaison Officer, Information Fusion Centre  
Address: AFPN 6504, 103 Tanah Merah Coast Road,  
#02-01, Singapore 498750  
Phone: +65 6594 5716  
Fax: +65 6594 5734  
E-mail: nzilo@infofusioncentre.gov.sg
22. Capt. (Navy) Karl HENRIKSSON  
Defence Attache, Embassy of Sweden  
Address: 111 Somerset Road, #05-01 TripleOne,  
Singapore 238164  
E-mail: karl.henriksson@foreign.ministry.se
23. Mr. HO Jin Yong  
MACC Alumnus, Nanyang Technological University  
Phone: +65 9750 0135  
E-mail: he\_renxiong@yahoo.com.sg
24. Mr. HO Yi Jjian  
Project Coordinator, The International Institute for  
Strategic Studies – Asia  
Address: 9 Raffles Place, #53-02 Republic Plaza,  
Singapore 048619  
Phone: +65 6499 0052
- Fax: +65 6499 0059  
E-mail: jian@iiss.org
25. Ms. Sol IGLESIAS  
Director, Intellectual Exchange, Asia-Europe Foundation  
Address: 31 Heng Mui Keng Terrace, Singapore 119595  
Phone: +65 6874 9708  
Fax: +65 6872 1207  
E-mail: sol.iglesias@asef.org
26. Mr. Iisgindarsah  
Research Analyst, S. Rajaratnam School of  
International Studies (RSIS)  
Address: Nanyang Technological University  
Block S4, Level B3, Nanyang Avenue, Singapore  
639798  
Phone: +65 6592 7519  
Fax: +65 6794 0617  
E-mail: iisgindarsah@ntu.edu.sg
27. Mr. Yang Razali KASSIM  
Senior Fellow, S. Rajaratnam School of International  
Studies (RSIS)  
Address: Nanyang Technological University  
Block S4, Level B4, Nanyang Avenue, Singapore 639798  
Phone: +65 6790 6817  
Fax: +65 6794 0617  
E-mail: isyangrazali@ntu.edu.sg
28. Lt. Michael KENNY  
COMLOG WESTPAC N2, USN  
Phone: +65 6750 2091  
Fax: +65 6750 2694  
E-mail: michael.kenny@fe.navy.mil
29. Capt. (Navy) Tomonori KOBAYASHI  
Defense Attache, Embassy of Japan  
Address: 16 Nassim Road, Singapore 258390  
Phone: +65 6830 3512  
Fax: +65 6733 1039  
E-mail: tomonori.kobayashi@mofa.go.jp
30. Dr. Kei KOGA  
Visiting Associate Fellow, S. Rajaratnam School of  
International Studies (RSIS)  
Address: Nanyang Technological University  
Block S4, Level B4, Nanyang Avenue, Singapore  
639798  
Phone: +65 6790 4815  
Fax: +65 6794 0617  
E-mail: keikoga@gmail.com
31. Mr. Collin KOH Swee Lean  
Associate Research Fellow, S. Rajaratnam School of  
International Studies (RSIS)  
Address: Nanyang Technological University  
Block S4, Level B3, Nanyang Avenue, Singapore  
639798  
Phone: +65 6790 6626  
Fax: +65 6794 0617  
E-mail: ISCollinKoh@ntu.edu.sg

32. Dr. David KOH  
Senior Fellow, Institute of Southeast Asian Studies (ISEAS)  
Address: 30 Heng Mui Keng Terrace, Pasir Panjang, Singapore 119614  
Phone: +65 6870 4529  
Fax: +65 6775 6264  
E-mail: davidkoh@iseas.edu.sg
33. Mr. Takeshi KOMOTO  
APEC Secretariat  
Address: 35 Heng Mui Keng Terrace, Singapore 119616  
Phone: +65 6891 9611  
Fax: +65 6891 9690
34. Mr. William KUCERA  
Research Analyst, S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS)  
Address: Nanyang Technological University Block S4, Level B3, Nanyang Avenue, Singapore 639798  
Phone: +65 6513 2039  
Fax: +65 6794 0617  
E-mail: iswkucera@ntu.edu.sg
35. Mr. Chris LECK  
Deputy Director, Defence Policy Office, Ministry of Defence  
Address: Ministry of Defence
36. Dr. LEE Lai To  
Senior Teaching Fellow, School of Humanities and Social Sciences, NTU  
Address: Nanyang Technological University 14 Nanyang Drive, Singapore 637332  
Phone: +65 6316 8741  
E-mail: LTLEE@ntu.edu.sg
37. Dr. LEE Yim Ping  
Senior Teaching Fellow, Centre for Research on Pedagogy and Practice, National Institute of Education  
Address: Nanyang Technological University NIE5-B3-31, No. 1 Nanyang Walk, Singapore 637616  
Phone: +65 6790 3191  
E-mail: yimping.lee@nie.edu.sg
38. Dr. LIM Choo Hoon  
SAFTI Military Institute  
E-mail: choohoon@starhub.net.sg
39. Mr. LIM Tian Kuay  
National Environment Agency  
E-mail: lim\_tian\_kuay@nea.gov.sg
40. Ms. Ratna MATHAI-LUKE  
Project Officer, Asia Europe Foundation  
Address: 31 Heng Mui Keng Terrace, Singapore 119595  
Phone: +65 6874 9744  
Fax: +65 6872 1207  
E-mail: ratna.mathailuke@asef.org
41. Ms. Sandra MAYNARD  
Political-Military Officer, U.S. Embassy Singapore  
Address: 27 Napier Road, Singapore 258508  
Phone: +65 6476-9437  
E-mail: MaynardSF@state.gov
42. Mr. Brian McCARTAN  
Student, S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS)  
Address: Nanyang Technological University Block S4, Level B4, Nanyang Avenue, Singapore 639798  
Phone: +65 9896 5753  
E-mail: brian1@ntu.edu.sg
43. Amb. NGUYEN Quoc Khanh  
Deputy Executive Director, Asia-Europe Foundation  
Address: 31 Heng Mui Keng Terrace, Singapore 119595  
Phone: +65 6874 9704  
Fax: +65 6872 1206  
E-mail: Nq.khanh@asef.org
44. Mr. Korovin OLEG  
Research Analyst, S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS)  
Address: Nanyang Technological University Block S4, Level B4, Nanyang Avenue, Singapore 639798  
Phone: +65 8439 2232  
Fax: +65 6794 0617  
E-mail: iskoleg@ntu.edu.sg
45. Dr. ONG Chye Hin  
Senior Teaching Fellow, National Institute of Education  
Address: Nanyang Technological University NIE2-03-03D, 1 Nanyang Walk, Singapore 637616  
Phone: +65 6219 6052  
Fax: +65 6896 9151  
E-mail: chyehin.ong@nie.edu.sg
46. Mr. PANG Yang Huei  
Editor, POINTER, GKS CSC  
Address: 500 Upper Jurong Road, Singapore 638364  
Phone: +65 6799 7755  
E-mail: pointer@starnet.gov.sg
47. Mr. Leslie PEH  
Policy Officer, Ministry of Defence  
Address: 303 Gombak Drive, #05-06, Singapore 669645  
Phone: +65 6768 2383  
E-mail: leslie\_peh\_han\_wei@mindef.gov.sg
48. Mr. Mazrey RAHMAN  
Brunei High Commission  
Address: 325 Tanglin Road, Singapore 247955  
E-mail: mazrey\_r@hotmail.com

49. Mr. Noah ROZMAN  
Second Secretary, Embassy of the United States of America  
Address: 27 Napier Road, Singapore 258508  
Phone: +65 6476 9100  
E-mail: rozmannd@state.gov
50. Ms. Joann SAW  
Senior Analyst, S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS)  
Address: Nanyang Technological University  
Block S4, Level B3, Nanyang Avenue, Singapore 639798  
Phone: +65 6513 8299  
Fax: +65 6794 0617  
E-mail: ismcsaw@ntu.edu.sg
51. Associate Professor Leonard C. SEBASTIAN  
Associate Professor, Coordinator of Indonesia Programme,  
S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS)  
Address: Nanyang Technological University  
Block S4, Level B4, Nanyang Avenue, Singapore 639798  
Phone: +65 6790 4402  
Fax: +65 6794 0617  
E-mail: islscsebastian@ntu.edu.sg
52. Mr. Naveen SHARMA  
Research Specialist, POINTER, GKS CSC  
Address: 500 Upper Jurong Road, Singapore 638364  
Phone: +65 6799 7755  
E-mail: pointer@starnet.gov.sg
53. Associate Professor SHENG Lijun  
Visiting Associate Professor, School of Humanities and Social Sciences  
Address: Nanyang Technological University, HSS 05-16 NTU  
Phone: +65 6592 2488  
Fax: +65 6794 6303  
E-mail: shenglijun@ntu.edu.sg
54. Ms. Susan SIM  
Managing Partner, Strategic Nexus Consultancy  
E-mail: susan.lk.sim@gmail.com
55. Mr. Daljit SINGH  
Institute of Southeast Asian Studies (ISEAS)  
Address: 30 Heng Mui Keng Terrace, Pasir Panjang Road, Singapore 119614  
E-mail: daljit@iseas.edu.sg
56. Dr. Tin Maung Maung THAN  
Senior Fellow, Institute of Southeast Asian Studies (ISEAS)  
Address: 30 Heng Mui Keng Terrace, Pasir Panjang Road, Singapore 119614  
Phone: +65 6870 4504  
Fax: +65 6775 6264  
E-mail: tin@iseas.edu.sg
57. Professor Geoffrey TILL  
Visiting Senior Fellow, Maritime Security Programme,  
S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS)  
Address: Nanyang Technological University  
Block S4, Level B4, Nanyang Avenue, Singapore 639798  
Phone: +65 6790 4909  
Fax: +65 6794 0617  
E-mail: isgtill@ntu.edu.sg
58. Mrs. TRAN Bao Ngoc  
Director (Program), APEC Secretariat  
Address: 35 Heng Mui Keng Terrace, Singapore 119616  
Phone: +65 6891 9616  
Fax: +65 6891 9690  
E-mail: tbn@apec.org
59. Mr. Andre VAN STRATEN  
Counsellor (Political), High Commission of the Republic of South Africa  
Address: 331 North Bridge Road, #15-01/06 Odeon Towers, Singapore 188720  
Phone: +65 6339 3319  
Fax: +65 6339 6658  
E-mail: LeeS2@dirco.gov.za
60. Mr. WONG Chee Wai  
Head, Military Studies Branch, SAFTI Military Institute  
Address: 500 Upper Jurong Road  
Phone: +65 6799 7750  
Fax: +65 6799 7758  
E-mail: Wong\_Chee\_Wai@starnet.gov.sg
61. Mr. YAP Tian Seng  
E-mail: ts\_yap@yahoo.com
62. Mr. Syed Ashfaq Hussain ZAIDI  
Board Member, Centre for Contemporary Islamic Studies (CCIS)  
Address: c/o 32 Onan Road, The Galaxy, Singapore 424484  
Phone: +65 9827 7172  
Fax: +65 6449 8017  
E-mail: ashusain@gmail.com
63. Mr. ZHANG Hongtie  
Director, People to People Exchange Department, Asia Europe Foundation  
Address: 31 Heng Mui Keng Terrace, Singapore 119595  
Phone: +65 6874 9711  
Fax: +65 6872 1207  
E-mail: hongtie.zhang@asef.org; hongtie88@yahoo.com

## About the S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies

The **S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS)** was officially inaugurated on 1 January 2007. Before that, it was known as the Institute of Defence and Strategic Studies (IDSS), which was established ten years earlier on 30 July 1996. Like its predecessor, **RSIS** was established as an autonomous entity within Nanyang Technological University (NTU).

The School exists to develop a community of scholars and policy analysts at the forefront of Asia-Pacific security studies and international affairs. Its three core functions are research, graduate teaching and networking activities

in the Asia-Pacific region. It produces cutting-edge security related research in Asia-Pacific Security, Conflict and Non-Traditional Security, International Political Economy, and Country and Area Studies.

The School's activities are aimed at assisting policymakers to develop comprehensive approaches to strategic thinking on issues related to security and stability in the Asia-Pacific and their implications for Singapore.

For more information about RSIS, please visit **[www.rsis.edu.sg](http://www.rsis.edu.sg)**





**S. RAJARATNAM SCHOOL  
OF INTERNATIONAL STUDIES**  
A Graduate School of Nanyang Technological University

Produced by BOOKSMITH [booksmith@singnet.com.sg](mailto:booksmith@singnet.com.sg)

S. Rajaratnam School Of International Studies, Nanyang Technological University  
Block S4, Level B4, Nanyang Avenue, Singapore 639798

TEL 65-6790-6982

FAX 65-6793-2991

E-MAIL [wwwrsis@ntu.edu.sg](mailto:wwwrsis@ntu.edu.sg)

WEBSITE [www.rsis.edu.sg](http://www.rsis.edu.sg)