The 1st e-ASIA Joint Research Forum

14-15 July 2011
Singapore

Chairman's Summary

1)   The participants to the first e-ASIA Joint Research Forum (Australia, Kingdom of Cambodia, Republic of India, Republic of Indonesia, Japan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, New Zealand, Republic of Singapore, Republic of the Philippines, Kingdom of Thailand, Socialist Republic of Viet Nam and the ASEAN Secretariat) shared the common interest in setting up joint international cooperation in science and innovation in the region.   In the meantime, comments and suggestions were given as below.

2)   Indonesia and India wanted to emphasize on application side of research but would like the collaborative framework to be flexible which should as well include collaboration in basic research.   There was a suggestion to extend the membership to all Asian countries, but Japan replied that, as the East Asia is the center of economic growth, we should rather focus on this region.

3)   Australia suggested it was better for the e-ASIA Joint Research Program ("JRP") activities to have linkages with the East Asia Summit (EAS) to get a political endorsement.

4)   The ASEAN Secretariat expressed that there was no term as "ASEAN plus 6", but the term "EAS" should be used.

5)   Singapore asked for confirmation that participation to the e-ASIA JRP activities were voluntary, so that memberships did not have to coincide with the EAS.

6)   Indonesia requested a presentation from Japan at the next COST meeting, because there were some ASEAN member states which were not represented at this forum.

7)   Singapore showed concerns about having to sign MoUs multiple times in case of having a new member country, and difficulty to agree on IPR issues.

8)   Vietnam pointed out existing scheme (ASEAN COST) should be more utilized.

9)   NZ summarized comments from other countries and said that it may be helpful if fundamental issues such as membership and reporting lines were addressed before institutional arrangements were discussed in detail.   Japan explained about the effectiveness of institutional approaches.

10)   India stated that there should be synergistic collaboration between this new initiative and existing ones, including the ASEAN-India S&T Development Fund.

11)   Thailand said that if formal MoU were necessary, then agreement on IPR would be required, which would make the procedure very difficult.   There were concerns about expenditures, too.

12)   Australia raised a question about industrial participation, and Japan replied that it is acceptable.

13)   India stated that on-top funding to existing projects, in case of India, would be considered as a new scheme, which would require approval from the parliament or the ministry.

14)   ASEAN Secretariat asked what would be the role and obligations of ASEAN COST if it would participate in the e-ASIA JRP as an observer.   Japan replied that bridging of activities between ASEAN COST and the e-ASIA JRP would be their important function.

15)   Lao PDR suggested that we should add "deployment of technology in the society" as the 5th form of collaboration.

16)   Australia cast a question about the scope of the responsibilities of the e-ASIA JRP Secretariat.

17)   Singapore explained about six flagship programs endorsed by ASEAN ministerial level, themes of which might also be issues for non-ASEAN member states.   These six flagship programs are a) Early Warning System for Disaster Risk Reduction led by Indonesia, b) Biofuel led by Malaysia, c) Development and Application of Open Source System led by Indonesia, d) Functional Food led by Thailand, e) Health led by Singapore and f) Climate Change led by the Philippines and Vietnam.   Australia agreed, and said that these six fields should be taken into the e-ASIA JRP as key components.   Japan responded that functional food and early warning system for natural disaster could be a bridge between ASEAN flagship programs and the e-ASIA JRP.

18)   Singapore again stated that flagship programs had limited resources and expertise, so that cooperation with ASEAN dialogue partners was sought.

19)   Indonesia suggested if Japan could participate in the COST meeting in Ho Chi Minh City, then the leading countries of flagship programs would make presentation on each of their program in details.

20)   ASEAN Secretariat explained that, as the COST was a closed meeting, participation of Japan for such presentations would be determined after consultation with leading countries, the COST and Vietnam as the host country.

21)   India pointed out that necessary cost would differ according to each project.

22)   The Philippines asked how the expenditures for the e-ASIA JRP Secretariat would be divided among members.   Japan replied that we would seek voluntary contribution from members.

23)   India suggested that three staffs for the e-ASIA JRP Secretariat should be from one country, to make management smoother.

24)   Cambodia asked to make clear the estimation of minimum cost for participation.

25)   ASEAN Secretariat requested clarification on how many countries should agree to inaugurate the e-ASIA JRP, which would be discussed later on.

26)   Thailand asked if there was any plan for creating a website for dissemination of information on e-ASIA JRP.   Japan replied that it was on its way to launch such a website in a short while.

27)   Australia suggested that important discussion points presented at this forum should be wrapped up and be reflected in the concept of the e-ASIA JRP.

27)   Singapore asked to receive feedbacks from not represented countries, such as China and South

7.15.2011

Korea.

28)　　Japan suggested to have the 2nd　e-ASIA Joint Research Forum in Japan in October to discuss draft MoU, guidelines and fields and areas of cooperation.