



BACKGROUND PAPER

The Roles of ASEAN Parliamentarians in Peacebuilding and Global Good Practices

April 2021

Researcher: **Mr HENG Sonya**

Notice of Disclaimer

The Parliamentary Center of Asia (PCAsia) is an independent parliamentary support institution for the client Parliaments which, upon request of the parliamentarians and the parliamentary commissions and their General Secretariats offers a wide range of trainings and research publications on current and emerging key issues, legislation and major public policy topics. The information in this research product is likely to be relevant to parliamentary and constituency work but does not purport to represent or reflect the views of the Parliamentary Center of Asia, their client Parliaments or any of its members.

The contents of this background paper, current at the date of publication, are for reference and information purposes only. This publication is not designed to provide legal or policy advice, and do not necessarily deal with every important topic or aspect of the issues it considers.

The contents of this background paper are covered by applicable Cambodian laws and international copyright agreements. Permission to reproduce in whole or in part or otherwise use the content on this website may be sought from the appropriate source.

© 2021 Parliamentary Center of Asia (PCAsia)

Table of Contents

1.	Introduction	1
1.1	Research Questions	1
1.2	Methodology	2
1.3	Limitation of the Paper.....	2
2	Definition and Scope of Peacebuilding.....	2
3	The Roles of ASEAN Parliamentarians in Peacebuilding	4
3.1	Cambodia.....	4
3.1.1	Public Representation	4
3.1.2	Legislative Roles	5
3.1.3	Government Oversight.....	6
3.1.4	Parliamentary Diplomacy.....	6
3.2	Indonesia	7
3.3	Myanmar	9
3.4	The Philippines	9
4	Global Good Practices of Parliamentary Roles in Peacebuilding	10
4.1	General Good Practices	10
4.2	Columbia.....	11
4.3	Afghanistan.....	11
4.4	Nepal and South Africa.....	12
4.5	Bosnia-Herzegovina, Rwanda, and Indonesia	12
5	Conclusion.....	13
	References.....	16

1. Introduction

Peacebuilding is considered the most extensive and transformative compared to other peace operations. Such an overarching nature of peacebuilding derives from its scope of building an environment that restores and solidifies peace among peoples, groups, and nations to avoid occurrence or recurrence of conflicts. Apart from peacemaking and peacekeeping, which normally exist during and after conflicts, respectively, peacebuilding is expected to be carried out perpetually and variedly even during a contemporary, more relatively peaceful, era—when economic cooperation and development dominates the agenda—to mitigate remaining conflicts and prevent future ones. [1][2]

In the context of ASEAN, a ten-member intergovernmental organization promoting peace, stability, and economic prosperity in a region with historical complexity of colonial struggles, Cold-War conflicts, and international border disputes, peacebuilding is highly relevant. Particularly, as some of its member states are progressing in post-conflict state-building, and the whole community are aiming to realize the 2025 Community Vision¹, ASEAN has been committed to peacebuilding as is clearly laid out in its Political Security Community Blueprints in 2009 and 2016. [3][4]

However, such a region-wide commitment is plausible only with the national commitment and effort of individual member governments, in which parliaments are expected to play proactive roles including public representation, legislation of related laws, budgeting, oversight of the executive's handling of related issues, and parliamentary diplomacy, among others. [5][6]

The aim of this paper, therefore, is to underline the roles of ASEAN parliamentarians in peacebuilding, by highlighting some relevant Member States, as well as global good practices.

1.1 Research Questions

1. What are the roles of ASEAN parliamentarians in peacebuilding in the past two decades?
2. What are the global good practices of parliamentarians in peacebuilding?

¹ The ASEAN Community Vision 2025 was developed in 2013 as a Post-2015 Vision to realize an ASEAN with further political cohesion, economic integration, social responsibility, and increasingly people-centered and rules-based environment.

The aim of the paper is to provide an understanding of the importance of parliamentarians in peacebuilding in ASEAN Member States. These roles include, but are not limited to, public representation, executive oversight, legislation of related laws, and international diplomacy. Moreover, the paper then seeks to draw on global good practices that may be applicable in the regional context.

1.2 Methodology

This paper conducts desk review of secondary data drawn from reports and documents of ASEAN Member States to elaborate their respective parliamentary roles in peacebuilding. Given the constraint of data availability and relevancy, only four ASEAN Member States are selected, including Cambodia, Indonesia, Myanmar, and the Philippines. The timeframe of the paper for ASEAN focus is within the last two decades, particularly since ASEAN incorporated peacebuilding as a regional commitment in their Political Security Community Blueprint from the 2000s.

The paper will also refer to related data from the United Nations; reports from Peace-related agencies, centers, institutes, and organizations; related academic publications; and relevant international news for conceptualization, comparative purposes, and global good practices regarding parliamentary peacebuilding.

1.3 Limitation of the Paper

Since peacebuilding is an extensive effort covering a wide range of areas from military to democracy and from health to economy, this study cannot be exhausted given its limited timeframe and coverage. Thus, the data preceding the timeframe for ASEAN focus (before 21st century) and in certain areas besides the parliamentary scope are not included. Moreover, the focus on the roles of parliamentarians alone makes the study of peacebuilding incomplete as many other main actors—the executive, local interest groups, and international stakeholders—are left unexamined.

2 Definition and Scope of Peacebuilding

Any attempt to explore the field of peacebuilding must include references to other complementary approaches as follows. First, *Preventive Diplomacy* is understood as the effort to prevent disputes from arising, to prevent existing disputes from escalating, and to limit the escalation, if any. Second, if conflicts erupt, *Peacemaking* plays the role of bringing conflicting

parties into talks to eventually reach a peace agreement, through peaceful means enshrined in Chapter VI of the United Nations (UN) Charter, including negotiation, mediation, arbitration, and judicial settlement, among others. Third, peace agreements, if mutually concluded, can be enforced through **Peacekeeping**, an operation that covers ceasefire monitoring, humanitarian assistance, military demobilization, electoral organization, and transitional administration. This overarching operation is principally carried out by the UN with the consent of all parties concerned and involves both military and civilian personnel. [7]

However, when no peace agreement is concluded—i.e. **Peacemaking** fails—or no ceasefire is realized—i.e. **Peacekeeping** fails—the international community may resort to **Peace Enforcement**, the use of heavily armed forces by the United Nations Security Council (UNSC) to enforce peace against the will of the conflicting parties as stipulated in Chapter VII of the UN Charter. [8]

Meanwhile, **Peacebuilding**—topping the UN agenda since the end of the Cold War—has been variously defined that no single definition sufficiently fits every context. Broadly defined, however, it can refer to a **multidimensional, inclusive, and perennial** process that restores and solidifies peace to avoid recurrence of conflicts. [1]

Multidimensionality means that the process itself incorporates a wide range of tasks, including efforts to mitigate factors that destabilize society, such as reintegration of former combatants into the government armed forces or society; promotion of democracy and the rule of law; fighting against corruption; demining and infrastructural rehabilitation; poverty reduction; and sectoral reforms—education, health, and justice, etc. [2] **Inclusivity** refers to the cooperation and partnership among many key stakeholders, such as the international actors, comprising international organizations (primarily the UN), third party states, diplomats, donors, peacekeeping forces, and conflicting states (in case of international conflicts); and local actors, comprising local citizens (including women), Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs), and local conflicting parties. [9] Finally, the **perennial** dimension signals the necessity of peacebuilding to be enduring over a long period of time to allow the post-conflict sociopolitical landscape to develop, consolidate, and sustain.

Though quite a demanding effort, effective and successful peacebuilding is worth the efforts, as it is extremely significant for the country per se and the region at large. Specifically, peacebuilding plays a critical role in the prevention of many jeopardizing issues, such as mass atrocities and

genocide, safe haven for terrorists², contagious diseases, massive flow of displaced persons and refugees, and unnecessary foreign interventions that could potentially lead to geopolitical rivalries and destabilization of the region. [9]

3 The Roles of ASEAN Parliamentarians in Peacebuilding

Generally, parliaments play a critical role in peacebuilding through both conflict prevention and reconciliation. Since the root causes of conflicts can lie in constitutional and electoral systems and in the distribution of public resources, a democratically elected public representative system is every essential. Besides a representation role, parliaments also serve as a forum for dialogue to link the executive and civil societies as well as oversee the executive's implementation of laws and policies to make it more accountable to the people. [10]

The following sections lay out specific cases of some ASEAN Member States, whose parliaments played notable roles in peacebuilding in their post-conflict state-building process, including Cambodia, Indonesia, Myanmar, and the Philippines.

3.1 Cambodia

Despite being the youngest member of ASEAN, Cambodia is nonetheless relatively more mature and experienced regarding peace operations including peacemaking that culminated in the Paris Peace Agreement in 1991, the ensuing peacekeeping by UNTAC in 1993, and the subsequent and ongoing peacebuilding effort till the present. [11][12] The roles of the Cambodian parliamentarians in peacebuilding can be examined through their public representation, legislation, government oversight, and parliamentary diplomacy activities in the latest legislature as follows.

3.1.1 Public Representation

To fulfill its role of representation, in its Third Legislature (2012-2018), the Members of Parliament of Cambodia had been assigned to defend the rights and interests of the communal councilors and people, to engage in social work, and to contribute to local development in their respective constituencies (provinces). Overall, throughout the country, they organized various

² A "terrorist safe haven" refers to an under-governed area exploited by terrorists to indoctrinate, recruit, coalesce, train, reassemble, plan, or execute their operations. It may exist regardless of state sponsorship of terrorism since its main cause is instability resulting from the lack of state effective control over the area. This reaffirms the importance of peacebuilding.

regional, provincial, and district forums as well as conducted many consultations, field research, and investigations. It is worth noting that in those forums and missions, there was involvement from the members of commune councils, commune clerks, citizens and/or their representatives, and representatives of non-governmental organizations. [13]

Notably, there has been particular involvement of women in the representation function of the Parliament of Cambodia. For instance, the female parliamentarians were active in organizing forums and workshops with female citizens and commune councilors. They also directly exchanged conversations with female commune councilors, female village chiefs, women, and children across many communes. Furthermore, the female parliamentarians had consultations with female commune councilors, officers in charge of women's affairs and children, and women across provinces and cities. [14]

The aforementioned activities represent one of the crucial elements in peacebuilding as they respond to the needs and concerns of citizens, which could turn into public dissatisfaction if not properly dealt with. Moreover, it also increases the chance of citizens complying with policy or legislative decisions if they have been well informed and given appropriate explanations.

3.1.2 Legislative Roles

In the Third Legislature (2012-2018), the Members of Parliament of Cambodia played a substantial role in the legislation function critical to peacebuilding. In total, the Senate reviewed and gave opinions on 102 Draft Laws and 15 Proposed Laws among the combined 117 Draft Laws and Proposed Laws submitted by the National Assembly. The specialized Commissions of the Senate also received and passed on 365 complaints to relevant institutions in charge of the issues. [15]

Specifically, among all those Draft Laws and Proposed Laws, certain laws that concern peacebuilding can be identified and classified into local and international peacebuilding as follows.

Laws concerning local Peacebuilding include: Law on the Organization and Operation of the Supreme Council of National Defense; Laws on the Amendment of Article 29 and Article 30 of the Law on the Anti-Money Laundering and Anti-Terrorist Financing (also with international impact); Law on the Organization and Operation of the National Election Committee; Law on the Election of the Members of the National Assembly; Law on the Election of the Commune Councilors; and Law on Disaster Management. [16]

Laws related to international Peacebuilding comprise: Law on the Adoption of the Kingdom of Cambodia as a Party to the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities; Law on the Adoption of the Kingdom of Cambodia as a Party to the Convention on the Early Notification of a Nuclear Accident and the Convention on Nuclear Safety; and the Protocol to the ASEAN Charter on Dispute Settlement Mechanisms. [16]

These laws—drafted and proposed by the National Assembly and ultimately reviewed and given opinions by the Senate—are highly relevant to the peacebuilding endeavor of the Cambodian government. In essence, they contribute to the reduction of discrimination against minority groups, the promotion of local democratization and human rights, the enhancement of national defense capacity and public safety, and the development of regional and international cooperation to promote global peace and stability.

3.1.3 Government Oversight

Throughout their Third Legislature, all the commissions of the Parliament of Cambodia conducted hearings with Ministries and governmental institutions and made visits to the 25 cities and provinces in order to explore and monitor the implementation of laws and policies of the government in their respective areas of responsibilities. The emphasis of the oversight was placed on the implementation of the Decentralization and Deconcentration Policy at the national and sub-national level. [17]

These oversight activities of the Cambodian parliamentarians have played a substantial role in ensuring the focus and commitment of the executive branch, and especially the concerned ministries, in fulfilling their responsibilities in promoting good governance at the national and sub-national levels, which are critical to local peacebuilding.

3.1.4 Parliamentary Diplomacy

Parliamentary Diplomacy generally consists of two categories. First, **Scrutiny of the Executive** refers to the communication of concerns or points of view by parliamentary assemblies to inter-parliamentary institutions (such as APA, IPU, etal.) to which they are connected. Second, **Traditional Diplomacy** allows parliamentarians to aim for greater goals such as promotion of democracy, transparency, inter-parliamentary cooperation, and bilateral or multilateral conflict prevention, among others, on the international stage. In such cases, parliamentarians can exercise legitimate international involvement due to the fact that they represent respective local publics; and that their

positions do not necessarily bind any government, thus making them able to operate on sensitive issues, which would have been difficult if conducted through executive diplomacy. [18] [19]

The Members of Parliament of Cambodia have been proactive in this area since they have attempted to fulfill not only their expected traditional roles in domestic Representation, Legislation, and Oversight, but also in Diplomacy, an area once exclusively reserved for the executive. [20] Since its First Legislature, the Parliament of Cambodia has regarded international cooperation as a core function in its institutional development, thus leading to its active participation in fulfilling international responsibilities and enhancing international cooperation with other parliaments and Inter-Parliamentary Organizations in the region and the world at large. [21]

Particularly, in the Third Legislature (2012-2018), the Cambodian Members of Parliament held meetings and joined various international events. There were also many international official visits by the Cambodian parliamentarians to exchange experiences and good practices, promote international cooperation, and build internal capacity. The Parliament of Cambodia also enhanced and expanded good relations with parliaments in many states through the establishment of friendship groups between and among them. Moreover, it is also a member of regional and global parliamentary organizations, including the Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU), ASEAN Inter-Parliamentary Assembly (AIPA), and Assemblée Parlementaire de la Francophonie (APF). In addition, there is also cooperation between the Parliament of Cambodia and other partnering organizations, such as PIC, CIM, GIZ, KAS, SES, KOICA, and Max Planck Foundation, as well as parliaments in many countries. [22]

3.2 Indonesia

In the Indonesian context, it can be observed that there are two distinct features of its approach to peacebuilding. First, Indonesia prefers persuasion to pressure when negotiating with host countries to explore ways for peace in those respective countries. Second it values the concept of “sharing” experiences, which incorporates a two-way approach—sharing its own experience, while learning from the host country to understand local contexts and local modalities. Guided by the belief that each country has unique challenges and contexts, Indonesia does not favor a “one-size-fits-all” policy. For example, there is an interesting case of international peacebuilding, in which Indonesia proposed to emphasize dialogue between the Indonesian People’s Consultative Assembly and Myanmar Assembly of the Union in peace-related programs and activities in Myanmar from

2013-2015. Those parliamentary dialogues were organized under the mandate of the Udayana University Institute for Peace and Democracy and the Directorate of East Asia and Pacific of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Indonesia. [23]

Domestically, the Indonesian government made drafts for the Grand Design and Blueprint of Indonesian South-South and Triangular Cooperation (SSTC), in which peacebuilding is among the key programs, while parliament is among the key partners along with partnering countries, the private sector, and Civil Society Organizations. The drafts were developed in 2011 as a legislative framework and policy instruments for peacebuilding and development cooperation until 2025. There are three main pillars to be addressed simultaneously: Development (poverty alleviation, disaster management and climate change, and human development); Economic Management (macro-economic management, public finance, and micro finance); and Good Governance and Peacebuilding (democracy, law enforcement, and peace keeping). [24] [25]

Aceh province in Indonesia is a significant case study for the Indonesian Parliament's role in peacebuilding, as the peace negotiations were built on the premise of devolving powers from the government to a regional parliament—the Dewan Perwakilan Rakyat Daerah Aceh (DPR). The Indonesian Parliament also played a role in promulgating the Law on the Governance of Aceh (LoGA) No 11/2006, which, in accordance with the Peace Agreement, stipulated that Aceh will exercise self-autonomy within all sectors, except foreign affairs, national defense and security, monetary and fiscal issues, and law and religion. Notably, the drafting process involved many national and regional stakeholders and underwent thorough parliamentary scrutiny at both regional and national levels to ensure that the law takes into account the interests of key stakeholders and society as a whole. [26]

However, there also exists certain obstacles to the peacebuilding process in Aceh. The Indonesian Parliament also proposed that the Indonesian Armed Forces Law (TNI-Law or Law 34/2004) also covered Aceh, which means allowing The Indonesian National Armed Forces to intervene in internal security of Aceh as in the rest of Indonesia. That is contradictory to the goal of the Free Aceh Movement as well as the Peace Agreement. The issue arose mainly due to the fact that the Indonesian Parliament was not a signatory to the peace agreement between the Free Aceh movement and the Indonesian government in 2005—designed to provide Aceh extensive autonomous governance and a provincial assembly in exchange for Aceh's abandonment of independence demands and transformation into a regional political party. Such a proposal implied

that the Indonesian Parliament treated the Peace Agreement and particularly the principles of Aceh's autonomy as a set of general guidelines rather than binding principles and commitments. [27]

3.3 Myanmar

As a legislative body in an ethnically diverse nation, the Myanmar Parliament could play a crucial role in peacebuilding through representation, particularly of the ethnic groups through the elected representatives in the provincial and national parliaments since 2010. [28] For peace to endure, a multi-ethnic society must have the voices of the ethnic groups to be institutionalized and channeled through parliaments, assemblies, and bureaucracies. [29] In 2015, the Myanmar Parliament, in an effort to consolidate nation-wide peace, adopted the "Ethnic Rights Protection Law", which clearly states the rights and privileges of ethnic groups, protection of the rights of ethnic groups, and prohibitions and penalties for the violation of the rights of ethnic groups. [30] However, overall, ethnic representation in Myanmar has not yet been largely included in the peace process, thus resulting in increasing demands for more engagement. [31]

Many other challenges facing the peace process also require parliament's intervention. They include the coordination of political dialogues between the government and Non-State Armed Groups (NSAGs); more inclusive representation of civil society and affected communities in the peace legislation; effective legal framework for free and fair elections, governance, and rule of law; regulation of the private sector in relation to natural resource and extractive industries to avoid "*Resource Curse*"³; and more liberal macro-economic reform and micro-economic reform in the conflict affected areas. [29]

3.4 The Philippines

³ Also known as "*Resource Trap*" or "*Paradox of Plenty*", the term describes a situation, in which a country fails to husband its abundant valuable natural resources, and consequently underperforms economically, or worse, even experiences unnecessary domestic conflicts over resource controls. This mainly results from overdependence on a few resource-dependent sectors and bureaucratic inefficiency to control the resources, including corruption.

The case of the Philippines, which has experienced numerous conflicts with various rebel groups, is also worthy of attention. For example, the Government of the Philippines and the Moro Islamic Liberation Front (MILF) based in Mindanao, in 2014, signed the Comprehensive Agreement on Bangsamoro to establish an autonomous region, in exchange for the disarmament of the MILF. The agreement led to the formation of the Bangsamoro Transitional Authority (BTA) as the transitional regional government of the Bangsamoro Autonomous Region with their own executive branch and legislature, in which the MILF constitutes the majority voice. However, the Congress could not address the issue of the suspension of the implementation of the Agreement, as the passage of the Bangsamoro Basic Law—the legal instrument for the implementation of the agreement—was delayed for years due to violent confrontation and lack of pressure from the Congress on the national level politicians to pass it through Congress. [32]

Furthermore, in 2018, the Congress of the Philippines passed a landmark law known as the Organic Law for Bangsamoro in the Autonomous Region in Muslim Mindanao (OLBARRM), to provide greater autonomy to the Moro population in southern Mindanao. This had, as a result, reinforced peacebuilding in the civil war-torn region. [33] Moreover, the Congress of the Philippines also approved a number of laws concerning the ongoing tension in addition to the executive commitment to realize a peaceful resolution, such as the Republic Act No. 9851 on the “Philippine Act on Crimes against International Humanitarian Law, Genocide, and Other Crimes against Humanity”. [34]

There was also close cooperation between the UN and the Congress of the Philippines through the UN Peacebuilding Fund. The Fund greatly facilitated the UN Country Team and the Office of the Presidential Advisor to the Peace Process in providing platforms for advocacy with the Congress; securing timely technical and legal support for parliamentarians and parliamentary staff; and deploying mediators to compromise on controversial issues through back-channel dialogues. [35]

4 Global Good Practices of Parliamentary Roles in Peacebuilding

4.1 General Good Practices

While it is imperative to reflect on the regional peacebuilding effort of ASEAN parliamentarians, a close observation of global good practices is also helpful. Generally, according to the United Nations Development Program (UNDP), parliaments from across the globe play crucial roles in contributing to the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) 2030, especially Goal 16, known as

“Sustaining Peace and Good Governance Goal”—aiming to sustain development through peaceful and inclusive societies; equal access to justice; and effective, accountable, and inclusive institutions—which is complimentary to peacebuilding. [36]

These roles, which can be regarded as good practices, include making law(s), overseeing the executive branch, and representing the public interests. Specifically, parliaments are expected to check government transparency to substantially reduce corruption and bribery, promote effective and accountable institutions, and ensure responsive, inclusive, participatory, and representative decision-making at all levels. This is plausible only when parliamentarians explore how to improve their own institutional procedures and systems, such as publicizing more parliamentary information, promoting parliamentary outreach, updating parliamentary committee work to the public, and ensuring more engagement from women, the vulnerable, and marginalized. Moreover, parliaments can enhance their proactivity on this Goal through internal monitoring and evaluation, information sessions, plenary debates and discussions, passage of relevant motions and resolutions, and action plans. [36]

There are also many specific cases worth examining as follows.

4.2 Columbia

In the case of Columbia, the Congress has proved to be a significant actor in peacebuilding. In 2016, it carried out its role in designing and implementing peace agreements and decision-making on policy that impacts peace. After years of peace negotiations and challenges, the FARC (Fuerzas Armadas Revolucionarias de Colombia) and the Colombian government agreed to formally bring an end to the decades-long conflict, with the substantial intervention by the Colombian Congress, who unanimously revised the peace agreement in late 2016, leading the country into a post-conflict stage. [37]

4.3 Afghanistan

The case of Afghanistan suggests parliament’s role in peacebuilding through its engagement in judicial reform, which is also stressed by the Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU). The engagement can be carried out by establishing military monitoring bodies, anti-corruption units, specialized courts, and national human rights commissions, among others, and by promoting human rights to public servants through trainings. These roles have been effectively exercised by Afghan parliamentarians

in 2006, through their mobilization to denounce the reappointment of a supreme court at odds with liberal legal reforms. [38]

4.4 Nepal and South Africa

Successful peacebuilding cannot exclude the post-conflict Security Sector Reform (SSR), which is widely considered a core pillar of peace and security architecture. [39] It is, therefore, a gap that parliamentarians could fill through legislation. For example, in the case of Nepal in 2011, Members of Parliament legislated a Seven Point Agreement to address the integration of paramilitary combatants into the national unified armed forces under the scrutiny of a democratic system. The legislation significantly contributed to bringing an end to the conflict and ushered in a multi-party system governed by the rule of law. [40] Likewise, in South Africa, after 1994, two parliamentary committees were created for defense legislation and oversight including the Defense Portfolio Committee and the Joint Standing Committee on Defense (JSCD), and were crucial in reviewing the draft and final versions of the 1996 Defense White Paper and the 1998 Defense Review. [41]

4.5 Bosnia-Herzegovina, Rwanda, and Indonesia

Another crucial aspect for peacebuilding concerns parliamentary participation by, and inclusion of, social groups including minorities, women, and former combatants. This would ensure that the legislature involves relevant representatives of important social groups in its decision-making processes, so that the legislative branch serves as a platform for inclusive and constructive dialogues, negotiations, and debates, and that its decisions reflect unified, fair, and sustainable peacebuilding efforts. For instance, the Parliamentary Assembly of Bosnia-Herzegovina reflects diverse power-sharing and serves as archetype of ethnic-based participation in accordance with the principle of ‘grand coalitions, minority veto and parity of representation’. [42]

Regarding women, in Rwanda, the constitution mandated by the Arusha Accords in 1993, reserves 24 seats for female parliamentarians [43], while in 2008, Sudanese inter-sectional parliamentarians brought about a historic consensus of 25% seat reservation for women in Sudan’s National Assembly. [44] The United Nations Development Program (UNDP) also recognizes the role of parliamentarians in promoting women’s political representation within each party, especially through the legislation of National Gender Action Plans. [45]

Finally, a peace agreement may allow for the formation of political parties by former combatants, who disarmed in accordance with an agreement. [46] Research by Georgia State University shows that from 1990-2009, more than half of former armed groups who signed peace agreements chose to form their own political parties and compete in the elections. [47] Many of them even remain competitive in post-conflict politics, as exemplified by the case of the Aceh Party in Indonesia's Aceh province, who is continuously seeking to foster alliances with other political parties to ensure collaboration within the regional parliament and have a regional voice in the national parliament. [48]

5 Conclusion

Fundamentally, the paper provides three main aspects as a reference for parliamentary roles in peacebuilding in ASEAN and global good practices. **First**, there exists clear interconnectedness among key peace-related approaches, including *Preventive Diplomacy*, *Peacemaking*, *Peacekeeping*, and *Peace Enforcement*, all of which are complimentary to *Peacebuilding*. As such, a peacebuilding mission is expected to cover many issues, include a wide range of actors, and expand over generations.

Second, the roles of ASEAN parliamentarians in local and international peacebuilding in the last two decades have been clearly demonstrated. Regarding **Cambodia**, *Public Representation* was fulfilled through many regular local and regional engagements—through consultations and forums—as well as contributions to local development and protection of citizens' rights. *Legislative roles* were mainly concerned with policies and laws to mitigate local discrimination and to promote democratization, human rights, national defense and public safety, and regional and international cooperation. The *Oversight function* was reflected in nation-wide site visits by parliamentarians to oversee the implementation of Decentralization and Deconcentration policy, so as to promote good governance. Meanwhile, *Parliamentary Diplomacy* by the Members of Parliament of Cambodia was carried out through various international meetings, events, and visits; cooperation with counterparts and organizations; and membership in many Inter-Parliamentary Organizations. These constitute a strong backbone for peacebuilding.

In the **Indonesian** context, there is emphasis on Inter-Parliamentary dialogue for international peacebuilding and the two-way approach of sharing to, and learning from, the host state. In Indonesia, peacebuilding is inserted as a key program in the International Cooperation Blueprint, in

which parliament is among the key actors. In the Aceh case study, the Indonesian Parliament played a role in the Law on Self-Governance of Aceh, but since the Parliament was not a signatory to the Peace Agreement, some elements of the Law were not aligned with the Agreement itself. That implies the need of the inclusion of parliament in the peacemaking process to ensure that any subsequent legislation would be consistent with the Peace Agreement.

Meanwhile, in the case of **Myanmar**, which is an ethnically diverse state, parliament is the only space where ethnic voices can be heard. So far, the Myanmar Members of Parliament have played their peacebuilding role through the passage of related laws, such as the Ethnic Rights Protection Law, yet concrete implementation of ethnic inclusivity in the peace process is still vague, while many parliamentary and bureaucratic challenges remain to be addressed.

While **the Philippines** congress has had numerous experiences in dealing with rebels, and has passed many laws dealing with peacebuilding, their role in dealing with the rebels are often bypassed by the executive. A good example from the Philippines is the UN Peacebuilding Fund as part of the cooperation between the UN and the Congress of the Philippines to provide necessary platforms and technical and legal support for parliamentarians and parliamentary staff.

Lastly, Global Good Practices are identified in the UNDP guidelines for parliamentary roles, particularly SDG Goal 16 concerning Governance and Peace, which includes government oversight and internal parliamentary capacity building. Specific cases from around the globe include the roles of Members of Parliament of Columbia in designing and implementing Peace Agreements; of Afghanistan in Judicial Reforms; and of Nepal and South Africa in post-conflict Security Sector Reform (SSR). Inclusion of social groups—minorities, women, and ex-combatants—is also one of the global good practices. The Parliament of Bosnia-Herzegovina serves as a good example of minority inclusion, while the Parliaments of Rwanda and Sudan took a major step in achieving substantial seats allocated for women. In Indonesia, former combatants have been actively engaging in political party formation and competition for parliamentary seats.

References

1. Barma, N. (2016). Rethinking the Peacebuilding Puzzle. In: *The Peacebuilding Puzzle: Political Order in Post-Conflict States*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp.12-13.
2. Lucuta, G. M. (2014). *Peacemaking, Peacekeeping, Peacebuilding and Peace Enforcement in the 21st Century*. [online] Peace Insight. Available at: <https://www.peaceinsight.org/blog/2014/04/peacemaking-peacekeeping-peacebuilding-peace-enforcement-21st-century/> [Accessed 02 Nov. 2020].
3. Asean.org, (2009). *ASEAN Political-Security Community Blueprint*. [online] Available at: <https://asean.org/wp-content/uploads/images/archive/5187-18.pdf> [Accessed 02 Nov. 2020].
4. Asean.org, (2016). *ASEAN Political-Security Community Blueprint 2025*. [online] Available at: <https://asean.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/05/ASEAN-APSC-Blueprint-2025.pdf> [Accessed 02 Nov. 2020].
5. United Nations Development Program, (2006). *Parliaments, Crisis Prevention and Recovery: Guidelines for the International Community*. Copenhagen: UNDP, pp.5-6.
6. Weisglas, F. W. and Boer, G. de (2007). Parliamentary Diplomacy. *The Hague Journal of Diplomacy*, 2, pp.93-99.
7. Boutros-Ghali, B. (1992). *An Agenda for Peace Preventive diplomacy, peacemaking and peacekeeping*. [online], p.5. Available at: https://www.un.org/ruleoflaw/files/A_47_277.pdf.
8. Caplan, R (n.d.). *Peacekeeping / Peace Enforcement*. Peacekeeping / Peace Enforcement. [online] Pesd.princeton.edu. Available at: <https://pesd.princeton.edu/node/561> [Accessed 13 Nov. 2020].
9. Autesserre, S. (2017). International Peacebuilding and Local Success: Assumptions and Effectiveness. *International Studies Review*, 19, p. 115.
10. Staphenhurst, R., O'Brien, M., and Johnston N. (2008). Introduction: Parliaments as Peacebuilders. In: M. O'Brien, R. Staphenhurst, and N. Johnston, ed., *Parliaments as Peacebuilders in Conflict-Affected Countries*, 1st ed. Washington D.C.: The World Bank, pp.1-5.

11. USIP.org, (2000). *Peace Agreements: Cambodia Peace Agreements Digital Collection*.
[online] Available at: <https://www.usip.org/publications/2000/02/peace-agreements-cambodia> [Accessed 11 Nov. 2020].
12. Peacekeeping.un.org, (2003). *United Nations Transitional Authority in Cambodia UNTAC (February 1992 - September 1993)* . [online] Available at:
<https://peacekeeping.un.org/sites/default/files/past/untac.htm> [Accessed 11 Nov. 2020].
13. The Senate of the Kingdom of Cambodia (2018). *Achievements of the Senate in the Third Legislature*. Phnom Penh: The Secretariat of the Senate, pp.33-34.
14. The Senate of the Kingdom of Cambodia (2018). *Achievements of the Senate in the Third Legislature*. Phnom Penh: The Secretariat of the Senate, pp.34-36.
15. The Senate of the Kingdom of Cambodia (2018). *Achievements of the Senate in the Third Legislature*. Phnom Penh: The Secretariat of the Senate, pp.31-32.
16. The Senate of the Kingdom of Cambodia (2018). *Achievements of the Senate in the Third Legislature*. Phnom Penh: The Secretariat of the Senate, pp.286-295.
17. The Senate of the Kingdom of Cambodia (2018). *Achievements of the Senate in the Third Legislature*. Phnom Penh: The Secretariat of the Senate, p.33.
18. Weisglas, F. W. and Boer, G. de (2007). Parliamentary Diplomacy. *The Hague Journal of Diplomacy*, 2, pp.93-94.
19. Weisglas, F. W. and Boer, G. de (2007). Parliamentary Diplomacy. *The Hague Journal of Diplomacy*, 2, pp.94-97.
20. The Senate of the Kingdom of Cambodia (2018). *Achievements of the Senate in the Third Legislature*. Phnom Penh: The Secretariat of the Senate, pp.36-37.
21. The Senate of the Kingdom of Cambodia (2018). *Achievements of the Senate in the Third Legislature*. Phnom Penh: The Secretariat of the Senate, p.37.
22. The Senate of the Kingdom of Cambodia (2018). *Achievements of the Senate in the Third Legislature*. Phnom Penh: The Secretariat of the Senate, pp.37-38.
23. Alexandra, L.A. (2017). Offering Support and Sharing Experiences: Indonesia's Approach to Peacebuilding. In: C. Call and C. de Coning, *Rising Powers and Peacebuilding. Rethinking Peace and Conflict Studies*, 1st ed. London: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 29-68.
24. Mula, K. (2018). *Conflict Prevention and Peacebuilding in Asia: Lessons in South-South Cooperation*. Korean Development Institute and The Asia Foundation, pp. 54-55.

25. Mauludiah, S.N. (n.d.). *Indonesia South-South and Triangular Cooperation: Our Stories and Experiences on Moving Forward*. Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Indonesia.
26. Caspersen, N. and Sindre, G. (2020). *Supporters, spoilers or sidelined: the role of parliaments in peacebuilding*. Global Development Centre and Westminster Foundation for Democracy, p. 16.
27. Caspersen, N. and Sindre, G. (2020). *Supporters, spoilers or sidelined: the role of parliaments in peacebuilding*. Global Development Centre and Westminster Foundation for Democracy, pp. 16-17.
28. Petrie, C. and South, A. (2014). Peacebuilding in Myanmar. In: M. Gravers, and F. Ytzen, *Burma/Myanmar—Where Now (Asia Insights)*, 1st ed. Copenhagen: Nordic Institute of Asian Studies, p. 239.
29. Horowitz, D. L. (1985). Racial Violence in the United States. In K. Glazer, and K. Young, *Ethnic Pluralism and Public Policy*, 1st ed. London: Lexington Books, pp. 8-30.
30. Pointmyanamr (2021). *The Ethnic Rights Protection Law No.8, 2015*. [online] Available at: <https://www.pointmyanmar.org/en/lawsandpolicies/ethnic-rights-protection-law> [Accessed 17 Feb. 2021].
31. Petrie, C. and South, A. (2014). Peacebuilding in Myanmar. In: M. Gravers, and F. Ytzen, *Burma/Myanmar—Where Now (Asia Insights)*, 1st ed. Copenhagen: Nordic Institute of Asian Studies, p.226.
32. ICG (2019). *The Philippines: Militancy and the new Bangsamoro, International Crisis Group Report 301*. [online] Available at: <https://www.iknowpolitics.org/en/learn/knowledge-resources/peacebuilding-through-parliaments> [Accessed 19 Feb. 2021].
33. International Crisis Group, (2019). *The Philippines: Militancy and the New Bangsamoro*. [online] Available at: <https://www.crisisgroup.org/asia/south-east-asia/philippines/301-philippines-militancy-and-new-bangsamoro> [Accessed 18/10/20]
34. ASEAN Inter-Parliamentary Assembly (AIPA). *The 9th AIPA Caucus, Jakarta, Indonesia, 17th–20th July 2017, Report of the 9th AIPA Caucus*. [pdf], p.32. [online] Available at: <https://www.parliament.go.th/ewtadmin/ewt/aipa2019/download/article/AIPAGA/Political/11POL9thAIPACaucusReport.pdf> [Accessed 24 February. 2021].
35. UN Peacebuilding. Tumblr, (2018). *Peace Day: Philippines*. [online] Available at: <https://un-peacebuilding.tumblr.com/post/178292243410/peace-day-philippines-we-need-to-work-on> [Accessed 20 Dec. 2020].

36. The United Nations Development Program (2020). *A handbook for Parliament's Role in Implementing the Sustainable Development Goals*. [pdf], p.16. Available at https://www.th.undp.org/content/thailand/en/home/library/democratic_governance/A-Parliamentary-Handbook.html [Accessed 20 Dec.2020].
37. Holmes, J. S. and Pavon-Harr, V. (2019). "Violence after Peace," in Meernik, J., DeMeritt, J. H. R., and Uribe-López, M. (eds) *As War Ends: What Colombia Can Tell Us About the Sustainability of Peace and Transitional Justice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 133–159. doi: 10.1017/9781108614856.007.
38. Suhrke, A. and Kaja, B. (2009). *Negotiating justice sector reform in Afghanistan. Crime, Law and Social Change*. 51 (2), pp. 11-230. doi: 10.1007/s10611-008-9154-0.
39. Muggah, R. and de Boer, J. (2019). *Security Sector Reform and Citizen Security: Experiences from Urban Latin America in Global Perspective*. London: Ubiquity Press. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5334/bcc>
40. Mayer-Rieckh, A. (2013). *Dealing with the Past in Security Sector Reform*. London: Ubiquity Press, pp. 51-53. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5334/bbu>
41. Griffiths, R. J. (2008). Parliamentary Oversight of Defense in South Africa. In: M. O'Brien, R. Staphenhurst, and N. Johnston, ed., *Parliaments as Peacebuilders in Conflict-Affected Countries*, 1st ed. Washington D.C.: The World Bank, pp.93-94.
42. Caspersen, N (2017). *Peace Agreements : Finding Solutions to Intra-State Conflicts*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, p. 67.
43. Devlin, C. and Elgie, R. (2008). *The Effect of Increased Women's Representation in Parliament: The Case of Rwanda*. *Parliamentary Affairs*, 61(2), pp. 237–254.
44. Tønnessen, L., & al-Nagar, S. (2013). *The women's quota in conflict-ridden Sudan: Ideological battles for and against gender equality*. *Women's Studies International Forum*, 41(2), pp. 122-131.
45. Saeedi, N. (2016). *Peacebuilding Through Parliaments*. [online] Available at: <https://www.iknowpolitics.org/en/learn/knowledge-resources/peacebuilding-through-parliaments> [Accessed 11 Feb. 2021].
46. Sindre, G. M. and Söderström, J (2016). *Understanding armed groups and party politics*. *Civil Wars* 18(2), pp. 109-117.

47. Manning, C., & Smith, I. (2016). *Political party formation by former armed opposition groups after civil war*. Routledge: Taylor and Francis Group. *Democratization*, 23(6), pp. 972-989.
48. Sindre, G. (2019). *Adapting to Peacetime Politics? Rebranding and Ideological Change in Former Rebel Parties*. *Government and Opposition*, 54(3), pp. 485–51.