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The ‘rise of Asia’ is a captivating and controversial topic. And we are all familiar with the arguments, projections and statistics: China will dominate the global economy by 2050. India’s growing middle class will comprise the world’s fifth-largest consumer economy by 2025. At least sixty per cent of the world’s population now resides in the region collectively known as ‘Asia’, and this figure is growing.

The Public Policy in the ‘Asian Century’ conference theme responds to these conversations and debates by raising important questions about whether and how the ‘Asian Century’ will affect public policy and administration as we know it. What are the implications for a traditionally domestic public policy when faced with global challenges? What are the skills and capabilities needed by today’s public servants to function effectively in a linked-up environment which pushes the boundaries of their engagements beyond national shores? Can governance be global? And what role do local, international and multilateral institutions have to play?

Whether you agree or disagree with the concept of the ‘Asian Century’, it serves as an important touchpoint to spark our thinking about the undeniable transformations we are witnessing in the contemporary policy environment. In this light, the ‘Asian Century’ is an important and useful device for challenging traditional thinking about public policy, administration and governance. It offers a chance to expand our thinking beyond national borders, and to encourage knowledge-sharing and lesson-learning between countries and cultures. These two days are your opportunity to canvas these issues, ask insightful questions, and share experiences and ideas. Welcome and enjoy.

THANK YOU

This conference has been made possible through the diligent work of numerous individuals who have given generously of their time, ideas and expertise. Thank you to everyone who has played a role, especially:

**Melbourne School of Government Staff**
- Professor Helen Sullivan, Director
- Professor Jenny Lewis, Research Director
- Dr Sara Riee, Research Fellow
- Ms Georgi Cahill, Events and Executive Officer
- Ms Hilary Blackman, Strategic Manager External Relations
- Ms Leanne McDonald, Research Development Manager
- Ms Celia Ujvari, Administration Assistant
- Ms Margherita Matera, Research Assistant

**‘Asian Century’ Project Steering Committee**
- Mr Nick Bastow, IPA (Victoria)
- Dr Jikon Lai, School of Social & Political Sciences, The University of Melbourne
- Dr Pradeep Taneja, School of Social & Political Sciences, The University of Melbourne
- Mr Mark Triffitt, School of Social & Political Sciences, The University of Melbourne

**Melbourne School of Government Assistant Research Directors**
- Professor Paul Jensen
- Professor John Langmore
- Professor Andrew Mitchell
### Program Overview

**Sunday, 8 December 2013**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16.15-17.00</td>
<td>Pre-Registration  Secretariat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.30-19.00</td>
<td>Welcome Reception  Alto Room</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Monday, 9 December 2013**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08.00-16.30</td>
<td>Registration  Secretariat (next to Clarendon Pre-function Area)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09.00-09.20</td>
<td>Opening and Welcome  Clarendon Ballroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09.20-10.30</td>
<td>Keynotes and Panel Discussion  Clarendon Ballroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.30-11.15</td>
<td>Morning Tea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.15-12.30</td>
<td>Parallel Sessions 1-4: Setting the Context for Public Policy in the 'Asian Century' Ballroom, Ballroom C, Flinders Room, Yarra Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.30-13.30</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.00-13.30</td>
<td>Book Launch: Professor Ross Garnaut, The University of Melbourne: Dog Days: Australia After the Boom Yarra Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.45-15.15</td>
<td>Afternoon Tea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.15-16.30</td>
<td>Plenary Session: Panel Q&amp;A  Clarendon Ballroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.30-16.50</td>
<td>Day 1 Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.50</td>
<td>Conference Close</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.30-22.00</td>
<td>Conference Dinner  Red Spice Road, QV Centre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tuesday, 10 December 2013**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08.30-16.30</td>
<td>Registration  Secretariat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09.00-10.30</td>
<td>Opening Plenary and Panel Discussion  Clarendon Ballroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.30-11.00</td>
<td>Morning Tea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.00-12.15</td>
<td>Parallel Sessions 10-13: Doing Public Policy in the 'Asian Century' Ballroom, Ballroom C, Flinders Room, Yarra Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.15-13.15</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.45-13.15</td>
<td>Book Launch: Professor Jenny Lewis, Melbourne School of Government: Academic Governance: Disciplines and Policy  Yarra Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.30-15.00</td>
<td>Afternoon Tea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.00-16.30</td>
<td>Plenary Session: ‘Doing policy’ in the ‘Asian Century’  Clarendon Ballroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.30-16.45</td>
<td>Closing Remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.45</td>
<td>Conference Close</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Welcome from the Director
Melbourne School of Government

I am delighted to welcome you to the inaugural Melbourne School of Government Conference on the theme of Public Policy in the ‘Asian Century’.

It is an exciting and challenging time to host a conference on this theme. Recent events within Australia and throughout the region pose pertinent questions about regional relationships, policy responses, and the role of government and institutions. Disasters like super typhoon Haiyan are a palpable reminder of the necessity of regional cooperation and global policy responses to issues like climate change and poverty.

Rapid economic and social development in Asia are redefining the potential and purpose of public policy. In Australia, policy makers are actively turning their attention to the policy, governance and practice changes required to maintain Australia’s economic and political strength in the region, while broadening and strengthening relationships with Asian nations. It is equally crucial to understand how other nations perceive the ‘Asian Century’ and the policy and governance implications for them.

At the Melbourne School of Government we take great interest in these issues and the challenges they pose. Our aim is to combine our collective expertise and leadership to generate wise, actionable solutions and improve the capacity of decision-makers to build shared futures. For these two days, you are a vital contributor to this aim, and we dare you to untangle the knotty issues, ask the bold questions and seek innovative answers. In the spirit of MSoG—which brings together academics from a range of disciplines including economics, international relations, law, politics, management and development studies to work with local and international public servants, industry leaders, community champions and social entrepreneurs—we also challenge you to reach beyond your comfort zone to engage new issues and ideas and extend your networks into related research and policy areas.

Over the next two days, we invite you to examine the implications of the ‘Asian Century’ for how public policy is made, managed and governed – what policy is, what it consists of, how it is realised and what this means for public administration, public management and governance. We are pleased to welcome contributions and experts from many parts of the world and we are confident that the range of panels and papers will provide a great basis for discussion and debate. We are keen for participants to engage with our research agenda and have convened a number of panels linked to our research themes involving national and international contributors. We are particularly pleased to welcome our keynote speakers: Professor M. Shamsul Haque, National University of Singapore; Professor Christine Wong, Director, Centre for Contemporary Chinese Studies, The University of Melbourne; and Professor David Kelly, Research Director, China Policy (Beijing). In bringing together this diverse and expert range of speakers, we hope to engage your interests and expand your vision for policy and governance.

This event is supported by the School’s constituent faculties: Arts, Business and Economics, and Law, with particular contributions from the School of Social and Political Sciences and Asialink. We would like to acknowledge and thank each of them for their contribution to making the conference happen.

We hope you enjoy the conference, take away fruitful ideas and become a part of our School’s community into the future.

About Professor Helen Sullivan:

Professor Helen Sullivan is Director of the Melbourne School of Government and a public policy researcher and teacher. She has degrees from the UK Universities of Birmingham and York and worked in a number of roles in government in the 1990s. Her academic career began at INLOGOV, University of Birmingham, followed by six years as Director of Research at the Cities Research Centre, UWE, Bristol, and then appointments as Director of the Advanced Social Science Collaborative and Director of Research and Knowledge Transfer in the School of Government and Society, University of Birmingham. She joined the University of Melbourne as Director of the Centre for Public Policy in 2011 and was appointed the Foundation Director for the Melbourne School of Government in 2013.

Helen’s research interests include: collaboration; democratic governance (particularly at the local level); and state-society relationships in public policy and service reform. Current research projects include an examination of the impact of the ‘Asian Century’ on public administration, governance and management, and the ‘Citizens’ Agenda’, an exploration of the relationship between social media, journalism and citizen participation in Australian electoral politics. Helen has published widely on public policy, public governance and public service reform in academic journals and is the co-author of a number of books including Working Across Boundaries (2003), Power, Participation and Political Renewal (2007) and Hybrid Governance in European Cities (2013). She also publishes regularly in practitioner media and has advised national and local governments as well as international institutions.

Helen has led innovations in bridging the gap between research and policy including designing the University of Birmingham’s first Policy Commission into the future of local public services. She is currently working in collaboration with the Victorian Public Service on an international project exploring the ‘21st Century public servant’.

Professor Helen Sullivan

Melbourne School of Government, Australia

I am delighted to welcome you to the inaugural Melbourne School of Government Conference on the theme of Public Policy in the ‘Asian Century’.
Keynote Presenters

**Professor M. Shamsul Haque**  
National University of Singapore

Professor M. Shamsul Haque, Department of Political Science, National University of Singapore, specializes in public administration and governance. His research interests cover diverse related issues such as comparative studies in governance reforms, development theory and policy, public service ethics and accountability, environment and sustainable development, and so on.

He has published four books and over sixty refereed articles in journals such as Public Administration Review, Administration & Society, Governance, Public Management Review, International Review of Administrative Sciences, International Journal of Public Administration, International Political Science Review, etc. He is Editor-in-Chief of Asian Journal of Political Science and Deputy Editor of International Review of Administrative Sciences.

In 2013, Professor Haque received the ‘Fred W. Riggs Award for Lifetime Scholarly Achievement in Public Administration and Comparative Development Administration’ from the American Society for Public Administration (ASPA).

---

**Professor Christine Wong**  
Director, Centre for Contemporary Chinese Studies, Asia Institute, The University of Melbourne

Christine Wong is the Director of the Centre for Contemporary Chinese Studies at the University of Melbourne. She was previously Professor of Chinese Public Finance and Director of Chinese Studies, School of Interdisciplinary Area Studies, and Fellow, Lady Margaret Hall, at the University of Oxford. She has taught on the faculties at the University of Washington, the University of California, Santa Cruz, University of California, Berkeley, and Mount Holyoke College. Christine’s research focuses on China’s public finance and public sector reform. Over the past fifteen years she has worked extensively in advisory capacities, for the World Bank, the OECD, and the Asian Development Bank, as well as through consultancies for the IMF, UNDP, UNICEF, and DFID. She is a member of the OECD Advisory Panel on Budgeting and Public Expenditures.

---

**Professor David Kelly**  
Director, China Policy – Beijing

David Kelly is Research Director, China Policy. His interests encompass a sweep of issues affecting China’s social, economic and political reforms.

A long-term resident in China, he is a regular commentator on current Chinese affairs in the global media. His more than thirty years’ research on China combined with his early IT training, created the ChinaBase research and learning tool.

David is concurrently a Visiting Professor at Peking University. He holds an honours degree in anthropology and philosophy and a PhD in Chinese studies from the University of Sydney. He has held a Fulbright Fellowship at the University of Chicago and senior academic positions in Australia, Singapore and China.

---

**Robert Bell**  
Head of Super Regional Business Development  
Australia and New Zealand Banking Group Limited

Robert Bell was appointed Head of Super Regional Business Development, ANZ Corporate and Commercial Banking in February 2012. Prior to this, Robert held a range of senior executive ANZ leadership roles globally, including most recently Chief Executive Officer, ANZ Japan (2009-2012); Chief Executive Officer, Central Pacific Region and Fiji (2006-2009).

During his 13 years with ANZ, Robert also notably held the position of Chief of Staff, Office of the CEO (2005-2006), responsible for ANZ Group CEO’s office and oversight of Group initiatives including Management Board meetings, senior leader forums and review processes across the ANZ group.

Previous senior leadership roles include Head of ANZ Margin Lending and eTrade; Head of Saving and Investment Products; and Marketing Manager. Before joining ANZ, Robert worked with CSL, an ASX listed pharmaceuticals company, in sales, product management and marketing roles. He holds a Bachelor of Business degree from Swinburne University, and has completed executive education at Melbourne Business School and Harvard Business School.

In addition, Robert has had non-executive experience in a series of directorship roles including ANZ Pacific Operations (Chairman), Bank of Kiribati (Chairman), Fiji Association of Banks (President) and Fiji Employers Federation.
Acknowledgement of Country

We would like to acknowledge the Wurundjeri people who are the Traditional Custodians of this Land. We would also like to pay respect to the Elders both past and present of the Kulin Nation and extend that respect to other Indigenous Australians present.

(Wurundjeri - The traditional owners of the land that The University of Melbourne and The Langham, Southbank is situated on)

‘Acknowledgement of Country’ by Jonathan Hill

Today we stand in footsteps millennia old.
May we acknowledge the traditional owners whose cultures and customs have nurtured, and continue to nurture, this land, since men and women awoke from the great dream.
We honour the presence of these ancestors who reside in the imagination of this land and whose irrepressible spirituality flows through all creation.

Source: Jonathan Hill is an Aboriginal poet living in New South Wales.

About Research@MSoG

Research@MSoG aims to provide excellent scholarship which has an impact on governance and public policy. This research underpins our ability to improve the capacity of policy makers to make sound decisions, design and deliver effective policies and programs, and build robust institutions in Australia, the region and beyond.

MSoG’s research agenda is informed by global and regional developments, in particular those associated with the ‘Asian Century’, and how country specific and regional public policy will need to adapt and change. Within this overarching focus, there are four research themes:

- Governance and performance: designing better governing institutions and improving policy making and policy performance
- Knowledge and expertise in public policy: using different types of evidence and new approaches, and managing competing perspectives
- Security and political engagement: responding to the effects of war, natural disasters, and dispossession, and improving political engagement
- Governing markets: improving the instruments that structure relationships between governments, governing institutions, and private actors

Research@MSoG Theme Panels

Governance and performance: Performance Measurement Around the World

Performance measurement is used around the world as a way to ensure the legitimate and rational use of public funds, to emphasize particular governmental goals and targets, and to ensure that officials are incentivized in line with these. Holding both institutions and individuals to account through such measurement has had many impacts on political-administrative systems, both desirable and undesirable. The rise of the performance measurement movement has also changed the way that public officials undertake their duties. This panel will explore the changing ways in which the measurement of performance is applied to public services, and also examine some of its consequences, in: the People’s Republic of China; Denmark, within a European perspective; and in the USA.
Knowledge and Expertise in Public Policy
This panel will provide three complementary perspectives on the challenges posed by the ‘Asian Century’, with a particular emphasis on the role of innovation, science and technology policy. Paul Jensen will provide a snapshot of the degree of ‘engagement’ between Australia and Asia through the lens of the Asialink Index. As much of Asia grapples with the rise of the urban middle class, pollution and natural disaster mitigation, the role of innovation to alleviate these concerns seems more and more acute. Guanghua Wan from the Asian Development Bank will put these challenges in perspective. Finally, Lauren Palmer from ATSE will pose the unique and complex implications for Australia: in particular, whether the groundwork we have laid will see us play an important role in the ‘Asian Century’.

Security and Political Engagement: ‘Dilemmas of Representation’
This panel focuses on contemporary questions of representation within MSoG’s ‘Security and Political Engagement’ theme. It will consider how state and non-state actors work within prevailing discourses of insecurity and risk to conceive, constitute and represent individual and collective interests in complex governance environments. The panel will explore a range of issues linking representation to ideas of legitimacy, sovereignty, rights and justice, and suggest that there are a number of dilemmas of representation facing academics, policy makers and activists.

The panelists will explore these dilemmas through a series of contributions addressing the following questions:

- What is the significance of borders and border work in representation?
- Whatever happened to the ‘indigenous century’?
- How can we understand representation in complex governance arrangements that may range from the local to the global?

The panel will draw on these contributions to discuss how dilemmas of representation may manifest themselves and be addressed in the ‘Asian Century’.

Governing Markets: ‘Regulation of Trade, Investment and Finance in the Asian Century’
Recent developments in Asia demonstrate its increasing significance to any discussion of public policy in the areas of trade, investment and finance regulation. Increasing investment from China into Western economies, the on-going negotiation of the Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement, the relative strength of Asian markets in facing the Global Financial Crisis, and the increasing sophistication of Asian financial markets, all point to the need to seriously consider how a revitalised Asia fits into approaches to public policy and governance. Key issues to be discussed will include the implications of new regional trade agreements being negotiated, regional cooperation on financial regulation in Asia and the management of foreign investment.

Public Policy in the ‘Asian Century’ Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08.30-16.30</td>
<td>Registration Secretariat (next to Clarendon Pre-function Area)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09.00-09.20</td>
<td>Opening and Welcome Clarendon Ballroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professor Helen Sullivan, Director, Melbourne School of Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professor Glyn Davis, Vice-Chancellor, The University of Melbourne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09.20-10.30</td>
<td>Keynotes and Panel Discussion Clarendon Ballroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professor M. Shamsul Haque, National University of Singapore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Keynote speaker 2: Robert Bell, Australia and New Zealand Banking Group Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q&amp;A: Chaired by Professor Mark Considine, Dean, Faculty of Arts, The University of Melbourne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.30-11.15</td>
<td>Morning Tea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.15-12.30</td>
<td>Parallel Sessions 1-4: Setting the Context for Public Policy in the ‘Asian Century’ Ballroom, Ballroom C, Flinders Room, Yarra Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.30-13.30</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.00-13.30</td>
<td>Book Launch: Professor Ross Garnaut, The University of Melbourne: Dog Days: Australia After the Boom With an introduction and discussion by The Hon. John Brumby Yarra Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.45-15.15</td>
<td>Afternoon Tea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.15-16.30</td>
<td>Plenary Session: Panel Q&amp;A Clarendon Ballroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chair: Peter Harris, AO, Chairman, Productivity Commission, Australian Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr Geraldine Kennett, CEO, IPAA Victoria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>David Hanna, Chair, IPAA Victoria Asian Century Taskforce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professor Deborah Youdell, University of Birmingham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Richardson, Director, Victorian State Office, Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.30-16.50</td>
<td>Day 1 Summary Clarendon Ballroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professor Mark Considine, Dean, Faculty of Arts, The University of Melbourne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.50</td>
<td>Conference Close</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.30-22.00</td>
<td>Conference Dinner Red Spice Road, GV Centre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Session 1
Defining the 'Asian Century' in a contemporary policy context
(Ballroom A)

Chair: Dr David Schmidtchen, Australian Public Service Commission

Public Policy in the ‘Asian Century’: Setting Context, Goals and Strategies to Raise its Effectiveness Containing Risk and Uncertainty
Dr Claudia Astarita, Italian Military Centre for Strategic Studies

The Asian Century: What? Whose?
Mr David Bellingham, University of Canberra

Towards a Research Agenda for Public Policy in the ‘Asian Century’
Dr Sara Bice & Professor Helen Sullivan, Melbourne School of Government

Session 2
Leadership, Knowledge and Governance in the ‘Asian Century’
(Yarra Room)

Chair: Associate Professor Michael Crozier, Murdoch University

Decentralising Governance: Asian Hybrids
Professor Brian Galligan, The University of Melbourne

China in an Age of Radical Modernity: Why the World’s most Populous Nation won’t become Liberal
Mr Mark Triffitt, The University of Melbourne

Restructuring Governance, Managing Conflict: ASEAN’s Human Rights Instrument
Dr Kelly Gerard, Murdoch University, Australia

Session 3
Institutions and Development in the ‘Asian Century’
(Flinders Room)

Chair: Associate Research Fellow Theresa Robles, Nanyang Technological University of Singapore

Building Cooperative Regional Security Relationships
Professor John Langmore, Melbourne School of Government

Understanding the Changing Institutions in the ‘Asian Century’: A Comparative Analysis of 'hollowing out state' in China, Indonesia and Vietnam
Ms Diep Tran, Victoria University of Wellington

Developing A Model For Policy Formulation– An Extension Of Kingdon’s Model Of Agenda Setting
Ms Aditi Raina, National University of Singapore

Session 4
Research@MSoG Theme Panel: Governance and Performance: Performance Measurement Around the World (Clarendon Ballroom)

Chair: Professor Jenny Lewis, Melbourne School of Government

Professor Yijia Jing, Fudan University, China
Professor Peter Trifantafillou, Roskilde University, Denmark
Dr Jie Gao, City University of Hong Kong
Dr Steven Putansu, Government Accountability Office, USA

Session 5
Roundtable Discussion: State Responses to the ‘Asian Century’: The First Murdoch Commission (Yarra Room)

Chair: The Hon. John Brumby, Vice-Chancellor’s Fellow, The University of Melbourne

Western Australia and the Evolving Regional Order: Challenges and opportunities
Commissioners:
Mrs Kerry Sanderson, AO
Mr John McCarthy, AO
Associate Professor Michael Crozier, Murdoch University
Dr Jeffrey Wilson, Murdoch University

Session 6
‘The Asian Century’? Critical Analysis and Progress to Date (Ballroom A)

Chair: Professor Mark Beeson, Murdoch University

The Asian Century White Paper One Year On: A Progress Report
Mr Nick Reece, The University of Melbourne

A Uniting Church’s reflection of the Asian Century White Paper
Rev Dr Ji Zhang, Uniting World

Should we be Sceptical About the ‘Asian Century’?
Professor Andrew Walter, Melbourne School of Government
Session 7
Culture, Values, Traditions (Flinders Room)

Chair: Associate Professor Adrian Kay, Australian National University

A Unique Chinese-Western Hybrid?: An Inquiry into China’s Emerging Animal Protection Framework
Dr Yangzi Sima & Dr Siobhan O’Sullivan, The University of Melbourne

What Weber Got Wrong: Confucianism, Communism and Modern Capitalism in East Asia
Associate Professor Jill Tao, Incheon National University

Is Asia the New Cultural Policy Moment? Developing New Models of International Cultural Engagement for the Asian Century
Ms Lesley Alway, Asialink Arts, The University of Melbourne

Session 8
Research@MSoG Theme Panel: Governing Markets: Regulation of Trade, Investment and Finance in the ‘Asian Century’ (Ballroom C)

Chair: Professor Andrew Mitchell, Melbourne School of Government

Professor Douglas Arner, Hong Kong University
Ms Valerie Hughes, World Trade Organization (WTO)
Ambassador Alan Oxley, ITS Global

Session 9
Urbanisation (Ballroom B)

Chair: Dr Guanghua Wan, Asian Development Bank

Drivers of Urban Development in China: Measuring Development and Comparing Models
Professor Jong Youl Lee, Professor Chad Anderson and Ms Bo Wang, Incheon National University

Comparison of Urbanization Policy under Jiang Zemin and Hu Jintao
Ms Bo Wang, Incheon National University

The ‘Asian Century’? The Urban Century
Professor Brendan Gleeson, The University of Melbourne

Public Policy in the ‘Asian Century’ Program

Tuesday, 10 December 2013

08.30-16.30 Registration

09.00-10.30 Opening Plenary and Panel Discussion Clarendon Ballroom
Opening: Professor Helen Sullivan, Director, Melbourne School of Government
Professor Christine Wong, Director, Centre for Contemporary Chinese Studies, The University of Melbourne
Professor David Kelly, China Policy, Beijing
Chaired by Professor Amitabh Mattoo, Director, Australia India Institute, The University of Melbourne

10.30-11.00 Morning Tea

11.00-12.15 Parallel Sessions 10-13: Doing Public Policy in the ‘Asian Century’ Ballroom, Ballroom C, Flinders Room, Yarra Room

12.15-13.15 Lunch

12.45-13.15 Book Launch: Professor Jenny Lewis, Melbourne School of Government: Academic Governance: Disciplines and Policy Launch by Professor Mark Considine, Dean, Faculty of Arts, The University of Melbourne Yarra Room


14.30-15.00 Afternoon Tea

15.00-16.30 Plenary Session: Research@MSoG: Governance and Policy in the ‘Asian Century’ Clarendon Ballroom
Chair: Ms Maxine McKew, Vice Chancellor’s Fellow, The University of Melbourne
With special guests:
Professor Jenny Lewis, Melbourne School of Government
Professor Paul Jensen, Melbourne School of Government
Professor John Langmore, Melbourne School of Government

16.30-16.45 Closing Remarks
Professor Helen Sullivan, Director, Melbourne School of Government

16.45 Conference Close
**Session 10**
**Governance Mechanisms for the ‘Asian Century’ (Ballroom A)**

Chair: Dr Avery Poole, The University of Melbourne

- Free Trade Agreements are a Result of a Regulatory Harmonisation between and within States: Facts or Fiction?
  - Associate Professor Bruno Zeller, Victoria University
  - Mr Janko Nikolic, The University of Melbourne

- Defining and Bridging Financial and Macroeconomic Surveillance Space in East Asia
  - Associate Research Fellow Theresa Robles, Nanyang Technological University of Singapore

- Why Stability is More Important than Democracy for Economic Development in the ‘Asian Century’: The Experience of Central Asia
  - Bakhytzhan Kurmanov, Australian National University

**Session 11**
**Health Policy and Governance in the ‘Asian Century’ (Yarra Room)**

Chair: Professor David Hayward, RMIT University

- A Capacity Approach to Asian Governance: Evidence from Disease Control and Prevention Networks in Singapore and Taiwan
  - Dr Allen Yu-Hung Lai, ESSEC Business School Asia Pacific

- Non-Communicable Diseases in Asia: A Political Economy Analysis of Determinants and Health Governance Responses
  - Professor Adrian Kay, Australian National University

- Towards an Optimal TRIPS-Compliant Industrial Policy for the Pharmaceutical Industry in Bangladesh
  - Mr Mamun Ul Ala, University of South Australia

**Session 12**
**Policy Performance and Enforcement (Flinders Room)**

Chair: Dr Claudia Astarita, Italian Military Centre for Strategic Studies

- Culture Matters: Lessons Learnt from the Policy Transfer of Public Sector Reforms in the South Asian Nation of Bhutan
  - Mr Lhawang Ugyel, Australian National University

- Enforcement Issues with China’s Two-Child Policy
  - Ms Angela Merriam, Asia Institute, University of Melbourne

- Accountability and Ethical Values in Financial Practices: A Case Study of Islamic Finance
  - Dr Jikon Lai, The University of Melbourne

**Session 13**
**Research@MSoG Theme Panel: Knowledge and Expertise in Public Policy (Clarendon Ballroom)**

Chair: Jenny McGregor, Asialink CEO

- Asian-Australian Engagement, 1990-2012
  - Professor Paul Jensen, Melbourne School of Government

- Green Urbanization in Asia
  - Dr Guanghua Wan, Asian Development Bank

- Science and Technology Policy in a Global Context
  - Dr Lauren Palmer, Australian Academy of Technological Sciences and Engineering

**Session 14**
**Exploring Citizens Roles in the ‘Asian Century’ (Ballroom A)**

Chair: Dr Kelly Gerard, Murdoch University

- Can We “Talk the Talk?” – Australia, Languages and the Asian Century
  - Ms Leah Bramhill, Department of Premier & Cabinet

- Politics and Policy: Australian Public Perceptions of Indonesia and Foreign Policymaking
  - Dr Avery Poole, The University of Melbourne

- Brain Drain Reversal and Return Subsidy
  - Professor Xiangbo Liu, Renmin University

**Session 15**
**The ‘Asian Century’ and the EU: Comparative Perspectives (Yarra Room)**

Chair: Associate Professor Bruno Zeller, Victoria University

- Whose Century? Developing Evidence-based Public Policy
  - Associate Professor Bruno Mascitelli, Swinburne University & Professor Bruce Wilson, RMIT University

- Emulating the European Union Model in Post-Crisis Asia: The Limits to Diffusion in the Asian Century
  - Professor Mark Beeson & Professor Diane Stone, Murdoch University

- The European Union in the Asian Century: Opportunities, Challenges and Change
  - Professor Philomena Murray, The University of Melbourne
Session 16
Media, Technology and Policy (Flinders Room)
Chair: Mr Nick Bastow, Institute of Public Administration Australia, Victoria

Social Media and Limitations on the New Electronic Civil Society in Northeast Asia
Professor Chad Anderson, Incheon National University
Associate Professor Margaret Simons, The University of Melbourne

Session 17
Public Administration in the ‘Asian Century’ (Ballroom B)
Chair: Professor Janine O’Flynn, Melbourne School of Government

Public Sector Human Resource Management: Observations from the 2013 Australia-China Dialogue on Public Administration
Dr Geraldine Kennett, Institute of Public Administration Australia [Victoria]

The Australian Public Service in the ‘Asian Century’
Dr David Schmidtchen, Australian Public Service Commission
Mr Justin Hanney, DPC Victorian State Government

Session 18
Research@MSoG Theme Panel: Security and Political Engagement: Dilemmas of Representation (Ballroom C)
Chair: Professor Helen Sullivan, Melbourne School of Government

Representation and Borders
Professor Adrian Little, The University of Melbourne

Whatever happened to the ‘Indigenous Century’?
Dr Mark McMillan, The University of Melbourne

Representation in Complex Governance Arrangements (Global/Local)
Dr Kate Macdonald, The University of Melbourne

About Our Conference Sponsor

Asialink is Australia’s leading centre for the promotion of public understanding of the countries of Asia and of Australia’s role in the region.

Its mission is to build an Asia-capable, deeply Asia-engaged Australia through knowledge, skills and partnerships.

Asialink excels in “soft diplomacy” - delivering high-level forums, international collaborations, leadership training, education, community health and cultural programs in Australia and Asia.

It works with business and academia to produce innovative research, engage in regular policy dialogue across Asia, and bring the best of new thinking on Australia-Asia engagement to a general audience.

Asialink facilitates a range of forums and services for business, government, academia and the broader community that serve to stimulate debate, provide increased understanding and promote greater engagement with the Asian region.

- The Asialink Leaders Program offers an unparalleled professional development opportunity by bringing together outstanding professionals from the corporate, government and community sectors to produce a regional network of leaders with skills to operate effectively in the Asian century.
- The role of Asialink Arts is to develop opportunities for cultural exchange between Australia and Asia and improve the Asia capability of the cultural sector based on the principles of partnership, collaboration and reciprocity.
- Asia Australia Mental Health (AAMH) partners with leading local and international organisations for improved mental health in the Asia Pacific.
- The Asia Education Foundation (AEF) provides teachers, education leaders and school communities with innovative programs, curriculum resources and networks to support the achievement of Asia literacy for every young Australian.

The Melbourne School of Government greatly appreciates Asialink’s generous sponsorship of this conference.
Public Policy in the ‘Asian Century’ Conference Program and Information Booklet

Abstracts of Public Policy in the ‘Asian Century’ Papers

Session 1: Defining the ‘Asian Century’ in a contemporary policy context (Ballroom A)

Public Policy in the ‘Asian Century’: setting context, goals and strategies to raise its effectiveness containing risk and uncertainty
Dr Claudia Astarita, Italian Military Centre for Strategic Studies (CeMISS), Italy

We are currently living in the ‘Asian Century’, but Asian borders still remain undefined. Some people might take it for granted that Australia, India and New Zealand are in, but what about the U.S. and Russia? Diversity in Asia is huge, sometimes troublesome. The region hosts mature democracies and autocratic regimes; economic giants and developing countries; religious and atheist nations; military powers and strategic dwarfs. Last but not least, diversity has favoured the emergence and nurtured the polarization of political, economic and strategic conflicting priorities in the region.

In a background where any attempt to implement a concerted action or to reach a compromise might seem utopian, Asian success stories of regional integration and commercial cooperation are undoubtedly extraordinary. However, this paper argues that in the ‘Asian Century’ yesterday’s strategies have become obsolescent, ineffective, and risky.

Until Asia was just considered a developing region located in the Far East, most of its accomplishments remained unnoticed. On the contrary, when a huge amount of political, economic and military power started accumulating there, the Asian geopolitical scenario radically changed, and the idea that the world was entering the ‘Asian Century’ emerged.

The aim of this paper is twofold: after clarifying the events that shaped the advent of the ‘Asian Century’, it specifies why defining Asian borders is crucial to infer on regional strategic planning. Further, aware that despite strong public agreement on society’s goals, choosing effective policies is not a simple task, this paper underlines how deeply Asian diversity negatively affects the definition of regional goals and priorities. In conclusion, after evaluating the opportunity of promoting multi-speed integration on political, economic, and strategic issues, as well as the one of favouring either cross-sectional cooperation or issue linkage, this paper offers some suggestions on how to influence public policy in the ‘Asian Century’.

The Asian Century. What? Whose?
David Bellingham, University of Canberra, Australia

The twenty-first century is increasingly referred to as The Asian Century (Asian Development Bank, 2011; Fidler, 2011, Australian Government, 2012), however the enthusiasm and optimism of western nations and corporation raises core issues. The first is fundamental, that one must understand the market one is entering, and Asia is complex, contradictory and changing. The second is more pressing, for many regard it as their right to a share of this growth? The extension of this position is how might they engage in a sustainable and mutually beneficial manner which is not, or is not interpreted as an anachronistic imperialist approach.

This paper first addresses the question What is Asia? It places this question in its contemporary global context by understanding what is The Asian Century. It continues to interrogate the concept of The Asian Century and challenges the global appropriation of this opportunity proposing a less western centric approach to this shift in global trade, communication and power for a more equitable and aligned structured engagement.

Towards a Research Agenda for Public Policy in the ‘Asian Century’
Dr Sara Rice, Melbourne School of Government, Australia
Professor Helen Sullivan, Melbourne School of Government, Australia

Global shifts in economic, political and even socio-cultural power suggest the 21st century may very well be the ‘Asian Century’. What is notable about the dominant discourse is the consistent focus on the content of future public policy. By contrast relatively little attention is paid to either the construct of public policy or the conduct of public policy. This conceptual paper defines central questions to advance a new research agenda for public policy in the ‘Asian Century’. In so doing, the paper seeks to open a fresh, two-way dialogue about the changing nature of the creation, management and governing of public policy to offer an innovative perspective on the contemporary role of policy in the Asian Century. The paper draws upon a systematic review of recent public policy literature to summarise current academic discussions related to increasing Asian influence. The research agenda set out in this paper is also informed by ongoing discussions and debates with Australian and international scholars and practitioners, and by the early work of the Melbourne School of Government’s ‘Public Policy in the ‘Asian Century’ research program. In initiating a research agenda for public policy in the Asian Century, the paper concludes with a suggestion of the dimensions and domaines which researchers might address to open a dialogue which can reflect upon, learn from, shape and enhance public policy in the Asian Century.

Session 2: Leadership, Knowledge and Governance in the ‘Asian Century’ (Yarra Room)

Decentralizing Governance: Asian Hybrids
Professor Brian Galligan, The University of Melbourne, Australia
Professor Baogang He, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore
Dr Avery Poole, The University of Melbourne, Australia

Variants of decentralized governance and federal hybrids are being adopted and adapted by Asian countries that are suited to their different pathways and stages of political and economic development. This paper will explore ways of thinking about Asian variants of decentralized and quasi-federal governance. It will focus on four key aspects: multilateral versus regional decentralization; centralism versus decentralisation in economic management; decentralisation and democratisation; and market-preserving federalism. Our purpose is a dialectical one: to apply theorising and comparative institutionalism developed in mainly Western liberal democracies to Asia; and to incorporate Asian experience in revising and developing our knowledge. It will draw upon the preliminary findings from a range of Asian countries covered in Federalism in Asia, edited by Baogang He, Brian Galligan & Takashi Itoiguchi (Edward Elgar 2007), and suggest avenues for continuing research.

China in an age of Radical Modernity: Why the world’s most populous nation won’t become liberal.
Mr Mark Triffitt, The University of Melbourne, Australia

China’s trajectory of development in unprecedented in modern history. Many Western accounts of China believe that China’s adoption of liberal markets combined with some form of liberal democracy is inevitable if it is to sustain growth and address a number of social, political and economic challenges. But that assumes the liberal order – i.e. the combination of liberal markets and liberal democracy – remains the ‘fittest’ way of managing the 21st century. The submission argues that the liberal order is no longer the fittest configuration of political and economic systems for the contemporary world. It argues that liberalism is a system based on abstract concepts and systems of liberal markets and liberal democracy are Modernity constructs, based on assumptions and organising principles that assumes the world of political and economic activity will always be configured in a linear way. However, these assumptions have been overtaken been by major changes in the way political and economic activity has been reconfigured over the past two decades. The changes, which mark the transition to Radical Modernity, have in effect de-linearised this activity through a combination of superspeed, super-scale and super-complexity. These fundamental changes have made it increasingly difficult for liberalism’s linear systems to decipher, explain and predict. The submission argues that China lies at the heart of Radical Modernity because of the speed, scale and complexity of the trajectory it is undertaking. It too facing the same significant problems of reconfiguring these new configurations through systems that are characterised predominantly by linearity and hierarchy. In short, a more effective way of looking at China’s development, particularly its development of policy frameworks, is not through the prism of liberalism, but through the prism of Radical Modernity which sees all political and economic systems North East and West, locked in a struggle to reassert order and stability over a political and economic world which is being increasingly reconfigured in unpredictable ways.

Restructuring Governance, Managing Conflict: ASEAN’s human rights instrument
Dr Kelly Gerard, Murdoch University, Australia

Recent years have seen a transformation in transnational public policy in East Asia, led by the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN). Regulatory networks involving state and non-state actors, such as the ASEAN Intergovernmental Commission on Human Rights, govern a widening range of issues, while ASEAN in its 10-member formation operates alongside a number of overlapping policy sites, with both fewer members (East Asian Growth Area and the Indonesia-Malaysia-Thailand Growth Area) and greater. This expansion of policy vertically, across scales, and horizontally, through the inclusion of non-state actors, has important consequences for regional governance. This paper frames these developments as part of a broader shift by ASEAN to establish a regulatory regional framework, in alignment with member states’ shift towards regulatory statehood. It first outlines the role of ASEAN’s regional regulatory framework, seen in its numerous regulatory networks governing issues such as investment regulation, policing, the rights of migrant workers, women and children, and the seasonal hazz. The paper then compares the operation of two of these regulatory networks, namely the Panel of ASEAN Experts on Fire and Hazard Assessment
and Coordination and the ASEAN Intergovernmental Commission on Human Rights, examining the relationship of these regional regulatory networks to relevant national institutions, and their processes for including non-state actors in policymaking. The paper argues that political elites have structured regional governance to manage conflict, evident in the marginalisation of dissenting social forces through the vertical and horizontal expansion of policy governing the seasonal haze and human rights. As such, the process of expanding policy across jurisdictions is not neutral, and should be examined in light of the conflicts and contestations that accompany it.

Session 3: Institutions and Development in the ‘Asian Century’ (Flinders Room)

Building Cooperative Regional Security Relationships
Professor John Langmore, Melbourne School of Government, Australia

This paper addresses the need to address the critical analysis of the stage in the traditional process model of policy making, and narrowing that set of solutions in preparation for the final policy decision (Sidney, 2007). However, of all the stages in the traditional process model of policy making, critical analysis of this stage is found to be most lacking, with no formal theory or model having been developed to describe or understand the processes taking place and is, therefore, arguably also the least understood (Linder and Peters, 1990).

Notwithstanding that, models for other stages, such as Kingdon’s (1995) policy stream model for agenda setting (looking at how issues come to the attention of government in the first place), have been well established and validated in the policy research community through several empirical case studies. Attempts to fill the knowledge gap within policy formulation by building a model based on Kingdon’s conceptualization of agenda setting, which is modified in order to accommodate the specific nature, activities and processes of the formulation stage.

The two primary modifications proposed are that, first, the problem stream merges into the policy stream in policy formulation and second, the policies stream interacts with the policy stream during policy formulation and critically relates to policy outcomes. It is also proposed that, similar to agenda setting, policy formulation involves the opening and closing of policy windows as well as policy entrepreneurs, whose presence plays a critical role in bringing the streams together and ensuring that their preferred policy alternatives move through to the next stage.

These propositions are then tested by analysing a unique case of policy formulation related to the reform of the public sector in the western state of Gujarat in India. It concludes by assessing whether or not the proposed model is found to be congruent with the findings in the case study as well as directions for future research.

Understanding the changing institutions in the ‘Asian century’: A comparative analysis of ‘hollowing out state’ in China, Indonesia and Vietnam
Ms Diep Tran, Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand

This research is aimed at providing insight into the ‘hollowing out’ process in developing and transition economies with special focus along the dimensions of legitimacy, private sectorization and conceding policy power to supra-national policy networks and entities. The research chooses China, Indonesia and Vietnam as case studies because of their strategic political positions and considerable important economic roles in shaping the geo-economic picture of the ‘Asian century’. The research will rely on an inter-disciplinary approach, with political economy and comparative studies as its primary research methodology.

Peters (1994) provides the seminal work on the ‘Hollow state’. Peters identifies three dimensions along which states are hollow out. The three dimensions are: (i) the loss of state legitimacy, (ii) the loss of state capacity, and (iii) reduced civil servants’ discretion. Rhodes (1994) augments Peters (1994) with an external hollow out dimension brought out by state’s joining supra-national union. Saward (1997) consolidates and summarizes the understanding of the hollow state, as the thinning out of national governments due to losing or conceding capacities to non-state actors, societal actors and/or supra-national entities.

Developing A Model For Policy Formulation– An Extension Of Kingdon’s Model Of Agenda Setting
Ms Aditi Raina, National University of Singapore, Singapore

Policy Formulation is the stage in the policy-making cycle that involves identifying, and/or crafting, a set of policy alternatives to address a problem, and narrowing that set of solutions in preparation for the final policy decision (Sidney, 2007). However, of all the stages in the traditional process model of policy making, critical analysis of this stage is found to be most lacking, with no formal theory or model having been developed to describe or understand the processes taking place and is, therefore, arguably also the least understood (Linder and Peters, 1990).

The First Murdoch Commission is an independent international inquiry into the growing economic interdependence of Western Australia (WA), Australia and the Asian region. The Commission is an initiative of Murdoch University (Perth, Western Australia) to help develop greater understanding among nations in the Region, and to consider the economic challenges and opportunities facing these nations in the coming 5 to 10 years.

The Western Australian economy has become closely intertwined with the dynamic economies of the Asian region over the last decade, now contributing 46% of Australia’s merchandise exports with only 11% share of the nation’s population. It provides around half of China’s iron ore imports, is the dominant supplier of liquefied natural gas (LNG) to Japan, and by 2020 Australia will produce more LNG than any country except Qatar. The WA resources sector is thus a key driver connecting the Australian economy into the dynamic economies of the Asian region. In addition to Australian Government representation overseas, WA has for some years also operated trade and investment offices in China, Japan, Indonesia, Korea and Singapore.

The Commission is examining development potentials in the Region through a set of specific themes, covering economic prospects, diplomacy and governance, expertise and innovation, and resources security and sustainability. A core task of the Commission is to evaluate the importance of regional engagement in advancing growth and development, with a view to enhancing mutual benefit and long term resilience for the Asian region including Australia and WA.

The Commission will produce a final report and recommendations with the objective of generating practical insight for policy development.

Session 6: ‘The Asian Century’? Critical Analysis and Progress to Date (Ballroom A)

The Asian Century White Paper One Year On: A Progress Report
Mr Nicholas Reece, The University of Melbourne, Australia

Prime Minister Julia Gillard released the Asian Century White Paper in October 2012 describing it as “a roadmap showing how Australia can be a winner in the Asian century.” The detail of this road map includes ambitious targets for Australia’s growth to reach by 2025 as well as a detailed implementation plan. With the White Paper now just over one year old [December 2013], this presentation will examine how Australia is progressing against the stated targets and objectives in the White Paper and whether there are any emerging issues that were not foreseen even one year ago.

The Asian Century White Paper formulism has been described as a roadmap showing how Australia can be a winner in the Asian century. This description of the road map includes ambitious targets for Australia’s growth to reach by 2025 as well as a detailed implementation plan. With the White Paper now just over one year old [December 2013], this presentation will examine how Australia is progressing against the stated targets and objectives in the White Paper and whether there are any emerging issues that were not foreseen even one year ago.
The detail of the Asian Century White Paper centers on five broad policy directions and 25 objectives for Australia to reach by 2025. The 25 policy objectives are, in turn, supported by several pathways – the actions that the Australian Government, in partnership with key stakeholders, needs to take to achieve each objective. In total, the White Paper sets out 133 policy pathways. Furthermore, the White Paper identifies ways to measure the implementation of many of these pathways and objectives. Measures of success for the remaining pathways are still being refined through the implementation processes.

The Australian Government has developed a comprehensive plan for coordinating work on the Asian Century White Paper across Australian Government departments and agencies. These arrangements include the appointment of a Minister Assisting the Prime Minister on Asian Century policy; the establishment of an Implementation Unit in the Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet; a Strategic Advisory Board of external experts to advise the Government on implementation and on emerging policy issues; a special Cabinet Committee to consider the implementation of policy made up of Ministers who have specific responsibilities for White Paper policy within their own portfolios. The Australian Government has also established governance structures to work with State and Territory and local governments, businesses and educational institutions, unions, academics and community groups to achieve its objectives.

With the White Paper reaching its first anniversary in October 2013, this paper will assess the progress of the government in advancing its five broad policy directions and meeting its 25 objectives and 133 policy pathways. While the timeframe to achieve the White Paper’s objectives is 2025, an assessment of progress after one year is significant. Many of the policy choices and actions in the White Paper were for immediate start and the Australian Government has already undertaken first steps in meeting the 25 objectives and 133 policy pathways. Using the government’s own performance criteria and objectives this paper will identify areas of over and underperformance. It will also identify emerging issues that were not foreseen in October 2012.

The analysis will draw upon publicly available information available through PM&C and responsible delivery departments and agencies. The paper will also rely upon interviews with key members of the Australian Public Service, members of the Asian Century Advisory Group and key contributors to the Asian Century White Paper process.

**Should we be sceptical about the ‘Asian Century’?**

Professor Andrew Walter, Melbourne School of Government, Australia

In the not so distant past there were many good reasons to think that “Asia” would not be talked about in the glowing economic terms it is today. Has the pendulum swung too far? Is the idea of an “Asian Century” coherent, and is the evidence in favour of its likely emergence compelling?

**A Unique Chinese-Western Hybrid?: An Inquiry into China’s Emerging Animal Protection Framework**

Dr Yangzi Sima, The University of Melbourne, Australia

Dr Siobhan O’Sullivan, The University of Melbourne, Australia

The UK’s Martin’s Act of 1822 was the world’s first modern animal welfare law. Almost 200 years later China is on the cusp of creating its first modern animal welfare regulatory framework. While China established laws to protect wildlife and conserve endangered species early on, an overarching animal welfare law is only now being considered. As China’s middle-class and the associated popularity of pet ownership has soared in the past decade, and with greater coverage of animal cruelty and abuse in the media and online, more and more Chinese are expressing their concerns for animal welfare, and the voices in civil society calling for legal protection of animals have grown louder. In December 2008, the drafting of China’s first animal protection law – Animal Protection Law of the PRC, commenced. In response to opposition, a second law, the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Law of the PRC, was to be drafted in 2009 and was submitted to the Standing Committee of the National People’s Congress in June 2010 as a (temporary) replacement of the Animal Protection Law. The creation of a new regulatory regime, where none had existed before, provides the ideal environment in which to assess the nature of regulatory protection in the Chinese context. This study first probes the varied levels of visibility different categories of animals have in China based on a media analysis and observation of local human/animal interactions. It then takes a detailed look at the draft laws to analyse the similarities and differences between China’s upcoming law(s) and the animal protection legislations elsewhere. It argues that the emerging animal protection framework manifests unique Chinese characteristics that have to be understood in relation to China’s economic, political and social conditions.

**What Weber Got Wrong: Confucianism, Communism, and Modern Capitalism in East Asia**

Associate Professor Jill Tao, Incheon National University, Republic of Korea

Behind-the-scenes struggles for power in the modern governments of China, Korea and Japan are often manifested in scholarly work from the region. As Japan, Korea, and especially China have seen as economic powers, scholars from these countries often write about areas of administration considered important by the nations’ political elite. A rise in interest, especially within China, of Confucian approaches to management and perceived conflicts with “Western” approaches to administration mirrors a tension within that country between traditional Confucianists, who spent decades trying to rid the country of its Confucian proclivities, and a rising intellectual class, drawn to older schools of thought. This paper seeks to place modern governments within Korea, China and Japan as seen through the eyes of their own scholars, as a foil for some of the more pervasive and enduring ideas of “Western” administration, rooted in Weber’s outline of ideal types of authority, especially legal-rational, and the logic of “Confucian administrative systems” and “Communist capitalism.” It will summarize the areas of conflict and highlight the logics of counterparts to Weber, and offer propositions for policy practices in East Asia that attempt to incorporate both East and West.

**Is Asia the New Cultural Policy Moment? Developing New Models of International Cultural Engagement for the Asian Century**

Ms Lesley Alway, AsiaLink Arts, The University of Melbourne, Australia

Recent policy papers and Ministerial speeches cite increased cultural engagement as a key pathway to broadening and deepening Australia’s relationship with Asia. Internationally, there is also an increased focus on cultural engagement with Asia. However, unlike many other sectors of the economy, there is currently a lack of data that might provide some guidance to effective policies in this important area.

This paper discusses the results of recent quantitative and qualitative research by AsiaLink Arts on the current status, aspirations, opportunities and barriers for developing effective cultural engagement between Australia and the countries of Asia. It positions this research in the context of the White Paper on ‘Australia in the Asian Century’ and the new national cultural policy, ‘Creative Australia’ as well as recent international research and Australian case-studies. The research reveals that strategies for international engagement that are primarily outward facing, export oriented and output driven are not necessarily conducive to developing effective, long term cultural relationships with Asia. These were also the strategies that more generally characterized Australia’s first ‘cultural policy moment’ in the mid ‘nineties, reflecting a broader adoption of ‘new public management’ principles by governments.

The paper explores the implications of the research for the development of a new conceptual framework for cultural engagement with Asia. This should be based on the priority to build long term relationships based on trust, partnerships, collaboration and reciprocity unencumbered by pressured outcomes. The paper concludes that the so called ‘Asian Century’ has precipitated a new ‘cultural policy moment’, but that this particular ‘moment’ presents a challenge for
Australian policy makers, funding agencies and the cultural sector as it requires a re-evaluation and invention of some of the assumptions and concepts that underpinned many of the initiatives of the first ‘cultural policy moment’. It also has implications for cultural policy makers in Asia who might look to adopt Western policy models to staff skill as part of the current major growth of investment in cultural infrastructure in Asia.

Session 9: Urbanisation (Ballroom B)

Drivers of Urban Development in China: Measuring Development and Comparing Models

Professor Jong Youl Lee, Professor Chad Anderson and Ms Bo Wang, Incheon National University, Republic of Korea

This study uses data from the top 100 Chinese cities covering the decade from 2000 to 2010 to look at the factors that drive urban development in China. There is adequate data available to test traditional measures of development, like housing price, based on Western theories even though there are fundamental problems with doing so due to the unique situation in China. This market is characterized by a Chinese housing market being shaped by factors like planned construction with waiting lists, housing as the best and most viable option for the typical Chinese with savings to invest, and the still-growing phenomenon of ghost cities.

This study uses regression analysis and makes an effort to use alternative measures to capture the reality of urban development over the past decade in China. In particular, the study asks whether traditional economic factors, new economy development, human resource development, the creative class model, or the rising power of cultural development is most associated with urban development in the major cities of China in the past decade. The study hopes to provide an answer, in the contemporary Chinese context, to the question of what drives urban development while looking for theories more connected to China’s unique situation to help explain the nature of China’s recent continuing urbanization.

Comparison of Urbanization Policy under Jiang Zemin and Hu Jintao

Ms Bo Wang, Incheon National University, Republic of Korea

China underwent dramatic changes from 1992 to 2012 during the party chairmanships of Jiang Zemin and Hu Jintao, including in terms of urbanization, which continued rapidly during these twenty years. This article compares and contrasts the national urbanization policy during these two periods, focusing on continuities and differences during the tenure of the two leaders. The article discusses the urban development policy of these two periods not only reflects the consistency of the general policy but also the changing of the grasping of the specific content of urbanization. Urban development in China is the outcome of the interaction of multiple factors, but the motive power of urbanization in China is reformation of economic system led by the central government.

This article mainly consists of a review of the main policy of the two periods, a comparison of the two periods from the following aspects: political factors, economic factors, cultural factors and social factors. Following dramatic historical and environmental changes and differences in leadership, leadership perspective and environmental pressure, during these twenty years, the Communist Party of China explored the process of urban development hard after the reform and opening up which is the most important factor explaining the accelerating urban development of China. There were also some changes to the policy, such as progressively strengthening market mechanisms under the guidance of the government, becoming a major driving force to promote the urban development of China as well as the adjustment of the distribution pattern of interests from the central government to local governments, making local government the main institution promoting urbanization.

The ‘Asian Century’? The Urban Century

Professor Brendan Gleeson, The University of Melbourne, Australia

Humanity has entered a new epoch, the urban age. That most humans now live in cities and larger settlements is a well-retailed fact. There is also general awareness that urbanisation is expected to continue and that – with some notable exceptions – growth remains both the modus and the challenge for the world’s cities. What is not so widely recognised is that the centre point of urban expansion is the Global South, especially Asia. Already one in ten humans lives in a Chinese city. In a globe overshadowed by unprecedented environmental threat, including resource depletion, it may be that urbanisation no longer represents the straightforward means to modernisation and human enhancement that it has long been considered. This suggests that the Global South should at least consider new models of city building that do not exacerbate the poor urban development paths taken by the North. What lessons are to be taken from Western urbanisation, including those that highlight success not just failure? How might these be applied to identification of resilient urbanisation models in The Asian Century?

Session 10: Governance Mechanisms for the ‘Asian Century’ (Ballroom A)

Free Trade Agreements are a result of a regulatory harmonisation between and within states; facts or fiction?

Associate Professor Bruno Zeller, Victoria University, Australia

Mr Janko Nikolic, The University of Melbourne, Australia

The paper argues that trade between nations and block of nations is conducted on several levels without interlocking regulations. The paper evaluates current practical utility of public law and private law trade harmonisation efforts in context of (i) the selected ASEAN Free Trade Agreements (FTA), and (ii) the AAN and the OHADA trading blocks. The findings of such evaluation put forward deficiencies of exclusively public law harmonisation approach and suggest that a broader, more methodically involved approach expouing ‘behind-the-border’ private law harmonisation is likely to lead to more significant utilisation of FTAs, a harmonisation of contract laws being the first step in that direction. This in turn is likely to result in greater business confidence and trust between countries and trading blocks, which in itself appears as the perfectly justified normative aim driving the public policy r(e)calibration.

Defining and Bridging Financial and Macroeconomic Surveillance Space in East Asia

Associate Research Fellow Theresa Robles, Nanyang Technological University of Singapore, Singapore

Financial crises have underscored two important points for East Asia’s economic and financial stability and resilience: regional economies must become more self-reliant while acknowledging that the growing interdependence has intensified the need for cooperation. Reconciling the need for self-reliance with the reality of increasing interdependence has critical implications for East Asian financial regionalism as it drives how regional and global processes link and interact with each other. This is further complicated by the fact that East Asia’s quest for self-reliance is not only driven by the weakening of major economies and its status as an emerging economic power but also, perhaps more so, by its dissatisfaction with how they (and the institutions they run) responded to the 1997/98 Asian financial crisis.

Such considerations have important consequences for the progress of financial and macroeconomic surveillance in East Asia as effective surveillance requires action at the bilateral, regional and multilateral levels. As we move towards a more complex global governance architecture, having strong and clear normative guidance in the form of common core values becomes crucial to the success of effective multi-lateralised surveillance. In the context of surveillance, defining common core values is complicated by (i) the pervasiveness of ambiguity and the politics of “contested knowledge” inherent in the surveillance process and (ii) the roles of transboundary networks of epistemic communities in international policy diffusion and coordination.

The proposed paper will explore how the different layers of financial and macroeconomic surveillance interact and drive the definition and allocation of surveillance responsibilities in East Asia at the regional and multilateral levels. It looks at how normative tensions limit coordination of, and compliance with, regional and multilateral surveillance mechanisms, and investigates whether the recent crisis has changed the normative dynamics in surveillance, focusing on (i) the growing calls to reconcile the quest of financial stability with the goal of financial development and broader financial inclusion and (ii) the weakening of epistemic communities as an effective intellectual compass to guide the surveillance agenda.

Why stability is more important than democracy for economic development in "Asian Century": the experience of Central Asia

Mr Bakhytzhan Kornenev, Australian National University, Australia

My research is presented in the subsection of leadership, research and governance in the “Asian Century”. The new “Asian century” poses a serious question of the relationship between the democracy and economic development. Most experts such as Jesse and Rodrik argued that democratic regimes achieve better economic growth for its citizens than authoritarian regimes. As the NATO forces leave Afghanistan in 2014, the question is raised whether the Kazak state’s semi-democratic regime will lead to rapid economic development in this impoverished yet strategic place; the region of Central Asia is infamous for political turbulence, terrorism and sectarian violence.

However, the experience of Central Asia indicates that the political stability remains the critical component of economic development. For instance, the strong leadership in Kazakhstan under the rule of Nazarbayev managed to maintain political stability, to establish property rights paths taken by China along with economic liberalization, all of which led to impressive economic growth in 2000s and today Kazakhstan has become the most prosperous country in the region. The weak leadership in the Kyrgyz Republic proceeded with economic reforms, but it permitted democratization, social
Non-communicable diseases (NCDs), including cardiovascular disease, cancer, diabetes and chronic respiratory diseases, are the leading causes of death and disability in Asia today. The unprecedented rise of NCDs in Asia represents a disease transition pattern that matches the region’s economic, social and political transformations. In this paper we argue that the governance capacity of policy elites along an analytical framework. However, current governance literature is unclear about which factor drives critical capacities to achieve policy outcomes and why, we developed an analytical framework of governance capacity to explain the variations in the policy outcomes. Our paper concludes with a number of determinants that are most pivotal in relation to policy outcomes among groups and between nations. This research holds several implications for governance scholarship and collaboration studies in particular. The conceptual framework of governance capacity suggests an innovative approach to examine and assess activities in Asian context, and explains the variations in policy outcomes. Successful service delivery depends on the presence of an adequate configuration of governance capacities that underpin. Each of the identified capacities is required and valued differently according to the context within which the lead organization finds itself.

Non-communicable diseases in Asia: a political economy analysis of determinants and health governance responses

Professor Adrian Kay, Australian National University, Australia
Mr Phillip Baker, Australian National University, Australia

Non-communicable diseases (NCDs), including cardiovascular disease, cancer, diabetes and chronic respiratory diseases are the leading causes of death and disability in Asia today. The unprecedented rise of NCDs in Asia represents a disease transition pattern that matches the region's economic, social and political transformations. In this paper we argue that the conditions that produce NCDs as well as the system of governance required to address them, are closely intertwined with transnational economic processes and actors. The expanded power of transnational corporations and financial institutions places significant constraints on traditional forms of multi-lateral global, regional and national health governance. The political economy approach, therefore, a useful and powerful framework through which to analyse different governance mechanisms available to address NCDs in the Asian century. Adopting such a framework, this paper takes four steps. First, we describe the rise of Asia in both economic and political terms, and the opportunities and challenges these represent for collective action to address shared health challenges. Second, we elaborate epidemiologically on the nature of the region’s health transition and illustrate associated economic and social externalities. Third, we claim that NCDs are - in political economy terms - communicable, describing the vectors by which they spread through the region. Fourth, we discuss the region's health transition and illustrate associated economic and social externalities. Finally, we summarise how key actors at the national, regional and international levels are constructing a myriad of hybrid governing mechanisms in response. In this step, the paper identifies distinct Asian forms of economic and state activity that provide challenges and opportunities for NCD prevention. Rather than free-market (neoliberal) fundamentalism as a given in the region, social and economic goals have been balanced to greater and lesser extents in distinctly Asian forms of welfare systems. Taking into account the above observations, some opportunities for strengthened forms of health governance are given.

Towards an optimal TRIPS-compliant industrial policy for the pharmaceutical industry in Bangladesh
– The role of government in promoting collaborative R&D

Mr Mamun Ull Alia, University of South Australia, Australia

Since 1982, under a protective regulatory regime, Bangladesh has made considerable progress in the pharmaceutical industry. However, all LDCs including Bangladesh are obliged to implement the Agreement on Trade Related Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS) of the WTO in 2016, which warrants an enhanced technology and R&D adoption to improve firms’ domestic and international competitiveness.

This study quantifies major dimensions of firm-level TRIPS-related vulnerability facing the Bangladeshi pharmaceutical sector, as perceived by owners/top-level managers, especially related to raw material, technology, quality, R&D, domestic competition and international competitiveness. Using data obtained from 94 pharmaceutical companies through a questionnaire survey, the quantification involves creating indices for individual firms for each type of vulnerability, by calculating the gap between the perceived impacts of the TRIPS Agreement and their associated adaptive capacity. Four robustness checks were performed to ensure the reliability and validity of the vulnerability indices.

Our analysis reveals that R&D-related and international competitiveness related vulnerabilities are the most important ones warrant immediate policy intervention. Also, using cluster analysis, we have classified the firms in terms of vulnerability. We find that in the less vulnerable cluster, firms have comparatively higher involvement in independent R&D or government R&D support funds. Moreover, the level of inter-firm and firm-academia/institution collaborative activities/networking is also significantly low.

Our study underscores the importance of immediate policy intervention to support the growing need for Bangladeshi pharmaceutical firms developing dynamic capability through developing programmes and practices that ensure a sustained institutional support for R&D and create incentives for multidimensional collaboration including public-private partnerships.
countries through various policy transfer mechanisms. Amidst such a spread, there has been a mix of success and failure in their implementation. Part of the reason for such a mixture of results can be explained by the nature of the reforms and the variations in the context and culture of the public administrative systems. This paper utilizes Geert Hofstede’s Value Survey Module (VSM 2008) to describe and compare the cultural dimensions of Bhutan. And through the investigation of the implementation of the PCS in Bhutan, the findings stress the importance of the interaction of culture and values with the public policy making and implementation processes.

Enforcement issues with China’s Two-Child Policy
Ms Angela Merriam, The University of Melbourne, Australia

For the past thirty years China has been home to the world’s most ambitious birth control policy. It is an example of state capacity at its extreme: a near-monopoly on reproductive rights. Relaxing the policy in Nov 2013 did not change this. Yet the trajectory of China’s birth control policy also highlights a weakening of the Chinese state. Indeed, despite the extreme lengths party apparatchiks have taken to enforce it, evasion is widely accepted.

Through the example of what I call the Two-Child Policy, this paper outlines some of the policy enforcement challenges facing China in the 21st century. It concludes with a discussion on what this may add to the study of public policy and administration.

Accountability and Ethical Values in Financial Practices: A Case Study of Islamic Finance
Dr Jikon Lai, The University of Melbourne, Australia

The Global Financial Crisis led many to ask two related questions: can financial practitioners be held more accountable for the impact of their actions on the wider society? How can we embed more desirable ethical values into financial practices? The recent exponential growth of Islamic finance at the global level offers an excellent opportunity to understand the issues and challenges involved in responding to these important questions, and to derive lessons for ‘conventional’ finance. This paper analyses the regulatory and supervisory structures that have been established in Malaysia, home to the most developed and highly regulated Islamic financial market in the world, to evaluate the compliance of financial instruments and practices with the Islamic system of ethics. Notwithstanding a well-designed regulatory structure, this paper argues that attempts to regulate ethical behavior in Islamic finance face three main challenges: (i) the economic motivations of the actors involved, (ii) common agreement over values to be instilled in financial practices, and (iii) the ultimate accountability of the religious scholars who act as gatekeepers of ethical behavior.

Session 14: Exploring Citizens Roles in the ‘Asian Century’ (Ballroom A)

Can We “Talk the Talk” – Australia, Languages and the Asian Century
Ms Leah Bramhill, Department of Premier and Cabinet, Office of Multicultural Affairs and Citizenship, Australia

For Australia to realise its full potential in the Asian Century, effective communication with our Asian neighbours across linguistic and cultural divides is essential in areas including business, government, diplomacy, the arts and education.

There is Government support for languages education at both the State and Federal levels, and yet the number of high school and university students studying Asian languages in Australia is declining. In Australia, the value of learning foreign languages is often underestimated by schools, parents and the greater community. Furthermore, little value is placed on Australia’s existing linguistic diversity, abundant within migrant and international student communities.

In order to meaningfully engage with key players in the region (both English speakers and non-English speakers), Asia capable Australians need to have an understanding of how to effectively communicate and tackle communication barriers. This does not mean that we all need to learn Asian languages, but rather be conscious of the importance of languages other than English, often an afterthought and underestimated by the native English speaker. Proficiency in an Asian language, although beneficial, is certainly not a prerequisite for Asian literacy, and “Asia capability” is much more than just being able to speak Chinese, Japanese, Korean or Indonesian.

If Australians themselves can’t “talk the talk” (in the literal sense) when engaging with their region, they should understand the importance of commissioning the professional expertise of someone who can, rather than assuming the other party will speak “enough English to get by” or relying on inadequate technology such as online machine translation. Failure to understand the importance of language for engagement could hinder Australia’s potential to achieve the aspirations outlined in the Australia in the Asian Century White Paper.

This paper presents the relationship between languages and Australia’s desire to engage with Asia. I will reflect on Australian and Asian perceptions of language learning, discuss challenges and opportunities in implementing languages education policies in Australia, consider the advantage our multicultural and linguistically diverse population could offer, as well as examine the importance of high quality language services for an Asia capable Australia.

Politics and policy: Australian public perceptions of Indonesia and foreign policymaking
Dr Avery Poole, The University of Melbourne, Australia

To what extent do Australian public perceptions of Indonesia influence foreign policymaking? A 2011 Lowy Institute poll found that Australian views of Indonesia are significantly less favourable than the Indonesian public’s perceptions of Australia. Despite democratic transition, counterterrorism efforts and the withdrawal of the military from Indonesian politics, many Australians still view Indonesia as a potentially threatening country in which the military dominates politics and Islamic extremism threatens the security of Australians. To what extent, then, do these views shape the political context in which Australian foreign policy decisions are made? Are the Australian government’s decisions on issues such as border security, immigration and development assistance overly influenced by public (mis)perceptions of Indonesia? This paper explores the relationship between politics and policy in Australia in regard to foreign policy towards Indonesia. It argues that greater education about, and awareness of, Indonesian peoples and policies are needed in Australia, and the foreign policy machinery must take responsibility for this. The ‘Asian Century’ White Paper goes some way to addressing the issue of public perceptions of Indonesia, but I argue that more needs to be done in order to mitigate the risk that Australian policy towards Indonesia is influenced by the desire to make political gains.

Brain Drain Reversal and Return Subsidy
Professor Xiangbo Liu, Renmin University of China, China
Professor Tianqiong Renmin University of China, China
Biancen Xie, Hangqing, Renmin University of China, Beijing, China

This paper explores how return subsidy affects an individual’s education, migration and return decisions within an asymmetric information framework. To achieve this, we develop a theoretical model in which agents are heterogeneous in their initial stocks of human capital. Our model can generate three types of migration: at the same time, permanent migration, immediate return migration, and return migration with some international working experience. We also examine the effects of differential return subsidy in different contexts and find that in the presence of asymmetric information return subsidy is possible to play a negative role in determining a developing country’s average human capital stock and thus its economic growth. After taking into account the potential negative impacts of return subsidies, we derive the optimal subsidy policies. Our results show that as subsidies for return can potentially produce negative effects, the magnitude and distribution of subsidies that a government can provide would become important.

Session 15: The ‘Asian Century’ and the EU: Comparative Perspectives (Yarra Room)

Whose Century? Developing Evidence-Based Public Policy
Associate Professor Bruno Mascitelli, Swinburne University, Australia
Professor Bruce Wilson, RMIT University, Australia

This paper presents many of the assumptions and proposals presented in the Asian Century White Paper. Asia’s recent growth rates and geographic proximity are strong reasons for paying much greater attention to Australia’s relationships with individual Asian states, and significant regional associations. However, when put into global context, Asian countries still have a long way to go to exercise a dominate place in global trade. Currently, inward and outward foreign direct investment in the Europe Union is some 6-7 times that of China, which is in turn, greater than Japan. Furthermore, it is difficult to see why countries so committed to neo-liberal economic policies are so accepting of China’s continued rise in dominant, given that it is still an economy which is centrally planned and ruled by a Communist Party. More generally, international security hot spots are now more prevalent amongst Asian nations, also adding to the uncertainty about longer-term predictions.

Rather than a century of Asian growth, it is likely that the foreseeable decades will see the evolution of a more complex pattern of global political and economic relationships in which there will be multiple sites of power and influence. Any neglect by Australia or other similar nations of this complexity, and particularly of the continuing importance of the European Union, is likely to be at a serious cost.

In this presentation, I will consider the relationship between languages and Australia’s desire to engage with Asia. I will reflect on Australian and Asian perceptions of language learning, discuss challenges and opportunities in implementing languages education policies in Australia, consider the advantage our multicultural and linguistically diverse population could offer, as well as examine the importance of high quality language services for an Asia capable Australia.
Emulating the European Union Model in Post-Crisis Asia: The limits to diffusion in the Asian century
Professor Mark Beeson, Murdoch University, Australia
Professor Diane Stone, Murdoch University, Australia

The European Union (EU) has exerted a powerful influence over the international system. Often overlooked is that this influence has not always operated in the manner the architects and admirers of the EU might have hoped. Instead, the diffusion of European norms and the policy transfer of the EU model of regional integration is mediated by triangular processes in Asia of (i) selective rule taking, (ii) translation and adaptation, and (iii) deviation or disallowing models from elsewhere by asserting alternative visions and models. We argue that there are important lessons for Australian policymakers as they seek to integrate more effectively into an ‘Asian century’ that may remain more ‘Asian’ and different than some people in Europe and elsewhere believe. In doing so, this paper represents a conceptual synthesis in contributing to both the public policy literatures on ‘policy diffusion, transfer and translation’ as well as the international political economy literature on regionalization.

The European Union in the Asian Century: Opportunities, Challenges and Change
Professor Philomena Murray, The University of Melbourne, Australia

Recently, the US has illustrated that it is making a determined pivot towards the Asia Pacific. Australia has produced a new strategy. Does the European Union (EU) now need its own pivot to Asia? The EU is not recognized as a key actor in Asia. It has come under criticism for its lack of coherence and consistency in its foreign policy and external relations with Asia. Negative perception regarding the EU’s ability, capacity and willingness to be a key international actor has been compounded by rivalries and disagreements among member states and EU institutions. The twin challenges of coherence and consistency remain crucial, as the EU seeks to have a greater presence and impact in Asia. This paper will seek to explore the EU’s experiences to date and its options in Asia, and I will focus in particular on East Asia.

Session 16: Media, Technology and Policy (Flinders Room)
Social Media and Limitations on the New Electronic Civil Society in Northeast Asia
Professor Chad Anderson, Incheon National University, Incheon, Republic of Korea
Miru Lee, Incheon National University, Incheon, Republic of Korea

Electronic media in general and social media in particular have developed recently, both growing as part of civil society and expanding the range of traditional civil society electronically. This has been a particularly powerful development in Northeast Asia, where a rapid increase in technological infrastructure following rapid development has joined with the trend towards e-governance to promote new forms of citizen participation. Social media have played a strong role in undermining authoritarian controls and empowering citizens in countries that had authoritarian governments for much of the 20th century. However, governments have responded to these new forms of participation with new restrictions and limitations on this new form of civil society. This study investigated the legal framework and practices for controlling social media in Japan, the People’s Republic of China, and South Korea, looking into the relationship between law and policy implementation. Social media had a positive effect in promoting citizen participation and involvement in politics and administration in all three nations. In terms of restrictions placed on social media, it was found that Japan had the least restrictions both in law and in implementation. South Korea was next most open, and the PRC was the least open with the greatest level of censorship and restrictions. The discrepancy between generally positive predictions for the future of electronic participation and systems of government restriction on social media is discussed with implications for future trends and suggestions for policy.

Session 17: Public Administration in the ‘Asian Century’ (Ballroom B)
Public Sector Human Resource Management: observations from the 2013 Australia China Dialogue on Public Administration
Dr Geraldine Kensett, Institute of Public Administration Australia (Victoria), Australia

This paper will present an analysis of the most recent meeting of the China-Australia Dialogue Workshop on Public Administration. The Dialogue is a unique institution, which brings together high level public administration practitioners and theorists from Australia, China, Hong Kong and Taipei. The 2013 Dialogue focused on Human Resource Management in the Public Sector, a subject of fundamental importance to the development of public administration in both China and Australia. This presentation will focus on the results of three of the six themes discussed at the Dialogue: Professional Development and Training, Performance Management and Human Resource Management Decision Making. Given the relative sizes of the public sector workforces in each of the countries, the significance of the activities undertaken by each country’s public sectors and the broader transitions underway in each country, deeper understandings about how these core ideas are conceived in theory and practice have the potential to make significant contributions to the development of each country involved in the Dialogue.
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