The Phnom Penh Plan for Development Management: A Retrospective

This retrospective marks more than 10 years of the Phnom Penh Plan’s achievements in building the capacity of the Greater Mekong Subregion (GMS) civil service and in strengthening networks among government policy makers and planners for deepening economic integration. The Phnom Penh Plan is a regional capacity-building program that supports knowledge products and services under the framework of the Greater Mekong Subregion Economic Cooperation Program.

About the Asian Development Bank

ADB’s vision is an Asia and Pacific region free of poverty. Its mission is to help its developing member countries reduce poverty and improve the quality of life of their people. Despite the region’s many successes, it remains home to approximately two-thirds of the world’s poor: 1.6 billion people who live on less than $2 a day, with 733 million struggling on less than $1.25 a day. ADB is committed to reducing poverty through inclusive economic growth, environmentally sustainable growth, and regional integration.

Based in Manila, ADB is owned by 67 members, including 48 from the region. Its main instruments for helping its developing member countries are policy dialogue, loans, equity investments, guarantees, grants, and technical assistance.
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Building the capacity of institutions and human resources continues to drive the Greater Mekong Subregion (GMS) Economic Cooperation Program, now in its third decade. Given the different development stages and income levels of the six GMS countries, the achievements made in subregional integration to strengthen national economies and to shield them from external shocks have been remarkable. Many factors have contributed, but a notable common denominator has been the improved capacity and skills of civil servants in the areas of public policy and development management. The Phnom Penh Plan for Development Management (PPP), supported by the Asian Development Bank (ADB) and other partners, has contributed to capacity building over the past 12 years.

The PPP’s work to develop the capacity of GMS public officials through learning programs, knowledge and research initiatives, and networking platforms remains highly relevant—as recognized in the GMS Strategic Framework 2012–2022. This publication examines the PPP’s contributions to capacity building in the GMS, the many valuable lessons learned on the way, and the challenges ahead.

From the outset, the PPP was the joint effort of many stakeholders: the GMS governments and their development partners, training and research institutions, numerous ADB staff, the PPP secretariat, and all the civil servants who participated in its activities. This publication recognizes the roles of these stakeholders in the PPP’s achievements and their lasting impact over the years.

For ADB and our development partners, it was vital to foster a sense of ownership in the PPP among GMS governments and to recognize the importance of investing in strengthening the capacity of GMS civil servants, both in the present and in the future. For ADB, the PPP was a landmark initiative that demonstrated the tremendous development benefit and impact of building capacity in one of Asia’s most vibrant subregions.

James Nugent
Director General
Southeast Asia Department, ADB
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Introduction

Just over 2 decades ago, six countries sharing the Mekong River embarked on an ambitious economic cooperation program, which is now recognized as one of Asia’s development success stories. The Greater Mekong Subregion (GMS) Economic Cooperation Program (GMS Program) comprises Cambodia, Yunnan Province and the Guangxi Zhuang Autonomous Region in the People’s Republic of China (PRC), the Lao People’s Democratic Republic (Lao PDR), Myanmar, Thailand, and Viet Nam. Together, the GMS members encompass a market of close to 326 million people. The subregion’s achievements have been remarkable, given the diverse stages of development and political systems of the GMS member countries. However, economic integration remains a work in progress. Continued cooperation to strengthen connectivity—in trade facilitation and the freer movement of capital and labor, to name just a few areas—will enable the GMS countries to achieve strong, socially inclusive, and sustainable growth in the future.

Capacity development is a critical component of the GMS Program, which was launched in 1992. Regional cooperation has also become more complex and increasingly important in achieving economic and social objectives. In the development community, it is now well understood that knowledge building, skills development, and networking are mutually reinforcing processes for developing capacity in public management. Under the GMS Program, cross-border infrastructure projects in transport and energy were the first areas of cooperation. But the program quickly evolved into a broader vision for subregional cooperation requiring “soft” components such as regulations, and strategies for the facilitation of travel, trade, and investments.

Notwithstanding the challenges which remain, opportunities also beckon. For five GMS countries, the ASEAN Economic Community in 2015 presents enormous potential for increased trade and investment. As development institutions have long recognized, deepening economic cooperation among countries with shared borders creates bigger markets and larger-scale economies, especially if barriers to trade and the movement of capital and labor can be removed. The GMS countries, however, still have limited capacity to maximize the benefits of economic cooperation and mitigate the environmental and social risks that can result from closer economic ties.
To tackle the challenges and maximize the opportunities, the GMS countries need middle and senior managers adept at public policy, project management, and leadership. Achieving a critical mass of government officials—rather than relying on a few “islands of excellence”—is essential for lifting the quality of development management. Although the capacity development of the GMS civil service has steadily improved, it remains inadequate in critical areas, especially in aligning national programs with subregional strategies and in managing multisector interventions. Addressing these shortcomings will require continuous and long-term support, calibrated to respond to a rapidly changing regional and global development environment.

The Phnom Penh Plan for Development Management, known as the PPP, was launched by the GMS governments in 2002 as a pioneering effort to promote regional cooperation and develop capacity in public policy and development management in their civil service. With support from the Asian Development Bank (ADB) and other partners, the PPP’s learning programs and knowledge resources have contributed to significant improvements in competencies across governments. The PPP’s networking platforms have served to strengthen the sense of community and commitment to economic integration in the GMS.

The PPP’s contribution to capacity development in the GMS has been recognized by GMS leaders and ADB Management. At the 2011 GMS leaders’ summit, the joint summit declaration praised the PPP for its vibrancy and relevance to the capacity development needs of the civil service. Among the leaders who recognized the plan’s value was former Chinese Premier Wen Jiabao, who praised the plan at the Second GMS Summit in Kunming in 2005. Former ADB President Haruhiko Kuroda, at the 40th Board of Governors meeting, commended the plan as a best-practice intervention in ADB’s role as a knowledge institution for its developing member countries.

This publication reflects on more than 10 years of the PPP’s achievements in building the capacity of the GMS civil service, and in strengthening networks among government leaders and policy makers to deepen economic integration. It also looks at the remaining challenges in further developing the capacity of future leaders in the GMS.

**Box 1: Financing the Phnom Penh Plan: A Truly International Effort**

Financing the PPP involved numerous development partners. ADB contributed $5.8 million to the plan. The other principal donors were the Government of the PRC, through the Regional Cooperation and Poverty Reduction Fund ($2.0 million); the Government of France’s Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Agence Française de Développement ($2.5 million); the Government of the Republic of Korea, through its e-Asia and Knowledge Partnership Fund ($1.5 million); and the New Zealand Aid Programme of the Government of New Zealand ($1.6 million). In all, the PPP used funds totaling $13.4 million.

Source: PPP Secretariat.
A Plan Takes Shape

Cambodian Prime Minister Samdech Hun Sen conceived the idea of a comprehensive and long-term capacity development initiative for future leaders, policy makers, and development managers in the GMS. It received enthusiastic support when presented to GMS leaders at the First GMS Summit in Phnom Penh in November 2002, held to mark the first decade of the GMS Program and to reflect on the progress made and the challenges ahead. The legacy of that landmark summit was making human resource development a strategic agenda for the subregion. The Colombo Plan—the multilateral scheme that did much to raise capacity development in Asia after World War II—was an early inspiration for its emphasis on human resource development.

At the time of the first GMS leaders’ summit in Phnom Penh, good progress was being made on subregional infrastructure projects and strengthening markets. But it was widely recognized that much more could be achieved by strengthening economic cooperation—and a major constraint at that time was the lack of capacity among civil servants for the task. For Arjun Thapan, former director general of ADB’s Southeast Asia Department (SERD), who led the PPP team for...
many years, this was the “weak spot” of the GMS. “Civil servants back then didn’t really appreciate how closer regional cooperation could benefit the GMS,” says Thapan. This was not surprising. Myanmar had been isolated since the early 1960s and Cambodia was still trying to rebuild its civil service. The Lao PDR and Viet Nam were undergoing reform processes.

ADB responded to the challenge by providing a $0.8 million technical assistance grant in start-up funding for the PPP in 2002, with ADB specialists developing the plan from the start. Although managed by a secretariat in SERD, the PPP was a joint effort of numerous ADB sector divisions, knowledge departments, and resident missions in GMS countries. The plan had four main objectives: to strengthen the leadership and managerial capacity of civil servants, to promote regional cooperation, to develop knowledge partnerships, and to produce GMS-relevant research to support policy making.

From the outset, GMS officials and ADB envisaged the PPP as a shared learning experience rather than a classroom exercise. It initially targeted senior officials, but its scope was soon widened to include junior and mid-level officials showing leadership potential and working in areas that could contribute to the goals of the GMS Program. “We thought it was important to introduce promising young officials to the program’s vision and to start developing their skills as development managers and policy makers of the future,” says Sok Chenda Sophea, minister attached to the prime minister and secretary general of the Council for the Development of Cambodia and a leading figure in developing the PPP. “This was a legacy issue for us.” In recognition of the role of women in public management, the PPP had a gender policy and women were included in increasing numbers.

To balance quality and quantity, the optimum group size for the learning programs was set at 24 participants—four from each GMS country. Most years, between 10 and 12 programs were held. To ensure high quality of participants, candidates were recommended by governments but screened by ADB using rigorous criteria. As momentum built, the plan increasingly designed customized programs for specific GMS capacity development needs and priority sectors. These included programs for the environment, energy, trade policy, tourism, agriculture, and labor migration. PPP programs were also designed to increase awareness of regional and global concerns such as climate change, combating corruption, and the need to increase subregional cooperation in science, technology, and
innovation. The majority of programs had a leadership component.

GMS governments were active in the plan’s operations through the PPP Steering Committee, which comprised senior government officials and representatives from development partners. The committee provided guidance on topics for learning programs and research, and served as a mechanism to ensure their relevance and responsiveness to the capacity development needs of the GMS. “The Steering Committee helped foster government ownership of the PPP,” says Monemany Nhoybouakong, the Lao PDR’s member of the committee. The plan had to inspire a strong sense of ownership among the country stakeholders to ensure their active involvement in shaping learning programs and knowledge resources, and their long-term commitment to the capacity development of the GMS civil service beyond the PPP’s life. “From the outset, the plan was seen as a collective effort and its success would not have been possible without the efforts of all its stakeholders,” says Htun Zaw, Myanmar’s member of the steering committee.

The following sections discuss in greater detail how the PPP developed capacity through knowledge partnerships and networks, ADB’s catalytic role in promoting knowledge resources, and how the plan contributed to strengthening economic cooperation through its learning programs, knowledge events, research projects, learning resource centers, and sponsored fellowships.

“We thought it was important to introduce promising young officials to the program’s vision and to start developing their skills as the development managers and policy makers of the future.”

Sok Chenda Sophea, minister attached to the prime minister and secretary general of the Council for the Development of Cambodia
LEARNING PROGRAMS

- GMS Sectors*
- Leadership and Development Management
- Public Policy, Management, and Governance
- Project Management
- Economic Corridor Development
- Regional Integration

* Agriculture; Education; Energy; Environment; Health Financing; Infrastructure; Labor Markets and Migration; Social Protection; Tourism; Trade Policy, Logistics, and Facilitation; Transport and Energy; and Urban Management

PARTICIPANT DISTRIBUTION

**2,569**

Country

- Cambodia: 464
- People’s Republic of China: 377
- Lao People’s Democratic Republic: 441
- Myanmar: 436
- Thailand: 487
- Viet Nam: 364

Gender

- Male: 1,595 (62%)
- Female: 974 (38%)

Position Level

- Top Management (Ministers, Secretaries, and Undersecretaries of State): 53
- Senior Management (Director Generals and Deputy Director Generals): 307
- Managerial (Directors): 1,124
- Supervisory (Chiefs): 654
- Junior (Technical Staff): 431

Sector

- Planning: 509
- Transport: 239
- Human Resources: 185
- Health: 120
- Economy and Finance: 396
- Environment: 191
- Education: 119
- Trade: 283
- Agriculture: 186
- Tourism: 178
- Energy: 132
- Science and Technology: 31
- Other Programs: 7

**CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT AND RESEARCH PARTNERS**

**TOTAL FUNDING**

- ADB: $13.4
- New Zealand: $2.5
- People’s Republic of China: $5.8
- France: $1.6
- Republic of Korea: $1.5
- Top Development Management Programs: 2
## Research Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Harvard Programs</th>
<th>Oxford Programs</th>
<th>Other Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kazakhstan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyrgyzstan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mongolia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tajikistan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkmenistan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uzbekistan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Journal of Greater Mekong Subregion Development Studies

- **Issues**: 7
- **Articles**: 37

## Fellows

- **Total**: 52
- **Harvard Programs**: 38
  - Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University
- **Oxford Programs**: 7
  - Said Business School, Oxford University
- **Other Programs**: 7
  - Columbia Business School, INSEAD, International Management Development Institute, and London Business School

## Alumni Events

- **Link Events**: 35
- **Participants**: 1,632

## Learning Resource Centers

- **Total**: 2
  - Phnom Penh, Cambodia
  - Vientiane, Lao PDR

## Short Learning Events

- **GMS Development Dialogues**: 8
- **Top Development Management Programs**: 2
- **Distinguished Speaker Series**: 1

## Total Funding

- **$13.4 Million**: ADB
- **$5.8 Million**: Republic of Korea
- **$1.6 Million**: New Zealand
- **$2.5 Million**: France
- **$2 Million**: People’s Republic of China
Developing Knowledge Partnerships and Networks

Rather than being a “bricks and mortar” institution, the Phnom Penh Plan was designed to build and expand knowledge partnerships and networks that could operate across the GMS and beyond. An early proposal for land to be provided—symbolically on a site along the Mekong River—was rejected in favor of a capacity development structure that encompassed all six GMS countries with no one country at the center of this endeavor. Despite its title, the PPP was a multicountry initiative that used the expertise and financing of multiple partners. “The PPP was designed to be a network of ideas, people, and institutions,” says Alfredo Perdigueru, ADB principal regional cooperation specialist and PPP program manager. “We at the PPP believe that modern capacity building is done best through knowledge partnerships to gain a mix of perspectives and to expose people to diverse ideas.”

To this end, the PPP linked up with several renowned institutions as knowledge partners. Within Asia and the Pacific, the Asia Development Institute in the Graduate School of Public Administration at Seoul National University lent its expertise to GMS civil servants with the strategies and programs used by the Republic of Korea for its successful—and swift—economic transition. Tsinghua University’s School of Public Policy and Management in Beijing ran a crisis management and disaster preparedness program. The Asia-Pacific Finance and Development Center in Shanghai organized a program that featured PRC leadership examples from which GMS officials could draw lessons and insights. New Zealand’s Victoria University of Wellington, in partnership with the GMS Tertiary Education Consortium Trust, organized programs in cross-border infrastructure in a market economy and in social protection. From Europe, the lessons and experience of regional integration in the European Union were provided by the Bruges-based College of Europe and the United Nations University Institute on Comparative Regional
Integration Studies, the Paris-based École Nationale d’Administration and National Foundation for Political Sciences, and the European Institute of Public Administration in the Netherlands. These programs included visits to the European Commission and the European Parliament. The program on public-private partnerships in infrastructure run by Agence Française de Développement’s Center for Financial, Economic and Banking Studies was highly relevant to the GMS’ development needs, and drew extensively on the center’s work in Asia, Latin America, and Africa in this area. All these institutions were chosen as knowledge partners in recognition of the expertise that they could bring to the plan beyond financial support.

The Mekong Institute was one of the PPP’s strongest knowledge partners. The institute started as a development project funded by the Government of New Zealand and is now an autonomous learning institution run collectively by the GMS countries. Despite their individual mandates, the PPP and the Mekong Institute found many areas of cooperation, with the institute being used as the “physical center” for various activities. Joint learning and research programs were organized on project management, monitoring and evaluation, poverty reduction, labor migration management, and contract farming. As a GMS-based institute, the Mekong Institute is well positioned to continue many areas of learning and research started by the PPP.

Li Kouqing facilitates a case discussion on the leadership experience of the Shanghai municipal government and the Suzhou Creek Rehabilitation Project.

GMS officials at the Mekong Institute campus in Khon Kaen, Thailand
The GMS’s lower-income countries benefited from the lessons learned in the economic transition and best practices adopted by the subregion’s middle-income members, namely, the PRC and Thailand. Developing capacity in Cambodia, the Lao PDR, Myanmar, and Viet Nam is now a major thrust of the GMS Strategic Framework 2012–2022 amid growing recognition in the GMS countries of the need to accelerate economic integration. This process was initiated under the PPP, with Chinese and Thai development partners sharing their expertise in and knowledge of tourism, state sector reforms, cross-border economic zones, trade facilitation, and logistics development. A notable PPP achievement was that 436 civil servants from Myanmar attended learning programs since 2003 and were able to meet and learn from their neighbors during the years of isolation.
# Box 2: Phnom Penh Plan Capacity Development and Research Partners

## GMS Institutions

### Cambodia
- Economics and Finance Institute
- Royal University of Law and Economics

### The People’s Republic of China
- Asia-Pacific Finance and Development Center
- Chinese Academy of Social Sciences
- Guilin Institute of Tourism
- Kunming University of Science and Technology
- School of Development Studies, Yunnan University
- School of Public Policy and Management, Tsinghua University
- School of International Trade and Economics, University of International Business and Economics
- Yunnan Research and Coordination Office for Lancang–Mekong Sub-regional Cooperation Yunnan University

### The Lao People’s Democratic Republic
- Champasak Agriculture and Forestry College
- National University of Laos

### Thailand
- Asian Institute of Technology
- Center for Logistics Research, Thammasat University
- GMS–Environment Operations Center
- International Trade and Development Institute
- Mekong Sub-region Social Research Center, Ubon Ratchathani University
- Thailand International Development Cooperation Agency
- Thammasat University

### Viet Nam
- Asian Institute of Technology in Viet Nam
- Central Institute for Economic Management
- College of Economics, Viet Nam National University
- Hanoi Business School, Viet Nam National University
- Hanoi National University of Education
- Institute of World Economics and Politics
- National Economics University
- Public Policy Training Program
- Viet Nam Institute of Economics

### GMS Institution and Network
- Mekong Institute
- Greater Mekong Subregion Tertiary Education Consortium Trust

*continued on next page*
### NON-GMS INSTITUTIONS

**Belgium**
- College of Europe
- Institute on Comparative Regional Integration Studies, United Nations University

**Canada**
- Estey Centre for Law and Economics in International Trade

**France**
- Center for Economic, Financial and Banking Studies
- École Nationale d’Administration
- National Foundation for Political Sciences

**India**
- Administrative Staff College of India

**The Republic of Korea**
- Asia Development Institute, Seoul National University

**The Netherlands**
- European Institute of Public Administration

**New Zealand**
- Victoria University of Wellington

**The Philippines**
- Asian Institute of Management

**Singapore**
- Lee Kuan Yew School of Public Policy, National University of Singapore

**Switzerland**
- Center for Asian Studies, Graduate Institute, Geneva

**The United Kingdom**
- London School of Economics, University of London
- London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, University of London

**Others**
- International Organization for Migration
- Public–Private Infrastructure Advisory Facility

Source: PPP Secretariat.
ADB’s Catalytic Role

Knowledge solutions to current and emerging development challenges are an integral part of ADB’s mission—and this thinking played a catalytic role in the Phnom Penh Plan. “ADB has long been a source of knowledge as well as financing for development projects,” says James Lynch, director, Regional Cooperation and Operations Coordination Division, SERD. He notes that knowledge-based support and technical assistance are playing an increasing role in operations. The PPP demonstrated ADB’s ability as a knowledge bank to transfer knowledge and leverage its long experience working in the GMS, as well as its country and sector expertise.

About 30 ADB staff worked on the plan as trainers and program developers. Two of them deserve special mention for their contribution to the success of the plan’s learning programs: Duy Thanh Bui, a senior energy economist, and Steven Schipani, an expert in regional tourism. “Above all we wanted to give non-energy civil servants a comprehensive view of the vital role of energy in regional cooperation and economic integration,” says Bui, who helped design a program in energy policy and management. The tourism management program not only provided participants with practical tools for their work in development management, but also benefited ADB’s operations. “The trainers made valuable contacts with government officials working in their field—and it’s fair to say that ADB operations in the GMS run much better when PPP alumni are involved,” says Schipani. Tran Van Ngoi, director of ADB’s Mekong Tourism Project, attended a PPP tourism training program and applied the tools learned while working on a community-based tourism project with Viet Nam’s Nung ethnic minority in the province of Cao Bang. “I’m happy to say this was evaluated as one of the most successful tourism projects in Viet Nam,” says Ngoi.
Contributing to Leadership in Development

In the early years, a major constraint on economic cooperation in the GMS was inadequate capacity to integrate and align national plans with subregional strategies and programs—and, just as important, to develop leadership in this area. The Phnom Penh Plan rose to the challenge by designing three types of learning programs. First, short learning events for senior officials in public policy and development management were conducted under the Distinguished Speaker Series (DSS) and Top Development Management Program (TDMP). Second, fellowships were funded for middle- and senior-level officials at top universities. And third, learning programs in development management and leadership, crosscutting themes, and specific sectors were designed to help align national plans with subregional strategies. These programs were directed at senior officials working in areas that could promote economic integration; mid-level civil servants, the backbone for implementing national and subregional plans; and junior officials showing leadership potential.

The DSS provided GMS policy makers an opportunity to interact with leading luminaries in their field. Cambodia’s Prime Minister Samdech Hun Sen presided over the inaugural DSS session on “Managing Water Resources in the 21st Century.” Held in Phnom Penh in 2006, it was attended by more than 300 representatives of government, including Cambodia’s Council of Ministers, development institutions, academe, civil society organizations, and diplomats.

The TDMP put the spotlight on pressing economic and development issues facing policy makers. Arjun Thapan, former director general of SERD at ADB, noted that “The program was organized to coincide with ministerial meetings to provide a platform for academics and development experts to share their specialized knowledge and research with ministers and senior officials.” He added that the program also addressed themes to help GMS ministers “look beyond purely national considerations and to see the bigger regional picture.” Among the themes chosen

―Asit Biswas (extreme left) explains global trends that will shape the future of water in the 21st century; Prime Minister Hun Sen (center) presided over the Distinguished Speaker Series

―The TDMP also underscored the importance of leadership as a catalyst for economic reform and integration.”

Arkhom Termpittayapaisith, deputy minister of transport of Thailand and concurrent secretary general, National Economic and Social Development Board

―ADB Ian Gill
for the program were governance, public management, environmental sustainability, and the management of shared natural resources. “The TDMP also underscored the importance of leadership as a catalyst for economic reform and integration,” says Arkhom Termpittayapaisith, deputy minister of transport of Thailand and concurrent secretary general, National Economic and Social Development Board.

To this end, forming a “core of GMS champions” became a key PPP strategy that used fellowship programs to send outstanding civil servants on courses in advanced management and leadership at prestigious universities and learning institutes in the United States and Europe. Among the most coveted courses were the Leaders in Development and Senior Managers in Government (SMG) programs at the John F. Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University, and the Oxford Advanced Management and Leadership Programme. Leadership and executive development programs were attended by 52 senior and mid-career GMS officials. Graduates of the fellowship programs—the “PPP fellows”—are now among the core of development leaders in the GMS and are playing a crucial role in promoting economic integration.

Interviews with PPP fellows attest to the way these programs equipped participants with practical tools for leveraging their expertise in development management and public policy. Cambodia’s Education Minister Hang Chuon Naron attended the leadership program at Harvard in 2004 and the Public Policy Course at the École Nationale d’Administration in Paris in 2008. “I took away a lot from both programs, but most of all they sharpened my analytical skills,” says Hang. These skills were put to good use working on a project to reform the budgets of Cambodia’s ministries of health and education. “We were able to come up with a budget surplus of around $700 million, which was used as a stimulus package to help strengthen the economy during the global financial crisis,” Hang points out.
Hoang Viet Khang, director general in the Ministry of Planning and Investment of Viet Nam and GMS national coordinator, credits the Harvard leadership program he attended in 2005 for his participatory approach to leadership. “Harvard was a game changer because it taught me to draw much more on the expertise of others to reach the right solution,” he says. Then at the PPP Strategic Leadership for GMS Cooperation Program in Shanghai in 2008, Khang prepared strategic recommendations for the government, based on regional development lessons learned, about the benefits that Viet Nam could gain from greater economic cooperation in the GMS.

In Myanmar, two PPP fellows—Phone Myint, former director general of the planning department of the Ministry of Health, and San San Aye, director in the same department—applied PPP learning programs to their work in the health sector. In 2005, Myint attended a leadership program in health care financing in Cambodia. The module on nongovernment organizations was particularly useful for a project that he worked on developing community-based financing for health care. In 2006, Myint attended the SMG Program at Harvard, which also emphasized a participatory approach to leadership. “It was a transformative experience,” says Myint. “The program made me much more aware of the need to take in the views of all stakeholders as a manager working with different departments and across sectors.” Myint used this approach—to “great benefit,” he says—in crafting a national health plan in 2006. Aye says that the PPP learning programs she attended under the plan had leadership components that also stressed a participatory approach. “They changed my mindset on leadership and I now encourage everyone to work as a team in my current work to design a scheme for universal health coverage.” Her PPP experience also gave her a strong regional perspective on health care issues. In 2013, she was a panelist for a session in universal health coverage at the 5th International Conference on Public Health in GMS countries in Myanmar, where she had the opportunity to share views with other health experts.

Two other PPP fellows—Suriyon Thunkijanukij, a division director and senior policy and plan analyst at the Office of National Economic and Social Development Board of Thailand, and Anuwan Vongpichet, a senior policy and plan analyst at the same office—both worked in logistics development. Suriyon took the Agence Française de Développement course in public–private

“PPP programs changed my mindset on leadership and I now encourage everyone to work as a team in my current work to design a scheme for universal health coverage.”

San San Aye, director, planning department, Myanmar Ministry of Health
Contributing to Leadership in Development

partnerships in infrastructure development and the SMG Program at Harvard in 2006. Suriyon says that Harvard’s extensive use of case studies to shed light on real situations was emulated by his team in drafting a logistics strategy for Thailand’s national and regional integration plans. The case study approach was also used in a logistics curriculum that he helped design and is now taught in Thai academic institutions. The PPP’s Competitiveness and Inclusive Growth Program, which Suriyon took in 2012, gave him “crucial insights” that were helpful in formulating Thailand’s Second Logistics Development Strategy (2013–2017) in a way that would promote more inclusive growth, both nationally and regionally. For Anuwan, the SMG Program at Harvard and the Competitiveness and Inclusive Growth Program, both taken in 2013, provided useful perspectives on improving the quality of economic growth. “The PPP learning programs” she says, “put a lot of emphasis on the need for more inclusiveness in the pattern of growth in developing Asia, but they also underscored the importance of maintaining competitive advantage—and this is a delicate and complex issue for development planners.” Anuwan is mindful of the need to achieve both objectives in her logistics work as part of a Thai government team assisting Myanmar in developing Dawei port and industrial estate into a trading hub.

“The PPP learning programs put a lot of emphasis on the need for more inclusiveness in the pattern of growth in developing Asia, but they also underscored the importance of maintaining competitive advantage—and this is a delicate and complex issue for development planners.”

Anuwan Vongpichet, senior policy and plan analyst, Office of National Economic and Social Development Board of Thailand
A Total Learning Approach

Phnom Penh Plan programs were developed using a total learning approach incorporating traditional and nontraditional learning and teaching mediums for an evidence-based approach to learning. Just as important as the topics covered by the programs were the ways in which learning was imparted and acquired. “The method of teaching had to be consistent with the GMS’s principles of shared ownership and cooperation,” says Pamela Asis-Layugan, PPP program officer. “We knew this couldn’t be achieved by holding classroom lectures and simply telling participants how things should be done.” Programs included group discussions, field trips, workshops, and other activities to make learning as participatory as possible. “Doing this helped overcome language barriers and other inhibitions in a way that would not have been possible if the program had been designed around a rigid classroom structure,” observes Asis-Layugan. Field trips were popular and—judging by the feedback—were eye-openers for some participants on the benefits of economic integration. “These were often held in areas benefiting from the GMS’s economic corridor approach to development, and skeptics were often won over after they talked to local business and community leaders,” says Asis-Layugan.

Field visits expose participants to “on-the-ground realities” and allow them to interact with various stakeholders.
Leadership laboratory: Learning from the experience of Ek Sonn Chan in reforming the Phnom Penh Water Supply Authority (top left)

Tourism practitioners learn tools in tourism site planning (right)

Carol Guina (center) guides discussion on trade policy (bottom left)

Participants visit the Angkor Wat temple in Siem Reap, Cambodia
“PPP learning programs were a unique experience that gave me a better understanding of national and regional issues in a more informal setting that really helped build a sense of community.”

Dongxiang Li, ADB advisor and former director of the International Department of the PRC’s Ministry of Finance

Team-building activities integral to the learning programs fostered a sense of common purpose in achieving the objectives of the GMS Program. Bringing together officials to talk openly about subregional economic issues—which sometimes touched on sensitive areas—was “one of the programs’ biggest payoffs,” says Jordana Queddeng, PPP program analyst. The relationships formed and contacts made in the learning programs were among the PPP’s most important objectives; the Leaders Networking for Knowledge (LINK), a PPP alumni event held in GMS capitals, ensured that program participants stayed in touch. Thirty-five LINK alumni events were organized and attended by 1,632 PPP alumni. For Dongxiang Li, ADB advisor and former director of the international department of the PRC’s Ministry of Finance, team-building activities were effective icebreakers. “GMS meetings tend to be rather formal and it is hard to get to know
one another at these events,” he says. “The PPP learning programs were a unique experience that gave me a better understanding of national and regional issues in a more informal setting and really helped build a sense of community among participants.”

Institutional partners in capacity development benefited from the total learning approach and adopted the same principles and methods. In Cambodia, for example, the PPP’s tourism management program was taught from 2006 to 2010 at the Ministry of Economy and Finance’s Economics and Finance Institute. The same program has been taught at the Guilin Institute of Tourism in the PRC since 2011. Jason Zhu, director of international affairs at the institute’s School of International Education and Exchange, credits the program for transforming the school’s “teaching style.” Says Zhu: “[The PRC] still uses more traditional methods, but the PPP program set a very good example of an interactive classroom, which we adopted.” The tourism courses now include, among other things, group discussions, field visits, and stakeholder analysis. Says Zhu: “The PPP program helped the institute to update its teaching methods at a time when we were trying to broaden our international appeal.”
### Box 3: Phnom Penh Plan Learning Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Location(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leadership and Development Management</strong> (27)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Crisis Management</strong> (1)</td>
<td>School of Public Policy and Management, Tsinghua University, People's Republic of China (PRC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>International Negotiations</strong> (4)</td>
<td>Asian Institute of Technology in Viet Nam, Center for Asian Studies, Graduate Institute, Switzerland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leadership and Executive Development for Middle Level Officials</strong> (5)</td>
<td>Asian Institute of Management, Philippines, National Economics University, Viet Nam, Hanoi School of Business, Viet Nam, Public Policy Training Program, Viet Nam, PPP Secretariat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leadership and Executive Development for Senior Level Officials</strong> (4)</td>
<td>Economics and Finance Institute, Cambodia, PPP Secretariat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leadership for Junior Officials</strong> (7)</td>
<td>Lee Kuan Yew School of Public Policy, National University of Singapore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rural Leadership</strong> (2)</td>
<td>Asian Institute of Technology, Thailand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic Leadership</strong> (4)</td>
<td>Asia-Pacific Finance and Development Center, PRC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic Corridor Development</strong> (9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Competitiveness and Inclusive Growth: North–South Economic Corridor Development</strong> (3)</td>
<td>PPP Secretariat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>East–West Economic Corridor Development</strong> (6)</td>
<td>PPP Secretariat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Management</strong> (11)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Design and Feasibility</strong> (4)</td>
<td>Mekong Institute, Thailand, PPP Secretariat</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*continued on next page*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Management (3)</th>
<th>Year(s): 2008, 2009, and 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institution(s): Mekong Institute, Thailand</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institution(s): Mekong Institute, Thailand</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Integration (4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lessons from the European Union (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution(s): National Foundation for Political Sciences, France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Europe, Belgium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute on Comparative Regional Integration Studies, United Nations University, Belgium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPP Secretariat</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Policy, Management, and Governance (21)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e-Governance (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year(s): 2004 and 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution(s): Administrative Staff College of India</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poverty Reduction and Participation (4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year(s): 2003 (2) and 2004 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution(s): Mekong Institute, Thailand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Institute of Technology, Thailand</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Management (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year(s): 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution(s): École Nationale d’Administration, France</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Policy (3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year(s): 2005, 2008, and 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution(s): École Nationale d’Administration, France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Institute of Public Administration, Netherlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics and Finance Institute, Cambodia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Science, Technology, and Innovation (3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year(s): 2010, 2011, and 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution(s): Asia Development Institute, Seoul National University, Republic of Korea</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Reforms (4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institution(s): Mekong Institute, Thailand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kunming University of Science and Technology, Yunnan Province, PRC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Human Resource Management (4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institution(s): Asian Institute of Management, Philippines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanoi School of Business, Viet Nam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics and Finance Institute, Cambodia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMS Tertiary Education Consortium Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*continued on next page*
Box 3 continued

### GMS Sectors (49)

#### Agriculture (1)
- **Year(s):** 2013
- **Institution(s):** PPP Secretariat

#### Education (1)
- **Year(s):** 2006
- **Institution(s):** Hanoi National University of Education, Viet Nam

#### Energy (3)
- **Year(s):** 2012, 2013, and 2014
- **Institution(s):** National University of Laos, Lao PDR
- **Institution(s):** PPP Secretariat

#### Environment (5)
- **Year(s):** 2004, 2005, 2008, 2009, and 2010
- **Institution(s):** Asian Institute of Technology, Thailand
- **Institution(s):** GMS–Environment Operations Center, Thailand

#### Health Care Financing (2)
- **Year(s):** 2003 and 2005
- **Institution(s):** Administrative Staff College of India
- **Institution(s):** London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, United Kingdom
- **Institution(s):** London School of Economics, United Kingdom
- **Institution(s):** Economics and Finance Institute, Cambodia

#### Infrastructure (8)
- **Institution(s):** Mekong Institute, Thailand
- **Institution(s):** GMS Tertiary Education Consortium Trust
- **Institution(s):** National University of Laos, Lao PDR
- **Institution(s):** Economics and Finance Institute, Cambodia
- **Institution(s):** Center for Financial, Economic and Banking Studies, France

#### Labor Markets and Migration (3)
- **Year(s):** 2006, 2007, and 2012
- **Institution(s):** National University of Laos, Lao PDR
- **Institution(s):** International Organization for Migration
- **Institution(s):** Mekong Institute, Thailand

#### Social Protection (3)
- **Year(s):** 2005, 2013, and 2014
- **Institution(s):** GMS Tertiary Education Consortium Trust
- **Institution(s):** Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand
- **Institution(s):** Asia Development Institute, Seoul National University, Republic of Korea

#### Tourism (9)
- **Institution(s):** Economics and Finance Institute, Cambodia
- **Institution(s):** Guilin Institute of Tourism, PRC

*continued on next page*
Box 3 continued

**Trade Policy, Logistics, and Facilitation (10)**
Institution(s): Lee Kuan Yew School of Public Policy, National University of Singapore School of International Trade and Economics, University of International Business and Economics, PRC Thailand International Development Cooperation Agency Estey Centre for Law and Economics in International Trade, University of Saskatchewan, Canada Centre for Logistics Research, Thammasat University, Thailand International Institute for Trade and Development, Thailand PPP Secretariat

**Transport and Energy (3)**
Year(s): 2011, 2013, and 2014
Institution(s): GMS–Environment Operations Center, Thailand

**Urban Management (1)**
Year(s): 2003
Institution(s): Asian Institute of Technology, Thailand

Source: PPP Secretariat.

“PPP fulfilled my insatiable thirst for knowledge and deepened my passion to become a stronger servant leader, especially when I spearheaded the Public Service Delivery Strategy in Cambodia.”

Lyna Neang, Cambodia

“PPP helped me become more “customer-oriented” in my work at the Department of Planning and Investment in Hue province, which involves promoting foreign direct investment, helping the private sector, and developing business strategies.”

Phan Canh Huy, Viet Nam
Snapshots of Cross-Border Activities: Invaluable Learning Experience

The Phnom Penh Plan organized several leadership development programs on Greater Mekong Subregion Competitiveness and Inclusive Growth, which provided opportunities for participants to share experiences, and acquire firsthand exposure to transboundary situations in the North–South Economic Corridor (NSEC). The snapshots in this section attempt to capture the invaluable experience of GMS officials during various trips around the NSEC in 2012, 2013, and 2014. The journey included field visits to Jinghong, Mengla, and Mohan in the PRC; Boten, Luang Namtha, and Houayxay in the Lao PDR; and Chiang Kong and Chiang Rai in Thailand.

At the Xisuangbanna Transboundary Nature Reserve and Protected Area, a biodiversity conservation corridor pilot site—part of the GMS Core Environment Program. Located in southern Yunnan and stretches down to the border with the Lao PDR.
Huabin Hu shares his leadership experience on the GMS biodiversity conservation corridors, covering 18,000 hectares and 48 villages, with five ethnic minorities in the PRC and the Lao PDR (bottom right).

The Xisuang banna Tropical and Botanical Garden of the Chinese Academy of Sciences promotes biodiversity conservation and sustainable development (top left).
Better connectivity in the GMS. Traveling using multimodal transport to be in three countries by air, land, and river.

From Jinghong to Kunming we soared

Crossing the border from Mohan to Boten and to many places by bus and van
Before the Fourth Thai–Lao Friendship Bridge was opened in December 2013, crossing the Mekong River in boats proved challenging. GMS officials “realized” what ordinary people experience.
The Fourth Thai–Lao Friendship Bridge is 630 meters long with a span of 480 meters and is 14.7 meters wide. It is located about 10 kilometers from Amphoe in Chiang Kong in the northeastern part of Chiang Rai in northern Thailand and about 12 kilometers from Ban Houayxay, the capital of Bokeo province in northwestern Laos.
Snapshots of Cross-Border Activities: Invaluable Learning Experience

Cross-border mobility of goods and people

Going through immigration at the Mohan border between the PRC and the Lao PDR

Briefing on the strategic advantages of the Mohan Economic Development Area, where industrial and service parks have been built

Observing logistics facilities in Boten, Lao PDR

PPP participants at the Boten border in Lao PDR
Luang Namtha, a quaint border town in the Lao PDR, is not just reaping benefits as a transit town but also attracting more tourists and investments. The challenge is how to make growth more inclusive.
Lanten women in Ban Nam Chang produce handicrafts and have active roles in village life.

A two way process: GMS officials and villagers learn from each other at the handicrafts center in Ban Nam Chang.
Kao Rao Cave in Vieng Phoukha District amid limestone mountains in the Nam Ha Protected Area.

The newly upgraded Luang Namtha Airport expected to boost tourist arrivals.
Snapshots of Cross-Border Activities: Invaluable Learning Experience

Enjoying the food, shopping, and a Baci ceremony in Luang Namtha

Cultural performance at the Ban Vieng Neua
The Phnom Penh Plan for Development Management: A Retrospective

The Golden Triangle, where two rivers (Mekong and Ruak) meet and three countries (the Lao PDR, Myanmar, and Thailand) share borders

Lessons on social entrepreneurship and sustainable alternative livelihood development in the Doi Tung Development Project, Chiang Rai, Thailand

Navuti economic forests: Understanding the macadamia and coffee value chains
Ceramic, paper, and textile production

Mae Fah Luang garden to commemorate the legacy of Her Royal Highness Princess Srinagarindra the Princess Mother who initiated development activities to raise quality of life of Thailand’s ethnic minorities in the Doi Tung area.
With the GMS countries facing increasingly complex development challenges, the knowledge resources needed to inform policy choices have become more important. Knowledge generation for policy making was a challenge for the Phnom Penh Plan, which had to provide the empirical basis for designing policy rather than just the tools. Moreover, because policy decisions affect various economic interests and members of society in different ways, decision makers needed to understand better the opportunity costs of their choices.

The knowledge–policy gap was most apparent in the less developed GMS countries, where research institutions have limited resources and capacity to conduct policy-based research. To narrow the gap, the PPP Research Program was launched in March 2009 to build capacity for policy-based research in GMS research and academic institutions.

Under the program, grants were made available for research into policy issues with subregional implications. It funded research projects related to labor markets, financial services, contract farming, and cross-border economic zones in GMS border areas. The program also encouraged collaborative research involving two or more GMS research institutions, consistent with the spirit of subregional cooperation and the PPP’s emphasis on knowledge partnerships. “This collaborative arrangement extended our research network,” says Nguyen Hong Son, rector of the Viet Nam National University–University of Economics and Business, noting that the university continued to work with scholars involved in the program even after research projects were completed.

Workshops organized at various stages of research studies improved the quality of research.
The research program’s capacity-building objective was addressed by appointing academic advisors to mentor research teams as well as peer reviewers to assess final reports before publication. Workshops were organized at various stages of research to discuss their conceptual framework, methodology, and findings. PPP Capacity Building Specialist Carolina Guina says this participatory process, rather than the “passive submission of reports,” greatly improved the quality of research.

In March 2012, a research forum—Pathways to Policy—under the PPP was held in Bangkok to present the findings of the research studies to government officials, GMS development partners, and PPP alumni. “The aim was to use the findings to craft more responsive policies,” says Porametee Vimolsiri, deputy secretary general of Thailand’s National Economic and Social Development Board. He continues, “Although many GMS forums have brought together academics, policy makers, business leaders, and civil society representatives, this was a first for discussing empirical research on regional issues.” Zanxin Wang, director at the School of Development Studies at Yunnan University, agrees: “Pathways to Policy was a rare opportunity for the academic community to present research findings to policy makers and for research to be considered as an input into policy making.” Studies on all four research projects have been published in the PPP Research Report Series, launched in 2012, which is aimed at disseminating research results to a wide audience to increase awareness of, and offer solutions to, development challenges facing the GMS.
Articles on the PPP research projects were also featured in the *Journal of Greater Mekong Subregion Development Studies*. Published once a year by ADB, the journal is a multidisciplinary peer-reviewed publication that makes an important contribution to the thinking and debate on GMS issues. It is directed at planners, policy makers, academics, and researchers, and serves as a platform for publishing research by universities and think tanks in the GMS. The journal was established to bridge the gap between research and policy making, and in doing so to contribute to informed policy choices, responsive advocacy, and meticulous scholarship. Since its launch in 2004, seven issues have been published, each containing around six articles.

The PPP research program has made its mark as a knowledge builder. It drew attention to the need for evidenced-based policy making, and sought to build capacity for this in GMS academic and research institutions through research grants, mentoring, and networking. Even before the research program started, the PPP provided scholars with a platform for disseminating their work through the journal.

“I gained leadership skills and techniques that were instantly applicable in my commitment to push for stronger economic linkages and institutional synergies between Guangxi Province and the GMS Economic Cooperation Program.”

Yan Yan, Guangxi Province, PRC

“PPP inspired me to become a more effective tourism strategist. As leaders, we must cope with diversity, change, and be creative.”

Auggaphol Brickshawana, Thailand
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Objectives/Scope</th>
<th>Main Findings</th>
<th>Policy Implications</th>
<th>Participating Research Institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Improving Management Policies for Cross-Border Contract Farming between China, Thailand and Laos | The research investigates the current gaps in contract farming policy and develops a framework for improving the management of contract farming in the Lao PDR, focusing on its impact on small farmers.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     | - Small farmers have benefited from contract farming.  
- Border trade policies are fundamental to contract farming.  
- Services and infrastructure increase farmers’ opportunities.  
- Farmers’ flexibility to choose crops can protect them from possible exploitation by powerful buyers and enable them to seek better economic returns.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      | - Contract farming arrangements should be designed to address specific constraints in the area where they are being promoted.  
- No single model of contract farming is applicable in all cases.  
- Contract farming is an institutional choice, given certain market constraints.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            | Mekong Sub-region Social Research Center, Ubon Ratchathani University (Thailand) - Lead  
- Yunnan University (PRC)  
- Champasak Agriculture and Forestry College (Lao PDR)  
- National University of Laos (Lao PDR)  
- Mekong Institute (Thailand)                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |
| Facilitation of Border Trade through the Improvement of Financial Services in the Border-Gate Areas of Viet Nam and Its Implications for the GMS Countries | The research establishes the importance of financial services in the border-gate areas of Viet Nam as a means of trade facilitation; assesses the quality of the financial services at the checkpoint areas of Viet Nam and paired areas across the border (in Cambodia, the PRC, and the Lao PDR); and identifies benchmarks for financial service provision in the border areas.                                                                                                                                                                                                                       | - Banking density in GMS border areas is still very low.  
- Asymmetric information problems exist.  
- Formal financial services should be made friendlier to users.  
- There are differences in the quantity and quality of cross-border supply of financial services.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  | - The presence of formal financial organizations in the border-gate areas should be increased.  
- Asymmetric information problems should be overcome.  
- It is better to facilitate the supply of cross-border financial services.  
- Skills training should be provided.  
- There is a need to formalize the informal service providers.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       | College of Economics, Viet Nam National University (Viet Nam) – Lead  
- Central Institute for Economic Management (Viet Nam)  
- Yunnan Research and Coordination Office for Lancang-Mekong Sub-regional Cooperation (PRC)  
- Royal University of Law and Economics (Cambodia)                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |
### Box 4: Phnom Penh Plan Research Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Objectives/Scope</th>
<th>Main Findings</th>
<th>Policy Implications</th>
<th>Participating Research Institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Policies for investment in China-GMS Cross-border Economic Zones Development: Incentive Effects and Redesign | The study investigates the locational advantage of BEZs in the PRC, the policies (incentives) that promote this advantage and their effects on firms’ investment decisions, and implications for the development of supply chains in relation to border areas in the Lao PDR and Viet Nam. | - Regional differences are statistically significant: the investment motives of firms, the perceived importance of incentives, policies and infrastructure, and the general assessment of CBEZs are specific to regions where firms invest.  
- Most investment in the CBEZs is from domestic firms.  
- Preferential tax policy plays a critical role in affecting firms’ investment decisions.  
- Firms’ investment decisions are affected by some elements of the investment climate.  
- Firms’ performance is also affected by some elements of the investment climate.  
- Firms’ performance is not significantly affected by market, political, and legal stability; logistics interruption; or irregular payments. | - To promote the development of CBEZs, both improved incentive packages and a favorable investment climate are indispensable.  
- Major efforts should be laid on the improvement of infrastructure, including transportation and public utilities.  
- Incentive policies should be designed to highlight the advantage of “border areas,” such as proximity to foreign markets, and availability of production factors in neighboring countries.  
- Policies for CBEZs should include applicable customs policies in order to reduce the transaction cost of multinational economic activities. | - School of Development Studies, Yunnan University (PRC) - Lead  
- Thammasat University (Thailand)  
- National University of Laos (Lao PDR)  
- Chinese Academy of Social Sciences (PRC) |

continued on next page
### Box 4: Phnom Penh Plan Research Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Objectives/Scope</th>
<th>Main Findings</th>
<th>Policy Implications</th>
<th>Participating Research Institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Increasing Female Labor Quality in the Border Gate Areas of Viet Nam and the Implications for GMS Countries | The project examines the factors that affect the earnings and quality of female labor in the BEZs in Viet Nam, and how the increase in earnings can be transformed into improvements in the quality of female labor, and ultimately into poverty reduction and the empowerment of women. | - There are many constraints in converting the increase on female labor income into the improvement of female labor quality in the BEZs.  
- BEZs play a limited role in enhancing female labor quality.  
- Self-exclusion for women occurs in BEZs.  
- The quality of working conditions and job security for women need to be improved.  
- Ensuring gender equity is an important concern. | - The interface between demand and supply of labor should be increased.  
- A sustainable structural transformation of the labor market in BEZs needs to be created.  
- Vocational training and skills enhancement for female labor should be provided.  
- Civil society can be mobilized in the advocacy for gender equity and women’s rights.  
- GMS cooperation on labor policy with regard to BEZs should be promoted. | - Institute of World Economics and Politics (Viet Nam) - Lead  
- Viet Nam Institute of Economics (Viet Nam) |

BEZs = border economic zones; CBEZs = cross-border economic zones.

Source: PPP Policy Briefs.
# Box 5: Journal of Greater Mekong Subregion Development Studies: Issues and Articles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Volume 1</th>
<th>December 2004</th>
<th>Authors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Training Needs Analysis for Development in the Greater Mekong Subregion</td>
<td>Geoff J. Mills, John E. Askwith, Harry Abrillo, and Jeff Howe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Competitiveness through Cross-Border Cooperation in Cambodia and Thailand</td>
<td>Francisco Roman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women and Men’s Perceptions of Borders and States: The Case of Fish Trade on the Thai–Cambodian Border</td>
<td>Kyoko Kusakabe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Interventions in the Fight against HIV/AIDS: A Case Study of Northeast Thailand</td>
<td>Steven Lim, Michael Cameron, Wongsa Laohasiriwong, and Chupasiri Apinundecha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Book Review) Do Tropical Gangsters Have Good Intentions? A Comparative Review of Robert Klitgaard and Thomas Dichter</td>
<td>Tess Del Rosario</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Volume 2</th>
<th>October 2005</th>
<th>Authors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trade Liberalization and Poverty Alleviation in the Greater Mekong Subregion</td>
<td>Anna Strutt and Steven Lim</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can Subregionalism or Regionalism Aid Multilateralism? The Case of the Greater Mekong Subregion and the Association of Southeast Asian Nations Free Trade Area</td>
<td>Jayant Menon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myanmar’s Cross-Border Economic Relations and Cooperation with the People’s Republic of China and Thailand in the Greater Mekong Subregion</td>
<td>Mya Than</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rewarding the Upland Poor for Environmental Services in the People’s Republic of China</td>
<td>Lu Xing and Li Hetong</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Management Measures and Current Practices in Solid Waste Management: A Case Study from Vientiane, Lao People’s Democratic Republic</td>
<td>Bhoj Raj Khanal and Bounsouk Souksavath</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Book Review) Social Challenges for the Mekong Region</td>
<td>Dachang Liu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Volume 3</th>
<th>Issue 1</th>
<th>July 2006</th>
<th>Authors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tourism: Blessings for All?</td>
<td>Mingsarn Kaosa-ard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism, Poverty, and Income Distribution: Chambok Community-based Ecotourism Development, Kirirom National Park, Kompong Speu Province, Cambodia</td>
<td>Men Prachvuthy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism Development: Protection versus Exploitation: A Case Study of the Change in the Lives of the Mosuo People</td>
<td>Wen Zhang</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Benefits and Income Distribution of Community-based Tourism: Nammat Kao and Nammat Mai, Lao PDR</td>
<td>Thavipheth Oula</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Distribution and Community-based Tourism: Three Case Studies in Thailand</td>
<td>Akarapong Untong, Sasipen Phuangsaichai, Natthida Taweelertkunthon, and Jakkree Tejawaree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Book Review) Development Project Interconnected Worlds: Tourism in Southeast Asia</td>
<td>Peggy Teo, Tou Chuanq Chang, and Kong Chong Ho</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Volume 3</th>
<th>Issue 2</th>
<th>December 2006</th>
<th>Authors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The People’s Republic of China Factor in Mekong Tourism</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wen Zhang, Yuli Huang, and Weixia Zhu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Capital Disinvestments and Sustainable Development in the Greater Mekong Subregion: Making Visible the Invisible</td>
<td></td>
<td>Javed Hussain Mir and C. Chandrasekharan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would You Like to Pay in Dollars, Baht, or Kip? Economic Consequences of Multiple Currencies in the Lao People’s Democratic Republic</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jayant Menon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-border Transport Infrastructure, Regional Integration, and Development: Implications for the Greater Mekong Subregion</td>
<td></td>
<td>Manabu Fujimura</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determinants of Bank Lending in Thailand Rural Financial Markets</td>
<td></td>
<td>Visit Limsonbunchai, Christopher Gan, and Minsoo Lee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Book Review) Shopping Tourism, Retailing, and Leisure</td>
<td></td>
<td>Trevor Sofield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Volume 4</th>
<th>December 2008</th>
<th>Authors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trade Facilitation in the Greater Mekong Subregion: Impacts of Reducing the Time to Trade</td>
<td></td>
<td>Anna Strutt, Susan Stone, and Peter Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Integration in the Greater Mekong Subregion and Cross-Border Transport Infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td>Manabu Fujimura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logistics Development in the North–South Economic Corridor of the Greater Mekong Subregion</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ruth Banomyong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing Tourism in the Greater Mekong Subregion Economic Corridors</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ramon Benedicto A. Alampay and Ludwig G. Rieder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biofuels and Rural Renewable Energy in the Greater Mekong Subregion: Issues, Challenges, and Opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td>Roehlano M. Briones and Mahfuzuddin Ahmed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Volume 5</th>
<th>December 2010</th>
<th>Authors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factors Affecting Firm-Level Investment and Performance in Border Economic Zones and Implications for Developing Cross-Border Economic Zones between the People’s Republic of China and Its Neighboring GMS Countries</td>
<td></td>
<td>Zanxin Wang, Xianming Yang, and Ying Chen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-Border Contract Farming Arrangement: Variations and Implications in the Lao People’s Democratic Republic</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kanokwan Manorom, David Hall, Xing Lu, SuchatKatima, Maria Theresa Medialdia, Singkhon Siharath, and Pinwadee Srisuphan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earnings and Quality of Female Labor in the Border Areas of Viet Nam and the Implications for GMS Cooperation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nguyen Manh Hung, Tuan Quang Bui, and Nguyen Thi Hong Nhung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving Accessibility of Financial Services in the GMS Border-Gate Areas to Facilitate Cross-Border Trade: The Case of Viet Nam and Implications for GMS Cooperation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nguyen Hong Son and Dang Duc Son</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Volume 6</th>
<th>October 2014</th>
<th>Authors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impediments to Growth of the Garment and Food Industries in Cambodia: Exploring Potential Benefits of the ASEAN–People’s Republic of China Free Trade Agreement</td>
<td>Vannarith Chheang and Shintaro Hamanaka</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASEAN–People’s Republic of China Free Trade Area and the Competitiveness of Local Industries: A Case Study of Major Industries in the Lao People’s Democratic Republic</td>
<td>Leebeer Leebouapao, Sthabandith Insisienmay, and Vanthana Nolintha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Impacts of the Thailand–Australia Free Trade Agreement and Thailand–New Zealand Closer Economic Partnership on Thai Dairy Import Prices</td>
<td>Patcharee Suriya, Christopher Gan, Baiding Hu, and David A. Cohen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasonal Pattern and Effects of Shocks on Outbound Tourism from the People’s Republic of China: The Case of Thailand</td>
<td>Akarapong Untong, Vicente Ramos, Mingsarn Kaosa-ard, and Javier Rey-Maquieira</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An Assessment of the Role of Nongovernment Organizations in Combating Trafficking of Women and Children in Cambodia and Viet Nam</td>
<td>Christopher Gan, Nong Thi Thuy Ha, Betty Kao, and Kongchheng Poch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: PPP Secretariat.

“PPP allowed me to design and implement holistic and innovative development plans and projects for the rural and agriculture sector in Myanmar.”

Win Htut, Myanmar

“The concepts and tools learned, as well as skills in negotiation, helped in my work developing trade policies and strategies, and in bilateral and multilateral negotiations.”

Douangboupha Latthana, Lao PDR
The Greater Mekong Subregion Development Dialogues: Inclusive Conversations

The breadth and complexity of development issues in the GMS inspired the Phnom Penh Plan to extend its reach to a wider constituency beyond the public institutions covered by the GMS institutional framework. The GMS Program facilitated subregional decision making, but there was no mechanism within the program for seeking the views of stakeholders outside government. In 2006, the PPP pilot-tested the first GMS Development Dialogue (GDD) to broaden the discussion of subregional issues to include the academe, the private sector, civil society organizations, and the media. Perspectives from these stakeholders served to deepen policy makers’ understanding of pressing development issues. The encouraging results of the first GDD led to the holding of eight of these events from 2006 to 2012.

Multisectoral participation in the GDDs generated diverse perspectives among stakeholders that reflected the uniqueness of each GMS country’s development context. The GDDs made this intricate, albeit robust, exchange of ideas possible through sessions that built a nexus between stakeholders and country perspectives. Stakeholder perspectives were presented in plenary sessions, followed by country breakout groups that provided an opportunity to reflect on the material from a national perspective. The final session of GDD plenaries established points of convergence and divergence across countries and stakeholder groups.
GDDs were video-linked, allowing an average of 100 participants to attend each GDD. The wide reach of the GDD made inclusive conversations possible in the GMS context, and thereby helped strengthen country ownership and contribute to the goal of regional cooperation.

The choice of themes was informed by front-burner issues in the GMS Program agenda. The eight GDDs covered energy security, climate change, food security, labor migration, corridor towns development, GMS–ASEAN synergies and complementarities, border economic zones, and social protection. The selection of themes made it possible “to use GDD outputs as inputs in refining the focus of subregional sector frameworks as well as parameters for determining project priorities discussed in the GMS working groups,” says Alfredo Perdiguero, ADB principal regional cooperation specialist and PPP program manager. The GDD discussions touched on national actions to underpin subregional cooperation. GDD-2, on climate change, called for action at three levels—carbon emission reduction, mitigation of climate change consequences, and human adaptation. GDD-3, on food security, recommended guiding principles for public policy, strategic partnerships, and areas for cooperation, as shown in Box 7. GDD-6 discussed complementarities between the GMS and ASEAN, and concluded that a mapping exercise was needed to identify synergies and linkages between the two. GDD-8, on social protection, called for strengthening social protection for migrant workers, starting with voluntary schemes, to lay the foundations for a subregional social protection framework.
### Box 6: Greater Mekong Subregion Development Dialogues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GMS: Climate Makers or Climate Takers? Understanding and Responding</td>
<td>21 May 2008</td>
<td>Bangkok, Thailand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to the Challenges of Climate Change</td>
<td>23 September 2008</td>
<td>Vientiane, Lao PDR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor Migration in the GMS</td>
<td>5 May 2009</td>
<td>Beijing, PRC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Strategic Role of Corridor Towns in the Development of GMS</td>
<td>20 November 2009</td>
<td>Manila, Philippines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Corridors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The GMS in the Next Ten Years: Enhancing Synergies and</td>
<td>22 July 2010</td>
<td>Phnom Penh, Cambodia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complementarities with ASEAN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Strategic Importance of Border Economic Zones in Developing</td>
<td>13 December 2011</td>
<td>Beijing, PRC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the GMS Economic Corridors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Security for Migrant Labor in the GMS</td>
<td>8 December 2012</td>
<td>Phnom Penh, Cambodia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: PPP Secretariat.

### Box 7: Report of the Greater Mekong Subregion Development Dialogue to the Working Group on Agriculture

The Third GMS Development Dialogue (GDD-3) was held in September 2008 in Vientiane, the Lao PDR. GDD-3, on food security, generated a wide range of perspectives from various sectors and provided insights into how the GMS countries, individually and collectively, could respond to the issue of food security at a time when global food commodity prices were surging.

The dialogue made positive contributions by (i) setting basic principles to guide policy choices to address the problem of sharply rising food prices; (ii) focusing attention on roles for the private sector, academic and research institutions, and civil society organizations in promoting long-term food supply; and (iii) identifying areas for regional and international cooperation on food security.

**Guiding Principles for Public Policy**

Because the causes and consequences of the 2008 food crisis were complex, solutions were expected to be intricate and multifaceted, and involve difficult trade-offs that would need to be carefully balanced. Another consideration from the policy perspective was whether countries were net food importers or exporters. Numerous policy options were available to help tackle the effects of the food crisis, including safety nets to ensure household food security, measures to reduce domestic prices through trade and subsidy policies, and interventions to enhance medium-term food supply. The big question was choosing the right options.

*continued on next page*
Box 7 continued

GDD-3 advocated a set of guiding principles to guide policy choices:

- Prioritizing the protection of the most vulnerable members of society from food price shocks so that health, nutrition, and education are not compromised by higher expenditures on food;
- Linking short-term safety net programs with medium- to long-term productivity improvement measures; and
- Social protection programs should combine social transfers with policies that enable stakeholders to respond quickly to market opportunities.

Strategic Partnerships

GDD-3 called for strategic partnerships with the private sector to promote agricultural investments. Contract farming could be an important approach to enhancing domestic food supply, but it was recognized at the dialogue that there must be mutual benefits—a win–win situation—for the investor and the host country. GDD-3 underscored the importance of investments in technology to secure long-term agricultural productivity, given the challenge of scarcity of land for agriculture and the competitive pressures in global agricultural trade. The dialogue examined how government, the private sector, and academic institutions, working together and with support from international organizations and development partners, could create the synergies needed for technological innovation in agriculture in the GMS. The dialogue also highlighted the benefits of partnering with civil society organizations to play an advocacy role for providing social protection for vulnerable groups and to identify target groups that should benefit from safety net programs.

Potential Areas for Regional and International Cooperation

GDD-3 made an important contribution to identifying areas for regional and international cooperation for food security. Under the ASEAN framework, an emergency rice reserve scheme has been in place since 1979, but it was recognized that the scheme needs strengthening. Both within ASEAN and the GMS, several technical cooperation activities were being carried out at the project level at that time. As the GMS implements the Core Agriculture Support Program, the main challenge is to identify collaborative projects to complement national initiatives for enhanced agricultural production. These could include information sharing and joint research into good practices that promote efficiencies in irrigation, land cultivation, and farm management, as well as postharvest handling and management.

GDD-3 served as an important reminder that the GMS is uniquely positioned in the world rice market. Thailand and Viet Nam, two of the world’s largest rice exporters, account for about 50% of global production. The Cambodia and the PRC are also net rice exporters. The GMS therefore has a social and moral responsibility to the rest of the world to stabilize the supply and price of rice through policy coordination. This is a responsibility that the GMS Working Group on Agriculture needs to reflect on more fully and profoundly in the course of its work.

Source: PPP Secretariat.
Learning Resource Centers: More than a Library

A Phnom Penh Plan milestone was the opening of the Learning Resource Center (LRC)—a one-stop knowledge resource on the GMS—in ADB’s Cambodia Resident Mission. Its facilities and services are aimed at stimulating development thinking and providing access to a trove of information on the GMS for government officials, academics and students, development practitioners, nongovernment workers, and members of the public. At the center’s opening in 2005, Cambodia’s former GMS Minister Khy Taing Lim said: “Access to development information will help scale up capacity-building activities in the GMS and help governments to make more informed decisions.”

Since it opened, the LRC has had some 15,000 users. “This is an encouragingly large number that shows there’s strong interest in the GMS from many different quarters,” says Dy Dara, former consultant on the PPP and now on the operations staff of the Cambodia Resident Mission. The center houses some 8,000 titles in print and electronic format, as well as online databases. Its resources have been increased through team-ups with 14 libraries and information centers of local and international development organizations in Phnom Penh, including the Cambodia Development Resource Institute, the National Library of Cambodia, the World Bank Public Information Center, the French Cultural Centre, and The Asia Foundation.

The LRC is active in organizing lectures, seminars, and discussions on GMS-related issues, and conducts a program for schools on the subregion’s economic cooperation program. “The LRC is much more than just a library,” says Seng Chanthol, a frequent user of the center. “Students meet up and network there as well as use its resources for projects.” Users give the center’s staff high marks for helping with online searches for information. Because Cambodia has limited internet access—less than 20% of the population has access to the internet—finding information online can be difficult for many. “The staff are always willing to help people having difficulties using the digital archive,” says Royal School of Administration student Ros Ratana.
The success of the center was replicated in the Lao PDR, where another LRC was set up in 2009 in ADB’s Vientiane Resident Mission. In 2014, its collection of 4,300 titles in print and electronic format was donated to the National University of Laos’ library, where a GMS–PPP section was established.
Beyond the Phnom Penh Plan

More than 10 years after the establishment of the Phnom Penh Plan, it was clear that most objectives had been met for the learning programs, knowledge resources, and networking platforms, and that the program had become a “mature” investment for ADB. Indeed, the PPP was ADB’s longest-running capacity development program. Evaluations by ADB’s Independent Evaluation Department and the PPP’s development partners rated the plan highly successful.

The PPP’s achievements in capacity development are recognized by other regional cooperation groupings in Southeast Asia, some of which have shown interest in learning from the PPP’s experience. Given the plan’s emphasis on cross-learning and knowledge partnerships, civil servants from outside the GMS would also benefit from learning programs that focus on the challenges and opportunities of subregional cooperation. To date, three PPP learning programs have been implemented with participants from the Brunei Darussalam–Indonesia–Malaysia–Philippines East ASEAN Growth Area and the Indonesia–Malaysia–Thailand Growth Triangle. This approach, if expanded, would benefit the GMS program through knowledge sharing as well as the sharing of costs.
One of the main legacies of the PPP is the firm commitment now being demonstrated by all six GMS countries to further develop the capacity of their civil services. Indeed, participants took a very active role in shaping the plan over the years to keep its mission relevant. Despite the plan’s achievements, capacity development in public sector management remains a priority issue for leaders and policy makers, who continue to explore how best to advance socioeconomic progress at the national and subregional level.

“For more than a decade, the PPP has contributed to increased awareness of the GMS, developed capacity, and nurtured cooperation among civil servants in the subregion,” says James Nugent, director general of ADB’s Southeast Asia Regional Department. “The plan also improved access to development information, built the capacity of research and training institutions, and provided platforms for networking and knowledge sharing. These significant achievements contributed to realize the GMS vision of a more integrated, prosperous, and equitable subregion,” added Nugent.
I learned negotiation, communication, and analytical skills—all useful in my work as an agriculture strategist when I set up new systems and interministerial collaboration in the agriculture sector.

Prak Thaveak Amida, Cambodia

Being a PPP fellow, I now have a firmer grip on the GMS, its people, vision, and cooperative framework. PPP has renewed my commitment to the GMS—what I call “GMS thinking.”

Wang Yan, Yunnan Province, PRC

PPP made me appreciate problem solving, management of public affairs, and leadership—all useful in my work in trade development.

Khemdeth Sihavong, Lao PDR

PPP taught me to lead in whatever I do. These skills have been really useful, not only at the Foreign Economic Relations Department but also at the Myanmar National Human Rights Commission.

Khine Khine Win, Myanmar

Through the PPP, the GMS Program taught me that the economic and financial return of a cooperation project needs to consider the impact on villagers for sustainability. For this reason, I pushed for the addition of “inclusive growth” in the Indonesia–Malaysia–Thailand Growth Triangle Blue Print (2012–2016).

Kittipol Chotipimai, Thailand

I have applied leadership and new management methods to make public administration reform in Viet Nam more efficient and effective.

Nguyen Thi Thu Hang, Viet Nam

continued on next page
The Phnom Penh Plan for Development Management: A Retrospective

PPP helped me develop and implement an organizational action plan to promote private sector development.

Touch Eng, Cambodia

The PPP provided invaluable opportunities to interact, share experiences, and establish a network with my counterparts in the GMS countries—a concrete way to promote regional cooperation.

Yin Yonglin, Yunnan Province, PRC

I became a better strategist, which I applied in my work at the Savan–Seno Special Economic Zone.

Phanomkone Dararassamy, Lao PDR

From the PPP, I learned that if you want good governance, good policies must be in place. I also used the PPP network in a seed research project to advance the agriculture sector in Myanmar.

Aung Kyi, Myanmar

The PPP opened my eyes to view tourism as part of a larger supply chain involving everything from taxis to handbags. Networking paved the way for more cooperation between and among national tourism organizations in the GMS.

Thitirat Sookphartjaroen, Thailand

PPP enhanced my awareness of present trends, challenges, policy issues, and other key concepts related to regional development.

Nguyen Duc Tan, Viet Nam

Source: PPP Secretariat.
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This retrospective marks more than 10 years of the Phnom Penh Plan’s achievements in building the capacity of the Greater Mekong Subregion (GMS) civil service and in strengthening networks among government policy makers and planners for deepening economic integration. The Phnom Penh Plan is a regional capacity-building program that supports knowledge products and services under the framework of the Greater Mekong Subregion Economic Cooperation Program.
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ADB’s vision is an Asia and Pacific region free of poverty. Its mission is to help its developing member countries reduce poverty and improve the quality of life of their people. Despite the region’s many successes, it remains home to approximately two-thirds of the world’s poor: 1.6 billion people who live on less than $2 a day, with 733 million struggling on less than $1.25 a day. ADB is committed to reducing poverty through inclusive economic growth, environmentally sustainable growth, and regional integration.

Based in Manila, ADB is owned by 67 members, including 48 from the region. Its main instruments for helping its developing member countries are policy dialogue, loans, equity investments, guarantees, grants, and technical assistance.