Proceedings of the Asia-Europe Peoples' Forum Social Justice Cluster
13-15 February 2018
Balay Kalinaw, University of the Philippines,
Quezon City, Philippines

Contents

Our Context

The world is riven by social injustices marked by worsening social inequality, dispossession, exploitation and exclusion. Concretely, in Asia, despite a booming economy, close to one billion people face massive unemployment and work informalisation, with barely any access to social services and support for a life of dignity. In Europe, more than 115 million people are living on the poverty line, facing indebtedness, joblessness and insecurity. However, states respond with policies that cut social services, and dismantle public utilities. Institutionalised welfare programs that have served as models of development have been undermined and eroded.

Austerity Measures

The dominant development paradigm's market-centric policies have affected the lives and livelihoods of peoples in Asia and Europe, especially the vulnerable sectors. Both regions face austerity measures driven by international public institutions, notably the International Financing Institutions, and in Europe through the European Union which has given the Commission additional powers to slash and control national public spending plans.

Even the IMF now claims to recognise that current policies increase inequality, and that these harm economic growth and stability. But the IMF and World Bank continue to worsen inequality by their conditionalities which require cuts in public spending, in spite of their formal priority for poverty reduction. They also promote cutting corporate tax rates and providing generous tax and fiscal incentives, which lead to losing and forgoing badly needed financial resources for social spending. Meanwhile, to recoup these losses, the IMF in particular pushes the adoption/increase of regressive consumption taxes such as Value Added Taxes which unjustly burden the poor and low-income groups. Women in great numbers are in lowly paid, insecure, informal work and are thus disproportionately impacted.

This internationalisation undermines and weakens democratic processes and outcomes at national level. Social movements thus face a challenge not only of winning public support and national level political support, but also defending the democratic processes against the institutions of globalisation.

Public Financing of Services and Public-Private-Partnerships

Further, in terms of realizing the Sustainable Development Goals and the Addis Ababa agenda, the World Bank and member-states of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) insist on Public-Private Partnerships (PPP) as the way forward. Yet cumulative evidence demonstrates that these are more expensive (and thus constrain peoples' access), more corrupt, less efficient and less sustainable than using public finance and public sector delivery. The focus of private companies on keeping profit as the primary motive, goes against the very basis of public services and even what constitutes 'public' and public good. No economy can be sustainable without a robust commitment to access of the people to affordable quality public services. These services are part of social commons which all people have a right to enjoy. People, simply as human beings, possess the inalienable right to essential services.

Entering into trade agreements are also promoted by the International Financing Institutions on the assumptions that these will increase Foreign Direct Investment and hence, financing for public services. However, such agreements have proven damaging to countries' revenue base and exploitative of human and natural resources.

Investments have served to extract revenue from public services to boost the returns to transnational corporations and finance capital.

Public goods and equality

All over Asia and Europe specific public services are experiencing a serious crisis, including housing, health care, education, water, energy and transport (roads, railways and ports). These services are vital and indispensable to life, to the dignity and development of individuals and society as a whole. They are public goods or social commons, and their provisioning must therefore be guaranteed and financed by states, from the taxes they collect, through public employment, and subject to democratic control through the participation of citizens. Where governments and local authorities fail to provide such services, or mismanage the provision of these services through corruption or negligence or under-provision, states should support the autonomous activities of people's organisations and local communities in provisioning for public services.

Because public services are proportionately more important for poorer groups in the population, poorer people are worse affected, while the rich and private corporations remain relatively unscathed even in times of austerity. The cutbacks invariably target public employment, which further exacerbates inequality. This is because the public sector provides greater opportunities for the employment of women and of disadvantaged ethnic and other groups; and because public sector pay is more equally distributed; and because the loss of jobs affects families which depend most on income derived from employment, rather than wealthy elites who benefit more from unearned income from profits or rent.

Political Dynamics

These dynamics have also led, especially in Europe, to the rise of great public anger against political elites which are more committed to neoliberal doctrines than to the welfare of their own people. This anger shows itself in the collapse of support for traditional parties, more particularly social democracy, and a growth in support for xenophobic and authoritarian politicians, as seen in European countries such as Hungary, the Czech Republic, Poland and Austria - and in the UK's Brexit vote - as well as in Asian countries including India and the Philippines.

 Social movements are playing a vital role in building new political movements, which recognise the real social and economic problems experienced by people, but reject the divisive politics of xenophobia, while challenging the unbridled power and impunity of corporations, and their capture of economies and states. These movements are already making impact in major cities in both continents, including Barcelona and Delhi.

Campaigning for public services and social commons is therefore a daunting task for Asian and European social movements. Public services require renewed and strengthened capacity for local and central governments to deliver quality services and use public finance to do so. It also involves reclaiming the strong democratic and people- centric role of the state, so that it can support and implement key demands of the social movements:

- Reverse the privatization of public goods or social commons
- Abandon the policy of using PPPs; use public finance to finance infrastructure and public services
- Advance the democratic control and management of public services, focusing on mechanisms for people's participation and monitoring,
- Introduce legislation, if possible with constitutional underpinning, to ensure that people's rights to public services are institutionalized and insulated from market forces and political patronage,
- Muster enough political will to abandon skewed tax policies which allow the mega-rich to hide their wealth via tax havens and illegal money flows, so that they can be taxed to finance decent public services

- Develop 'public-people' partnerships to support non-profit groups like cooperatives and social enterprises which can achieve more people-centered and accountable modes of social service delivery.

The rebuilding of public services is not an isolated campaign. It is linked with struggles of other democratic and progressive institutions across many sectors - for land, food sovereignty, decent work and social rights, just trade and ecological/climate justice. It is a key part of a vigorous and wide -ranging movement for systemic change to an alternative development paradigm that will place people and planet first, and at the center of development.

Conference Programme

13 February

Preliminary Session – Welcome messages and introductions

PLENARY 1

Public Services and Social/Economic Development	**David Hall (United Kingdom)**
	Rene Ofreneo (Philippines)

PLENARY 2

Beyond states: Global/regional actors and Free Trade Agreements	**Barry Coates (New Zealand)**
Illusion of PPPs	**David Hall**

PLENARY 3

Sectoral Issues and Struggles:

On Housing /Right to the City	**Meena Menon (India)**
	Eric Villanueva (Philippines)
On Water	**Miriam Planas (Spain)**
	Alghiffari Aqsa (Indonesia)
On Transport	**Mladen Domazet (Croatia)**

BREAK OUT GROUPS

On Housing, Water and Transport

Sharing of Housing, Water and Transport Workshop Results

SOLIDARITY DINNER

14 February

PLENARY 4

Our Alternatives to Reclaim our Public Services:

Remunicipalisation and Re-nationalisation	Satoko Kishimoto (Japan/Belgium)
The Social Commons: Democratization and Participation	Francine Mestrum (Belgium)

PLENARY 5

Organising our Public Services:

Financing and Real Progressive Taxation	**Mae Buenaventura (Philippines)**
Public Services and Labor	**David Boys (US)**

PLENARY 6

Sectoral Issues and Struggles:

On Health	**Sharad Onta (Nepal)**
	Vittorio Agnoletti (Italy)
On Education	**Peter Ronald DeSouza (India)**
	Raquel Castillo (Philippines)
On Energy	**Soeren Becker (Germany)**
	Lidy Nacpil (Philippines)

BREAK OUT GROUPS

On Health, Education and Energy

---

15 February

PLENARY 7

Sharing of Health, Education and Energy Workshop Results

Sharing of Campaigns

World Solidarity Movement	**Koen Detavernier (Belgium)**
ASEAN Civil Society Conference/ASEAN People's Forum	**Eduardo Tadem (Philippines)**
Coalition of Services of the Elderly	**Emily Beredico (Philippines)**
DIGNIDAD	**Ana Maria Nemenzo (Philippines)**
Freedom from Debt Coalition	**Sammy Gamboa (Philippines)**
Network for Transformative Social Protection	**Maris dela Cruz (Philippines)**

CLOSING PLENARY

Summary of Salient Points and Future Actions	**Tina Ebro**
Finalization of Conference Statement	**Francine Mestrum**
Concluding Remarks	**Charles Santiago (Malaysia)**

Proceedings of the Asia-Europe Peoples' Forum Social Justice Cluster Conference

PRELIMINARY SESSION

Welcome messages

Tina Ebro, current AEPF Focal Point in Asia, formally opened the AEPF Conference themed: *"Assuring affordable, accessible and quality Public Services for all: Tool for levelling inequality, mobilising for transformative change!"*

On behalf of AEPF, the co-organizers and the secretariat, she welcomed and thanked the participants for coming to the three-day conference.

Sally Rouseet, of the AEPF French Collective and a member of the International Organizing Committee gave a briefer on the AEPF. The Forum is an inter-regional network of social movements, trade unions, NGOs, campaign networks, scholars, and parliamentarians in Asia and Europe that advocate alternatives for a just and sustainable world. Working since 1996, AEPF organises the biennial convergence of civil society organisations prior to the Asia Europe Meeting (ASEM) of Asian and European governments.

The AEPF sees that the current trans-border, geo-political and social-economic-ecological crises can no longer be addressed only at local and national levels, but requires the cooperation and solidarity of people's networks regionally, inter-regionally, and globally. The Forum provides catalytic space to analyze and address issues, put forth demands, as well as opportunities make linkages and strategize around shared issues and coordinated actions.

Rouseet shared that the IOC is continually looking at how the AEPF can be used in a more effective way. One of the strategies being used are the thematic conferences, such as this conference of the Social Justice cluster. The IOC monitors how things are developing in the different clusters and tries to provide avenues for critical reflection and synergizing. She closed by stressing AEPF's key role in helping build the solidarity of progressive social movements in Asia and Europe.

Introductions

Ana Vitacion, Coordinator of DIGNIDAD, recognized the following organizations participating in the conference:

International/regional	Philippines
11.11.11	Alab Katipunan – Youth
ASEAN Civil Society Coalition (ACSC)	Alliance of Progressive Labor (APL)/Sentro ng mga Nagkakaisa at Progresibong Manggagawa (SENTRO)
ASEAN Parliamentarians for Human Rights (APHR)	Buhay Na May Dignidad Para Sa Lahat (DIGNIDAD)/Life of Dignity for All
Asia-Europe Peoples' Forum – Asia	Bukluran ng Manggagawang Pilipino (BMP)

Asian Peoples' Movement on Debt and Development (APMDD)	Center for Energy, Ecology and Development (CEED)
Centre for the Study of Developing Societies (CSDS)	Coalition of Services of the Elderly (COSE)
Costituzione Beni Comuni (Constitution and Common Wealth)	Freedom from Debt Coalition (FDC) and Chapters (Davao, Iloilo, Negros, Western Mindanao)
Engineers without borders Catalonia/European Water Movement	HomeNet Philippines
Focus on the Global South	Institute for Philippine Cooperative & Social Enterprise Development (IPSCED)
Institute for Political Ecology	Institute for Popular Democracy (IPD)
Institute of Medicine, Tribhuvan University, Kathmandu Nepal	Kilos Maralita (KM)
Jakarta Legal Aid Institute (LBH Jakarta)	Koalisyon Pabahay Pilipinas (KPP)
Medicina Democratica	Laban ng Masa (LNM)
Network for Transformative Social Protection (NTSP)	Medical Action Group (MAG)
Public Services International (PSI)	Oriang
Public Services International Research Unit (PSIRU), University of Greenwich	Pagkakaisa ng Manggagawa sa Transportasyon
Transnational Institute (TNI)	Palag Na!
United Nations Civil Society Advisory Committee (UNCSA/UNCSAC)	Pambansang Koalisyon ng mga Kababaihan sa Kanayunan (PKKK)
University of Bonn	Partido ng Manggagawa (PM)
	Philippine Movement for Climate Justice (PMCJ)
	Polytechnic University of the Philippines Student Council
	Program on Alternative Development, UP Center for Integrative and Development Studies (UPCIDS)
	Public Services Labor Independent Confederation (PSLink)
	Sanlakas
	Social Watch
	Sustainability and Participation through Education and Lifelong Learning (SPELL)
	Tambuyog
	UP-SAMA
	Urban Poor Associates (UPA)
	WomanHealth

PLENARY 1: Public Services and Social/Economic Development

Public Services Economic Advantages[1]
David Hall (UK)

On the austerity policy

Austerity policies are not only being applied in Europe, including the UK, but also in many developing countries, especially those subject to International Monetary Fund (IMF) programmes. Eight years ago, the IMF viewed public spending was growing too big and was getting to be a major problem, thus the need implement austerity measures by cutting back on public services. The IMF target is for public spending to be reduced by 24% in high income countries and 11% for developing countries by 2030.

However, austerity does not help economic recovery; it actually damages it – a fact acknowledged by the IMF. This is backed up by long-term economic data and analysis, illustrating that public services is linked to growth, employment and development and that austerity therefore, has a negative impact on economic growth.

On claims of greater efficiency of the private sector

There is no evidence across sectors of the claim that the private sector is efficient, nor that it is more efficient than government. Many cases of privatization have come to this conclusion. For example, among UK privatisations in general, the literature shows "little evidence that privatisation has caused a significant improvement in performance" (Martin and Parker 1997, Florio 2004). A meta-review of 27 econometric studies on comparative public/private efficiency in waste and water various countries reached a similar finding: "We do not find a genuine empirical effect of cost savings resulting from private production" (Bel and Warner 2010).

On Public Services as enabling greater equality

Many studies on rising inequality fail to factor in the role of access to public services in bringing about greater equality. Public services have a great impact on economic equality and democratic power which is not replaceable by an equivalent increase in post-tax disposable income. The value of public services has been shown to equally benefit people across sectors and income groups, with their value much greater for poorer groups relative to income. In the aggregate, they are worth more than social services, overall.

Public services have more impact on income equality than tax or benefits. Taxation systems do not have great equalising effect on distribution of income. There is greater impact on reducing inequality than social benefits (and far greater impact than taxation), in high-income countries and in Latin America. Furthermore, public services also create greater equality in the distribution of disposable income, through public sector employment, and through avoidance of 'catastrophic' expenditure.

Public ownership also increases democratic control and enables reduction of overall rise in share of profits (the Piketty effect).

---

[1] Annex A.

On the UK experience

The UK has seen growing public support for public ownership, and a return to public ownership of public services. One indicator is the public response to the 2017 elections during which the Labour Party released a manifesto in support, among others, of public ownership of water, energy grids and renewable generation, rail, and post. As a result, the Labour Party gained more than 40% of votes.

There is also an ongoing national campaign against privatization of public services. Dubbed "We Own It!", the campaign has been fighting against privatization since 2013, conducts research, highlights good practice in the public sectors. All these contributes to the aim of changing the discourse that private is better, and shifting the debate towards public ownership of essential services.

Public Services and Philippine/Asian Economic Development in Wicked and Contradictory Times[2]
Rene Ofreneo (Philippines)

The world faces 'confusing times'. On one hand, there are unparalleled technological advances such as artificial intelligence, the internet, drone-driven agriculture, etc., and yet more than 800 million people are starving, a third of the world's population is unemployed/underemployed, and inequality has grown so deep that eight persons own half of earth's wealth. Cold War has been replaced by the war on terror, and new global rivalries have emerged. Demagogues and strongmen/strongwomen are moving into high positions of power, offering draconian solutions to weak governance coupled with urgent, unmet peoples' needs.

The situation is further aggravated by the changing direction of globalization, as exemplified for example by US President Donald Trump and his protectionist 'America First' policy, and the IMF's issuances admitting that neo-liberalism had been over-sold and did not lead to benefits trickling down to the masses.

In Asia and Southeast Asia in particular, the World Bank (WB) and the Asian Development Bank's (ADB) warning of rising inequality has come to the fore. In the Philippines, 40 families (out of 105 million Filipinos) control the economy.

And yet, solutions offered by these international financial institutions are more of the same – among them, the "noodle bowl" of Free Trade Agreements. However, it must also be noted that the big powers in the region (Japan and China including the USA) have their respective national/global agendas that they defend as they enter into FTAs.

In effect, while neoliberal economics has lost its allure, it remains the dominant framework in global/regional trade talks and continues to guide macro-economic planning of many countries, which cover trade, investment, various sectors (industry-agriculture-services) and domestic competition. Neo-liberals have also adopted vocabulary of the CSOs – e.g., people empowerment, inclusive growth, sustainable development, gender equity, etc., while still upholding privatization, deregulation and trade/investment liberalization.
.

---

[2] Annex B.

In the face of the changing context, neo-liberals have begun undertaking "strategic" adjustments under an expanded and seemingly pro-people New Washington consensus. These include addressing 'moral hazards' such as (corruption), developing human capital, providing social protection for the poor (Bolsa de Familia in Latin America and 4Ps in the Philippines and bringing in some degree of regulation over business and financial practices.

From the structural adjustment of the 80s privatizing public assets, the Philippine government has gone on to privatizing several public services through so-called public-private sector partnerships (PPP). This mode was eventually supported as the primary mode of project implementation through the all-out privatization of infrastructure development and delivery of public services. There is no doubt, from the Vision statement of the Philippine Development Plan that neo-liberal economics will persist, and that trickle-down economics will remain despite evidence showing how it perpetuates poverty and deepens inequality.

In conclusion, there is need to –
- question privatization as motor of growth
- assert people's role in controlling delivery of public services
- learn from the good experiences and practices of other countries in building a truly inclusive, balanced and sustainable society through a strong public sector
- partnership of government (at all levels) with organized citizenry

---

PLENARY 2: Beyond States: Global/Regional Actors and Free Trade Agreements

---

Free Trade Agreements
Barry Coates (New Zealand)

The WTO General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS) was passed after heavy corporate lobbying. Although developing countries were provided safeguards, they have been under pressure to deregulate more sectors and facilitate market access.

The economic implications are huge, considering that services account for more than two-thirds of most economies, and an even higher share of employment. They cover important economic sectors, such as energy, transport and telecommunications; important environmental sectors such as waste, water and tourism; and vital public services including health care, education and social services. GATS further reinforced the race-to-the bottom for labour rights and wages, environmental and consumer protection, and for standards that are appropriate to cultures and each society. Social services opened to private investors led to provision based on the capacity to pay higher user fees and non-delivery for groups without the financial resources to do so.
Constraining the right to regulate, the GATS embodies an inherently deregulatory approach to services that denies countries the policy space to support their domestic suppliers. Once countries have made GATS commitments, the government cannot limit the number or size of suppliers in those sectors. It thus limits the government's right to regulate in the public interest, which includes consumer safety, public health, equal access to education, environmental protection, and action on climate change.

GATS does not directly mandate privatisation, but enables privatisation to occur since governments are bound not compete with or impede investments from flowing in by providing services themselves. Once commitments

have been made, they are almost impossible to reverse due to WTO conditions, including various compensatory measures. Technically, "services supplied in the exercise of governmental authority" are exempt, but since public services co-exist with private suppliers, this exception is practically irrelevant.

TiSA as a new threat

New services negotiations, the Trade in Services Agreement (TiSA), would not only have a blanket top-down approach, but would also allow multinationals to challenge government laws by asserting that the effect of the law is greater on them. Another dangerous provision that extends GATS and undermines government authority is that regulation should be "no more burdensome than necessary" to foreign investors. Worse than GATS, TiSA will pass the costs of deregulation onto vulnerable people, workers and the environment.

Leaked versions of the TiSA financial services chapter shows the extent of ambition by big banks such as Citicorp. for financial liberalization, regardless of whether domestic regulations discriminate against foreign investors. Information Technology multinationals want to prevent any restriction on data storage of data, while the US and other countries allow their national security agencies access to override privacy restrictions. Federal Express wants to tap into profitable delivery services . Walmart and retail giants want unrestricted access internationally, and fossil fuel corporations seek protection from discrimination despite their proven contributions to worsening climate change.

Even though most of the TiSA text and the offers of sectoral liberalisation have already been agreed, the election of President Trump has suspended US involvement, and TiSA negotiations are currently on hold. There is still time to defeat TiSA.

Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP)

The TPP met strong civil society opposition since it was signed in February 2106. Among its most dangerous provision is the Investor State Dispute Settlement (ISDS) mechanism which allows corporations to sue host governments over new laws or policies that reduce their profits on the grounds that they have not had 'fair treatment' or they have been disadvantaged compared to domestic companies or if their investment has been 'indirectly expropriated'. The adhoc ISDS panels have generally favored corporate interests, with over 60% of the awards to multinationals ranging from US$10 million to more than $1 billion. Only scant information on corporate claims has been leaked out due to the ISDS' opaqueness, but this already shows a sense of the damaging effects of ISDS on human rights, state regulatory authority and the environment.

While the TTP is at a virtual standstill because of the US' withdrawal, the Regional Comprehensive Economic Partnership (RCEP) is making headway among members of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) and 6 large economies in the region. Civil society has been actively involved in fighting RCEP, including through strong interventions at negotiating meetings on issues such as ISDS, impacts on public health and access to essential medicines, jobs and workers' rights, farmers and small food producers and fisheries. Governments will try to conclude RCEP negotiations in 2018. Civil society campaigning needs to mobilise across RCEP countries to defeat this push for pro-corporate rules in Asia.

Trade agreements like TiSA, TPP and RCEP are incompatible with affordable and accountable public services and the protection of the commons. Civil society has won important changes, which must be defended and maximized in in holding the line against these treaties that create new rights for multinationals. At the same time, we need to be set our vision on transforming trade and investment treaties on the basis of core principles that include fair trade and equitable sharing of benefits, ecological limits and sustainability, protection for human rights, and

respect for democracy. Treaties must exclude public services; desist from pressuring states to privatize; subjected to full transparency standards, monitoring and evaluation; ensure provisions for public consultation during the course of negotiations; and must be submitted before signing for parliamentary scrutiny, debate and decision.

Reclaiming public services:
Ending the private sector push from global institutions[3]
David Hall (UK)

Despite recognition that access to decent, essential public services is an inalienable right, millions of citizens are still denied access to essential services, in the OECD as well as developing countries. A massive scale-up of resources for investment in infrastructure is urgently needed, especially in marginalised and rural areas of low income countries. But these should be public investments, supporting the social contract between states and citizens, and built on accountability processes and public participation. They should also entail a transfer of resources to developing countries, a commitment still largely unfulfilled to provide financing for development, and reverse the outflow of economic, environmental, financial and human resources from South to North.

Public services should not be treated as commodities for trade and commercial profit. They fulfil essential social and economic needs that cannot be delivered by the free market. Government control and delivery of services is crucial for accountability and to ensure affordable and universal coverage. However, a powerful alliance of the global elites, International Financial Institutions (IFIs), free trade proponents, donors and the private sector continue to push private sector investment as the answer. Privatisation, corporatisation, contracting out and forms of private sector involvement, and in more recent years – Public-Private Partnerships (PPPs) – are promoted as the pathway to development, with trade treaties providing the framework to lock in a reduced role for the state.

Efforts to push PPPs among developing countries are continuing despite growing evidence of problems, and IFIs remain influential in driving their adoption among developing countries. IMF Managing Director Christine Lagarde said "we don't do that anymore", but practice shows otherwise. Pursuing past roles, IFIs provide grants and loans, give advice and technical assistance, promote regulatory change, monitor and evaluate projects, advocate for PPPs, act as intermediaries in negotiations, encourage donors funding, and partner with the private sector.

Accounting for only around 5% of OECD infrastructure, PPPs are being promoted by IFIs and donors among cash-strapped developing countries as the only way to access finance, both loans and grants. This is partly because PPPs are financed 'off balance sheet', which does not add to their debt levels. Fiscal responsibility is undermined by a lack of transparency over contract provisions, as well as a lack of disclosure of actual and contingent liabilities. This creates an incentive for politicians to regard PPPs as free money, ignoring the high costs in future years, the contingent costs of guarantees and the costs to users. PPPs are also seen as a way of hurdling capacity limitations within government to manage complex infrastructure projects. However, low capacity means governments may not fully understand the pitfalls of PPPs and have thus little negotiating leverage. As a result, PPPs are often weighted towards the interests of the private sector. PPPs are further promoted as more efficient than the public sector, although claims are not supported by objective evaluation. At best, the record is mixed, with poor PPP outcomes already documented in the health, education and water sectors in particular.

---

[3] Annex C.

Meanwhile, there is mounting evidence against PPPs across the OECD, being met by strong public and civil society campaigns to reclaim the services that have been privatised. Though information access is difficult, research by academics, NGOs, trade unions and research institutes reveal that costs are higher as investors demand a much higher rate of profit compared to similar projects in the OECD. Higher costs typically result from a number of factors, among them, higher borrowing costs for the private sector than for governments; complex transactions entailing higher costs; greater construction costs; and government guarantees on profits and against contractual changes.

PPPs investors cherry pick projects that can be profitable, such as in the case of a PPP for a new hospital in Lesotho, for which the IFC gained US$720,000 as success fee. Half the country's health budget was being spent on payments to the private consortium that built and runs the project, meaning that scarce public funds were being diverted for primary healthcare services in the rural areas where health indicators were comparatively poorer. Costs also escalated despite initial claims to the contrary, while investors were guaranteed a 25% return on their equity. The example also shows how investors create mechanisms to reduce their risk, and transfer it to the government. In other cases, governments agree to confidential guarantees for the exchange rate, level of demand or pricing that create contingent liabilities.

There is now a strong push to standardise PPP terms, paving the way for entrenching various advantages and privileges for private investors. Consistent with the trend of loading more risks onto governments, investors are gaining more protections to ensure their profits and investments. For example, the standard contract would give rights to multinational firms to circumvent local laws/courts and sue states under the discredited Investor-State Dispute Settlement (ISDS). So far, most ISDS cases have been decided in favor of the MNCs.

Civil society has had an impact on the design and implementation of PPPs – commissioning critical research, forming alliances, supporting partners, building campaigns and forming global advocacy alliances. A strong statement against PPPs and urging public alternatives was signed by 152 civil society organisations. Concerted joint action has been crucial in highlighting the failings, avoiding some of the worst abuses and helping to build civil society capacity.

The challenge is not to improve PPPs, but to end them, and reclaim public services. The model that multinationals will construct and deliver services for the benefit of citizens is flawed. Pressure needs to be mounted on the IFIs to back off from their support for PPPs and to support public sector alternatives. Accountability needs to be put back onto governments to deliver affordable, quality public services, as part of their social contract with citizens.

Addressing the problem of PPPs, the Labour Party put forward the following demands and calls:

- No new PPPs; end all existing PPPs
    – PFI/PPPs already discredited by parliamentary reports 2010/11
    – Problems exposed by collapse of PPP firm Carillion Jan 2018
    – Remunicipalisation of failed $1billion waste management PPP (Manchester) Sept 2017

- Deal with cost of compensation problem:
    – not by terminating contracts, which risks huge compensation
    – Rather nationalise the PPP companies: better prospect for compensation (at least in UK law, possibly others)

- International: stop the Department for International Development (DFID) promoting PPPs in developing countries

- Potentially: active support for alternatives

PLENARY 3: Sectoral Issues and Struggles

HOUSING/RIGHT TO THE CITY

Housing and Public Services[4]
Meena Menon (India)

Urban Poverty can be understood as a *lack of access* to basic services and basic social protection, caused and aggravated by various factors. Privatization of all services is pushing up profits and created huge disparity in most of the global south, Asia, and in Europe too, in times of 'austerity'. Social housing is either unavailable or inadequate. Housing has become inaccessible to most, even the middle class, because of the prevailing dominant market approach which has profit as its primary motive. Rental housing is totally privatised as well.

It is expected that 70% of world population will be urban by 2050, and that most urban growth will occur in less developed countries. We thus need to think seriously about our urban futures, and to see how urban can be sustainable.

Many consider the terms sustainability and urbanization as mutually exclusive. Is it possible to reverse urbanization? What is the role of technology? Should we think more around how cities will have to be made more sustainable, rather than the hope that cities can be done away with altogether at lease in the imminent future? Most important, what are the basic social needs of a population that is largely urban and how will they be met?

There is a need for a more comprehensive urban program of action, for more policy activism on sustainable cities, urban planning and sustainable urbanization. Urban activism will perhaps have to go beyond defensive struggles and evolve a better understanding of the urban space, solutions to urban poverty, and engagements with urban aspirations. This is critical, not only for the urban poor, but also to save the environment and the planet. Moreover, the idea that rural is naturally and environmentally sustainable and urban is as naturally destructive is clearly neither true nor useful. A discourse on sustainability will have to include the urban demographic in one way or another. Sustainable futures will need a comprehensive planning of both the rural as well as the urban to be effective. We must also evolve a better understanding of the urban space, find solutions to urban poverty, and engage with urban aspirations. But we do not have the luxury of time -- big cities in developing world are imploding.

A "demand...[for] a transformed and renewed access to urban life", the "right to the city" (RTC) was a phrase first used by Henri Lefebvre. Well-known thinker and urban geographer David Harvey developed the theoretical framework of this concept as one that is "far more than the individual liberty to access urban resources: it is a right to change ourselves by changing the city. ... The freedom to make and remake our cities and ourselves." Harvey further stated that the Right to the City is possible only through the "management of common property resources for individual and collective benefit".

RTC means urban poor must have access to all basic amenities, or they will be unable to survive in the city with any degree of dignity. Since there are no common lands, water, lakes, forests in the city, universal access to all

---

[4] Annex D.

basic amenities is possible only through subsidized public services, ensured by the state. Providing shelter is of no use if it is not accompanied by the conscious provision of access to urban services such as water, electricity, waste management, lighting, roads, transport, clean air, and open public spaces, proximity to schools, hospitals, etc., and self-sufficient in terms of employment opportunities so people do not have to travel far.

Governments signed on to the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) but they are not legally binding. They are nonetheless expected to establish a national framework for achieving this comprehensive set of demands. At the same time, global policy increasingly reduces the role of governments, while expanding that of private entities, corporations and the private sector. In this context, we must maximize the opportunity to pressure governments through Goal 11 which specifically seeks to "Make cities inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable".

Urban planning, as opposed to the market approach, must be multi-disciplinary and multi-dimensional in nature, intersecting the complex needs of urban life and stressing the uplift of the urban poor towards ending disparity. But there is massive urbanization process where the overriding interest is maximum return on investments. For the elite in the developing world, property is not only good asset creation, but a way to launder money. Land speculation, and change of land use and pro-land owners land acquisition laws have created immense pressure on land, and in most cities there is hardly any land for any public purpose. There is a freeze on social housing and on state-led rentals, such that consequently, home loans are increasing.

Real estate speculation has created immense pressure on land. Freeing land for public purpose, especially for housing cannot be done without a class-biased land acquisition. Excess land of the big urban landowners has to be acquired for housing the urban poor. It is possible to build enough social housing for all those who need it, and provide all public services as long as urban spaces are comprehensively planned to prevent centralizing land use.

To move towards a radical land policy, land acquisition or public purpose – or eminent domain -- needs further discussion. Big urban landlords are into land acquisition. Even so- called socialist governments and local authorities hesitate to nationalize. Many urban social movements also support the demand for individual ownership of plots. But protection of public property and public need should be more sacrosanct than the right to private property. We have had only few recent attempts to look at *commoning* urban land, such as housing cooperatives, common spaces.

In working towards a comprehensive approach for sustainable futures, we will need participatory, people – oriented, multi stakeholder planning mechanisms, catering to all the needs of all sections of the people. This will entail a comprehensive planning of both the rural as well as the urban. City planning should be climate friendly as well as based on locality-based self- sufficiency.

Elements of people's vision of the city should include citizens to develop alternative urban plans; a sustainable and equitable plan of the city; parameters on housing and physical infrastructure, labour and employment, social infrastructure, governance; multi-level dialogues involving citizen groups, experts and academicians, planners, municipalities, government; and building broad consensus and outreach.

The urban poor movement: securing urban spaces in the privatized city[5]
Eric Villanueva (Philippines)

---

[5] Annex E.

In 2008, the Supreme Court ordered government agencies to clear the waterways in Metro Manila of all obstructions, which included around 104,000 informal settler families living in waterway easements. But the settlers resisted the government's plan to relocate them, as usual, to distant off-city "socialized" housing sites. This input looks at how successful have they been.

As part of the context, the trend among internal migrants in the Philippines is to move to the richest metropolitan centers, which is their most preferred destinations because of comparatively higher wages, more opportunities for formal and informal employment and basic services that they could try to access. These areas continue to grow in density. For example, the top 200 cities already have a 49.7% share of the total Philippine population. The urban population is projected to reach 102 million by 2050.

Government's standard response, through the National Housing Authority (NHA), has been to build mostly off-city housing. NHA is currently constructing more than 100,000 housing units (mostly off-city) for informal settlers in danger zones, but it has been estimated that only *30,000 families have so far relocated to NHA-built resettlement sites.* This is because relocation to off-city resettlement sites is the option least preferred by the urban poor, and understandably so because of fundamental reasons -- the lack of access to water, power, and other essential services; lack of access to jobs; distance and, hence, high transportation costs to access livelihood opportunities in the cities.

They find, however, an inhospitable place where life is more difficult for the poor and low-income groups. These include difficulties in transportation, clean air, medical services, good schools, health services and air access; poor road conditions, prostitution and sexual harassment, natural hazards, various crimes, and the threat of eviction. Twenty percent of all Filipinos do not have access to safe, reliable water service due to number of reasons that include uncertain home tenures, right of way issues, steep capital costs per household for dispersed communities and geographical remoteness.

Off-city resettlement has been found to perverse socio-economic impacts: (1) loss of livelihood, (2) lack of adequate access to basic services, and (3) disruption of social networks. Compared to the ISFs who were resettled off-city and those that remained in-city, the income gap between the two groups rose to more than 50%. (World Bank, *Philippines Urbanization Review*, 2017.)

Along with the drive to push the urban poor out of the city is the unprecedented privatization of urban and regional planning. This features a handful of large property developers who have filled in governance gaps and assumed new planning powers. They play a growing role in mass transit and other infrastructures; cut through the congested and decaying spaces of the `public city' to allow for the freer flow of people and capital; and implant spaces for new forms of production and consumption into the urban fabric.

In 2010, Kilos Maralita (a national urban poor federation), together with socio-political movements, began organizing informal settlers in waterways danger zones in anticipation of government actions following the Supreme Court order. Large sub-city and inter-city coalitions where formed and consensus among the settlers were forged on how to relocate. From 2011- 2016, these efforts resulted in more than 10,000 families successfully securing financing for their in- city/ near city proposals, among many other gains.

Proposals on Informal Settlers and Social Housing were also put forward, urging government to adopt a number of measures, such as using the people's plan approach in social housing projects, particularly relocation of ISFs; securing in-city and near-city lands for socialized housing projects under ISF people's plans; providing funding for ISFs still in danger zones; and subsidizing social and project preparation and capacity-building in support of ISF housing proposals. These must be accompanied by provision of essential services and substantially improving

living conditions in existing government resettlement sites; and curbing corruption and unnecessary costs in social housing projects. Further proposed were establishing a regulatory and legal framework supportive of people's plans and housing cooperatives, and guaranteeing housing as a basic human right of all citizens; recognizing the housing cooperative ownership instrument; exempting all socialized housing from the capital gains tax; establishing the Department of Housing to integrate the functions of the National Housing Authority.

WATER

(Re)municipalisation in Catalonia and Spain[6]
Miriam Planas (Spain)

Building on many years of citizens' campaigning for basic rights and against corrupt practices of traditional politicians, a citizen-led, progressive coalition gained power in many Spanish cities in 2015, including Madrid and Barcelona. A wave of citizens' actions swept through these areas to reclaim public and democratic water from private control in several Catalan municipalities, creating a favourable political environment for remunicipalisation.

Valladolid (300,000 inhabitants) is the largest city to have remunicipalised water services in Spain after 20 years of privatization. The new government installed after the 2015 municipal elections decided to remunicipalise water services service. In July 2017, it created a public company to remunicipalise and recover water services. Within six months after remunicipalisation, the public company managed to increase by one percent the wages of workers which had been frozen for three years.

The second biggest remunicipalisation undertaking in Spain took place in Terrassa, fourth biggest city in Catalonia. A private company (Mina d'Aigües de Terrassa S.A.) managed the water service in Terrassa under a 75-year concession that was due to expire on 9 December 2016. Neighborhood associations, social movements and ordinary citizens began organizing in March 2014 to reclaim their water services from Mina. They created *Taula de l'Aigua*, a citizens platform aiming to recover direct public management of water in Terrassa, with

However, the progress has been slower compared to Valladolid due to the longer period of time that water services have been privatized. A lot of data has to be recovered, including the exact number of workers in the company. Two years of intensive informative and educational work done by Taula de l'Aigua succeeded in making the water issue central to the political agenda. In July 2016, the City Council approved a motion in favour of direct management of water. Mina challenged the Council's decision to end the concession and return the water system to the city government by filing a court case in December 2016, but so far it has only managed to secure temporary contract extensions. In the meantime, Taula de l'Aigua continued to promote the management model approved by the Terrassa Citizen Parliament in February 2017, to make sure the recovery of public water in Terrassa is also a step forward in managing water as a common good.

The remunicipalisation trend continues in Spain. In 2018, the first Catalan Association of Cities and Entities for Public Water Management was formed. This initiative originated from a conference in Madrid in November 2016 that for the first time brought together cities, water operators and social movements to work for remunicipalisation in Catalonia.

---

[6] Annex F.

The Agbar group (of which Mina is a subsidiary) has strategies of its own to. It has managed to have a provision included in the state general budget that makes it difficult for public companies to hire workers from the private sector once remuniciaplisation happens. It also persists in appealing against remunicipalisation by campaigning through various media.

This was met by citizens actions such as the signature campaign launched in Barcelona last December 2017. In less than two months, more than 15,000 signatures were collected. The citizens initiative also held an assembly of more than 100 people, media campaigns, exhibitions, conferences and a solidarity concert. Fifty associations came on board the citizens' initiative.

To counter Agbar's moves, alliances must be strengthened among and between cities, civil societies and water operators. Remunicipalisation must be used as an opportunity to build a new model that secures social control. In the case of water, this should take into account the limits of the ecosystem. In re-appropriating the limits to water, the human right to water must be applied. Remunicipalisation is not only about reclaiming public water but also about reappropriating democracy and finding new ways of democracy.

Citizens' Lawsuit Against Water Privatization in Jakarta[7]
Alghiffari Aqsa (Indonesia)

Strategic litigation, used by the Jakarta Legal Aid Institute and KIARA in the legal fight to reverse water privatization in Jakarta, refers to a type of lawsuit that aims to bring about change in the substance, structure and culture of the law. It requires several elements: conducting in-depth research, involving affected grassroots communities; and creating a social movement that brings together civil society, undertakes strong campaigning and mobilizes the people.

Jakarta's water privatization was clinched by the World Bank in 1992 when it loaned USD92 million to the state water facility, PAM Jaya, with the condition for the privatization of the city's water infrastructure. The succeeding years would see foreign, local private corporations and politically influential, wealthy Indonesians joining forces to invest into the privatization undertaking. These included Thames Water Overseas, Ltd. (UK), Suez Lyonnaise des Eaux (France), the Salim Group and President Soeharto's own son. In 1997, Suez and Thames Water signed a 25-year contract with PAM JAYA for the management of Jakarta's water under the new privatized set-up. A new contract was signed in 2001 between the city-owned PAM Jaya and the concessionaires Suez and Thames; this was done without the approval of the Jakarta governor.

Building on many years of struggle, the Peoples Coalition Against Water Privatization in Jakarta (KMMSAJ) through The Right to Water Advocacy Team, filed a Citizens Lawsuit before the Central Jakarta District Court, against President and Vice President of Indonesia, ministry and local government officials, among others. The lawsuit charged them with several offenses that included violating the Indonesian Constitution and other laws; nepotism and corruption; constraining the state water facility's authority to manage water; adversely affecting citizens' access to water especially the poor who could not afford rising water tariffs, and their health because of the poor water quality; and losses in state revenues.

The complainants were comprised of leaders of Women Solidarity (Jakarta Branch), Friends of the Earth Indonesia (Jakarta Branch), Peoples Coalition on Rights to Water (KRUHA), and the Urban Poor Consortium.

---

[7] Annex G.

The legal battle first won in 2015 at the Central Jakarta District Court, which found merit in the lawsuit, saying that the defendants failed to fulfill the residents' right to water and also violated the law by handing over the city's water operation to private companies. As stated in the Indonesian Constitution and the Water Resource Law: "Water shall be under the power of the state and be used to the greatest benefit of the people".

However, the defendants appealed and the decision was overturned by a higher court, stating that the plaintiffs did not have legal standing and that the complaint did not fulfill the criteria of a Citizens Lawsuit.

KMMSAJ then filed an appeal before the Supreme Court. Finally, in October 2017, it succeeded in winning a favorable verdict. The SC annulled the district court's decision and granted part of the plaintiff's lawsuit. It also declared that the defendants failed to fulfill the right to water of their citizens, and caused losses to the Jakarta government and its constituents. It ordered the defendants to stop water privatization in Jakarta; return water management to PAM Jaya, as provided by law; and conduct water management according to the right to water principle as stated in International Covenant on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights that has been ratified by Law No. 12/2005, and General Comment No. 15/2012 on Right to Water.

The fight is not yet over. The contract is still valid since there is no explicit verdict to annul the contract. Furthermore, the government has to pay 2-4 trillion if it wants to withdraw from the contract before its expiration in 2022. The impacts on investments and the possibility of being sued in arbitration court can prevail upon government to maintain the privatized set-up.

Thus, as part of the struggles ahead, the Coalition will persist in demanding the SC to execute the court decision; reconsolidate the grassroots organizations and networks; exert public pressure on the government and water companies to follow the court decision; promote the concept of remunicipalization and recommend the formation of a remunicipalization team. It is expected that the water companies will take action through arbitration and the coalition will need all the support and solidarity from international networks.

TRANSPORT

Public services for all: Transportation
Two cases from Croatia[8]
Mladen Domazet (Croatia)

Framing this input is political ecology – an approach that combines the instruments of ecology and political economy, in order to explain relations between humans and nature. Specific focus is placed on the different outcomes of social and cultural norms that determine how different communities can access Nature (resources and services).

This approach has been used in on-going research in the sectors of water (public water management company); communal services (water and waste) in four Croatian cities; railways; and electricity production. Its main aims are to use public companies as a showcase of democratising the state and opening doors for incremental introduction of commons based principles into governance models; develop arguments for social movements and initiatives (in cooperation) that will back up (following failed privatisation and PPP attempts by government)

---

[8] Annex H.

transformation of public companies; increase capacity for regular social control over public companies; gain broader social support for improvement of services and social impact of public companies; and develop hybrid public – civic collaborative models of governance systems.

Transport and other infrastructure are still publicly held in Croatia. However, problems of corruption, inefficiency, poor quality of service, high indebtedness, etc., exist, and serve to embolden proponents of privatizing governance and public infrastructure through various ways such as through divestment, concessions and public-private partnerships. Transport is one of the targeted sectors.

Croatian Highways is is a publicly owned company that functions as the administrator of most of the highway network. It is important in linking the Adriatic and Continental regions, providing a conduit for major cargo transport, servicing the tourist industry and Adriatic) and serving as the means for international transit. It has been wracked by massive corruption scandals.

In 2013, the national highways infrastructure was turned over to a private concesssion. The state guarantees the number of cars on the highways or pays financial compensation. This concession would lock Croatian inter-city transport strategy into road transport for next 40 years, at the expense of railways despite environmental, social and financial advantages.

A civic coallition of trade unions and CSOs is opposing this concession. They conducteed a citizens petition -- referendum on *Highways* consession "We Won't Give Our Highways" initiative -- asking for a national referendum on the privatisation of highways governance.

Although the effort managed to collect more than the minimum number of signatures required for a referendum, the constitutional court ruled against holding the referendum. Nonetheless, the government was forced to step down in the face of public opposition to the concession plan. It then announced the restructuring of the public company.

The Institute of Political Ecology, based on its 2016 research, developed various proposals: democratisation of governance of the *Croatian Highways;* changing the performance criteria from profit to physical and social accessibility, road safety, ecological footprint, workers rights, financial sustainability, quantity of cargo transport, and equitable regional development.

The *Croation Railways* is another publicly owned company that IPE studied. With the overall goal of advocating alternatives and improvements, the research in 2015 aimed to map the governance of railway services in EU countries; analyse current process of governing railway services in Croatia; and assess the results of governing services.

The Croatian railways management and service facing significant problems, such as the absence of coordination among the three public companies running the sub -sectors (passenger, cargo, infrastructure); very poor quality of railway service due to poor infrastructure resulting in declining ridership); corruption cases in public procurements procedures; and the continued presence in the company of a politically appointed management (though already previously downgraded). The research found private rail cargo companies cherry-picking profitable aspects of business to buy. Management was also involved in manipulating and sowing disunity in the railway workers unions. These cases typify the neo-liberal push in Europ's railways.

But there are also several cases of democratised railway companies: multi-stakeholder cooperatives and not-for-profit railway companies. Recommendations put forward for the Croation railways included developing a long-

term transport strategy which includes a railway sector; uniting the 3 public railway companies into one holding company; creating common benchmarks for annual assessment of public railway companies: quality of service (speed, comfort, punctuality, safety), physical and social access to railway services, ecological and financial sustainability, gender equality, workers rights, transparency of procurement, participation of citizens and clients; enabling unification of all the railway unions; establishing association of railway users; and changing the composition of the Supervisory Board of the 3 public railway companies to include additional representatives of workers, users (citizens and industry), external experts, NGOs, etc.

Commons-based proposals are needed to fight back the *economism* logic. There are alternatives that include various forms of public and civic partnership in action; introducing social and ecological dimensions beyond profit; developing forms of participation in governance structures and supervisory bodies of public transport companies; adopting digital tools to monitor transactions of public companies; and strengthening and diversifying supervisory role of bodies in public companies.

OPEN FORUM

- How do you get out of these agreements, e.g., infrastructure projects dating decades back and with sovereign guarantees. It traps us in perpetual debt bondage.

  o Look at the enforcement clause of each contract. Taking over the company can be considered. Change the process of arbitration. Pursue action based on the Concept of illegitimate PPP debt. Challenge legally.
  o London PPPs included a break clause in the contract. Look for break clauses.

- The Philippines is the only country with automatic appropriations for debt service. We were able to secure from congress a provision to conduct a debt audit of 20 loans. Unfortunately it did not move. This provision remains in the 2018 budget, and there is also a pending Senate resolution on debt audit of all loans. So these are opportunities we can tap into.
- It is necessary to look into global consultancies and the failure of these consultancies.
- On engaging TNCs based on OECD guidelines 2011; developments on the campaign or binding treaties for TNCs
  o There are some aspects of the OECD guidelines that can be used. The issue of international regulation of TNCs is crucial.
- There is a need to elevate the discourse. There is so much effort on emotions rather than empirical data. There is a need to bring it down to the masses.
- On the production of ideas -- Even the discourse is a struggle. There are alternative discourses and research. There is a need to bring in politics in the discourse on public services.
  o Look at the link between public procurement and multinationals
  o Ineffectiveness of government has contributed to the acceptability of privatization
- How do we capacitate the government to undertake effective public services?
  o There is no free lunch. There is no magic product. We need to look past the false promises. All the promises of privatization have been shown to be false.
  o we should look at the push for reclaiming public services vs. the lack of consumer movement/group

Break Out Groups
Housing, Water and Transport

Workshop questions:

1. What are the issues and struggles in reclaiming our public services on … (health, water, transportation, housing, education and energy)? What are the urgent challenges related to these issues and struggles?
2. What are the existing policies, programs and practices?
3. Who are the major stakeholders, players of the sector involved in the challenges and/or barriers?

Workshop 1: Transport

Brief background:

With the onslaught of neo-liberal globalization, states are forced to accede to the international order. Trade liberalization, deregulation and privatization of public utilities and services are the order of the day. In many countries, states have succumbed to the structural adjustment policies and to multi-lateral and bilateral agreements of free trade that led to privatization of several public utilities and services, to the detriment of its citizens and to the benefit of trans-national companies.

Transport has been identified as one of the important sectors that people must reclaim from corporate control and privatization in the interest of the common good.

Issues that need to be addressed

1. Ecological issues

In most developing countries, air pollution is a problem and to address this, various forms of public transportation are being targeted for upgrading, if not phase-out. Even as the biggest emitters of greenhouse gases (GHGs) are developed countries, governments of developing countries are slowly transitioning from crude oil usage to euro 4 fuels or electric-supported vehicles.

In the Philippines, this was met with strong resistance from transport groups because there are no plans in place for a just transition to a low carbon economy. The transition to e-transport is anti-poor as this solution will only benefit big businesses and big car manufacturers. The timeline to the transition cannot be met by small jeepney drivers and operators and this will lead to the corporatization of public transport in the jeepney sector[9].

---

[9] The National Transport Workers Union in the Philippines and an affiliate of SENTRO submitted a specific proposals on jeepney modernization entitled: "No Phase Out Without Just Transition and Just Modernization".

Another issue is the congestion in urban areas where business, investments and dwelling places are concentrated. The population is quite high and all those factors related to these developments naturally attract migration from rural areas to urban areas to look for work opportunities.

2. Infrastructure

Indebtedness (sovereign guarantee) - This pertains to the State's foreign borrowings from countries such as China to finance its ambitious development plan. The "Build, build, build" program of the current administration is significantly supported by the China-Philippines partnership, under which the Philippines' continued control over several strategic areas is contingent on the ability to pay debts owed to China.

PPS - in the event that the Government needs additional funds and operators of a certain project and service, the government can enter into a private partnership with a corporation. In this case, the contractor can exact possibly higher fees to recover its investments and maintenance of the project, as in the terms of Build-Operate-Transfer schemes.

3. Geographical concerns

Rural to Urban (by sea or air) – people's access to other parts of their country should not be constrained by the high cost of air and sea fares. The importance of mobility to its citizens -- where he/she wants to go either to work, to spend vacations or raise a family -- must be recognized by the government through such means as putting in place enabling policy.

4. Economic Agenda

Transport system (tourism, consumerism) - to cater the business needs, the transport system in this regard is designed to meet its main objective, and that is Profit. Where malls, amusement parks and tourism areas are developed, the government , private companies and even individual operator and driver develop a route and a system to ensure that people from different strata of the society will go or pass by these areas that will eventually consumed food or buy products or avail of its services.

5. Corporatization

E- transport- if the transport groups cannot meet the guidelines set by the Government in acquiring e transport for instance, this kind of transport system will only lead to business control and oligopoly of business oligarchs in the country.

6. Corruption

Most government agencies that handle public transport rules and regulations are prone to corruptions. Illegal terminals set on the streets, franchising, opening of routes are some of the facts related to issues on corruption. With the system already entrenched in the agencies' culture, it need an organized and sustainable campaign by all party in interest, particularly the social movements to eradicate corruption in the future.

7. High cost of transportation

Because transportation is relative to every day's life, it is one of the basic public services that government should look into. There are several factors in the high cost of transportation that were mentioned herein, high cost of

fuel due to VAT, the unregulated petroleum industry, big business role in the transport system among others. If the state in the short term will not strongly regulate the architect of the transport profit regime, the cost of transportation will always be high.

8.   Life and Work Balance

Because of the rapid urbanization, this may result to health problems/hazards and safety and should be addressed. Moreover, long working hours and severe traffic congestion will have a negative result to the productivity of the workers, time for leisure and relaxation and stress that affects the life and work balance of every individual.

3 Major Issues

1.   Transport System – The state should reclaim its function/role in developing a transport system that is controlled by the government, publicly owned and managed particularly railways, shipping and jeepneys.

2.   IT Platform- the agencies that manage the transportation regulation, traffic and other technological platforms and devices should be coordinated and managed by the state and not by big businesses. The role of the government to regulate must benefit the riding public and not the big corporations or businesses.

3. Planning- the right of the people particularly the marginalized sectors in the transport industry to participate in the planning, governance and monitoring of the transport system in their own country. This is to institutionalize the check and balance between the government and its people.

What is to be done?

1. Continue to campaign vs. PPP, debt issues.

2. Ensure that CSOs must be active participants and articulate advocator of its agenda in the government by continuing to engage in government planning with the end of view of sustainability of the plans in the sector and for efficiency of services delivery as their participation will contribute to economic development as well. In doing so, life and work balance must continue to be in the mainstream of all the plans in the sector. Parallel to these, strengthen and expansion of organized groups that will engaged the government and big businesses at the local, regional and international level is imperative.

3. Involve Unions, NGOs, Commuters group/ participation of all interested groups in strategizing to reclaim the transport system to be truly for the public good.

Workshop 2: Housing

1.   Issues

  •   Insecure housing tenure, inadequate and unsafe housing, poor access to basic amenities, and threats of evictions and demolitions continue to beset millions of people who are known as the urban poor, squatters, or informal settlers.

- The business sector controls most lands and influences urban planning in a way that marginalizes housing for the poor.

- Land and housing are becoming less and less affordable to ordinary families, both in the rich and in the poor countries.

- The housing problem is a manifestation of class conflicts, with one side of the conflict -- the homeless, the poor, the ordinary workers -- demanding recognition of housing as a basic right of all citizens.

- Policy support to decent, adequate, and affordable housing is lacking, or poorly implemented by governments.

- Financing and funding allocations for housing are not enough or not efficiently used to address homelessness and poor housing conditions

- In the Philippines, government housing projects, implemented through the National Housing Authority, are poorly built, inadequate, ridden with corruption, distant from in-city jobs, and unresponsive to the needs of the urban poor.

- In government housing resettlement sites in the Philippines, amortization payments are very low due to inadequate incomes. Many families are compelled by their circumstances to illegally sell or transfer the rights to their housing units to move back to in-city informal settlements, where they have better access to odd jobs.

- In the Philippines, government-built housing is least preferred by the urban poor, who instead demand public financing for their own housing projects that they aim to undertake to implement and manage through their cooperatives and associations.

- Few applications for housing financing are coming from the urban poor informal settlers due to lack of capacity.

- In Europe, the management of public housing projects turned bad after tenant takeover.

2. Actions

- Work for comprehensive public policy and funding support for socialized housing. Demand government accountability on its obligation to provide for housing.

- Demand the exercise of the power of eminent domain by public authorities to ensure the availability of land for socialized housing.

- Support public financing to people's housing proposals. Encourage informal settlers to come up with their own proposals and plans for on-site slum redevelopment or for in-city resettlement.

- Document and share people's narratives, success stories, and feasible solutions on housing.

- Adopt diverse socialized housing solutions and models that ensure adequacy, resiliency, and affordability. Adopt diverse ownership governance modalities, such as public rental housing and cooperative housing.

- Support the capacity-building efforts for organizations concerned with housing, including the associations and cooperatives of home seekers and home dwellers.

Workshop 3: Water

Issues

Different issues still preventing enjoyment of the right to water and enabling water privatization abound across the region. For one, in areas that have already been privatized, such as Jakarta and Metro Manila, we see the continuous rise in tariffs even as water quality and service remain problematic; the adverse effects on poor peoples' access; the lack of citizens' participation, transparency and accountability of both concessionaires and state agencies; corruption and mismanagement; and dodging tax responsibilities, among others.

At the same time, other problems have cropped up or are intensifying. Problems at source, for example, are becoming more felt in the increased scarcity and contamination of water resources. As well, corporations are steadily gaining new rights such that they are now entities at par with governments and can sue them in arbitral courts or through the Investor-State Dispute Settlement mechanism, which is gaining greater reach.

In the face of these persistent issues, we face the huge challenge of reinvigorating the struggles against privatized water and mobilizing the people.

Strategies

Organization is a key strategy towards educating and mobilizing people. In Cebu, a province in Southern Philippines, we formed a broad coalition called the Cebu United Forces for Sustainable Water to confront the privatized arrangement embedded in bulk water projects, water scarcity and corruption. Another coalition based in Manila remains active in campaigning and addressing water issues.

For PSI, it is important that we continue to debunk the myth of water privatization. Through the links we make between trade unions and community groups, we popularize the message that water is a human right and must not be subjected to the profit-driven motivations of private investors.

Part of unmasking the false promises of water privatization is maximizing public finance issues. These include exposing corporate profits vis-à-vis the ways they cut corners on capital expenditures to improve quality, delivery and adequacy. We also show how corporations pass on to the public, by way of higher tariffs, the costs (e.g., corporate income taxes) that should be borne by any regular business enterprise.

Pressing for informed public participation is another fight we are waging. The regime of arbitration as the prime and only way of settling contractual violations and other disputes must be resisted because it robs citizens of the right to intervene on a vital resource, and because of its inherent opaqueness, effectively shields corporations and complicit government officials from public scrutiny and accountability.

The demand for a central government agency focused on water has been raised to deal with fragmented policies, varying contexts and unmet needs, and other water-related issues.

What is to be done?

Peoples' organizations and social movements use various forms of advocacy and campaigning that have collectively contributed to expose and consequently weaken the privatization discourse. But in the backlash from corporations, persistent and new challenges are ever-present and need to be addressed and resisted. Some of the ways we can continue to strengthen our fight for water in public hands are --

- Taking advantage of existing platforms such as the World Water Forum.
- Collaborating and mobilizing within and across countries for global/regional actions during the World Water Day.
- Linking with trade justice movements in the fight against unequal trade agreements, particularly provisions for ISDS.
- Linking with trade unions in advocacies and campaigns on tax and fiscal justice.
- Strengthening solidarity in our struggles, not only in fighting against water privatization but also defending the gains of our organizations and movements.
- Continuing our knowledge-building efforts by sharing campaign lessons and good practices.
- Build/sustain consumer networks.

PLENARY 4: Our Alternatives to Reclaim Public Services

Remunicipalisation and Re-nationalisation[10]
Satoko Kishimoto

Thousands of politicians, public officials, workers and unions, and social movements are working to reclaim or create effective public services. They do this most often at the local level. Our research shows that there have been at least 835 examples of (re)municipalisation[11] of public services worldwide in recent years, involving more than 1,600 cities in 45 countries. Remunicipalisation is taking place in small towns and in capital cities across the planet, following different models of public ownership and with various levels of involvement by citizens and workers.

Out of this diversity a coherent picture is nevertheless emerging: it is possible to reclaim or build effective, democratic and affordable public services. Ever-declining service quality and ever-increasing prices are not inevitable. More and more people and cities are closing the chapter on privatisation, and putting essential services back into public hands. Contradicting the prevailing narrative that public services are too expensive, local

---

[10] Annex I.

[11] We use 'remunicipalisation' to refer to the process of bringing previously private or privatised services under public control and management at the local level. We are aware that a term it is not always entirely adequate, as in some cases the reclaimed services have always been in private hands, or did not previously exist. In these instances, 'municipalisation' would be a more adequate term. (Re)municipalisation covers both instances. There are also examples of public services that have been de-privatised at the national level. We treat such 'renationalisations' separately in order to focus on local actions and also because some forms of renationalisation (when it concerns centralising power or temporarily rescuing failed private companies) do not fall within the scope of our research. Finally, there are numerous examples of citizens and users taking the lead in reclaiming essential services from commercial entities to run them on a non-profit basis for their communities. For us, these cases also fall under (re)municipalisation insofar as they are oriented toward public service values and non-commercial objectives. De-privatisation then serves as an overarching term for (re)municipalisation, renationalisation and citizen-led reclaiming of public services, all of which are oriented towards fighting against the ills of privatisation.

authorities and citizen groups are demonstrating that (re)municipalisation addresses people's basic needs and our wider social and environmental challenges is possible.

Remunicipalisation is rarely just about the change of ownership structure from private to public. It is fundamentally about (re)creating better public services that work for all. This includes restoring a public ethos, universal access, affordability and ensuring transparency and accountability towards elected officials and citizens as opposed to focusing only on the most lucrative parts of the service.

Remunicipalisation is a local response to austerity. Energy (311 cases) and water (267 cases) are the sectors providing the most examples of (re)municipalisation. Roughly 90 per cent of (re)municipalisations in the energy sector took place in Germany (284 cases), the country famous for its ambitious Energiewende policy. Water remunicipalisation has occurred most in France (106 cases), the country with the longest history of water privatisation and home to leading water multinationals Suez and Veolia.

Remunicipalisation is rarely just about the change of ownership structure from private to public. It is fundamentally about (re)creating better public services that work for all. This includes restoring a public ethos, universal access, affordability and ensuring transparency and accountability towards elected officials and citizens as opposed to focusing only on the most lucrative parts of the service. This is why several British cities have created new municipal energy companies: to do away with private shareholders, dividends and bonuses and to shift the focus to access to energy for poorer households.

Remunicipalised public services often involve new forms of participation for workers and citizens. For example, the new water operators in Paris, Grenoble and Montpellier are making decisions together with citizens about the reform and operation of water services. In Norway, tripartite co-operation in which trade unions, the municipality and local politicians dialogue to solve workplace issues have a proven track record in improving public services. The democratisation of public services is also at the centre of the remunicipalisation movement in Spain, which was born in the aftermath of the global financial crisis from the resistance against evictions and water and electricity cuts.

Finally, remunicipalisation is often a first step towards creating the public services of the future: sustainable and grounded in the local economy. Inspiration can be found in the European towns and villages aiming for 'zero waste' with their remunicipalised waste service, or providing 100 per cent local, organic food in their remunicipalised school restaurants. Public services are not perfect just because they are public. Public services must also continuously improve and renew their commitments to society.

The diverse forms of public-public partnerships are flourishing. We see it in the way that municipalities and citizens have joined forces in Germany and beyond to push genuine energy transitions. The new Nottingham municipal energy company catalysed similar experiences in other cities, and eventually resulted in a common partnership. The French and Catalonian networks of public water operators pool their resources and expertise, and work together in dealing with the challenges of remunicipalisation. More than 200 Norwegian municipalities exercise local tripartite co-operations with trade unions to make public services efficient and democratic. Over 2,300 cities throughout Europe have united to oppose the EU-US TTIP free trade agreement as well as similar deals based on liberalisation and privatisation policies. The progressive coalition Barcelona en Comú and many other related coalitions in Spain have articulated a global 'municipalist' vision within which they practice diverse forms of direct participatory democracy and work pragmatically for solutions to global challenges.

The resurgence of (re)municipalisation provides an important window of opportunity for citizens and workers to regain the democratic control that has been eroded by privatisation over the past decades. Evidence is building

that people are able to reclaim public services and usher in a new generation of public ownership. Fortunately the momentum is building, as diverse movements and actors join forces to bring positive change in our communities.

Public Services as Social Commons: Democratization and Participation[12]
Francine Mestrum

Oxfam's study on inequality cites an example of stark inequality – four days of work of a CEO equals a whole life of work for a Bangladeshi textile worker. This inequality is unsustainable, and is a problem of social justice, as much as it is a problem of re-production.

But how does one solve these problems? For interntional financial institutions, the way forward is achieving growth and redistributing the fruits of such growth. But the Oxfam data shows this does not work – so now the poor have to produce the growth themselves

Structural adjustment was supposed to boost growth but it only deepened inequality. It led to the dismantling of welfare states, violations of labour rights and to states withdrawing from public services to hand them over to the private sector. Privatization and neoliberal globalization enabled and promoted land grabbing, monopolizing seeds, destroying forests, eroding health services, public transport, education systems, and the like. There has indeed been redistribution, but from the poor to the rich.

Under this set-up, all that was collectively owned, such as land and forests and seas, but alo economic and social rights, and public services, is being taken over by big business and private investors. In the olden days, this was called the "enclosure of the commons"; today we know it as accumulation by disposession (David Harvey).

To live, we need to produce and re-produce. Our social protection systems with labour rights and public services, education, health care, housing, water, etc. are part of this reproduction system which people need to live, work and survive. But this system is in crisis, and it is a crisis of re-production.

Employment increasingly fails to sustain livelihoods. We see this in fisheries, bio-factories, privatized health and education. People must reclaim all these public services and goods they need to survive, for they are crucial for production and re-production. These good are our commons, and we should not allow new enclosures to block or constrain peoples' access to this social commons, which is key to our survival.

By social commons, we mean collective 'ownership'/responsibility and democratisation of access to public services. This is not necessarily state-owned and provided because many states as well as municipalities are not democratic. The social commons go beyond states and markets, beyond the private vs. the public, but NOT WITHOUT states and markets, nor without private and public ownership. That is not the central question.

What IS central in matter of the social commons?
- We will always need states/public authorities to uphold and fulfill human rights, redistribution, security, anti-discrimination, but another kind of State, which is a kind of public service itself.
- Markets should not be banned; but commons is based on use value, not exchange value
- Private ownership can be excluded, to the greatest extent possible, but this should not in any way give absolute rights to owners.

---

[12] Annex J.

- The role of citizens and their organisations/trade unions
- The commons is the result of a shared process of decision-making, the constitution of the 'we' in a political community – at whatever level you want to work: local, national, regional, global.
- The commons concerns the responsibility citizens want to take for their common goods, their use, their regulation, their monitoring
- This should happen in the framework of general rules concerning security, non-discrimination, and in cooperation with public authorities.

The Social Commons is a solution to inequality and the crisis of re-production. To realize it, we need a processes of "Commoning" which implies and means –
- re-imagining all our institutions, politics, economics and social relationships
- developing and instituting new social practices in a new context of individual freedom and collective responsibility
- democratizing democracy itself, re-thinking solidarity
- citizens building power together

The Social Commons further offers a participatory and emancipatory way of defending individuals and society, of organising public services, and a strategic tool to fight neoliberalism, privatisation and commodification.

Social commons is transformative when applied consistently. They allow changing power relations, the economic system and the preservation of the sustainability of life, of humans, of society and nature.

For the Left, the language of commons – an old practice – offers an opportunity to re-define its strategies, to renew its thinking on production, markets, nature and states; to build a new narrative to better organise our resistance to neoliberal and conservative forces.

Destroying public services is destroying society, social relationships, solidarity and collective values. Preserving and promoting public services is promoting citizenship and the sovereignty of people.

PLENARY 5: Organising our Public Services

Tax and Fiscal Justice: Financing for Essential Social Services[13]
Mae Buenaventura

Around 1.2 billion people in Asia and the Pacific live on less than $3.10 a day, with one-third barely surviving on less than $1.90 a day. In stark contrast, the number of billionaires in Asia rose from 558 to 680 from March 2016

---

[13] Annex K.

to 2017, or an additional 122 billionaires in just a year. Their combined wealth ballooned by $404 billion over the same period. Globally, in the last 12 months, the wealth of billionaires increased by $762 billion, of which more than half ($404 billion) went to Asian billionaires (Oxfam).

The Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) are supposed to signal a change in ambition, based on overall requirements of additional public financing annually. Estimates peg this at around 27% of GDP of low-income countries (LICs), and 7% of GDP of lower-middle income countries (LMICs), which translate to additional financial requirement of around $1.4 trillion annually. All in all, $343-360 billion is needed by LICs and $900-944 billion by LMICs to achieve the SDGs. But there is a gap of $150 billion or more each year. For low-income countries where financing needs are much greater, even if they reach their revenue targets, these will not fill the public financing gap.

It has thus grown even more urgent to effectively plug the loopholes through which revenues, both actual and potential, are being siphoned out of developing countries and into the private coffers of corporations and ultra-wealthy, politically influential elites through legal and illegal means.

Illicit financial flows (IFFs) – negative flows of financial resources that are largely legal but highly iniquitous – resulted in US$620 billion - 970 billion bleeding out of the developing world as of 2014. Similarly damaging are illicit inflows (technical smuggling) estimated at $1.4-$2.5 trillion in 2014 (Global Financial Integrity). Combined, illicit outflows and inflows accounted for 14.1 - 24.0% of total developing country trade over 2005-2014. An average of 87% of illicit financial outflows over the 2005-2014 period was traced primarily to fraudulent mis-invoicing of trade. (http://www.gfintegrity.org/press-release/new-study-illicit-financial-flows-in-developing-countries-large-and-persistent/)

Corporate tax abuse - Profit shifting and tax dodging (evasion and avoidance) by corporations is said to cost all countries an estimated total of $600 billion in annual revenue losses. But the impacts are differentially heavier for developing countries. As a share of GDP and total tax revenues, the most intense losses were suffered by low- and lower middle-income countries, and across sub-Saharan Africa, Latin America and the Caribbean, and South Asia. (https://www.taxjustice.net/2017/03/22/new-estimates-tax-avoidance-multinationals/) Tax abusive behavior of corporations costs developing countries at least $100 billion/year. (https://www.oxfam.org/en/even-it/paradise-papers-hidden-costs-tax-dodging)

Enabling factors built into a fragmented financial architecture driven by self-interest corporations and rich elites, aid this hemorrhaging of financial resources from the South. We must stress that North governments are also complicit, as they wash their hands of historical responsibility in the erosion of domestic resources and urge developing countries to curb tax abuse to fund the SDG's rollout.

Tax havens/financial secrecy jurisdictions is one major enabling factor but the biggest of these that belong to the OECD (e.g., Luxemburg, Liechtenstein, etc.) are not named by this rich-club of only 35 member-countries. Almost 70% of world trade occurs via MNCs, and many of them use subsidiaries in tax havens where corporate income tax is nil or very low and where offshore accounts are assured an almost impenetrable cloak of financial secrecy beyond public scrutiny, national regulation and law enforcement. Nine out of ten of the world's 200 companies use tax havens, which is hardly surprising considering that corporate investment in tax havens grew four times from 2001 - 2014. Studies calculate that at least $24 - $36 trillion in anonymous private financial wealth, most of which belong to the top 0.1 percent of the world's richest, are stashed in more than 90 financial secrecy jurisdictions worldwide (James Henry). US companies alone (and only 50) accounted for $1.6 trillion as 2015. (https://thewire.in/180013/asias-regional-tax-wars-indicate-time-review-tax-incentives/; https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/panama/2016-04-12/taxing-tax-havens)

National governments must also be taken to account for the revenue-eroding policies and programs meant to attract investments, despite no sound supporting evidence. One of the most privileged sectors enjoying a range of tax and non-tax perks is the mining industry. The biggest producer and user of coal, Semirara Mining and Power Corporation, is a case in point. While it claims contributing heftily to national income, it gains much more from very generous tax incentives provided by the government.

Governments further enter without benefit of public debate and consultation into Bilateral Tax Treaties (BTTs), of which the most damaging to the sovereign authority of taxation are BTTs with developed countries. Developing countries (investment-receiving) give up more of their sovereign taxing authority than developed countries (investment-sending).

As a consequence of revenue loss due to tax incentives, lowering corporate income taxes, free trade agreements, corruption, etc., there is now a rising trend in the imposition of regressive consumption taxes such as Value Added Taxes/Goods and Services. It is well established that consumption taxes unjustly burden the poor, particularly women who are typically low-waged and consume VAT-covered basic goods for their families. VAT/GST now accounts for up to two-thirds of tax revenues in most developing and low income countries, while only about one-third of tax revenues is raised from these sources in developed countries (UNDP 2).

The perspectives of tax and fiscal justice provide as a frame and perspective to debunk the standard rationale for privatizing social services, i.e., lack of funds, as well as to promote public investments into strengthening the of adequate and quality social service delivery. We aim to --
- Affirm the role and obligation of governments to implement progressive and distributive tax policies
- Mobilise domestic resources for public services and other vital government functions
- Strengthen state accountability and the social contract
- Reduce state dependence on aid and debt financing
- Correct the power imbalance between citizens and MNCs

And we do these by --
- Exposing the negative impact of tax injustices on ordinary people and our families around the world – from the South to the North
- Taking transformative actions and campaigning for solutions to end tax injustices
- Building a global movement to increase awareness and solidarity around tax justice issues

(https://www.globaltaxjustice.org/en/about)

Public Services and Labor
David Boys (US)

Labor rights are human rights -- that is enshrined in the convention of the International Labour Organisation which is the only tripartite agency of the UN with members from government, labor market regulator, employers, and trade unions.

Labor rights recognize the rights to form a trade union and to engage to a collective bargaining. These are recognized because in the capitalist system, the employers own and have the only and main control over the means of production. These rights thus serve as a counter balance to this reality.

Unions are a collective organization of workers who pay dues. It is only the formal sectors that are unionized, and pay a percentage of their wages to the union. But this is not enough to sustain labor unions who also often serve their communities.

Over the past 20 years, there has been a dangerous and growing trend of keeping wages low, of out-sourcing and other unfair labor practices, causing some members to leave the union or the communities where they work.

Union members have the right to elect their leader to set policies and priorities. Trade Unions are duty and legally bound to the collective agreements that set conditions, policies and rights and obligations of both employers and unions. These documents are legally binding under the labor relations system. Under the legal process, a party that violates the collective agreement can be taken to court. Collective agreements defend the rights of labor unions.

In public services, such as hospitals, the military, police and fire-fighting, not all unions have the right to collective agreement. This is because unions cannot oblige the government to fund what they have started in protecting their rights.

Another labor right is to withdraw labor and to hold strikes, when and if the agreements are violated or not implemented. As a priority, union leaders are expected to protect and defend labor rights to improve workers' conditions, using the collective strength and the bargaining agreement as a tool.

In the private sector, small labor unions ask their global union to map out all the subsidiary union in the corporations to negotiate for a global labor standard.

There are regional and global private actors that directly or indirectly influence their members such as the IMF, WB, OECD, WTO, regional development banks, UN agencies, the ASEAN, WHO, national development agencies like USAID, etc. These organizations do not want to recognize us, and neither do private firms. But they are compelled to do so, which means we have to figure out how to deal with them. At the national level, in order to improve the working conditions and wages of workers, one has to be able to influence the decision makers and their processes.

What we do is to learn to work with the communities that belong to the public services sector. Universal access to quality public services is the corner stone of the labor union. In Public Services International, the specific focus is on labor rights and justice. A majority of our members are women who receive very low pay.

On the PPPs, many of the labor unions were initially not opposed to privatization. In the first wave, it promised good management techniques, new tools and good working conditions. But after five years, this was no longer the case. Labor started to be outsourced and made increasingly informal, paid low wages and subjected to poor working conditions.

We also need to address the immediate of concerns of union members and communities on what to do with climate change in relation to public services. There is a rising number of climate refugees desperate for protection. Who is going to provide protection to our members in the public sector?

PSI is working closely with the trade and tax justice movements. We need tax justice for quality and affordable public services. We demand tax justice and accountability in public spending for the common good and redistributing the wealth that workers help create. .

PLENARY 6: Sectoral Issues on Health, Education and Energy

HEALTH

Social Justice in Health: Struggle of Nepal[14]
Sharad Onta

In 1990, the first people's movement replaced absolute monarchy and a multiparty parliamentary system with a constitutional monarchy was established. But succeeding years were rocked by the Maoist insurgency from 1995-2005. In 2004, the King took over state power and imposed a ban on political parties as well as jailed or house arrested political leaders. This oppressive regime however was short lived as the 2nd peoples movement uniting opposition in Nepal displaced the monarchy, leading to the removal of a 200-year old monarchy and the establishment of a federal republic in 2006.

Nepal has moved forward but is steadily being engulfed by private sector. This began as early as the 90s, when the government's structural adjustment programs opened opportunities for the private sector to create a market for health, rationalized by the thinking that people are willing and capable to pay for health services.

Today, more than half of the doctors and nurses, and more than two-thirds of pharmacists are engaged in private sector. Over half of hospital beds are owned by private firms. Subsequently, the public health budget was reduced and health care became more expensive and concentrated in urban centers.

The poor have been the most affected by the deprivation of health care. This is masked by gross national averages that do not show the discrepancies and gaps in health indicators between ethnic groups and rural and urban areas.

Nepal's Constitution guarantees that basic health services should be covered by the general tax and provided as public services so people should not have to pay at the time of service use. But there is still conflict between the views on social justice in health and market orientation. On one hand, the progressive forces are fighting to de-privatize health, while on the other, supporters of the market option push for health insurance based on prepayment of premium equally by all citizens and expanding the health services market.

The market view does not address the principle of social justice in health and cannot achieve Universal Health Care. The progressive option would be to create a public health fund with contributions determined through progressive taxation, but the health needs of citizen should be adequately met regardless of the scale of contribution.

---

[14] Annex L.

The Right to Health and Access to Therapies --
Our Fight against the Privatisation of Health Care Services[15]
Vittorio Agnoletto (Italy)

Health is a human right. All States parties to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights have a legal obligation not to interfere with the rights conferred under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Covenant, including the right to health. This is also reflected in the Italian Constitution which provides that health is a fundamental right and that it should be freely given especially to the poor. However, with the push of international financial institutions such as the World Bank, healthcare has become a market that only those with the capacity to pay can access, and from which billions of dollars are made in profits.

Meanwhile states have reduced their budgets for prevention. This is indicated by the 1.8 million people infected with HIV in 2016 and the 212 million cases of malaria estimated worlwide in 2015. Italy, for one, had the smallest increase in public spending from 2009-2015 as compared to other European states as well as lower health spending per capita. But the trend can be seen across Europe. In Spain, the universal system was replaced by an insurance company. In the UK the National Health Service was destroyed and the production of services was privatized. In Italy, in Lombardy, the right-wing government is trying to privatize the healthcare of more than three million people.

The situation is made worse by the privately owned pharmaceuticals who have the exclusive patent rights to sell the medicines, and are thus able to set exorbitant prices. In 29 years, 156 drugs were created, but only 21 were made for neglected diseases. Tragically, 10 million people die every year simply because they cannot get medicines that already exist. Drug prices are set to maximize profit of the companies, without regard for difficulties of access among ordinary citizens. The largest pharmaceutical companies spend more on marketing than Research and Development, whose actual costs they refuse to divulge.

There are many examples of how big pharmaceuticals are driven by profit and not curing the sick. Belgium and the Netherlands have refused to provide the cystic fibrosis drug, *Orkambi*, because they were unable to negotiate an acceptable price. Distributors Novartis and Bayer have threatened legal action (judicial review) if NHS decides to offer Avastin (bevacizumab) which has been proven safe and effective, and would be 10 times cheaper.

Recommendations on enhancing access to cheaper medicines include the following:

On comprehensive access strategies --
- publicly funded research & development should include formal strategies for ensuring access to medical products
- they should consider all potential barriers to access, and include comprehensive strategies for overcoming these barriers

On non-patenting/responsible patenting --
- where possible, the end products of pharmaceutical research & development should not be patented, and should be available as a public good
- generic production of medicines should be promoted for it is an effective strategy for reducing price and improving access

---

[15] Annex M.

On open access policies --
- Third-parties should have the rights to use the discoveries of publicly funded research
- The principles of open science and data sharing are essential to an effective R&D system

On Drug Prices
- Publication of drug prices would facilitate advocacy, and improve accountability.

On Transparency in the Price of Research & Development
- There is no transparency on the average cost of researching and developing a medicine.
- Pharma-sponsored studies are likely vast over-estimates; independent estimates have been 10x lower.
- Publicly funded research must produce public goods.

ENERGY

Asian Struggles on Energy[16]
Lidy Nacpil

In Asia, work related to energy is being done around –

1. **Fighting for the right to energy and energy services, and democratic energy systems.**

   There are many struggles across many countries in Asia such as having electricity services, being able to afford electricity services, having reliable and affordable energy for basic needs and livelihoods. For over two billion people in Asia do not have the adequate access to energy, and access to electricity in their homes. In many countries, revenue usually comes first before provision of public services. To sustain profits, areas far from privately owned services are not prioritized for electricity service. This is a fight to access affordable, reliable energy for basic needs and livelihood.

   The terms "corporatization" and "privatization" were actually coined in the context of the electricity sector. Corporatization refers to services theoretically stated-owned, but being ran as corporations with profitability as the primary concern. Privatization is private-ownership.

   The issues of privatization and corporatization include rising costs of electricity, low priority for poor consumers and non-commercially viable areas, grossly disadvantageous financing arrangements which led to accumulation of debts (illegitimate debts) and the public assumption of private risks.

2. **Resisting dirty and harmful energy projects in Asia: mega and large dams, coals, agro and biofuels, etc.**

   Agro and biofuels have become a threat to our right to food because it is now a major reason for the massive conversion of planting staple foods to producing agro and biofuels. This is a common issue in Asia countries where governments have turned to agro and biofuels production to cater to the high demand in Europe.

---

[16] Annex N.

While agro/biofuels lessen greenhouse gas emissions for Europe, their production in Asia exacts great costs. These range from harmful impacts on communities, people, and environment due to air, water and land pollution, displacement, loss of livelihoods, and decline in economic productivity, among others.

3. **Struggle to fight for the just and swift transition out of fossil fuels and harmful energy systems into renewable and clean, democratic and efficient energy systems; and against false solutions**

There are major considerations, no less than stopping climate change and stabilizing global warming to 1.5 degrees. For large/rich countries, the goal is zero emissions by 2030, and for the rest of the world, zero emissions by 2050.

We are currently in the process of building a peoples' platform for renewable energy (RE). There are a lot of parameters around RE, one of which is taking into account the impacts of RE on people and communities. In shifting towards RE, it must also be ensured that their interests are not compromised. Development and adoption of RE should be conducted in a manner that does not threaten our other rights.

RE should also not be corporate-driven. Companies of fossil fuels are beginning to realize that renewable energy would be their source of revenue in the future, therefore major fossil fuel companies are investing on this today.

It also requires changes in infrastructure since RE systems work best when control, management and distribution are decentralized and redistributed under a combination of state and other forms of ownership.

Flowers in the cracks of a core infrastructure system --[17]
Current transformations in the European Energy Sector
Soeren Becker

The backbone of industrial capitalism and 'energopolitics', the European energy market has traditionally pursued certain energy pathways, such as nuclear (France), coal (Poland), a mix in Germany of nuclear and coal, and early renewables in Denmark. While several changes have been unfolding, which include the intermingling of public and private interests in the field, these have not been enough to overcome privatization, commercialization and concentration of the sector in the 80s and the 90s. Energy consumers felt no positive effects on pricing and delivery, and vulnerable groups continued to experience energy poverty.

However, from around 2005 onwards, the energy oligopoly began to be perforated partly, by new local municipal or cooperative entities de-centrally generating energy or running grids on a local or regional level. Their efforts are around renewable energy projects and can be characterized as collective and political, often small and creative (vis-à-vis existing social issues. Specifically, they show collective ownership and political aspirations beyond energy transition, involving cooperatives and communities in the peripheries, North-South exchanges, etc.

---

[17] Annex O.

One important urban example of **organisational transformation** is the experience of Hamburg, Germany where one of the core remunicipalisation cases in Europe has taken place. First, it is one of the first cities to adopt a remunicipalisation approach, second, remunicipalisation involved various sectors.

In 2009, a new public renewable energy supplier called Hamburg Energy was created, which has been shown by statistical information to lead to increased build-up of renewable energy. A referendum held in 2013 to gain a new infrastructure organization and take back public ownership of energy services successfully asserted the importance of a socially just, and democratically controlled energy sector. The state was not only forced to take back ownership but the District Heating Strategy was also decentralized and new channels of participation were opened. Moreover, the Hamburg experience inspired public campaigning along similar lines in other European cities. The idea of state ownership opened new ways of thinking about consuming energy.

In Berlin, a similar referendum with a concrete participatory mechanism and 'water-proof' socio-ecological orientation took place. In London, the 'Switched on London' campaign (influenced by the Berlin campaign) for a climate-just and public energy provider was launched. In Barcelona, the Foundation of Barcelona Energía (generation, support and delivery) was set up in February 2018. It has an Advice Centre on energy rights which is part of the progressive government agenda and is connected to the debate on new municipalism and technological sovereignty.

The relationship between publics and services are also steadily been undergoing transformation. **S**ocial movements are highlighting the enforcement of new goals, development of new ownership patterns and enabling the promotion of renewable energy. Management-wise, control in participatory utility approach vs. the membership approach in cooperatives is being discussed. Labour is still an under-explored linkage point. For customers, improvements in services are being linked effective control and implementation. In relation to social justice, the diversity of new forms provides vehicles for more equitable service provisioning.

As steps forward, it is important to make these connections:
- Linking different notions of justice (energy democracy, energy justice, just transition, climate justice)
- Linking environmental modernisation and labour issues/ trade unions
- Linking different stages in the value chain (include resource extractivism and trade)

OPEN FORUM

- Elaboration of the participatory utility approach vs. membership in cooperatives?
    - Through the participatory mechanism, one buys shares on energy through cooperatives. The question though is who can be a member of the cooperative? While in the membership approach, the state takes on the control.

- On the social commons
    - What we need are new ways of thinking, learning and working. We need to change our language and concepts to align them with the changing context and realities on the ground. Developing new concepts should be geared towards winning hearts and minds.

- On Gender Justice
    - Women mostly bear social reproduction roles. We should include care work in our re-conceptualizations. Gender Justice as a human right is crucial and also provides avenues for going beyond the political rights.

EDUCATION

Education: the challenges before us[18]
Peter Ronald de Souza (India)

The colonization of South countries brought with it colonization of our minds. In India, the "oriental plan" of education was to produce "a class of persons Indian in blood and colour, but English in tastes, in opinions, in morals and in intellect". Today, there is another wave of colonization sweeping, that is, a recolonization of minds by the neo-liberal orthodoxy and their proxies. On the new vocabulary of the policy discourse on education, what used to be referred to by the World Bank as 'democratic citizens' is now 'human capital' (World Bank); development of 'capabilities' is now the creation of 'skill sets' required by market (skilling mission Government of India); previously 'social investment' is now 'commercial investment'.

What are the problems of education in India? At the school level, there are many issues such as lack of resources, absenteeism, dropouts, textbooks, safety, public and private schools etc. These can be generally categorized into three -- differentiation, discrimination and disempowerment. Issues at the university level involve curricula, technical education, (education for sympathy) privatization, etc., but we will mention just one -- 'cultural nationalism'

School Differentiation is geared towards the production of elites. There are nine 9 types of schools in India from government schools especially for the rural poor to International schools for the elite. Differentiated schools act as filters separating, segregating and marking children:
- 'In a differentiated schooling system the possibility of children engaging in a collective shaping of society in challenged and leads to the loss of generating a democratic culture'.
- 'A differentiated system is responsible for the persistence of inequities and the widespread and complex problems of denying equality of educational opportunity to all'.
- 'The children in each of these schools occupy different and graded positions as citizens'.

(A.R.Vasavi, "School Differentiation: Pluralism and Separatism in India's Schooling System)

Discrimination persists against marginal groups such as minorities, women, tribal communities, migrants, etc. *Dalit* children, for one, experience this in various ways (Geetha Nambissan. 'Exclusion and Discrimination in Schools: Experience of Dalit Children'. 2009.) –
- **Attitude of teachers**: name calling, menial not status jobs in the school, seating in the back, not asked questions in class, message of social inferiority conveyed.
- **Attitude of fellow students**: No playing together, no sharing of books and notes, discrimination in drinking water, no sharing of food and snacks, no invitation to homes.
- **Support system:** dropping out because of low self-esteem, no help with homework, books, financial resources etc.
- **Reproducing low self-esteem**: harassment when walking to school, cultural capital absent.

The school may thus be an oppressive, and not an emancipatory site for some groups in rural India.

---

[18] Annex P.

Disempowerment particularly in the case of the Adivasis highlights that the largest burden of development has fallen on tribal communities in India, resulting in displacement, loss of traditional livelihood practices, and the imposition of the modern state framework on communities that have alternative cosmologies. The education system --

- Results in 'systematic marginalization and invisibilisation of Adivasi interests accounts for the failure to provide adequate relevant and quality education at all levels'
- '… has been deployed in a mode of assimilation and domination which only reproduces the range of inequalities and disadvantages'
- Produces a 'neglect of Adivasi Knowledge forms, languages and cultural practices which has been detrimental to the cultural core of Adivasis
- Is challenged in 'retaining the positive ethos of Adivasi life-world while also enabling them to engage with the larger world.

(P.Veerbhadranaika et al: 'The Education Question from the perspective of Adivasis: Conditions, Policies and Structures')

Reclaiming our education at multiple levels involves --
- Public schooling and citizen education
    - Education as a common good (UNESCO)
    - Education for citizenship
- Reclaiming the mindscape -- curricula, conceptual language, etc.
    - Decolonization but not nativism
    - Respect cosmologies of subaltern groups without making them museum communities
    - Respect plurality but ensure social justice.
    - Employability but full development of persons not just skills for the market
- Humanities and the Social Sciences
    - The education of sympathy is being repressed once again today, as arts and humanities programs are increasingly being cut back in schools in many nations, in favour of a focus on technical and scientific education, which is seen as the key to a nation's financial success. (Nussbaum, 'Tagore Dewey and the Imminent Demise of Liberal education')
    - The assertion of cultural nationalism against secular education, e.g., onslaught on Jawaharlal Nehru University, Hyderabad Central University, etc.)

Education and Lifelong Learning:
Profit motive at odds with concept of 'public good'
Raquel Castillo[19]

Goal 4 of the SDGs states: "Ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all." Education is recognized as a basic right, which means that it is primarily the responsibility of the state, as a duty bearer. But, as illustrated in the Philippine experience, the role of the private sector in education is steadily expanding especially in the secondary and tertiary levels.

---

[19]Annex Q.

The Senior High School (SHS) Voucher System being implemented today (until 2019) is funded from a $300 million ADB loan to the Philippine government. This program aims to help finance the tuition of private Senior High School students and the infrastructure for some SHSs under the Education Department (i.e., public SHSs). Following ADB's proposed modality, it is being delivered through a public–private partnership (PPP) modality.

Since then, bigger amounts of taxpayers' money are going into the voucher system which supports only private SHSs and private institutions, in the main. Globally, we saw an increase from 2005-2015 in the number of countries where the percentage of children enrolled in private schools is greater than one-fifth.

We in the DIGNIDAD Coalition and SPELL call for "Universal, free, quality education for all up to the tertiary level!" in our eight-point demands, knowing the reality that basic education is not enough for decent work and a Life of Dignity.

This right is far from assured. Republic Act 10931 on Universal Access to Quality Tertiary Education Law passed in 2017 is not universal at all, and therefore not rights-based. Provisions in the draft Implementing Rules and Regulations (IRR) are bound to favor private universities and colleges, as priority will be given to students in cities and municipalities *without state universities and colleges and LUCs (?)*. Moreover, the IRR provides for a Tertiary Education Subsidy to be granted to students in private higher education Institutions.

The purpose of education is to build people's capacity development, and not Human Capital Development, which is the neoliberal paradigm. Developing skills for work as against maximizing potential for decent work is meaningless if this is not embedded in community development plans and ecological industrial policy and plans.

Education and Research are public goods and part of the social commons. As Marc Delapouve points out, Research and education are two global common goods crucial for transitioning the relationship between humanity and the earth system, ensuring the conditions for its survival, for peace, well-being and life fulfillment of all populations.

Such a transition requires that:
- the principles of solidarity and cooperation overcome the principle of competition;
- new financing and technology transfer mechanisms be implemented adapted to the needs and trajectories of the different countries;
- procedures be developed that take into account the needs, uses and specific knowledges of populations;
- inequalities be reduced

"A major contribution of research — including the social and human sciences — and education is indispensable for such a transition. With that aim, it is important to put an end to policies primarily focused on meeting the demands of multinational companies and on promoting the competitiveness of the territories subject to extreme international economic competition created by free trade agreements" (Delapouve) Research and education must not be reduced to being tools of competitiveness.

The 22nd General Assembly of the World Federation of Scientific Workers in Dakar on December 8th, 2017, agreed to call on governments, the world scientific community and all the inhabitants of our planet facing a serious environmental crisis, to launch an exceptional research project amounting to about 1200 billion euros per year. It also addressed authoritarian control over federally funded research programs and curbing external communications about research conducted in leading federal agencies such as the Environment Protection agency (EPA) in the US.

At the same time, higher education (HE) and research are undergoing deep transformations worldwide, associated with regressions of academic, scientific and professional freedom. These are expressed in the production and diffusion of knowledge and technics toward the demands of business and the strengthening of regional and national economic competition.

Calls have been raised on these concrete actions:
- solidarity with all actors in HE and research;
- access to quality HE for all;
- severe reduction in the reliance on adjunct staff, with the creation of permanent positions ;
- a sharp increase in direct permanent public funding for research, in order to prop up academic freedom and strengthen the development of knowledge and progress in science and humanity;
- an end to austerity policies which are especially harmful to the fields of arts and letters, and human and social sciences;
- promote the culture of debate and collective action.

Hence the ultimate agenda is for a transformative education and lifelong learning -- common goods that will promote a culture of solidarity and resistance.

Break Out Groups
Health, Energy and Education

Workshop questions:

1. What are the issues and struggles in reclaiming our public services on … (health, water, transportation, housing, education and energy)? What are the urgent challenges related to these issues and struggles?
2. What are the existing policies, programs and practices?
3. Who are the major stakeholders, players of the sector involved in the challenges and/or barriers?

Workshop 1: Health

Workshop participants were Mercy Fabros (WomanHealth-Dignidad)-Facilitator, Ana Maria R. Nemenzo (WomanHealth-Dignidad-NTSP), Nestor Yaranon (Kilos Maralita), Jenny Marbella and Arissa Tomeldan (Institute for Popular Democracy), Emily Beredico (Coalition of Services of the Elderly), Tambuyog, Eduardo Tadem and Ma. Dolores Alicias (UP-CIDS Alternative Development Program), Sharad Onad (Nepal), Vittorio Agnoletto (Italy), and Maris dela Cruz (Network for Transformative Social Protection)-Documenter.

The group discussion was divided into two parts. For the first part, workshop participants looked into the national context or situation in terms of access or delivery of health service. They identified the common issues and concerns as well as the policies, programs or practices causing these concerns. The stakeholders were also pinpointed.

The second part of the workshop explored possible ways of addressing the concerns or problems that were identified. In particular, the participants ascertained priorities and common actions as well as strategies.

In general, the common issues and concerns are on inequity, accessibility and affordability of health care. Issues raised under inequity were huge discrepancy or gap in the cost and quality of healthcare service between private and public health care providers. Another was low government expenditure on healthcare – below the WHO-recommended 5% of GDP health expenditure or 9% of national budget for healthcare making the out-of-pocket expenses remain a higher percentage in health spending by an individual. Lastly, lacking and mal-distribution of health human resource was also considered by the group as an issue of inequity.

As regards affordability, it is not only the high hospitalization cost, but also the high prices of medicines that are among the common issues that also make healthcare inaccessible; medical treatment depends on one's financial capacity. This problem is aggravated by free trade agreements where provisions on intellectual property rights (IPR) exist, posing threat to the public's health as prices of medicine on life-threatening illnesses are expected to shoot up.

Foremost among the concerns is the neoliberal and narrow framework setting aside a holistic approach to healthcare. Technicalization or medicalization of health care instead of making healthcare a social issue is a trend

in many countries. This is reflected in the current emphasis of government and private health institutions on curative and tertiary care rather than on preventive and primary care. Social determinants like poverty, work, food, environment and social services are not given much attention in developing health care programs; the preventive and primary care aspects linked with social determinants are not addressed so much. Another issue here is health-seeking behavior of people.

A key issue within the neoliberal framework is the policy of commercialization or financialization of healthcare – in particular, privatization of hospitals and healthcare. The privatization of public hospitals or health services in the Philippines come in many forms including administrative costs being shouldered by the public hospital while medicines and fees for diagnostic tests have to be secured outside the public hospital (this means higher price of medicines and fees for laboratory tests provided by privately-owned pharmacies and diagnostic centers).

Aside from privatization, other EXISTING POLICIES, PROGRAMS, PRACTICES that cause above issues include trade policies or free trade agreements. For example, in the European Commission, drugs is under the Trade Division when before it used to be under the Health Division. The lean and mean or austerity program being implemented in many countries is also among the common programs causing concerns or problems as regards people's access to quality healthcare.

For PRIORITIES and COMMON ACTIONS of people's movements and other stakeholders within AEPF, the participants identified a common goal – that is to make healthcare more equitable, accessible, and affordable.
To realize such goal, it is essential to oppose and stop the free trade agreements including the Regional Comprehensive Economic Partnership (RCEP) which put people's health in jeopardy (thru privatization and IPR that would make medicines more expensive).

Further, another action would be to call on governments to create a public pharmaceutical industry at the national and international levels. To address brain drain or movement of health human resource, social movements should push for the adoption and eventual implementation of a code of conduct that obliges states receiving health workers to pay or compensate the sending state of health workers. This compensation is for the cost of training and lost service in sending country due to outbound movement of health workers.
The MAJOR STAKEHOLDERS that have to be taken into account in public actions including policy interventions are governments, academicians or researchers, companies (including pharmaceuticals and private health providers), health workers, patients, and civil society.

THERE ARE SEVERAL CAMPAIGN STRATEGIES that can be employed to push for above demands. One is to build a strong network at the continental and global level. This requires strengthening each and everyone's national efforts, and exchange of information across issues.

The other strategy is having a convergence of activists under a common goal to guarantee healthcare for all. National, regional, interregional, or international gathering of campaigners and advocates, public fora, and symposia are important in knowledge sharing and connecting activists for convergence of campaigns and collaboration/complementation of actions. Activists have to work together with other international networks on health justice as well as on trade justice.

Lastly, a public information campaign has also to be waged to win more allies and effect greater influence in policy making. Organize a media campaign. Among the targets of visibility or communications initiative are WHO and WTO.

Workshop 2: Energy

The group identified three key issues common to Asia and Europe:

1. Proliferation of dirty energy project like coal
2. Privatization
3. High Cost of electricity.

In the Philippine situation, civil society organizations are currently advocating the shift from fossil fuels to renewable energy and they are campaigning against the construction of additional coal power plant. Participants from the Philippine provinces of Cebu, West Mindanao and Davao narrated the efforts of campaigners to derail and stop the proposed coal power plants.

The participant from Davao mentioned the difficulty of mobilizing people because of the declaration of Martial Law in Mindanao. The issue regarding the proposed seven power supply agreement pushed by the Manila Electric Company which will build seven new coal plants was also discussed.

Everyone agreed that the proliferation of dirty, costly and harmful energy can also be attributed to the privatization of the power industry. This is enshrined in the framework law called the Electric Power Industry Reform Act (EPIRA). National organizations such as the Freedom from Debt Coalition are calling for its repeal and working on developing an alternative law.

In Europe there is a push also for remunicipalisation of the power sector , In Croatia the push against privatization is not the focus of their organization but more on the public transportation issues.

All of the participants agreed that the privatization and corporate greed were the primary reason why cost of electricity in the Philippines is high. The participants from West Mindanao mentioned the privatization of Agus and Pulangi, a hydro power plant that supplies the electricity needs in Mindanao , if privatized , they fear that the prices of electricity will be high.

Struggles and Issues

PALAG Mindanao is currently continuing and maintaining the campaign against the privatization of Agus and Pulangi. The National Power Corporation is maintaining the operations of a hydro plan though there are push from the private sector and the government to privatized the hydro power plant.

PMCJ mentioned an initiative to pilot community project to shift from fossil fuels to renewable energy, targeting reduction and community managed for a period of 15 years. The group also agreed that there should be a platform and campaign sharing and more importantly engaging social movements against corporate greed.

Andrew from APRN suggested to released and issue publication materials against IFI's that financed coal power plants. Mladen from Croatia mentioned about Germany and the promotion of Renewable Energy which has support from the German government .The access to energy and just transition in Asia is big issue while in some parts in Europe this is a non- issue.

Common actions

1. To continue the Climate Justice Campaign in Asia and Europe
2. To support campaigns against energy extraction like mining
3. Popularized the demand for global system following Paris agreement
4. Also there is a need to connect the workers issue with regard to the construction of coal power plants, those who will be displaced should be provided with livelihood

Major messages

1. Community energy. Power for the people powered by the people, energy democracy
2. Popularize the issue by promoting good practices showcasing the German experience with renewable energy
3. Sharing government support to promotion of Renewable Energy
4. The European campaign for commons should be translated to other countries
5. There is need to sustain connection between EU and Asia through common messaging and popularization of Reclaim Public Services on energy.
6. Develop a body after the workshop into solid body/group to sustain campaign and promote cooperation.

Workshop 3: Education

Participants in this workshop were Marivic Raquiza from Social Watch Philippines and University of the Philippines College of Public Administration and Government; Raquel Castillo from Sustainability and Participation through Education and Lifelong Learning (SPELL), Philippines; Alghifarri Aqsa from Jakarta Legal Aid Institute; Peter De Souza from Center for the Study of Developing Societies (CSDS), India; Sharad Onta from Institute of Medicine, Tribhuvan University, Kathmandu, Nepal;and Michael Alunan, journalist advocate from Business Mirror, Philippines.

The workshop group put up front the 'article of faith' or political position: that education is a right and a public good and it was the state's role to provide universal education. However, everyone, even neoliberals, say that.

Cognizant of actual trends in education, the group wanted to push the envelope further. The discourse needs to be sharpened and questions needed to be asked like "What kind of education?" and "Education for whom?" The kind of education that has been universalized has been not so much of education but a kind of 'mis-education'. We are producing students and graduates who have been so technocratized into becoming workers who find themselves caught in the global value chains. And it promotes a kind of passivity and docility and uncritical thinking that we do not want, that mitigates against the kind of transformative world we dream of. Education has been marketised, commercialised and can be so dehumanizing.

The kind of education we want is one that really instills in our people critical thinking, a love for social justice, sympathy and solidarity; one that allows us to free the mind in an environment of academic freedom. We realize that that battle is getting lost in a predominantly technocratic society.

This is not to downplay the importance of skills building especially in a developing country context. Developing skills to access decent work is definitely a legitimate aspiration. But we would like that to happen under a more liberating and transformative paradigm. We would like to see scientists and engineers appreciative of the

humanities and arts so that we can develop full human beings. Thus there is need to focus on coming up with more progressive curricula and pedagogies.

Another important issue concerns the inflated role of the private sector in education. The state often makes the excuse and invokes fiscal constraint and lack of funding for education. As a consequence, there is uncritical acceptance of the increasing role of the private sector in providing for this service and this needs to combatted by pushing for increased public investment in quality education, and being creative in tapping non-traditional sources of funding like taxing multinational corporations and other modalities of financing.

In this digital age, there is strong concern about the unregulated impact of IT in shaping developing minds. Two things have to be done at the very least. We need to embark on an inquiry on the owners and IT entrepreneurs and be clear about the agendas they are actually promoting. At this point where we hear of a push for sale and ownership of cyberspace, we need to protect the world wide web and declare it as part of the social commons, in much the same way that we consider education systems as part of the intangible commons.

Secondly, we need to improve technical education so that people are not limited to being just technicians, but have opportunities for something more liberating or emancipatory.

It is important to embark on a thorough study of the political economy of education – who are the players, what are the agendas, what are the mechanisms and policies that have promoted these sorts of things – and this can serve as the basis for our strategy of resistance.

A concrete recommendation is to explore the creation of an independent and representative Commission that can help provide guidance to research that will be of help in our strategy of resistance.

OPEN FORUM

- On the "benefits" of PPPs
    - The best teacher is experience but we hope to be able to teach without having to go through the experience
    - Privatization propagates the notion that the state is inherently inefficient/corrupt and thus public services should be deferred to the private sector
    - It also promotes the notion that direct investment spurs development.

- The private sector belong should not be asked to come run your life. It does not belong in public services because it is designed to prioritize and maximize profits.
- In Asia, control of essential services often lies in the hands of the oligarchy which exerts huge control and influence over the economy, politics and other important social aspects. The inequality framing contributes to exposing them and highlighting the greed and sheer illegitimacy of a tiny elite controlling society.

The enjoyment of human rights can help generate active citizens and help them think of ways to act strategically

---

PLENARY 7: Sharing of Campaigns and Advocacy Strategies

World Solidarity Movement[20]
Koen Detavernier

With the support of the World Solidarity Movement (WSM), the Asian Network on the Right to Social Protection was formed in 2014. It is composed of 19 organizations from the trade unions, social movements and NGOs in six countries (India, Bangladesh, Nepal, Cambodia, Indonesia and Philippines). Rooted in the labor movement, it fights for the right to social protection for workers, a minimum living wage and the right to a decent life for all.

Part of ANRSP's work is supporting CSOs working to achieve social protection for all. One example is the Mutual Association of Solidarity Services (AMUSSOL), set up in 2005 by a WSM partner organization in the Dominican Republic. It allows men and women workers in the informal economy to access social protection, a right that is not guaranteed by the Dominican state for this part of the population. The mutual association of solidarity services, serves as a 'virtual employer' for men and women workers in the informal economy. Its affiliates pay their monthly fee to AMUSSOL, which channels it to the national Social Security Treasury. As a result, more than 60,000 men and women workers of the country are today entitled to a family health coverage, workplace accident allowances and a pension.

Other efforts include involvement in mutual health schemes in Africa, trade unions around the world and the Christian labor movement in Belgium.

We believe that achieving social protection is a matter social change, a process that has the following elements:

1. Rights-based approach
   - upholding and fulfilling the right to health; rights holders as beneficiaries

2. Multiple stakeholders
   - A national social protection policy is developed, implemented and monitored by various stakeholders with
   - different but very complementary roles – the state, civil society (social movements in particular) and the private sector

3. Multiple measures

   A universal social protection policy consists of a number of measures:
   - Measures of prevention (social security)
   - Measures of protection (social assistance)
   - Measures of promotion
   - Measures of transformation

4. Life-cycle approach
   - A widely supported social protection policy responds to the needs of people throughout their life-cycle.

---

[20] Annex R.

5. Multiple sources of financing
   - Building a global, largely supported and national social protection policy requires many resources: human resources and financial resources: social contributions, wage policy and fiscal policy

The national campaign "Social Protection for All" represents consensus built across ideological lines, on one definition of social protection: *Social protection must ensure for every person, during his/her entire life cycle, a sufficiently large income and access to quality basic services, to make sure they are able to cope with the risks and events of life. This can only be achieved when social protection systems consist of a coherent set of solidarity based, structural and collective initiatives and measures. As a consequence, social protection may not be commercialised.*

Twenty NGOs, trade unions and mutual health associations are behind this campaign. A manifesto pushing the four key demands below, was supported by 60 CSOs in Belgium.

- Embed the right to social protection in **laws and treaties**
- Guarantee sustainable and **solidarity-based financing** for universal social protection
- Involve **social actors** in the development and governance of social protection
- Conduct a **coherent policy** to strengthen social protection at national, regional and international level

New Perspectives on Civil Society Engagement with ASEAN[21]
Eduardo C. Tadem

Established in 2005 in Kuala Lumpur, the ASEAN Civil Society Conference / ASEAN Peoples' Forum (ACSC/APF) is the main forum for civil society engagement with the ASEAN process. Its constituents include workers, the peasantry, urban poor, fisherfolk, women, youth/children, LGBT community, indigenous peoples, migrants, older persons, employees, professionals, students and persons with disabilities. They are organized around the thematic priorities of human rights, social protection, foreign policies, trade and investments, labor and migration, social inequalities, peace and security, food sovereignty, women, gender and LGBT rights, and climate justice.

Throughout 11 eleven years of engagement with ASEAN, the ACSC/APF has focused on organizing national consultations and workshops, national and regional meetings with government counterparts, regional consultative meetings, crafting the ACSC/APF annual statement, holding of a parallel conference with the ASEAN Summit, mass mobilizations (rallies, etc.) and an interface with ASEAN heads of state.

ACSC/APF addresses a wide range of issues and concerns:

- Iniquitous free trade agreements
- Rampant land conversions and land grabbing
- Heightened militarization
- Pollution
- Disasters
- Migration
- Feminization of the informal sector
- Absence of a genuine agrarian reform and land de-concentration
- Neglect of agriculture
- Gender inequality and disempowerment of women
- Lack of universal health care, poor access to education
- Power and water issues
- Homophobia and misogyny

---

[21] Annex S.

- High-skilled and low-skilled divide among migrant workers
- Internal conflicts and displacement
- Trafficking of persons
- Marginalized informal sector

A major lesson learned from ACSC/APF's 10-Year Review of its work (2005-2015) is that "individual **ASEAN member countries have consistently resisted and vacillated with regards civil society participation and engagement**". Further, "ASEAN and its member governments have been seen to be more comfortable with the private sector and academic and research think tanks than with civil society." The review concluded that "the **level of commitment of ASEAN is perceived to be only on the level of rhetoric**, and not as intentional, owing to the fact that enabling environments are not present to facilitate people's participation."

What we need now is "Thinking and Acting Outside the ASEAN Box". This means d**eveloping strategies** of engagement that go beyond mere assertions of its independence and autonomy from the states' agenda; and taking the lead in initiating the process of establishing a regional integration model that offers an alternative to the existing ASEAN process, one that is based on people-to-people interactions rather than state-to-state relations or purely market-oriented interactions.

This Roadmap towards an Alternative Regional Integration Model has the following elements:
- Economic - people to people trade via the media of alter-trade organizations through producer and trading cooperatives
- Production - social enterprises, producer cooperatives and communities engage in exchanges on the technologies of sustainable food production systems
- Power/Energy - community-based renewable energy systems such as solar, wind, and biogas technologies
- Political
    - Informal and formal networks of civil society organizations and social movements on various issues - environmental issues, women's rights, workers' and human rights, human security, and many other concerns
    - Joint political advocacies and peasants' rights, corresponding actions via mass mobilizations during international gatherings as well as lobbying with states and multilateral organizations.
    - Communities have engaged in local planning and practiced conflict settlement mechanisms.

- Social
    - Long existing self-help groups and local networks have coordinated their social protection activities
    - Community-based health systems guided by primary care principles, "barefoot" health practitioners, and the development and fine-tuning of age-old healing practices including the use of organic and generic medicines
    - Alternative learning practices such as folk schools, non-formal centers, and lifelong learning advocacies
    - For shelter, vernacular architecture principles that utilize indigenous designs, technologies and construction materials

- Cultural
    - Visual artists and other performers have been networking through regional events that showcase the richness, diversity, and historical depth of Southeast Asia's creative arts.
    - Political and economic issues that are the concern of civil society groups are also highlighted and represented via these cultural interactions and presentations.

Civil society movements play a key role in addressing several challenges towards alternative regionalism. They need to build and strengthen linkages between and among local and national groups. Research and documentation and constant monitoring of popular initiatives are needed to build a data base of practices. Since these innovative practices are often marginalized, they require information campaigns to mainstream the challenge and alternatives to orthodox models of production, marketing, and distribution.

In its November 2017 statement, the ACSC/APF resolved to "develop and adopt a new vision for engagement by civil society with ASEAN based on greater people to people interactions that will establish, expand and strengthen a new peoples' regional integration process based on the alternative practices of peoples, networks, and organizations across the region's societies."

ACSC/APF must, therefore, firm up and tighten its links and interconnections and establish close working relations with grassroots initiatives and relate directly with the creative practices of peoples struggling to carve a better and more dignified life for their families and communities and for future generations.

Coalition of Services of the Elderly[22]
Emily Beredico (Philippines)

In the Philippines, a law was passed in 2010 expanding the Senior Citizens' Act to include a social pension for indigent older persons amounting to PhP500/month (less than US$10 today). COSE and HelpAge International reviewed the implementation of the program and found that 1) while social pension has a meaningful impact on the income and expenditure of recipients, this impact is limited by the very low benefit level (i.e., the real value of the social pension benefit has depreciated); and 2) targeting and selection of beneficiaries were highly subjective and lacked a systematic process. They recommended increasing the benefit amount from PhP500 to PhP1500 so that it meets the basic needs of older people, and index it to inflation; and considering the feasibility of more universal approaches to a social pension.

A universal rather than a targeted approach recognizes that receiving a social pension is a right and not a gift. It also has several practical advantages: avoiding targeting errors; providing security for low-income informal sector workers; simple and transparent eligibility criteria; and cheaper administrative costs.

COSE continues to wage its campaign for a Universal Social Pension. Despite expansion of the Senior Citizens' Act, the pension system is still limited in catering only to salaried formal sector workers and to indigents. This means that senior citizens caught in the middle are being left behind. Recent developments show that the 2018 national budget will cover only 34% of the projected 8.7 million senior citizens. Much bigger budget allocations have been given to salary hikes for military and uniformed personnel, and the pension and gratuity fund of military and government retirees.

Senior citizens themselves have actively mobilized and trooped to Congress to make their issues and demands known. A bill has been filed that removes the criteria of indigence, and if passed into law, all senior citizens who are not already receiving pensions from contributory schemes will be entitled to receive a social pension. It is now under review by the House Committee on Appropriations.

---

[22] Annex T.

DIGNIDAD
Ana Maria Nemenzo[23]

DIGNIDAD is the local face of the network for transformative social protection which is our regional network. The National Network on Transformative Social Protection (NTSP) also helped organize DIGNIDAD in the Philippines. Our previous formation was known as the Campaign for a Life of Dignity but this expanded to include other networks and coalition.

Dignidad has a wide range of sectoral members which include urban poor, women, older persons, PWDs, labor, faith-based groups, etc. It was launched on Feb. 22, 2016 during the presidential elections period as part of the electoral campaign of Walden Bello for Senator.

Our Demands are:
- Decent work and sustainable livelihood
- Free and quality heart care
- Socialized and decent housing
- Free education up to the tertiary level
- Safe and affordable food
- Guaranteed access to water and electricity
- Safe and reliable public transport
- Living pension for older people
- Adequate income support for children, PWDs, the unemployed, and calamity survivors

We participated in the National Social Development Consultation where the concept and agendas of social protection were introduced --- Universal Transformative Social Protection. We also engaged consultations conducted by the National Economic Development Authority (NEDA) in the drafting of the Philippine Development Plan 2016 - 2022.

An assessment we conducted on the Philippine Development Plan showed that the government failed miserably as the economic development framework still follows the neo-liberal globalization policy which fosters global competitiveness, privatization, deregulation, etc.

The fight for social protection is not a stand-alone project but should be accompanied by economic and social changes, in the framework of viewing the economy as the provisioning for human life. Realizing democratic governance is an essential element of this struggle.

Freedom from Debt Coalition
Sammy Gamboa

Freedom from Debt Coalition is one of the longest running broad coalitions in the Philippines. Formally launched in March 1988 by 90 organizations, we are a nationwide multi-sectoral, non-sectarian and pluralist coalition conducting policy advocacy work and waging campaigns to realize a common framework and agenda for economic development. FDC has grown over the years to more than 250 organizations and individual members in the

---

[23] Annex U.

National Capital Region and Luzon, and in seven chapters in the Visayas and Mindanao regions.

The Coalition addresses the economy and economic development. Specifically, our scope of work includes the following:

- Fiscal and Tax Policies
- Reclaiming the commons, which includes the right to public services
- Alternatives in the context of developing a people's economic agenda

One of our focus areas in the immediate is to launch a renewed push to audit the debts claimed from the Philippines. This is guided by the notion of illegitimate debts, which basically proceeds from the conviction that citizens should repudiate and press states to cancel loans tainted, among others, by environmental destruction, community displacements and other forms of harm; lack of public consultations, transparency and accountability; and contracted at the behest of public officials.

Through our work as a coalition, 20 suspicious debts have been identified for closer scrutiny by congress to establish the basis for cancellation; this continues to enjoy an allocation in the national budget. At the same time, FDC will lead efforts to reinvigorate an independent citizens' debt audit process that shall conduct its own review process and put forward recommendations. Funds freed from debt servicing of debts found illegitimate should go into building public capacity for the provision of adequate, affordable and quality public services.

FDC also continues to do advocacy and campaigning on essential services, particularly water and power, which disastrously, have already been subsumed under the government's neoliberal framework of surrendering these vital sectors to the profit-seeking directions of the private sector. With the failures of privatization already surfacing in many parts of the country, the push for a reversal or a return of essential social services to public hands gains more currency than ever.

Network for Transformative Social Protection in Asia[24]
Maris dela Cruz

Universal, comprehensive and transformative social protection towards a Life of Dignity for All

The Network for Transformative Social Protection (NTSP) is regional platform advancing a campaign for a life of dignity for all through universal, comprehensive and transformative social protection, and the agenda to put social dimension in regional integration such as the agenda for a Social ASEAN.

The Network was formed in 2009, a year after representatives of human rights and poor people's movements in Southeast Asia tackled the responses to financial, energy and food crises at the sidelines of AEPF-7 in Beijing in 2008. People's organizations, sectoral and issue-based movements of (workers, urban poor, women, youth, older people, persons with disabilities), academics and parliamentarians in Asia – most are based in Southeast Asia – comprise the Network.

The NTSP believes that social protection is a tool for tackling poverty, inequality, exclusion, and vulnerability; that it is a mechanism for social justice, sharing the benefits of growth and country's resources equitably. However, social protection coverage remains low – only 27% of the world's population enjoys comprehensive social protection.

---

[24] Annex V.

Poverty and inequality incidence has remained high in Asia, where majority of the population are in precarious living condition. Social protection is a human right, a commons. Work, essential services, food and social security that comprise social protection are entitlements for people so everyone can live a life of dignity.

To be effective and meaningful, social protection must be participatory, legislated, state-guaranteed, Integrated in the national development strategy, gender responsive, ecologically sustainable, and solidarity-based.

NTSP calls for a social protection that is universal – FOR ALL. It must be comprehensive – with life-cycle approach to attain full human potential and life with dignity; it covers work and living income (decent work, sustainable livelihoods), essential services (healthcare, housing, education , water, energy), food, and social security (living pension/income for older people, PWDs, children, unemployed, and calamity survivors). Finally, social protection must be transformative – empowering people and transforming society by addressing power imbalance, structural causes of poverty and inequalities (i.e. neoliberal economic programs, tax/fiscal policies, patronage system, etc.), and development goals that go beyond providing safety nets.

Overall, the NTSP campaign aims to contribute in strengthening social movements, and in helping the poor and marginalized become active agents of social change in order to realize their collective economic and political strength. It endeavors to build movements, connect or link up with other struggles, and win allies including parliamentarians to jointly push the campaign agenda at the national and regional levels.

The activities of NTSP include agenda building, public awareness-raising, capacity building, linking with other related struggles (tax, trade, climate, SDGs, fighting inequality, anti-privatization campaign, human rights, democratization…), and lobbying at the national and regional levels.

Moving forward, the NTSP aspires to do more information, education, and capacity building activities through country-level discussions, learning exchange visits, and fellowship training Programme. Together with broader groups, it shall advance anchor campaigns on universal healthcare, living income for workers, older people, and calamity survivors, and adequate and affordable food. It shall also sustain its engagements/participation at the regional levels such as with ACSC/APF (ASEAN), AEPF (ASEM), and on global sustainable development agenda. It will continue to link with other related campaigns and proactively promote social protection.

NTSP works with the Working Group on Social ASEAN (composed of CSOs, trade unions, migrant workers, parliamentarians); Asia-Europe People's Forum – with Social Justice Thematic Circle; ASEAN Civil Society Conference/ASEAN People's Forum; Global Coalition on Social Protection Floor; Fight Inequality Alliance; and with tax and trade justice campaigners. It also collaborates with other networks on social protection like Asian Network on Right to Social Protection, Asian Roundtable on Social Protection, and the European Working Group on SP, as well as with academics and policy-makers particularly under the joint project on social inclusion particularly on healthcare by the Center for Integrative Studies of the University of the Philippines and UNESCO.

OPEN FORUM

- What is the democratic governance being implemented by the various regional efforts and mechanisms so that there is accountability to the different members of the regional formations?
  - Effectiveness of the regional networks is based on the effectiveness of the national networks. It is not easy to be proactive but it can be done.

- If national affiliates are active, efforts will be effective. Secondly, activists should be more proactive than reactive.

  o Democratic governance both on the national and regional levels are a work in progress. Decisions emanate from the national level but these should arrive from the consultations done with the regional.

- Can the economics of social protection be applied at the municipal level?

  o Economies of scale are needed on social protection (also sustainable finances) so applying social protection policies at the municipal level may be problematic.
  o There is always room for change and improvement on the finances (on and for democratic governance).

- The government (power) discourse should be discussed so that counter-discourses can be strengthened. The legal structures should be engaged to not weaken the counter-discourse.

  o The struggle is a process. It is important to carry out reforms and changes at the local level. You cannot change regional structures but you can challenge the power structure at the national level. It is a process which needs everyone's help.

CLOSING PLENARY

Conference Statement[25]

Assuring Affordable, accessible and quality public services for all
Asia Europe People's Forum
Social Justice Cluster
Manila Conference, 13 to 15 February 2018

POLITICAL DECLARATION

One very clear message came out of this conference: **public services should be in the hands of public authorities and citizens and be fully and exclusively committed to serve the society as a whole**. Some speakers put emphasis on the role of the state, others on municipalities and still others on citizens and their self-organisations. But they all agree public services must **not be made into profit-making mechanisms**, such as international institutions and too many governments now tend to do.

The privatisation efforts of the past decades have failed. Many essential services are not affordable for the majority of poor people, quality is substandard, employment and wages are undermined. Research shows that privatisation leads to excess profits for corporations and high costs for the public. Whether we speak of water, health care, education, public transport, energy, in each and every sector the same problems arise.

Moreover, **transnational corporations**, the drivers of privatisations, do not hesitate to push for free-trade agreements with private arbitration clauses, so that they can sue governments whenever laws or regulations are proposed in the interest of citizens but possibly affecting their profits.

As a consequence of failed privatisations, the conference shared many examples of reclaimed public services that resulted in significant public benefits, including lower costs. 835 examples of services taken back under municipal ownership and control have been documented, demonstrating that the title of the conference 'Reclaiming public services' is becoming an exciting reality.

Movements of citizens and residents are getting stronger to reclaim what is theirs: universal quality of fundamental infrastructures and services in the public interest. To make this possible, governments will have to seriously question, in a participatory process, their macro-economic framework and their tax and public spending policies, as well as their unjust laws, so as to make financial resources available. Public services will also have to contribute to the reduction of the disastrous inequalities and to the sustainability of the environment.

Whether these services are provided by States, municipalities or people's organisations, the way they are conceptualized, regulated and monitored is crucial for their success. **Real participatory democracy is therefore an essential and common characteristic of the public services this conference wants to promote, based on the successful best practices.**

---

[25] Read by Francine Mestrum.

Public services go beyond public ownership to embrace dynamic forms of democratic participation and accountability. The conference gave examples of democratic planning of inclusive public services, such as for transport, renewable energy and housing.

It means that in this new era with a new awareness of **what is necessary for a life in dignity for all**, and with a better understanding of the fundamental differences between progressive policies and a neoliberal and conservative ideology, we can overcome the simple divisions between state and market, private and public.

This conference has been a major contribution to **the alliance of all progressive forces**, working in the framework of the commons, our collective ownership of our common nature and built infrastructure. We worked to re-define strategies, to renew its thinking on production, markets, nature and the State, to create a new narrative **to better organize our resistance to neoliberal and conservative forces.**

New forms of cooperation are required, between public authorities at different levels, trade unions and other social movements, academics and legal experts. In the same way as this conference was built, progressive forces can make real progress once they understand their common interest. Victory is possible.

Destroying public services is destroying the very society that makes us what we are, social relationships, solidarity and collective values. Preserving and promoting public services is promoting citizenship and the sovereignty of the people.

Summary of Salient Points and Future Actions
Tina Ebro
Coordinator, Focal Person in Asia
AEPF

Amidst this gross and rising inequality of 62 people owning as much wealth as 3.6 billion of the poorest people the world, amidst massive unemployment and work informalization which is becoming structural -- workers' families have barely any access to affordable, accessible and quality public services - like universal health care, free education up to the college level, decent public housing, a living requirement of water and power, and reliable public transportation, among other public essentials

We need to answer the plea, can we achieve a dignified life for all? People, as human beings have the inalienable right to essential services. These are public goods and part of our social commons. They are vital to life, to the dignity and development of individuals and society as a whole. Their provisioning must therefore be guaranteed.

Yet, the World Bank and IMF continue to impose conditionalities that cut public spending and require privatization of public service financing and delivery. Inequitable trade agreements lock in privatization and expose our governments to the risk of costly arbitration in one-sided international tribunals. States continue to retreat from their obligation to guarantee and finance decent public services.

However, a movement to reclaim public services is sweeping Europe and gaining momentum in Asia. Inclusive people's platforms and unions, academics, local officials, parliamentarians and policy-makers have taken up the challenge of reversing the privatization of public services and returning them to public ownership and democratic

control. International campaigners and scholars have joined with Philippine counterparts in Manila to share insights and experiences.

Together, we have deepened our understanding of the mounting evidence that reveals the failed promises of privatization. We affirmed that effective and accountable public services are a powerful tool to promote greater equality, build social cohesion and improve living standards for all.

We shared documentation, including the 835 examples of municipalities that have benefited from replacing privatization by democratic and participative delivery of public services. We have been inspired by those and other alternatives.

This conference has been a great learning experience, and our exchanges have strengthened our advocacies through the sharing of best practice, strategies, tactics and lessons learned. We have identified new initiatives to build a more powerful movement to reclaim public services.

Our discussions have stressed the following:
- We will continue our vigorous and -wide ranging campaigns that will enable us to generate the broadest public support and understanding of our agenda.
- We will widely disseminate our messages and alternatives through the social and mainstream media, and seek to encourage campaigns are covered by in the media.
  The Asia-Europe Peoples Forum will disseminate the Final Statement, papers and video clips through the social media and key outlets in mainstream media, and target relevant state agencies at the national, regional and global level.
- We will continue our painstaking lobby work to grow more advocates among legislators and policy-makers, and unite all groups reclaiming public services through building broad coalitions at the national, regional and global level.

In our discussions, we were inspired by Jeremy Corbyn who urged the immediate social ownership and democratic control of public services, a vision which will require great change in societies and a major social struggle world-wide. Our effective cooperation at the regional, inter-regional and global level is more important than ever.

But the real battleground for reclaiming public services is in the streets, workplaces, communities and villages. In addition to our research, lobbying and movement-building, we will also need to act strongly and directly, through litigation and legal reform, civil disobedience and strikes, national consultations and massive protests, consumers' actions and boycotts, pickets and marches, among others.

There will be change in national and global policies only when we have strong social movements that embrace the fight for social, economic and ecological justice across countries and across continents. So we will promote broader and stronger forms of organization and mobilizations that can create the compelling pressure from below to reclaim the state, and support our key goals to:

- Introduce legislation, with constitutional underpinning if possible, to ensure that people's rights to public services are institutionalized and insulated from market forces and political patronage;
- Finance public services by building the political will to enforce real progressive taxation and abandoning unjust tax policies which allow the mega-rich to hide their wealth through tax havens and illegal money flows;
- Abandon the policy of using PPPs, and use public finance to finance infrastructure and public services;

- Establish public ownership and democratic management of public services, including mechanisms for people's participation and oversight;
- Foster public-poor-partnerships that enable impoverished communities to participate fully in the planning, implementation and oversight of projects.

Lastly, we recognize that rebuilding public services is not an isolated campaign. It is closely linked with struggles for decent work, land and food sovereignty, just trade and climate justice. It is part of the transformative change towards an alternative development paradigm for people and planet, within a more enlightened socio-economic system that, as Naomi Klein characterized, "closes deep inequalities, strengthens and transforms the public sphere, generates plentiful, dignified work and radically reins in corporate power."

Concluding Message
Charles Santiago (Malaysia)

In 2007, the *Financial Times* featured a write-up on the "masters of the universe". The article was about the restructuring of Europe after the financial crisis. Playing key roles were the US Sec of finance, the President of the European Central Bank, and other individuals, all of whom were from Goldman Sachs.

So who is running the world? Who's running the policies of the world? Profits and finance rule the world.

Governments are increasingly no longer making public policy. Although they are elected, this authority has been handed over to corporations and lobby/interest groups. Corporate capture of public policy facilitates the entry of privatization in social services. It is advanced by international financial institutions, and cronies capturing government privatization contracts for health care, education etc. Lobby/interest groups sit and plan with governments on how to restructure public policy. They wage media campaigns, sugar-coating the so-called advantages of privatization. They've become very powerful over the years.

For example, the push for plain packaging in Malaysia was supported by the government. But soon after the announcement was made, all the intellectual property rights organizations in Southeast Asia were all over the government of Malaysia with the message that if you do it, we will sue you. The government immediately backed off, saying that this will send out the wrong message that Malaysia is not too investor-friendly.

We are here talking about privatization of social services but the decisions to turn them into profit-making activities are in a small handful of people. We have no control.

However, if the 99% come together and exert pressure on our governments, we can reverse this situation and turn the pyramid on its head. We need to consolidate this political power. The challenge is to organize around these issues, and to fight inside and outside parliaments, starting fundamentally with making our governments accountable.

Elected governments must be people-centered governments. But we are in an environment, especially in Southeast Asia, where it is difficult to push genuine development. Seven of the ten ASEAN member countries are headed by dictators. What we need to do is to start thinking of new kinds of politics and new ways of working together, but all change must come from the bottom.

In Selangor, Malaysia, the change has started at the most basic level, the local councils. The state today provides 20 cubic meters of water free of charge to everybody, so every household in Selangor gets 11.40 ringgit subsidy

every month for water. Last year the state introduced a provision that every household earning less than MYR[26] 3,000 ringgit/month will be given a MYR500 subsidy for health care. This has been raised to MYR700 ringgit.

Further, because the cost of living has gone up, while wages remain low, another measure will be introduced in Parliament to provide in a year, MYR2,400 ringgit subsidy for the basic needs of families earning less than 2,000 ringgit/month, especially women-headed households. This will be sourced from revenues which come from the people and which will now be returned to the people. Selangor has a very small state budget of only about 3 billion ringgit or less than a billion dollars, which is not very much. But from very little, we can do a lot.

We need governments working in the interest of people. This is the only way to take on the masters of the universe.

Adjourn.

---

[26] Malaysian ringgit

Speakers' Profiles and Thoughts on Public Services

Alghiffari Aqsa *is the Director of Jakarta Legal Aid Institute, one of the oldest and biggest legal aid organizations in Indonesia. He is also a fellow of The Global Network for Public Interest Lawyer (PILNet) and International Commission of Jurists Victoria (ICJ Victoria). He was appointed Overseas Counsel of the Victoria Bar Counsel.*

He was involved in the following strategic litigations: judicial review against privatization of higher education, against blasphemy law, against privatization of coastal and small islands; citizen law suit against torture, against forced eviction, and on the right to water.

The citizen lawsuit for the right to water sets a precedent for the poor and marginalized groups of Indonesia who wish to claim their human rights when they have been violated by either government or private companies. The public can exercise oversight and control over government policies that use Cooperation Agreement schemes in the provision of public services through citizen law suits.

This lawsuit is also an instructive example of successful collaboration between many parties, including lawyers, NGOs, national and international academics, ordinary citizens, as well as the media. Various non-litigation advocacy activities accompanied the proceedings inside the courtroom, such as demonstrations, community organizing, hearings, lobbying, and public discussions.

Jakarta experienced 20 years of water privatization. Last October, the Indonesian Supreme Court ordered the termination of water privatization and restored public management to ensure the people's fundamental right to water. The Indonesian struggle demonstrates the effective working together of unions and citizens networks to bring about transformative changes. Unions, NGOs, journalists worked together to reverse this through persistent research, education, advocacy and mobilization over the years.

However, there is need for vigilance at this juncture, since corporations may sue the Indonesian government at an international arbitration court. These corporations who made little investment, left half of the population of Jakarta without water access and made Jakarta water price one of the most expensive in Asia and made huge profit. After all they are accountable to nobody. Privatisation is the model of profit over people. We cannot allow these corporations steal any more money from Jakarta.

ⱌ

Barry Coates *was recently a Green Party MP in the New Zealand Parliament. He was active in campaigns on climate change, corporate accountability and trade justice for the Pacific as Executive Director of Oxfam Aotearoa New Zealand for 2003-14, and co-Chair of the Global Campaign for Climate Action before the Copenhagen Summit. Barry was previously Director of the World Development Movement (re-named as Global Justice Now!), and led campaigns on the Multilateral Agreement on Investment, the WTO (No New Issues), and GATS (General Agreement in Trade in Services), as well as campaigns for corporate accountability, indigenous rights and workers' rights. He was Chair of the UK Trade Justice Movement and active in the fair trade movement in the UK and NZ.*

Barry has a degree in economics and a Masters from Yale University.

After leaving Parliament in September 2017, Barry has been undertaking research on finance and investment. He plans to work with others to build a strong public movement to divert finance away from exploitation, short term greed and unsustainability to inclusive and responsible finance, corporate accountability and impact investment.

"Ending the private sector push from global institutions"

Access to decent public services is an essential part of a rights-based approach to development. Public services should not be treated as commodities for trade and commercial profit. However, a powerful alliance of the global elites, International Financial Institutions (IFIs), free trade proponents, donors and the private sector are focused on another agenda. Private sector investment is being promoted as the answer to infrastructure needs for the developing world. Public Private Partnerships (PPPs) have become their instrument of choice, and trade treaties the framework to lock in a reduced role for the state.

Civil society has made important gains in forcing accountability for the IFIs and defeating agreements like the Trans-Atlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP). Now there is a desperate attempt by the hyper-globalisers to lock in frameworks that would prevent civil society from regulating global corporations and reclaim public services. The World Bank is pushing PPPs in their new long-term strategy that gives priority to private sector finance and delivery of infrastructure, and supports publicly-financed services only as a last resort. Meanwhile there are negotiations on trade and investment treaties like the Trade in Services Agreement (TiSA), Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) and Regional Comprehensive Economic Partnership (RCEP) that would establish a binding deregulatory model, giving multinationals new rights to sue governments in ad-hoc international tribunals.

Once again, civil society and social movements need to gear up to oppose and defeat these dangerous initiatives. Crucial decisions will be made in the coming months. But we need to also use these campaigns to build on our growing base of support, setting out a positive vision for a huge increase in affordable and accountable public services to meet the needs of all.

 C&

David Boys is the Deputy General Secretary of Public Services International (PSI) and assists the General Secretary in implementing the priorities from PSI Congress. David oversees PSI sectoral work and directly coordinates PSI's international work on the utilities of water, waste and energy. This includes helping unions and allies fight privatisation and promote remunicipalisation; conducting policy and advocacy work on finance and governance of utilities as well as union and worker mobilisation and representation.

David is a recognised authority in the water sector and was a member of the UN Secretary General's Advisory Board on Water and Sanitation. PSI advocates the public-public partnerships between public utilities as an alternative to the for-profit based public-private partnership model which has dominated the sector for the past 15-20 years. David also coordinates corporate social responsibility and investment issues with worker-trusteed pension funds.

C&

David Hall is a Visiting Professor in the Business School, University of Greenwich, London. From 2000-2013 he was Director of the Public Services International Research Unit (PSIRU), which carries out empirical research into public services and privatisation, globally. He has published numerous reports for PSIRU, articles in academic journals, book chapters, and two books. He has addressed meetings of many global institutions, including the World Bank

infrastructure division, United Nations department of economic and social affairs (UNDESA), the OECD, UNCTAD, ILO, the European Parliament, the EU Economic and Social Committee, the constitutional court of Indonesia, and the global congress of Consumers International.

ങ

Francine Mestrum *has a PhD in social sciences and worked at the European institutions and several Belgian universities. Her research concerns the social dimension of globalisation, poverty, inequality, social protection, public services and gender. She is an active member of the International Council of the World Social Forum and helps in the organisation of the Asia Europe People's Forum events.*

She is the author of several books (in Dutch, French and English) on development, poverty, inequality and social commons. She is the founder of the global network of Global Social Justice and currently works on a project for social commons.

Though social protection lacks a serious theoretical foundation, several ideologies can be used to implement it. It can be at the service of people, but it can also be at the service of markets and growth. The current neoliberal philosophy wants governments to cut public spending, which means that at any rate, social expenditures are severely limited.

However, markets, and the production system they require, cannot function properly without a decent reproduction, or simply put, if people have no clean water, no education system, no health care, no public transport, etc., the economic system will fail. Moreover, and this is for us an even more important argument: social protection is a human right, confirmed in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and repeated and explicitly stated in the International Covenant for Economic, social and cultural rights as well as other regional treaties.

The experience of the past decades, all over the world, has shown that privatised public services cannot do the job: they are too expensive, so that poor people cannot afford them, they are rarely universal because they are then not profitable, they cut back on employment and do not allow for any democratic and participatory approach.

That is why there is now a broad movement to reclaim these services, at the national, the regional or the municipal level. This is the movement we want to support and promote. Social protection and public services are ours: people pay for them with taxes and social contributions, and that is why we call them social commons. They should be universal and be at the service of all, and not only of those who are rich enough to pay for them. Public services belong to the public, they can and should be organised in a democratic and participatory way.

ങ

Meena Menon *is an activist, a researcher and writer. Meena worked as a full-time organizer with a left party for 20 years. She was Vice President at GKSS union (Mill Workers Struggle Committee), Mumbai. She was India country coordinator with Focus on the Global South. Until recently she was a senior consultant on urban policy with Action Aid in India, as part of which she helped to set up Citizens Rights Collective (CiRiC)- an urban policy group- a network for labour organisations working with informal labour, and also a policy training school called Urban Action School. She played an active role in the Peoples SAARC process in India and the global network called People's Agenda for Alternative Regionalisms (PAAR) initiative with Focus on the Global South and Transnational Institute. She is working with a network of labour researchers in India. Meena's areas of work include labour, urbanization,*

housing, alternative regionalisms, peace and security, and new politics. She is co-author of a book, One Hundred Years, One Hundred Voices - The Mill Workers of Girangaon - An Oral History (2004). She is currently working on a book on radical student politics in India in the 60s-70s.

The worst forms poverty and inequality is no longer a condition associated solely with impoverished villages. It is the reality behind the glittering façades of most modern cities, especially in the developing world. In 2008, for the first time, the world's population was evenly divided between urban and rural. It is expected that 70 percent of the world population will be urban by 2050. There is an urgent need for policy consensus to ensure effective urban planning and solutions to the immense challenges posed by rapid urbanization and the disparity that accompanies it. Goal 11 of the Sustainable Development Goals sets out the objective to "Make cities inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable". It is time to unpack this and make the urban habitat a major policy focus in the discourse of civil society. Housing is one of the most difficult areas of urban life. High cost of renting and absolutely impossible cost of buying housing, the lack of proper social housing solutions, the paucity of even minimal housing has made this a major area of housing policy pronouncements and electoral promises in most developing countries of Asia. However it is a policy area marked by a singular lack of consensus. Most urban movements are reactive movements, demanding a stop to the destructive and cruel eviction of the poor from slums and shanty towns. But there have been fewer attempts to find solutions and build consensus on them. Questions under debate with respect to social housing include the following:

- Should the focus be on ownership or rental?
- Do we want upgrading or rehabilitation of slums and shanties
- What should be the various kinds of housing to cater to different kinds of needs in the city?
- How should land be owned and used?
- What kind of housing services should be made mandatory?

There was a time when a demand for shelter essentially referred to a roof over one's head. However, a concept of Habitat is not that of a mere built structure. It must include essential civic services, and a concern for the environment. Comprehensive city planning rather than a free market approach is the one factor no one discusses in this sector. Solutions must include:

- a need for comprehensive planning as opposed to market approach
- provision of access to urban services: of water, electricity, waste management, lighting, roads, transport (especially when the houses for the poor are built far outside city limits)
- ensuring clean air and open public spaces
- moving away from automobiles to public transport and other cleaner modes; accordingly
- an approach to sustainable building and aesthetics

Social housing is therefore one of the most critical areas of public services that needs discussion on solutions. Any discussion of public services without integrating housing needs would be incomplete and ineffective. It also follows that if people are to survive in the urban space, comprehensive planning with a conscious bias towards the poor and vulnerable has to be part of the city's main priorities.

ℭঌ

Míriam Planas *is a member of Engineering without borders Catalonia, working for development cooperation to guarantee universal access to basic services. She is also actively involved in Aigua es Vida, the citizen platform in Catalonia, which consists of more than 50 organisations working towards públic, democràtic and non-commercial*

wàter management. She is also an active member of Spanish Public Water Network and European Water Movement.

Water is life not only for people, who cannot live without water, but also for the environment, which involves protecting the quality of water and ecological flows in rivers. (Re)municipalisations of water is a tool to move a step forward and require municipalities to develop water policy that takes into account the limits of the quality of local water resources. Water management is a key tool for ensuring regional balance and respect for the environment, based on a concept of water not as a resource, but as a natural good, and an essential part of the ecosystem in which we live.

Participation must be the anchor of a new water management model. This model needs to ensure that the reclaiming of public water management in municipalities result into truly democratic deepening, through mechanisms of transparency, accountability, education and training for citizens. All this is to keep at bay the old practices of the private management model, characterized by opacity, corruption and enrichment through water.

<div align="center">ca</div>

Dr. Mladen Domazet *is a Research Director at the Institute for Political Ecology, in Zagreb, Croatia. He graduated in Physics and Philosophy from the University of Oxford and completed a doctorate in Philosophy of Science at the University of Zagreb. His research interest currently focuses on theories of scientific explanation, degrowth-compatible explanatory frameworks of social metabolism, and social attitudes relevant to sustainability. He will share insights that originate from his Institute's research about democratisation of public services. The research argues for the introduction of principles that would ensure quality, accessibility, operational sustainability, accountability, user participation, environmental protection according to which we could assess whether state enterprises work for the public interest.*

Our research aims to explore a whole spectrum of public services in the country, from water and waste management to electricity production and railway transport. We see the state enterprises handling natural resources and public infrastructure as a battlefield where struggle for good life, sustainability, public interest and quality of services should be won.

Moreover, since Croatia and the region of South Eastern Europe are exposed to strong push for privatisation of public services, our research findings aim to serve as an instrument for movements and coalitions opposing privatisation, and thus leaving services in the public hands. The research informs these movements of the potentials and pitfalls of the current management of public services, and its transformation without privatisation.

Fortunately, in Croatia public services are publicly owned, and we have to keep it that way. We need to resist strong push towards privatisation, by showing how the quality of services can be maintained only if they are in public hands and if citizens have control over their management

However, our research also shows that we cannot keep the current model where the state enterprises don't work in the public interest but serve the interests of a small number of political and economic elites, and tarnished by suspicious, non-transparent and corruptive practices. That is why", Domazet said, "anti-privatisation struggle needs to go hand in hand with democratisation of the governance systems of state enterprises, and broadening of civic understanding of public interest."

Our state enterprises behave irresponsibly toward citizens and toward public interest, so our research aims to argue for more transparency and participation in their everyday operations.

We argue for introduction of principles that would ensure quality, accessibility, operational sustainability, accountability, user participation, environmental protection according to which we could assess whether state enterprises work for the public interest. We also need to gain broader public support and understanding that quality of services can be protected and maintained if they remain publicly owned, but with more regular civic oversight.

Presently we see primarily infrastructural degradation and reduction of quality and scope of service of railway transport, together with inefficient financial and economic performances. Also, workers' rights are more and more fragile, and their solidarity fragmented. That opens the door for privatisation which should be prevented. We should avoid repeating costly and frustrating mistakes of other European countries that currently remunicipalise or renationalise public services after privatisations that failed to uphold public interest of services.

<div align="center">͓</div>

Satoko Kishimoto *is an activist researcher at the Transnational Institute, (TNI) a research and advocacy NGO based in Amsterdam. She started the water justice project in TNI to seek Alternatives to Water Privatisation. She is the co-founder the Reclaiming Public Water (RPW) Network which was created as a result of the book 'Reclaiming Public Water: Achievements, struggles and visions from around the world' in 2005. Lately she engages with joint research and advocacy on remunicipalisation in water sector and other public services. She edited the book Our Public Water Future: The global experience with remunicipalisation (2015) and* Reclaiming Public Services: How cities and citizens are turning back privatization *(2017).*

The book *Reclaiming Public Services: How cities and citizens are turning back privatization,* is a sharing of new initiatives in public ownership and the variety of approaches to deprivatisation. From New Delhi to Barcelona, from Indonesia to Germany, thousands of politicians, public officials, workers, unions and social movements are reclaiming or creating public services to address people's basic needs and respond to environmental challenges.

There have been at least 835 examples of (re)municipalisation of public services worldwide in recent years, involving more than 1,600 cities in 45 countries. Remunicipalisation is taking place in small towns and in capital cities across the planet, following different models of public ownership and with various levels of involvement by citizens and workers.

Why are people around the world reclaiming essential services from private operators and bringing their delivery back into the public sphere? There are many motivations behind remunicipalisation initiatives: a goal to end private sector abuse or labour violations; a desire to regain control over the local economy and resources; a wish to provide people with affordable services; or an intention to implement ambitious strategies for energy transition or the environment for example.

Out of this diversity a coherent picture is nevertheless emerging: it is possible to reclaim or build effective, democratic and affordable public services. Ever-declining service quality and ever-increasing prices are not inevitable. More and more people and cities are closing the chapter on privatisation, and putting essential services back into public hands.

<div align="center">͓</div>

Sharad Onta, *MD, MPH, PhD D is a Professor of Community Medicine and Public Health at the Institute of Medicine, Tribhuvan University, Kathmandu Nepal; member of Faculty Board (highest academic authority of the Institute);*

member thesis committee for Master in Public Health (MPH) and PhD programmes; Coordinator Community Based Learning Programme of the Department. Member, Academic Council of University; involved in teaching International Health, supervising research projects and thesis of master and PhD students, scientific publications and academic policy decisions in public sector. He is the author of several scientific papers and chapters of books on public health and health policies.

Health is not just a biomedical entity. It is life with dignity - fundamental human right. Diseases do not always kill the people, as the science and technology have invented remedies of many of them. The socio-economic and political environment created by unjust value, structure and system depriving the people of those remedies kills the people. Therefore, our fight is not only against the diseases to overcome and eliminate them. We struggle for establishment of sustained systems guided by equity and social justice. This is not an issue of a community or a country; this is a concern of our globe.

The argument that countries with low income do not have capacity to safeguard the health of its citizen has no basis. It is resulted in compromises accepting discrepancies in health between the people across the country region and the globe at large unacceptable for civilized world. This is a prime moment to establish the value that every country, rich or poor, must protect the health of every citizen. It is possible, if we act together with the vision, commitment and honesty.

On the Social Agenda of the Left in Nepal

The left political parties have brought significant positive policy changes, like free essential health services, free maternal health care, social support to elderly citizens and so on when they shared the state power. Now, people have given the left parties an overwhelmed mandate to form the central and provincial governments. The governments are not yet formed. It is hoped that left political parties together will meet the expectation of people form and implement pro people policies

Nepal introduced user's fee for health services in public facilities from early 1990s. After peace negotiation with the CPM (Maoist), which was in armed insurgency, state power was shared by the CPM (Maoist) and Ministry of Health was led by Maoist. At its leadership in 2008, user's fee was abolished and essential health services were declared free. During that period, I was in Advisory Team of Health Ministry. Later, free basic health services were included in the Constitution of Nepal as fundamental right of citizen. It is considered a significant achievement in health by the left force.

<div align="center">℃ℬ</div>

Dr. Sören Becker *is a Geographer interested in alternative ways of organizing infrastructure and technology in cities. He has developed this general interest while studying the rise and impact of new forms of organisation in energy transitions in Germany and beyond that seek to promote aims around democratic participation, social justice and ecological sustainability. His work on energy remunicipalisation and community energy was published through various academic articles. He is working as a researcher at the University of Bonn and Humboldt University Berlin where he is involved in both teaching and research. His current research focus is conflicts in the realisation of "smart city strategies" in Berlin and other European cities.*

The uninterrupted provision of energy (mainly in the form of electricity) is seen as a backbone for modern life in both the spheres of production and consumption, including everyday amenities. Energy is thus a major public service, the high importance of which has resulted in an intermingling of state and business interest in the field – transformed, but not overcome by privatisation, commercialisation and concentration of the sector in the 1980s

and 1990s. After around 2005, however, the energy oligopoly became perforated partly, by new local municipal or cooperative entities decentrally generating energy or running grids on a local or regional level.

This development was often linked to renewable energy technologies producing less carbon emissions; however, across Europe projects connected the technical issue of energy generation with questions regarding of social justice and democratic participation. The resulting new forms of organisation are interesting in three respects: a) they have questioned the commodification of public services and business goals that are directed at reducing economic cost only; b) new patterns of local ownership altered who makes and controls core decisions about the development of energy infrastructures, and who profits from them; and c) new, experimental models of citizen participation that could also inform other sectors were implemented. Importantly, these developments unfolded in both rural areas and major metropolises like Berlin, Hamburg, London and Barcelona.

On a more general level, these developments point to the possibility of alternative forms of organising and directing public services towards the needs of the populace, and facing challenges of climate change. Creating islands within the concentrated corporate energy landscape, claims for collective ownership became an important means for discussing the direction and condition of public service provision. Ensuring the orientation towards new goals in practice, however, implies more than discursive shifts. To materially alter business practice and technology used, the traditional form of public ownership was reframed by new channels of direct citizen participation and control.

<div align="center">☪</div>

Vittorio Agnoletto *is an Occupational Health Medical Practitioner, professor in "Globalization and Health Policies" at the University of Milan. He's a part of the International Council of the World Social Forum. In November 2017 he was spokesperson of the International Forum for the Right to Health against G7 Summit. He was Member of the European Parliament who he worked on human rights and free trade agreements especially the EU-ACP FTA. In 2001 he was spokesperson of the global movement against G8 in Genoa in 2001.*

He was founder of the Italian League Against HIV (LILA) and member of the HIV National and International Committees, he has managed a lot of research projects in Europe and in Africa on public health, access to medicines, drug addiction, HIV, and compulsory license. Author of several scientific publications on national and international reviews.

He is a member of the associations: Medicina Democratica (Democratic Medicine) and CostituzioneBeniComuni (Constitution and Common Wealth).

"Health is a right of everyone, not the business of a few."

The privatization of health increases year by year everywhere, only the rich ones will be able to cure themselves. It is not true that the privatization of health systems produce a saving in spending, simply transfers substantial expenses from the State to the individual citizen. The privatization of health, the appropriation of the human body as a source of income proceed hand in hand with the privatization of the Common Goods necessary for the survival of mankind and other species, to begin with water and land.

For us, as the WHO states, health continues to be "a state of complete physical, mental and social well-being and not just the absence of the *state of illness." Poverty, housing conditions, work rather than unemployment affect quality but also the duration of our lives; in the USA the poorest die 14 years earlier than the richest.*

Big Pharma competes with the military industry for the best dividends to be distributed to its shareholders. In the meantime, eleven million Italians have given up at least one pathology, and half of the HIV-positive people in the world cannot access treatment and in what was the rich West more than a million people cannot take the new effective treatments against hepatitis C ..

We ask that our governments challenge the TRIPs -The Agreement on Trade Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights - in the World Trade Organization; it makes no sense to guarantee a monopoly of production for twenty years, when in one year companies often recovered all expenses and investments.

The challenge we are launching is to contribute to construct a long-lasting alliance between a sector of the scientific world and the social movements because health can have neither master nor borders".

Participants

#	Organization	Name
1	11.11.11	Lo, Frances
2	11.11.11	Paguio, Sabyte
3	11.11.11	Vanslambrouck, Kris
4	AEPF Peace & Security Cluster	Fabros, Corazon
5	Alliance of Progressive Labor (APL-SENTRO/National Anti-Poverty Commission (NAPC - Labor Sector)	Bustillos, Edwin
6	Asia Europe People's Forum (AEPF)	Menon, Meena
7	Asia Europe People's Forum (AEPF) French Collective	Rouseet, Sally
8	Asia Pacific Research Network (APRN)	Zarate, Andrew
9	Asia Parliamentatians for Human Rights (APHR)	Bayang, Jennifer
10	Asian Peoples' Movement on Debt and Development (APMDD) / Tax and Fiscal Justice Asia (TAFJA)	Buenaventura, Mae
11	Balig Visayas	Zaut, Oyette
12	Buhay Na May Dignidad Para Sa Lahat (DIGNIDAD)	Vitacion, Anabelle A.
13	Buhay Na May Dignidad Para Sa Lahat (DIGNIDAD)	Ofreneo, Rene
14	Bukluran ng Manggagawang Pilipinas (BMP)	Delizo, Rasti
15	Business Mirror	Alunan, Michael
16	Center for Energy Ecology & Development (CEED)	Aranges, Gerry
17	Centre for the Study of Developing Societies (CSDS)	DeSauza, Peter
18	Coalition of Services of Elderly (COSE)	Beredico, Emily
19	CPE, Inc.	Tarrobago, Arnold
20	Daily Inquirer	Doyo, Ma. Ceres. P
21	Engineers without borders Catalonia/European Water Movement	Planas, Miriam
22	FDC/Laban ng Masa (LNM)	Calleja, Kristine
23	FDC-West Mindanao	Gonzales, Lucita D.
24	Focus on the Global South	Purugganan, Joseph
25	Freedom from Debt Coalition (FDC)	Baulso, Bryan
26	Freedom from Debt Coalition (FDC)	Maglinong, Zeena B.
27	Freedom from Debt Coalition (FDC)	Mendoza, Malu
28	Freedom from Debt Coalition (FDC)	Obanil, Rovik
29	Freedom from Debt Coalition (FDC)	Villena, Jofti
30	Freedom from Debt Coalition (FDC)	Julian, Anabel
31	Freedom from Debt Coalition (FDC)	Julian, Nicholas
32	Freedom from Debt Coalition (FDC)	Gamboa, Sammy
33	Freedom from Debt Coalition (FDC)	Aban, Angging
34	Freedom from Debt Coalition (FDC)	Jacinto, Eusebio
35	Freedom from Debt Coalition (FDC)	Puhawan, Erwin

36	Freedom from Debt Coalition (FDC) - Iloilo	Ong, Ted Aldwin
37	Freedom from Debt Coalition (FDC) - Negros	Goco, Priscilla
38	Freedom from Debt Coalition (FDC) - Southern Mindanao	Paconot, Jong
39	Freedom from Debt Coalition (FDC)- Cebu	Navea, Teody
40	Global Social Justice	Mestrum, Francine
41	Green Party New Zealand (GPNZ)	Coates, Barry
42	HomeNet Philippines	Ofreneo, Rosalinda Pineda
43	Individual/Documentor	Cruz, Edgar Allan
44	Initiatives for International Dialoguue (IID)	Gus, Ricky
45	Institute for Philippine Cooperative & Social Enterprise Development (IPSCED)	Villasquez, Bob
46	Institute for Political Ecology (IPE) - Croatia	Domaset, Mladen
47	Institute for Popular Democracy (IPD)	Tomeldan, Arissa
48	Institute for Popular Democracy (IPD)	Marbella, Jenny
49	Institute for Popular Democracy (IPD)/AWCP	Conti, Amelis A.
50	Institute for Popular Democracy (IPD)/Kilos Maralita Federation	Villanueva, Erik
51	Institute of Medicine, Tribhuvan University, Kathmandu Nepal	Onda, Sharad
52	Jakarta Legal Aid Institute	Aqsa, Alghifarri
53	KABAPA	Domingo, Trinidad
54	Kilos Maralita (KM)	Manato, Manny
55	Kilos Maralita (KM)	Yaranon, Nestor
56	Kilos Maralita (KM)	Magahis, Buboy
57	Koalisyon Pabahay Pilipinas (KPP)	Delgado, Nida T.
59	LEARN	Castillo, CJ
60	Medical Action Group (MAG)	Hernandez, Edel
61	Medicina Democratica - Italy	Agnoletto, Vittorio
62	Network for Transformative Social Protection (NTSP)	Dela Cruz, Maris
63	OFW FC	Cantos, Manuel D.
64	ORIANG	Santos, Flora
65	Pambansang Koalisyon ng mga Kababaihan sa Kanayunan (PKKK)/DIGNIDAD	Miciano, Amparo
66	Partido Manggagawa	Abana, Yuen
67	Philippine Movement for Climate Justice (PMCJ)	Amano, Fatsen
68	Philippine Movement for Climate Justice (PMCJ)	Esquerra, Jinky
69	Philippine Movement for Climate Justice (PMCJ)	Guzman De, Val
70	Philippine Movement for Climate Justice (PMCJ)	Yula, Khevin
71	Philippine Movement for Climate Justice (PMCJ)	Ymata, Glenn

72	Program on Alternative Development, UP Center for Integrative and Development Studies (UPCIDS)	Tadem, Eduardo
73	Program on Alternative Development, UP Center for Integrative and Development Studies (UPCIDS)	Nuque, Angelie
74	Public Services International (PSI)	Boys, David
75	Public Services International (PSI)	Grecia, Norman
76	Public Services International Research Unit (PSIRU), University of Greenwich	Hall, David
77	Public Services Labor Independent Confederation (PSLink)	Geron, Annie E
78	SANLAKAS	Pedros, Aaron
79	Senate Economic Planning Office	Turingan, Peter
80	Social Watch Philippines/UP NCPAG	Raquiza, Marivic
81	Student - Caloocan	Cabo, Joanna
82	Student - Caloocan	Rodrigue, Elisse Faye
83	Student - Caloocan	Sarto, Sarah Mae H.
84	Student - Caloocan	Soto, Darlyn Ivy
85	Sustainability and Participation through Education and Lifelong Learning (SPELL)	Maghinay, Ramil
86	Sustainability and Participation through Education and Lifelong Learning (SPELL)	Castillo, Raquel
87	Tambuyog	Rodriguez, Ronald
88	Transnational Institute, (TNI)	Kashimoto, Satoko
89	University of Bonn (Uni Bonn)	Becker, Soren
90	UP Center for Integrative and Development Studies (UPCIDS-UNESCO Project)	Alicias, Denden
91	UP SAMA	Verzola, Rebecca
92	WomanHealth Philippines	Nemenzo, Ana Maria R.
93	WomanHealth Philippines	Farbros, Mercy
94	WomanHealth Philippines	Gallinera, Merlia
95	WomanHealth Philippines	Sim, Rosheic
96	World Solidarity Movement (WSM)	Detavernier, Koen

Annexes

Note: Due to the large sizes of the presentations and papers, they cannot be appended to this document. Please click on the link to access the Annexes from Dropbox.

Annex A   Public Services Economic Advantages by David Hall (UK)

Annex B   Public Services and Philippine/Asian Economic Development in Wicked and Contradictory Times Dr. Rene Ofreneo (Philippines)

Annex C   Reclaiming public services: Ending the private sector push from global institutions by David Hall (UK)

Annex D   Housing and Public Services by Meena Menon (India)

Annex E   The urban poor movement: securing urban spaces in the privatized city by Eric Villanueva (Philippines)

Annex F   (Re)municipalisation in Catalonia and Spain by Miriam Planas (Spain)

Annex G   Citizens' Lawsuit Against Water Privatization in Jakarta by Alghiffari Aqsa (Indonesia)

Annex H   Public services for all: Transportation Two cases from Croatia by Mladen Domazet (Croatia)

Annex I   Remunicipalisation and Re-nationalisation by Satoko Kishimoto (Japan)

Annex J   Public Services as Social Commons: Democratization and Participation by Francine Mestrum (Belgium)

Annex K   Tax and Fiscal Justice: Financing for Essential Social Services by Mae Buenaventura (Philippines)

Annex L   Social Justice in Health: Struggle of Nepal by Sharad Onta (Nepal)

Annex M   The Right to Health and Access to Therapies -- Our Fight against the Privatisation of Health Care Services by Vittorio Agnoletto (Italy)

Annex N   Asian Struggles on Energy by Lidy Nacpil (Philippines)

Annex O   Flowers in the cracks of a core infrastructure system Current transformations in the European Energy Sector by Soëren Becker (Germany)

Annex P   Education: the challenges before us by Peter Ronald de Souza (India)

Annex Q   Education and Lifelong Learning: Profit motive at odds with concept of 'public good by Raquel Castillo (Philippines)

Annex R   Asia Network on the Right to Social Protection by the World Solidarity Movement

Annex S   ACSC/APF by Eduardo Tadem (Philippines)

Annex T   Universal Social Pension Campaign by COSE

Annex U   DIGNIDAD by Ana Maria Nemenzo

Annex V   Network for Transformative Social Protection by Maris dela Cruz