From practices to praxis: ASEAN's transnational climate governance networks as communities of practice

Salazar, Virgemarie

From Practices to Praxis: ASEAN's Transnational Climate Governance Networks as Communities of Practice

Virgemarie Salazar (iD)

Abstract

In the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), member states recognise the need for multi-sectoral and multi-stakeholder engagement on climate change, but the participation of non-state actors in regional processes remains limited. This research focuses on the case study of three transnational governance networks on climate change in ASEAN and their efforts to participate in regional governance mechanisms. Data from semi-structured interviews of network members and texts of relevant documents are analysed from the perspectives of the communities of practice theory and participatory governance. This study finds that transnational networks in ASEAN provide non-state actors with opportunities to participate in regional governance of climate change by engaging in shared practices. However, the question on whether their practices can be considered as meaningful participation needs to be addressed. Hence, analysing transnational networks as communities of practice can help explain how practices bring about continuity and change in ASEAN's governance of climate change.

College of Social Sciences, National Chengchi University, Taipei

Corresponding Author:
Virgemarie Salazar, College of Social Sciences, National Chengchi University, No. 64, Section 2, Zhinan Road, Wenshan District, Taipei 11605.
Email: 107265505@g.nccu.edu.tw

Introduction

In Southeast Asia, the emergence of transnational networks involving non-state actors such as non-governmental organisations (NGOs), civil society groups, and experts is enabling transnational governance wherein state and non-state actors can negotiate inter-dependent and at times conflicting interests and ideas towards achieving common goals (Caballero-Anthony, 2018; Breslin and Nesadurai, 2017). These transnational networks have been a part of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) community-building. Despite ASEAN's inter-governmental design and core norms espousing state sovereignty and non-interference, ASEAN elites work with non-state actors through transnational networks to govern regional issues. While there have been efforts to apply multi-stakeholder and participatory approaches, non-state actors continue to have limited engagement in ASEAN processes (Acharya, 2003; Collins, 2013; Rüland, 2014; Gerard, 2014; Gerard, 2015; Rother, 2015; Glas and Balogun, 2020). On sustainability and environmental issues, ASEAN's top-down governance structure persists for cooperative arrangements have been less successful in fully realising the representation and participation of stakeholders such as civil society groups and prioritising collective action over national interest (Anbumozhi, 2017; Elliott, 2012; Elliott, 2017; Allison and Taylor, 2017; Seah and Martinus, 2021). Hence, the question remains on whether ASEAN processes on regional cooperation can effectively manage issues as complex as climate change with cross-sectoral linkages and dense networks of actors operating in a decentralised manner.

This study focuses on the practices of ASEAN transnational networks involved in climate change initiatives. These networks are categorised as transnational governance networks defined as networks composed of various actors from the public and private sectors operating cross-border to direct or steer constituents towards achieving certain goals (Andonova et al., 2009). Establishing a network is a common strategy that transnational actors adopt for it allows them to operate on a wider scale and create links with NGOs abroad and local grassroots organisations (Keck and Sikkink, 1998). Networks create political spaces allowing transnational actors to participate in these spaces as they negotiate meanings with other actors to influence policies and behaviours. Using data from nine semi-structured interviews of network members and textual analysis of relevant documents and reports, this study examines ASEAN transnational networks as communities of practice where practices constitute collective understanding, learning, and identities. Moreover, this study aims to relate the concepts of communities of practice and participatory governance in ASEAN by looking into the involvement of non-state actors in governance processes on climate change.

The paper is outlined as follows: The relevant literature regarding communities of practice provides the theoretical background to explain the current state of transnational governance of climate change in ASEAN. Subsequently, three case studies of transnational governance networks in ASEAN are presented to support the argument on transnational networks as communities of practice. The succeeding section examines the factors that determine the degree of participation accorded to non-state actors in regional governance. The last section further delves into the analysis of communities of practice in ASEAN to explain the dual nature of practices which both can promote and hinder participation in climate change governance.

Communities of Practice

The practice theory of international relations focuses on practices as the unit of analysis to examine both the macro-level phenomena and micro-level processes in interpreting international politics on a more granular degree (Pouliot and Cornut, 2015). Practices, as defined by Adler and Pouliot (2011), are socially meaningful and recognisable patterns of performative acts informed by background knowledge or common understanding of certain ways of doing. Simultaneously, practices reify background knowledge of the material world over time and contribute to meaning-making and identity formation (Adler, 2019). Thus, practice theory examines a world mediated by people's actions which are both individually performed and collectively acknowledged. Several studies have demonstrated the fundamental value of studying micro-level practices in establishing connections between practices of individuals and groups with broader issues in international relations such as informal diplomatic practices (Wiseman, 2015) and epistemic practices in the United Nations (Bueger, 2015). Regarding international peace, the concept of security communities has been studied through the practices of actors resolving interstate disputes (Pouliot, 2008), as well as the micro–macro dynamics of peacekeeping efforts to explain the contributions of bottom-up approaches to national and international peace (Autesserre, 2014).

Practice theory assumes that behaviours are constitutive of actions, and actions are constitutive of practices as background knowledge is turned into actions laden with social meaning. The behaviour of actors captures the material aspect of doing, while action adds meaning to the intentions and beliefs of the actors at the subjective level, as well as norms and identities at the inter-subjective level (Adler-Nissen, 2016). This theory rejects the problematic dichotomies characterising the relationships between structure and agency, ideas and the material world, and continuity and change (Adler and Pouliot, 2011). Compared to concepts like norms, regimes, and institutions, practice theory has received relatively less attention despite being an important feature of global governance for it highlights the structuring effects of informal processes (Pouliot and Thérien, 2018).

While practices are performed by individuals in social settings, these acts are also evident in communities of practice, which are social structures where meanings are co-created, learning occurs, and practices are constantly evolving for these communities consist of people that are informally and contextually bound by a shared interest in learning and common practices (Adler, 2005). Communities of practice have three dimensions:

(1) mutual engagement sustained by members, homogeneous or not, towards developing practices through regular and meaningful actions; (2) a joint enterprise that provides a source of sense-making and coordinates the engagement of members; and (3) a shared repertoire composed of language, concepts, tools, and ways of doing that constitute the practices and identities of members (Wenger, 1998).

This analytical construct lies in the intersection of participation, sense-making, and learning, which makes it applicable to collective action issues in international relations. By focusing on transnational networks in ASEAN, the communities of practice theory provides a suitable framework for analysing collaboration between state and non-state actors to govern transnational issues such as climate change through networks that open political spaces to non-state actors allowing them to represent their interests and concerns, as well as integrate knowledge claims in ASEAN's climate change initiatives. Furthermore, this theory accounts for the ability of practices to discuss agency and structure in explaining social order (Bueger and Gadinger, 2015), which is useful in understanding ASEAN's governance mechanisms.

As a fundamental building block of social learning, communities of practice are comprised of competent members that build their community through engagement and direct participation (Wenger, 2010). Several studies have applied this theory to understand practices, social interactions, and learning among others. Adler (2008) writes that the expansion of security communities is due to communities of practice and not because of states or social networks. He explains that institutions spread across functional and geographical boundaries through the practices of like-minded groups of actors that enable socialisation, persuasion, and rational decision making (Adler, 2008). On climate change adaptation, one study proposes a model that supports the role of specialised networks akin to communities of practice in tailor fitting available information to the needs of decision makers (Kalafatis et al., 2015).

Moreover, institutions contribute to the understanding of communities of practice by providing opportunities and settings wherein the informal aspects of international norms and rules are manifested through the practices of transnational actors 2022. Communities of practice when studied in relation to institutions can bring about synergistic effects. By zooming in on the practices of actors that embody rules, norms, and decision-making arrangements, scholars can better examine institutions and their outcomes. On European integration, practice turn has enabled scholars to capture snippets of the everyday aspects of European governance involving elites and non-elites, along with the practices of institutionalised decision-making circles of the European Union (EU) (Adler-Nissen, 2016). Likewise, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and the EU have been characterised as communities of practice in the making given that their regular informal interactions demonstrate signs of mutual engagement and joint enterprise along with exchanges of new practical knowledge that can be further developed into shared repertoires (Græger, 2016). Another study on the EU finds that its ability to promote security primarily rests on providing venues where members and non-members can develop cooperative security practices (Bremberg, 2015).

Studying communities of practice vis-à-vis institutions also illustrates that learning in these communities is neither linear nor unidirectional for practices allow members to

constantly renegotiate collective meanings, knowledge, and identities through their participation (Kuhn, 2002). For instance, a study on inclusive practices in the World Bank demonstrates that collective learning is not only a product of socialisation or negotiation among members but also through interactions and contestations with other communities (Sondarjee, 2021). It highlights that learning often occurs through active contestation of knowledge as members engage with each other through boundary objects, knowledge brokering, and boundary encounters. Similarly, research on climate security in the EU claims that while a community of practice is emerging, as indicated by a shared understanding among members, overlapping and conflicting practices are mostly responsible for EU's climate security policy (Bremberg et al., 2019).

On ASEAN, similar research employing the communities of practice theory centre on norms. In examining ASEAN's diplomatic environment, a study finds that ASEAN norms constituted a habitus, referred to as ASEAN rationality, which shapes formal and informal diplomatic practices making it difficult for actors to institute reforms (Davies, 2016). As a result, ASEAN has evolved as an organisation in which old norms co-exist with new ones. Likewise, a study on the practice of the non-interference norm in response to Cyclone Nargis in 2008 and the Rohingya crisis shows that while the norm was practiced consistently, there have been variations in the understanding and implementation of the norm in the two cases presented (Glas and Laurence, 2022). Another study claims that despite ASEAN's aim to achieve people-centric governance the actual practice of this norm maintains an elite-driven model of governance that gives limited space for civil society to participate (Glas and Balogun, 2020).

Furthermore, it bears noting that while epistemic communities share some similarities with communities of practice, these two concepts remain distinct. Learning or knowing, which happens by participating in practices, is the focus of communities of practice. Epistemic communities, on the other hand, serve as agents of new ideas in the form of knowledge useful for decision makers to construct their political realities (Haas, 1992). An epistemic community is usually comprised of actors with professional and social stature who make authoritative claims on pertinent issues, and whose success depends on their expertise and political acumen. As a theoretical construct, epistemic communities focus on scientific knowledge and truth claims of experts than on common practices (Bremberg et al., 2019). Nevertheless, linking the two concepts can prove beneficial in analysing institutions and governance beyond state boundaries. Adler and Faubert (2022) propose to expand the research agenda of epistemic communities by integrating the notion of practices. Through the study of epistemic communities of practice, scholars can look into the ways by which practices translate knowledge into power, the role of institutions and organisations in global governance, and the means of acquiring and maintaining authority through practices (Adler and Faubert, 2022).

While this study also discusses ASEAN norms, the focus is on bringing together ASEAN institutions and the practices of transnational climate governance networks to determine the prospects and challenges of improving participation and inclusivity in ASEAN's climate change processes. This paper aims to examine the practices of transnational climate governance networks in ASEAN to understand the contexts that bring

about participation, practices, and learning among state and non-state actors. Participation and inclusion in climate change governance are examined through the practices of community members and the processes they engage in to negotiate shared meanings as they cooperate towards common goals.

Transnational Networks as Communities of Practice

In numerous declarations, statements, and resolutions, ASEAN member states have voiced their support to intensify regional mechanisms in the face of enduring and emerging transnational challenges including climate change. In 2007, heads of state and government of ASEAN, along with Australia, China, India, Japan, South Korea, and New Zealand, signed the Singapore Declaration on Climate Change, Energy, and the Environment. This declaration recognises that climate change brings about adverse impacts on socio-economic development, health, and environment particularly in developing countries in the region. Likewise, ASEAN member states signed and ratified the 2015 Paris Agreement on Climate Change to demonstrate their commitment to be actively involved in climate action at the global, regional, and national levels. The ASEAN Working Group on Climate Change (AWG-CC) was established in 2009 to oversee the implementation of climate change strategies identified in the ASEAN Strategic Plan on Environment and the ASEAN Socio-Cultural (ASCC) Blueprint 2025. It is also responsible for examining pressing climate issues in the region, making policy recommendations to ASEAN senior officials and ministers, and coordinating the positions of member states (Seah and Martinus, 2021). Moreover, important documents lay down the strategic objectives for environmental cooperation in ASEAN until 2025: ASCC Blueprint 2025, ASEAN Strategic Plan on Environment 2016–2025, and 2018 ASEAN Multisectoral Framework for Climate Change: Agricultural and Forestry Towards Food and Nutrition Security and Achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals.

Despite ASEAN's goals on multi-sectoral and multi-stakeholder engagement on climate change, a key institutional gap in ASEAN is the lack of robust participation from non-state actors in regional mechanisms on climate change (Seah and Martinus, 2021). The ASEAN State of Climate Change Report published in 2021 has identified the need to establish networks, groups of scientists, and communities of practice as part of the region's synergistic response in assisting member states towards achieving their Paris Agreement commitments on climate change adaptation and mitigation. The report notes that networks of experts, scientists, and practitioners should be involved in knowledge production and sharing of solutions, which is an important aspect in developing innovations at the regional level (Arino et al., 2021). Networks support interactions between organisations, individuals, and groups. Other than material resources, network members also exchange knowledge to build capacity in joint problem-solving, which is particularly salient in governing "wicked" problems like climate change (Weber and Khademian, 2008). Networks can connect various stakeholders with links to grassroot communities thereby enabling the inclusion of local knowledge in regional consultations and governance processes. Furthermore, networks serve as spaces for engagement of

non-state actors in transnational governance (Stone, 2008). Hence, this paper aims to understand ASEAN networks involved in climate change initiatives as communities of practices to determine whether the practices of members enable participatory governance.

Data from nine semi-structured interviews and relevant publications indicate that members of communities of practice engage in activities such as knowledge sharing, capacity building, drafting of regional guidelines, and forging common positions that enable the interaction between formal and informal members involved in common domains (see Table 1). Key informant interviews were conducted involving formal and informal members of the three transnational networks from March to May 2022. Respondents were chosen based on their knowledge and linkages with the three ASEAN transnational networks. Furthermore, textual analysis of documents such as meeting reports, project evaluation reports, and publications of the three networks were also examined to supplement the interview data. Although an ethnographic study is more appropriate for this research, the use of interviews and textual analysis are deemed sufficient and valid in identifying patterned activities and reconstructing shared meanings. Supplemental material provides detailed and verbatim accounts from the data gathered to demonstrate reliability of the findings. The case studies of the three networks are discussed below.

ASEAN Regional Knowledge Network on Forest and Climate Change

In October 2008, the ASEAN Regional Knowledge Network on Forest and Climate Change (ARKN-FCC) came into being as the brainchild of the ASEAN Senior Officials on Forestry (ASOF). During a meeting in Kuala Lumpur, the officials decided to establish a regional knowledge network to support ASEAN's activities on forest and climate change issues by providing policy inputs, learning good practices, and stimulating research on developing effective solutions. Each ASEAN member state appointed a member to the ARKN-FCC responsible for engaging with other members at the regional level along with coordinating and facilitating activities at the national level. Members of the ARKN-FCC were mostly from forestry departments of government agencies. Network members also invited partners such as individuals or organisations to contribute to projects and other activities.

The network was tasked to create a regional pool of experts, which can undertake collaborative policy research from the perspective of the ASEAN member states and promote knowledge exchanges. The involvement of experts and research institutes was also meant to improve ASEAN's capacity to use evidence in negotiations, particularly in relation to the Conference of the Parties (COP) meetings to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and meetings of parties to the Kyoto Protocol. Furthermore, the inaugural workshop of the ARKN-FCC in 2008 pointed out the need to advance an ASEAN common position to further consolidate regional initiatives and strengthen the stance of member states in multi-lateral negotiations. The ARKN-FCC was also envisioned to provide a venue for non-state actors and the broader research community to be involved in ASEAN's policymaking.

Table 1. ASEAN Transnational Climate Networks as Communities of Practice.

ASEAN networks/ working groups	Working group members	Informal members	Space for interaction	Common domain	Set of practices
ARKN-FCC/ AWG-FCC	Officials authorised by ASEAN member state governments (usually from forestry ministries or bureaus)	Experts or resource persons appointed by member state governments, donors and partners participate when deemed necessary by members of the working group	Annual meetings, conferences, joint activities with donors and implementing partners	Forest, climate change	Knowledge sharing, capacity building, forging common positions in negotiations
ASFN/ AWG-SF	Officials authorised by ASEAN member state governments (usually from forestry ministries or bureaus)	ASFCC implementing partners: CIFOR, ICRAF, NTFP-EP, RECOFTC, SEARCA; ASFCC development partners: SDC, GIZ, NORAD, JAIF, Asian Forest Cooperation Organization (AFoCo), Asia-Pacific Network for Sustainable Forest Management and Rehabilitation (AFPNet), UNFAO-RAP, UN-REDD	Annual meetings, workshops, conferences, field visits, joint activities with donors, implementing partners, and national/local actors	Social forestry, climate change	Knowledge sharing, capacity building, networking, learning interventions, developing regional guidelines

(Continued)

Table 1. Continued

ASEAN networks/ working groups	Working group members	Informal members	Space for interaction	Common domain	Set of practices
ASEAN-CRN	Officials from agricultural research and development agencies of member states	Development partners: CGIAR, Center for Sustainable Agricultural Mechanism (CSAM), Cuso International, UNFAO, Grow Asia, ICRAF, RI-Phils; Other members: Donor partners, private firms, academics, international organisations, NGOs, civil society groups, related ASEAN working groups	Annual meetings, seminars, workshops, conferences, joint activities with donors, implementing partners, and national/local actors	Climate-smart agriculture, climate-smart land use, climate insurance	Knowledge sharing, capacity building, forging common positions in negotiations, developing regional guidelines

ASEAN: Association of Southeast Asian Nations; ARKN-FCC: ASEAN Regional Knowledge Network on Forest and Climate Change; ASEAN-CRN: ASEAN Climate Resilience Network; ASFCC: ASEAN-Swiss Partnership on Social Forestry and Climate Change; ASFN: ASEAN Social Forestry Network; AWG-FCC: ASEAN Working Group on Forest and Climate Change; AWG-SF: ASEAN Working Group on Social Forestry; CIFOR: Center for International Forestry Research; GIZ: Internationale Zusammenarbeit GmbH; ICRAF: International Council for Research in Agroforestry; JAIF: Japan-ASEAN Integration Fund; NGO: non-governmental organisations; NORAD: Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation; NTFP-EP: Non-Timber Forest Products-Exchange Programme; RECOFTC: Regional Community Forestry Training Centre for Asia and the Pacific; SDC: Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation; SEARCA: Southeast Asian Regional Center for Graduate Study and Research in Agriculture; UNFAO-RAP: UN Food and Agriculture Organization-Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific; UN-REDD: United Nations Collaborative Programme on Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation in Developing Countries.

In the early years of ARKN-FCC, its research agenda focused on national stock-taking and producing policy briefs on the relationship between deforestation and climate change as well as biodiversity and poverty reduction. Developing pilot projects for the United Nations Collaborative Programme on Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation in Developing Countries (UN-REDD) and the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) was also a priority. Moreover, it completed a project in partnership with the United States Agency for International Development's Lower Emissions in Asia's Forests (USAID-LEAF) programme. The ARKN-FCC convened forestry experts from the different member states to discuss the factors driving deforestation in the region to guide member states involved in the REDD + process. A decision-making tool was developed as an output of this programme to assist member states and mobilise stakeholders in developing and implementing policies to address deforestation and degradation.

In 2016, senior officials decided to restructure the subsidiary bodies of ASOF into working groups; hence, the ARKN-FCC was turned into the ASEAN Working Group on Forest and Climate Change (AWG-FCC). The working group's main objectives include providing evidence-based inputs to decision making, supporting the effective implementation of strategic plans of action, promoting the exchange of information and knowledge, and increasing capacity building to improve related activities at the regional and national levels. Each member state nominates a national focal point to facilitate the implementation of activities of the working group. Other members of the AWG-FCC are individuals appointed by member states. If deemed necessary, the AWG-FCC invites experts from international organisations, academia, private sector, and civil society organisations to its meetings and events to participate as resource persons and observers. Reports of the AWG-FCC are submitted to the ASOF and transmitted to the ASEAN Ministers on Agriculture and Forestry (AMAF).

In terms of knowledge exchanges, the Plan of Action for the ASEAN Cooperation on Forest and Climate Change (2021−2025) indicates that AWG-FCC shall promote the sharing of knowledge on national strategies on adaptation and mitigation in the forestry sector in support of the nationally determined contributions of member states. Exchanges of knowledge and best practices are also conducted through the ASEAN forestry website towards strengthening regional mechanisms for collaboration. For 2021 and 2022, the AWG-FCC's accomplishments include virtual dialogues, trainings, and workshops along with cooperative projects with Germany, Switzerland, and Regional Community Forestry Training Centre for Asia and the Pacific (RECOFTC).

ASEAN Social Forestry Network

In 2005, the ASOF established the ASEAN Social Forestry Network (ASFN), known as the first government-led network on social forestry in Southeast Asia. In founding this network, ASEAN acknowledges the importance of forest management for the benefit of local communities. The ASFN promotes linkages with members of civil society organisations, research organisations, academe, businesses, and experts to exchange experiences and knowledge on sustainable forest management towards improving the well-being of

communities living in and around forests. Through the practice of social forestry, ASFN engages and empowers communities through awareness-raising, capacity-building, participatory policy-making, and recognition of their rights and knowledge systems.

The ASEAN-Swiss Partnership on Social Forestry and Climate Change (ASFCC), funded by the Global Programme on Climate Change and Environment of the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC), was a flagship project of the ASFN. From 2011 to 2021, ASFCC developed social forestry approaches and worked to integrate a social forestry policy framework into the climate change adaptation and mitigation strategies of member states through knowledge sharing, capacity building, networking, and learning interventions. Other accomplishments of the ASFCC include raising awareness and understanding on the linkage between forestry and climate change issues at national and sub-national levels with the help of partnerships with local NGOs and civil society groups, as well as the adoption of national forestry laws, policies, and guidelines in eight member states. Likewise, the ASFCC-assisted member states in forging common positions in negotiations under the UNFCCC process particularly on the UN-REDD + mechanism in the lead up to the COP-21 in Paris.

Under the ASFCC, national focal points of ASEAN member states engaged with implementation partners such as the Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR), Non-Timber Forest Products-Exchange Programme (NTFP-EP), International Council for Research in Agroforestry (ICRAF) or the World Agroforestry Centre, Southeast Asian Regional Center for Graduate Study and Research in Agriculture (SEARCA), and RECOFTC. Several development partners were also involved in the ASFCC project especially the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit GmbH (GIZ), Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation (NORAD), Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA), Japan-ASEAN Integration Fund (JAIF), UN Food and Agriculture Organization-Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific (UNFAO-RAP) among others.

CIFOR provided research results to inform policies and practices on climate change mitigation and adaptation in the context of social forestry in selected areas in Vietnam, Indonesia, and Laos. It also supported ASFN, network partners, and the ASEAN Secretariat through its capacity-building efforts. NTFP-EP had been involved mainly in promoting the engagement of indigenous peoples, community forestry groups, and other vulnerable groups with ASFN through activities such as supporting community livelihood adaptation strategies in Indonesia, Malaysia, Philippines, and Cambodia, as well as facilitating exchanges on the REDD + process, and mainstreaming social forestry in national and local units, among others. ICRAF led research and participatory learning process towards the formulation of the ASEAN Guidelines for Agroforestry Development. SEARCA joined during the second phase of the programme to administer the ASFN Strategic Response Fund (ASRF), a flexible funding mechanism to enable member states to launch projects that are relevant to the objectives and priorities of the ASFCC. RECOFTC led capacity-building efforts targeting relevant civil society groups and NGOs. In Malaysia, Myanmar, and Thailand, RECOFTC worked to strengthen the national social forestry working groups and assisted countries in piloting

social forestry approaches contributing to climate change adaptation and mitigation efforts.

The ASFN recognised the importance of communication and networking with stakeholders to gather relevant information and knowledge useful in making informed policy decisions and scaling up best practices. Likewise, the network formed relationships among stakeholders to foster learning by way of workshops, trainings, exchange visits, and conferences organised by the ASFN Secretariat and implementing partners. Aside from annual meetings of member state representatives and implementation partners, ASFN organised annual conferences since 2010 attended by over 200 participants. These conferences served as a knowledge-sharing platform, which contributed to efforts in mainstreaming social forestry practices in the region. On climate change mitigation and adaptation, the ASFN supported REDD + pilot projects in ASEAN countries, which are a rich source of information that can be shared to facilitate the coordination of regional and national initiatives. The ASFN also highlights the importance of recognising customary land rights and the participation of local communities alongside efforts to reduce emissions from deforestation and forest degradation.

In 2016, the ASFN transformed into the ASEAN Working Group on Social Forestry (AWG-SF), which reports to the ASOF and then to the AMAF. The AWG-SF aims to continue ASFN's function of linking forestry policymakers with other network participants and extend its objectives by providing policy-relevant research to inform the decision-making process of ASEAN senior officials and ministers, supporting the effective implementation of strategic plans, recognising the rights of indigenous people and other communities dependent on forests towards enhancing their welfare and livelihoods, and articulating ASEAN's common position on social forestry in international forums. The AWG-SF is one of the five working groups that report to the ASOF, which oversees ASEAN cooperation in forestry. Indonesia's Ministry of Forestry hosts the AWG-SF Secretariat whose functions entail coordinating activities, communicating with national focal points and partners, and disseminating knowledge.

ASEAN Climate Resilience Network

The ASEAN Climate Resilience Network (ASEAN-CRN) started as an initiative that Thailand proposed to the ASEAN Technical Working Group on Agricultural Research and Development (ATWGARD), which is the working group that provides policy inputs on matters related to research and development in agriculture. Its establishment was recognised and endorsed by the AMAF to build a shared understanding within ASEAN on the issues surrounding climate change and agriculture. The ASEAN-CRN supports the ATWGARD's efforts to implement regional benchmarks at the national level through mutual learning. Since 2013, it has served as a knowledge exchange platform on climate-smart agriculture in the region. Its main thrust involves improving the resilience of the agricultural sector to climate impacts towards achieving food security.

The network is comprised of focal points from the agricultural research agencies of member states, donor partners, private firms, academe, international organisations,

related ASEAN bodies such as the Working Group on Crops and the Working Group on Climate Change, and research institutions including the International Rice Research Institute (IRRI). Facilitating linkages between state and non-state actors is an important aspect of ASEAN-CRN's work on mobilising resources, knowledge sharing and capacity building, drafting regional policies, supporting policy implementation at the national level, and advancing research and innovation.

Ahead of the official annual meetings of the ATWGARD, ASEAN-CRN also conducts annual meetings to discuss priority decisions and resolutions, which are then passed on to the ATWGARD for endorsement to the senior officials. The recommendations of the senior officials are discussed and decided upon at the ministerial meeting of the AMAF. As the de facto permanent chair, Thailand has taken on the role of championing ASEAN-CRN's plans and activities by liaising with the ASEAN Secretariat and advocating on its behalf in relevant ASEAN meetings. In its own annual meetings, the ASEAN-CRN Secretariat and network members coordinate ongoing initiatives according to the work plan, review accomplishments and contributions to ASEAN strategic plans, and form partnerships for future projects.

The ASEAN-CRN regularly organises knowledge exchange events. From 2015 to 2021, the network held workshops and conferences on the following topics: climate-smart agricultural practices, climate insurance, climate information service for agriculture, regional food systems, and climate-smart land use policies among others. These events provided opportunities for representatives from inside and outside government to share knowledge and experiences and discuss collaborative activities that can contribute to regional efforts. Some events had been instrumental in the formation of guiding frameworks such as the workshop on climate-smart agricultural practices, which was linked to the creation of the ASEAN Regional Guidelines on Promoting Climate-Smart Agriculture. The objective of the first volume of the Guidelines is to facilitate the sharing of knowledge and information on climate-smart practices in agriculture to achieve climate resilience and productivity in agricultural production. The second volume delved with national studies assessing the impacts of climate change on agricultural value chains in crops like rice, maize, and cassava; while the third volume focused on an implementation strategy to contribute to the ASEAN Comprehensive Recovery Framework. In its conference in 2021 on climate-smart land use practices, ASEAN-CRN invited a diverse group of participants including youth representatives, indigenous peoples, and women's organisations involved in cross-sectoral issues of food agriculture, forestry, rural development, and environment thereby promoting a more inclusive dialogue towards better informing ASEAN strategies and frameworks.

On capacity building, its ASEAN Climate Leadership Program (ACLP) held in 2020 aimed to enhance the leadership skills of key individuals engaged in developing solutions to climate change through climate-smart land use. The ACLP focused on taking a systemic view of land use to promote collaboration and break the silos among the sectors collectively working on the issue. The network has also established the ASEAN Negotiating Group on Agriculture (ANGA), which enabled ASEAN to raise awareness and position itself as an important actor in advancing climate resilient agriculture in

the UNFCCC process. Since 2018, ANGA has been representing ASEAN's common positions on agriculture in multi-lateral negotiations. The network ensures that the common positions are aligned with national and regional plans and guidelines and based on scientific knowledge and expert advice.

The case studies illustrate that regular meetings, workshops, and forums of the ARKN-FCC, ASFN, and ASEAN-CRN serve as platforms for knowledge sharing and learning towards informing policy and governance decisions. The networks, for instance, organise annual conferences and preparatory meetings in time for the annual meetings of ASEAN working groups where their proposals are reviewed by state actors. Likewise, capacity building programmes involving government representatives at the local and community levels, such as forest officers and agronomists, are learning interventions whose benefits have the potential to trickle down to the grassroots. The efforts of ASFN and ASEAN-CRN are also evident in coming up with regional guidelines that provide member states with technical support, since the process of drafting them provide space for stakeholders and experts to contribute their knowledge and experiences in drawing best practices (Salamanca and Anschell, 2020). As for forging common positions, the process involves integrating scientific studies, expert opinions, local practices, national targets and priorities, and regional policies in ASEAN's negotiating positions (Bacudo and Lim, 2021).

It is evident that transnational governance networks in ASEAN have formed practices that embody material resources, formal and informal institutions, and knowledge claims, as well as structures for collective meaning-making, and participation. These networks are venues of participation offering opportunities for interaction among members and the stakeholders they are trying to engage. Through these venues, networks can as well facilitate the participation of various actors in the governance process by way of sharing scientific research, professional expertise, policy experience, local knowledge, and customs among others.

By serving as venues of participation, networks enable the exchange, transfer, and learning of ideas, information, and possible solutions on climate change from different stakeholders. Joining these networks accord non-state actors with opportunities to contribute to the formation of shared practices. For instance, some non-state actors assume the role of knowledge brokers who help interpret policy-relevant inputs that are passed on to the working groups for consideration. Due to the close linkage of the networks with the ASEAN working group secretariats, knowledge brokers can establish channels for knowledge transfer and learning. While non-state actors may not have direct access to decision making in ASEAN, their participation in transnational networks allows them to assert their concerns through consultation and dialogue. Thus, the case studies establish that transnational networks seen through the lens of communities of practice theory enable the participation of non-state actors in climate change governance. Still, further inquiry is required to know whether their practices can be considered as meaningful participation, which is a necessary factor in establishing communities of practice. The next section examines the factors that enable participatory governance of climate change in ASEAN.

Participation in Communities of Practice

Participatory approaches to governance aim to open access to decision making and integrate diverse perspectives and sources of knowledge towards promoting acceptance and better implementation of policy decisions. Analysis is centred on how communities of practice open decision making and related governance spaces to non-state actors by allowing the representation of their interests and concerns in ASEAN's climate change initiatives. Representation of concerns has been identified as a causal mechanism that links participation to environmental outcomes (Newig et al., 2018). While this study does not aim to establish causal links between participatory governance and climate change outcomes in ASEAN, the same mechanism is applied in knowing how transnational networks can become communities of practice by promoting participatory governance through enhanced representation and engagement of non-state actors.

Opening decision-making processes presents opportunities for non-state actors, particularly those from the marginalised sectors, to participate in governing complex issues such as climate change. Their involvement increases the likelihood that they can advocate for their concerns through dialogue and other forms of interactions with decision makers. Although actual decision making in ASEAN is limited to member state representatives, transnational networks are venues where state and non-state actors regularly interact through shared practices that can constitute decisions and actions at the regional level in one way or another. Furthermore, an open and inclusive process can also facilitate the negotiation and validation of knowledge claims in transnational governance spaces. Expert authority is a form of power that international organisations like ASEAN can exercise to achieve certain goals. These entities create and validate knowledge claims and combine them with political considerations in translating their expertise into authority that bestows them power to shape international politics (Miller, 2007).

Data from interviews and relevant documents are examined to understand the factors that affect the participation of non-state actors in communities of practice. Findings indicate that transnational networks have provided spaces for the participation of non-state actors in climate change governance through the representation of their concerns and knowledge claims albeit in varying levels and often on a limited basis contingent on the degree of openness, inclusivity, trust, and authority accorded to informal members. Moreover, factors such as silos and ASEAN norms often impede the participation of non-state actors, which have implications to ASEAN's governance efforts on climate change.

Openness. Participation of non-state actors in transnational networks in ASEAN vary depending on the level of access granted to them. Since ARKN-FCC has focused more on developing common positions for negotiations, its members are restricted to government representatives from the forestry bureaus who act as negotiators along with government-appointed experts. Outside this circle, ARKN-FCC invites experts and representatives from NGOs and civil society advocates as resource persons tasked to brief or inform the ARKN-FCC on highly specialised and technical issues only when deemed necessary by the members. Otherwise, discussions and meetings of the

ARKN-FCC are limited to a small group of focal persons. As for the ASFN, its formal members are more open to the participation of informal members. A respondent claims that partners like them "always get invitations to join the closed sessions" unlike in other working groups that normally restrict participation of non-state actors in official meetings. Another respondent comments that ASFN was "more fluid, and it was more open" in the past indicating that arrangements have changed since it became a formal ASEAN working group.

With ASEAN-CRN, its convenor explains that the network has brought together partners and sought opportunities for more partnerships unlike other working groups that follow strict protocols. "It is a platform, a venue, an opportunity that is not provided by these formal ASEAN working groups, which are both limited in time and limited by protocols," the convenor says. However, another respondent asserts that ASEAN is participatory in terms of governments, but it remains difficult for NGOs to fully participate. While ASEAN-CRN conferences and forums are open to different groups and individuals to join, only a selected number of partner organisations have close working relationships with it.

Non-state actors in communities of practice are often sources of knowledge and information and at times partners in implementing regional projects and national action plans. The ARKN-FCC facilitated knowledge exchanges on REDD + and UNFCCC provisions that helped ASEAN put forward common positions in multi-lateral negotiations. One respondent notes that ARKN-FCC organises technical workshops with the research community to know about new findings that are relevant to the negotiation process and its work programme. Another one explains that exchanges in the ARKN-FCC usually occur among member state representatives first. After which, they seek inputs from experts and resource persons.

As for ASFN, its partners work at the regional and national levels. At the regional level, the partners have been involved in the development of agroforestry guidelines. Partners also assist the Working Group on Social Forestry in coordinating regional efforts and sharing lessons among member states. Some partners have engaged with national focal points to build their capacity in implementing the guidelines at the community level. In the domain of social forestry, it is necessary that the initiatives of the working group reach the grassroots. Hence, the working group cooperates with implementing partners to ensure that guidelines developed by ASEAN are applied on the ground. While implementing partners try to connect with a wider group of stakeholders, one respondent says that "we are not in a position to really engage in all the policymaking processes that are going on." This indicates that the access and influence of partners concerning policymaking at the regional and national levels remain limited.

With regards to ASEAN-CRN, its Secretariat has been working with development partners to gain their continued support along with technical experts from international research institutes and UN agencies. These partners have provided financial and technical support to ASEAN-CRN activities. Other partners attending annual ASEAN-CRN meetings have also shared their expertise and contributed to the drafting of resolutions endorsed to the working group.

Inclusivity. Transnational networks recognise the significance of engaging a broader group of non-state actors in planning and programme implementation. Being inclusive also pertains to the integration of knowledge claims from non-state actors in governance processes, which promotes participation as well. The national focal points of the ARKN-FCC come from government ministries such as the Ministry of Environment and Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Although the network is composed of mostly government representatives, the ARKN-FCC involves experts and donors from outside the network such as when preparing proposals submitted to the ASEAN senior officials for approval. One respondent says including perspectives from experts through dialogue can lead to knowledge creation necessary in forging common goals and identifying priority areas of actions that the working group can focus on. For instance, they work together with all the members of the network and involve experts such as those from the UNFCCC Secretariat or members from other networks. Members of the ARKN-FCC acknowledge the importance of ensuring scientific basis in the policy process and working with the scientific community. Another respondent explains that they try to bridge science and policy in their initiatives by including "a broad range of stakeholders in our events."

In terms of local knowledge, ARKN-FCC takes into consideration local knowledge in addressing safeguards of forest-related activities under the REDD + negotiations. However, member state representatives remain to be the interlocutors of local knowledge and not the grassroots communities themselves. A respondent notes that "local knowledge that come from 10 ASEAN member states were used in our arguments for the negotiation."

Back when it was still a network, the ASFN was able to convene a diverse group of implementing partners and donors to participate in the ASFCC project with the encouragement of the Swiss Development Council, the main funding agency of the 10-year project. Although the project ended in 2021, the working group continues to engage with some of the ASFCC project members. In time for the annual working group meeting, the Working Group on Social Forestry holds an annual conference and workshops where partners, local representatives, civil society groups, and government officials can dialogue and interact.

Given that social forestry entails the involvement of the local community in sustainable forest management, the ASFN finds it necessary to consult local representatives and be cognizant of their existing practices, including traditional knowledge, in designing and implementing programmes. Interactions with local representatives are often carried out in learning group workshops arranged by the implementing partners. "Whenever we organize the learning group workshops, we bring them down to the ground … local representatives have the opportunity to share what they have," one respondent claims. Likewise, ASFN partners have published case studies to document traditional knowledge and practices concerning sustainable forest management.

As for the ASEAN-CRN, it has more flexibility for it does not rigidly follow ASEAN's bureaucratic protocols. For instance, formal ASEAN working groups do not

share official documents with third parties, but the ASEAN-CRN openly shares its documents. A convenor of the ASEAN-CRN also notes that the network strives to include the voices of farmer organisations in meetings together with the views and suggestions of representatives from agricultural agencies. Furthermore, ASEAN-CRN welcomes the participation of civil society and indigenous peoples. "The doors are never closed to them," a respondent claims. On the inclusion of local knowledge, a respondent explains that "voices of local knowledge are through government representatives" similar to the case of ARKN-FCC. Since ASEAN is an intergovernmental organisation, a respondent asserts that government representatives should also be aware of relevant local knowledge. "At the national level consultations, the government representatives should already be well-informed and should have been supporting some of the indigenous ways," says the respondent.

Trust. Members of transnational networks and their partners and donors have worked together for years. Throughout this long-standing working relationship, some level of trust is necessary to turn engagements of state and non-state actors into meaningful interactions. Shared trust is built over time as network members seek prospects to support dialogue and cooperative arrangements with the government and other stakeholders. A respondent shares that "when ASEAN reviewed all working groups, all knowledge networks, the ARKN-FCC was among the other networks considered very important to continue to exist and now it has become a Working Group on Forest and Climate Change." Another respondent claims that ARKN-FCC has influence due to the trust from ASEAN senior officials: "We provide guidance, and we also advise the policymakers on the final decision." Likewise, an implementing partner of the ASFN says that over the years of working together ASEAN has come to trust them as a broker. "We facilitate mutual dialogue between the government, NGOs, and local representatives … We try to seek opportunities to support each other so they trust us." Similarly, a respondent points out that the members of the ASEAN-CRN actively participate and support the projects since they trust the facilitator.

In mediating between the science community and technical policymakers, for instance, a member of the ASEAN-CRN explains that trust is crucial in performing the functions of a broker. "They need to trust you that you will bring them forward towards the steps in exploring climate change adaptation and mitigation," a respondent adds. Efforts to maintain openness and flexibility promote trust building among network members. For instance, respondents have noted that the Working Group on Social Forestry operates in a relatively open and flexible manner compared to other working groups. Doing so engenders trust, which is important if social forestry initiatives are to succeed. As such, working group members and partners understand that sustainable management of forests entails community-based interventions based on open and inclusive dialogue involving indigenous peoples, youth, forest communities, and other marginalised and vulnerable groups.

Authority. Respondents are keenly aware that acknowledgement of their authority over certain policy issues is necessary for their actions and inputs to be viewed as valid and credible. The evaluation of the ASFN project points out that when policy advice is grounded on practical considerations and local experience, it is perceived as more credible and implementable (Durst and Soriaga, 2020). Moreover, a respondent shares that ARKN-FCC encourages national focal points to have a mechanism that involves experts to bring in science-based inputs. At the regional level, ARKN-FCC engages with global experts to expand the network. In the case of ASFN, the assessment of its ASFCC programme suggests that accurate and consistent information on social forestry is critical for policymaking and planning. According to one respondent, the working group, with the help of implementing partners and donors, has increased awareness on social forestry in ASEAN, and as a result several member states have reformed their policies and laws to integrate a social forestry perspective. Another respondent mentions that ASEAN-CRN's authority is vital in brokering knowledge on climate-smart agriculture especially since climate change has been dominated by energy and forestry sectors. With authoritative information, non-state actors can help persuade decision makers to consider the recommendations of experts and NGOs to inform their policies. Moreover, authority can be applied to emphasise traditional knowledge and practices, along with finding points of convergence between local and scientific knowledge in drafting recommendations submitted to the working groups for approval.

Silos. ASEAN has a wide scope of cooperative arrangements categorised thematically into three pillars: political-security, economic, and socio-cultural. These pillars are further organised into sectors to manage coordination among the different ministerial bodies of member states. Committees of senior officials, technical working groups, and task forces provide the support mechanism to the plans and actions at the ministerial level. Given that climate change is a cross-sectoral issue, many of ASEAN's plans and programmes span a number of ministerial bodies under the economic and socio-cultural pillars. Respondents have observed that working groups addressing climate change issues are not well integrated resulting in organisational silos that can inhibit collaboration and effective governance. According to a respondent, "these working groups are not integrated unless maybe at the level of nationally determined contributions, but how much that percolates down to these different working groups and how much these working groups work together is still a question."

Silos compartmentalise knowledge as a resource by confining it to certain groups thereby impeding the flow of information to the intended users. Silo mentality is found to hinder the development of participatory approaches that are beneficial in dealing with complex problems like climate change, which requires engagement with diverse stakeholders (Boxelaar et al., 2006; Kearney et al., 2007). "If they really wanted to do something on how ASEAN cooperates, they have to breakdown their silos. A lot of knowledge is stuck within the different silos," one respondent claims. The ASEAN-CRN tried to address this constraint through its ASEAN Climate Leadership Program, which was

designed to enhance the leadership skills of individuals engaged in climate-smart land use programmes by teaching them to break silos towards developing solutions through cross-sectoral transformative actions.

ASEAN Norms. The practice of ASEAN norms is also constraining the participation of non-state actors in climate change governance. According to respondents, ASEAN's intergovernmental structure, combined with sovereignty and non-interference norms, affects efforts to make ASEAN processes more participatory. Respondents have observed that the effects of this constraint are evident in the following areas: lack of direct involvement of non-state actors in decision making, slow adoption rate of regional standards, and limited knowledge of state actors with respect to local and traditional practices. In ASEAN, non-state actors remain at the margins of decision making, which is restricted to state actors guided by domestic interests thereby perpetuating a top-down governance structure (Anbumozhi, 2017). Moreover, inter-governmentalism characterises ASEAN's cooperation on environmental issues such as climate change for ASEAN as an organisation has little authority over member states since national governments are reluctant to cede their sovereignty in decision making to a higher body (Schreurs, 2010).

One respondent notes that "at the ASEAN level it might be very difficult to influence national policies except by things like ASEAN standards" given that each member state asserts its sovereignty. The different outcomes on social forestry goals in each member state are also due in part to ASEAN norms that give the organisation very little influence over the actions of member states at the domestic level. A respondent explains that "some countries make more progress than others especially countries that have a favourable enabling environment." Similarly, another respondent shares that "the principle of non-interference, sovereignty and all of that are quite strong culturally within ASEAN to the point wherein sometimes I think there are complaints among those working with the Secretariat that we cannot do anything without the approval of member states."

In ASEAN, decisions are reached through consensus whether at the working group level or the ministerial level. Hence, actors involved in ASEAN activities must abide by this norm which often prolongs the process. A respondent notes that in the ARKN-FCC if an agenda item is not supported by a member state, they will try to resolve the issue among themselves before it is endorsed to the senior officials. Consensus on proposed projects and activities is often reach through regular coordination. Under the Working Group on Social Forestry, the Secretariat regularly circulates information to formal and informal members with formal members meeting around five times in a year. For instance, a discussion may entail policy review involving partners and national focal points. Another respondent claims that building consensus in ASEAN is not for the weak since the process can take years. "In consensus building you have to be very patient. Some of the things are easily solved if there is just, for example, continuity of representation." Despite the challenges that transnational networks encounter in upholding ASEAN norms, state and non-state actors continue to uphold these norms

thereby emphasising the deep connection between the norms and the practices of trans-national actors.

The case studies of three ASEAN transnational networks discuss ways in which they help foster participation of non-state actors in governance to achieve regional climate change goals. Findings of the case studies indicate that ASEAN transnational networks provide spaces for the participation of non-state actors in climate change governance through the representation of their concerns and knowledge claims albeit in varying levels and often on a limited basis contingent on the degree of openness, inclusivity, trust, and authority accorded to them. Moreover, factors such as silos and ASEAN norms tend to constrain the participation of non-state actors. While it is evident that non-state actors in ASEAN have been involved in climate change governance, this study finds that the degree of their participation varies and appears marginal.

Therefore, these findings suggest the dual nature of practices enabling actors to both exercise their agency to initiate changes as well as perpetuate the existing structure by producing and reproducing entrenched norms, ideas, and power relations. Although transnational networks serve as venues of participation allowing state and non-state actors to engage in collective practices, participation of non-state actors remains minimal indicating that these networks have yet to transform their practices into praxis through meaningful participation, which entails not just taking part in practices but also in constructing meaning and social connections with other members of the community to achieve situated learning (Wenger, 1998). With only limited participation in climate change governance mechanisms, transnational networks cannot fully function as communities of practice that constitute meanings and identities of members to promote learning.

From Practices to Praxis

The practice theory in international relations assumes that practices of state and non-state actors can influence decisions, policies, and behaviour in international politics through learning. This study examines practices of actors in transnational networks since net-works provide opportunity structures from which knowledge can be used for collective action such as in climate change-related issues (Tosun and Schoenefeld, 2017). Practices in network activities can be seen as channels for sharing material and non-material resources which can result in innovation as actors acquire and create knowledge to inform policymaking and governance (Bixler, 2021). Interactions, no matter how ordinary or inconsequential at first, constitute practices and background knowledge that often bind networks together enabling them to form communities of practice. In one way or another, all communities of practice are networks because they maintain connections among transnational actors; however, they differ from networks in the aspect of social structuring since communities of practice are formed through networks of relationships (Græger, 2016). Networks acting as communities of practice not only offer inter-subjective relational structures that support the creation, exchange, and use of knowledge for these communities are also agents that sustain governance processes.

Communities of practices are venues where shared meanings are negotiated and forged, discourses become basis for decisions and actions, and new agenda emerge (Adler, 2005). It is through practices that members of these communities coordinate interactions from which learning or knowing occurs (Lin and Beyerlein, 2006). Thus, communities of practice are responsible for facilitating learning, developing joint enterprises, and fostering institutions that underpin transnational governance.

The case studies illustrate that state and non-state actors participating in transnational networks are bound by their practices to govern climate change transnationally. This is evident in their practices to promote coordination, knowledge sharing, capacity development, and consensus-building. Through their involvement in networks, state actors and non-state actors can represent their different interests, ideas, and knowledge claims in their efforts to provide relevant information to decision makers and take part in governance initiatives. Their participation brings shared practices, and the knowledge generated become reified in practices shaped by the interests of the various actors, ASEAN institutions, and prevailing ideas such as knowledge claims.

While ASEAN's transnational governance networks on climate change have established practices that can foster learning, further inquiry into these networks reveals the limited participation of non-state actors in ASEAN's governance processes. This finding brings into question whether shared practices of transnational networks can be considered as meaningful participation. Communities of practice require full and active participation in practices for members to develop a sense of belonging and mutual understanding, which are central to learning (Handley et al., 2006). Participation in communities of practice means engagement that builds relationships and identities or a form of practice as praxis for situated learning to occur. Thus, there seems to be a need for transnational networks in ASEAN to transform their practices into praxis before they can become communities of practice.

Turning practices into praxis sheds light on the dual ability of practices to instigate change as well as perpetuate the prevailing social order, which points out the micro-level mechanisms that impinge on regional governance on a macro-level. Members brought together by a common domain and guided by background knowledge conduct practices that are mutually constituting the agents and structure of climate change governance in ASEAN. This study illustrates that the participation of non-state actors in transnational networks, albeit in a limited manner, allow them to take part in governance through shared practices that facilitate the exchange, transfer, and learning of ideas, information, and possible solutions on climate change. While decision-making authority in ASEAN still rests on state actors, non-state actors can exercise their agency through their participation in transnational governance network. Findings of this study indicate that certain degrees of openness, inclusivity, trust, and authority enable non-state actors to assert their agency through practices that promote learning. This highlights the agency of non-state actors to affect change in ASEAN; however, their agency appears to be limited by the same practices that reproduce the existing social order.

In terms of structure, the practices of transnational networks seem to replicate ASEAN's social order mainly characterised by its inter-governmental design and state-

centric norms that limit the participation of non-state actors. The presence of silos and adherence to norms of sovereignty, non-interference, and consensus decision making are also the result of collective practices making it difficult for non-state actors to meaningfully participate in climate change governance. Knowingly or unknowingly, non-state actors also engage in practices that perpetuate the prevailing structure in ASEAN, which constrains their participation. This point is similar to the argument on the development of an ASEAN rationality, which hampered the ability of state actors to revise ASEAN's organisational design post-1997 (Davies, 2016). Norms embedded in practices impede the transition of transnational networks into communities of practice; hence, practices must translate into praxis in which learning and shared identities advance collaboration between state and non-state actors.

Analysing the participation of non-state actors in transnational networks through the perspective of communities of practice imply the dual ability of practices to affect continuity and change in international politics. Through repetitive patterns of activities, practices tend to promote stability, and, at the same time, practices can also cause shifts in the existing social order that may lead to change (Bueger and Gadinger, 2015). Applying communities of practice theory in studying ASEAN opens a wealth of possibilities for future research. Related studies on collective action, regional cooperation, and multilateral efforts can also benefit from examining the relationship between participatory governance and communities of practice. Since this study only involves three transnational governance networks in ASEAN, similar research can be done to include other transnational networks within ASEAN and beyond.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

Funding

ORCID iD

Virgemarie Salazar   https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8998-7144

Supplemental Material

Supplemental material for this article is available online.

References

Acharya A (2003) Democratisation and the prospects for participatory regionalism in Southeast Asia. *Third World Quarterly* 24(2): 375–390.

Adler-Nissen R (2016) Towards a practice turn in EU studies: the everyday of European integration. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies* 54(1): 87–103.

Adler E (2005) *Communitarian International Relations: The Epistemic Foundations of International Relations*. London: Routledge.

Adler E (2008) The spread of security communities: communities of practice, self-restraint, and NATO's post—Cold War transformation. *European Journal of International Relations* 14(2): 195–230.

Adler E (2019) *World Ordering: A Social Theory of Cognitive Evolution*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Adler E and Faubert M (2022) Epistemic communities of practice. In: Drieschova A, Bueger C and Hopf T (eds) *Conceptualizing International Practices: Directions for the Practice Turn in International Relations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp.47–76.

Adler E and Pouliot V (2011) International practices. *International Theory* 3(1): 1–36.

Allison L and Taylor M (2017) ASEAN's 'people-oriented' aspirations: civil society influences on non-traditional security governance. *Australian Journal of International Affairs* 71(1): 24–41.

Anbumozhi V (2017) Ensuring ASEAN's sustainable and resilient future. In: Baviera A and Maramis L (eds) *ASEAN@50 Building ASEAN Community: Political–Security and Socio-Cultural Reflections*. Jakarta: Economic Research Institute for ASEAN and East Asia, pp. 309–323.

Andonova LB, Betsill MM and Bulkeley H (2009) Transnational climate governance. *Global Environmental Politics* 9(2): 52–87.

Arino Y, Prabhakar SVRK, Lee Y-Y, et al. (2021) *ASEAN State of Climate Change Report.* Jakarta: ASEAN Secretariat.

Autesserre S (2014) Going micro: emerging and future peacekeeping research. *International Peacekeeping* 21(4): 492–500.

Bacudo I and Lim A (2021) *Positioning ASEAN in International Climate Negotiations: Lessons Learned from the ASEAN Negotiating Group for Agriculture (ANGA)*. Jakarta: ASEAN Climate Resilience Network.

Bicchi F (2022) Communities of practice and what they can do for International Relations. *Review of International Studies* 48(1): 24–43.

Bixler RP (2021) The knowledge network: identifying actors and structural dimensions of knowledge transfer. In: Ferreira CC and Klütsch CFC (eds) *Closing the Knowledge-Implementation Gap in Conservation Science: Interdisciplinary Evidence Transfer Across Sectors and Spatiotemporal Scales*. Cham: Springer International Publishing, pp. 143–169.

Boxelaar L, Paine M and Beilin R (2006) Community engagement and public administration: of silos, overlays and technologies of government. *Australian Journal of Public Administration* 65(1): 113–126.

Bremberg N (2015) The European Union as Security Community-Building Institution: venues, networks and co-operative security practices. *Journal of Common Market Studies* 53(3): 674–692.

Bremberg N, Sonnsjö H and Mobjörk M (2019) The EU and climate-related security risks: a community of practice in the making? *Journal of European Integration* 41(5): 623–639.

Breslin S and Nesadurai HES (2017) Who governs and how? Non-state actors and transnational governance in Southeast Asia. *Journal of Contemporary Asia* 48(2): 187–203.

Bueger C (2015) Making things known: epistemic practices, the United Nations, and the translation of piracy. *International Political Sociology* 9(1): 1–18.

Bueger C and Gadinger F (2015) The play of international practice. *International Studies Quarterly* 59(3): 449–460.

Caballero-Anthony M (2018) *Negotiating Governance on Non-Traditional Security in Southeast Asia and Beyond.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Collins A (2013) *Building a People-Oriented Security Community the ASEAN Way.* Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.

Davies M (2016) A community of practice: explaining change and continuity in ASEAN's diplomatic environment. *The Pacific Review* 29(2): 211–233.

Durst P and Soriaga R (2020) Final Evaluation of the ASEAN-Swiss Partnership on Social Forestry and Climate Change (ASFCC). Swiss Agency for Development and Co-operation (SDC).

Elliott L (2012) ASEAN and environmental governance: strategies of regionalism in Southeast Asia. *Global Environmental Politics* 12(3): 38–57.

Elliott L (2017) Environmental regionalism: moving in from the policy margins. *The Pacific Review* 30(6): 952–965.

Gerard K (2014) ASEAN and civil society activities in 'created spaces': the limits of liberty. *The Pacific Review* 27(2): 265–287.

Gerard K (2015) Explaining ASEAN's engagement of civil society in policymaking: smoke and mirrors. *Globalizations* 12(3): 365–382.

Glas A and Balogun E (2020) Norms in practice: people-centric governance in ASEAN and ECOWAS. *International Affairs* 96(4): 1015–1032.

Glas A and Laurence M (2022) Changing norms in practice: noninterference in the UN and ASEAN. *Journal of Global Security Studies* 7(2): ogac003.

Græger N (2016) European Security as practice: eU–NATO communities of practice in the making? *European Security* 25(4): 478–501.

Haas P (1992) Introduction: epistemic communities and international policy coordination. *International Organization* 46(1): 1–35.

Handley K, Sturdy A, Fincham R, et al. (2006) Within and beyond communities of practice: making sense of learning through participation, identity and practice. *Journal of Management Studies* 43(3): 641–653.

Kalafatis SE, Lemos MC, Lo Y-J, et al. (2015) Increasing information usability for climate adaptation: the role of knowledge networks and communities of practice. *Global Environmental Change* 32: 30–39.

Kearney J, Berkes F, Charles A, et al. (2007) The role of participatory governance and community-based management in integrated coastal and ocean management in Canada. *Coastal Management* 35: 79–104.

Keck M and Sikkink K (1998) *Activists Beyond Borders: Advocacy Networks in International Politics.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell.

Kuhn T (2002) Negotiating boundaries between scholars and practitioners: knowledge, networks, and communities of practice. *Management Communication Quarterly* 16(1): 106–112.

Lin Y, Beyerlein MM (2006) Communities of practice: a critical perspective on collaboration. In: Beyerlein MM, Beyerlein ST, Kennedy FA, et al. (eds) *Innovation Through Collaboration.* Bingley: Emerald Group Publishing Limited, pp. 53–79.

Miller CA (2007) Democratization, international knowledge institutions, and global governance. *Governance* 20(2): 325–357.

Newig J, Challies E, Jager NW, et al. (2018) The environmental performance of participatory and collaborative governance: a framework of causal mechanisms. *Policy Studies Journal* 46(2): 269–297.

Pouliot V (2008) The logic of practicality: a theory of practice of security communities. *International Organization* 62(2): 257–288.

Pouliot V and Cornut J (2015) Practice theory and the study of diplomacy: a research agenda. *Cooperation and Conflict* 50(3): 297–315.

Pouliot V and Thérien JP (2018) Global governance in practice. *Global Policy* 9(2): 163–172.

Rother S (2015) Democratizing ASEAN through "alternative regionalism"? The ASEAN Civil Society Conference and the ASEAN Youth Forum. *ASIEN* 136(July): 98–119.:

Rüland J (2014) The limits of democratizing interest representation: ASEAN's regional corporatism and normative challenges. *European Journal of International Relations* 20(1): 237–261.

Salamanca A and Anschell N (2020) *ASEAN Guidance for Climate-Smart Land Use Practices: A Review.* Jakarta: Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ).

Schreurs MA (2010) Multi-level governance the ASEAN way. In: Enderlein H, Wälti S and Zürn M (eds) *Handbook on Multi-Level Governance*. Cheltenham : Edward Elgar, pp. 308–320.

Seah S and Martinus M (2021) *Gaps and Opportunities in ASEAN's Climate Governance.* Singapore: ISEAS-Yusof Ishak Institute.

Sondarjee M (2021) Collective learning at the boundaries of communities of practice: inclusive policymaking at the World Bank. *Global Society* 35(3): 307–326.

Stone D (2008) Global public policy, transnational policy communities, and their networks. *The Policy Studies Journal* 36(1): 19–38.

Tosun J and Schoenefeld JJ (2017) Collective climate action and networked climate governance. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Climate Change* 8(1): e440.

Weber EP and Khademian AM (2008) Wicked problems, knowledge challenges, and collaborative capacity builders in network settings. *Public Administration Review* 68(2): 334–349.

Wenger E (1998) *Communities of Practice: Learning, Meaning, and Identity.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wenger E (2010) Communities of Practice and Social Learning Systems: the Career of a Concept. In: Blackmore C (ed) *Social Learning Systems and Communities of Practice*. London: Springer, 179–198.

Wiseman G (2015) Diplomatic practices at the United Nations. *Cooperation and Conflict* 50(3): 316–333.

Author Biography

Virgemarie Salazar is a PhD candidate under the International Doctoral Program in Asia-Pacific Studies of the College of Social Sciences at the National Chengchi University in Taipei, Taiwan. Her research interests include ASEAN regionalism and governance of transnational issues such as climate change and disaster management.