2. This legal pluralism, broadly defined, exists in the countries of multiethnic and multicultural Southeast Asia, particularly Cambodia, Indonesia, Lao PDR, Myanmar, Philippines, Thailand, Timor Leste, and Viet Nam. The colonial histories of these countries and their diverse ethnic, cultural and religious formations predating colonization explain the development and character of their legal pluralism which has survived attempts at harmonization under a unitary state legal order in the colonial and post-colonial periods.

3. Legal pluralism in Southeast Asia takes various forms. In Lao PDR, customary practices of ethnic groups flourish and "remain a crucial source of law for many people" but there is no state policy on how those practices are to be treated within the state framework.[3] In Indonesia, the state recognizes the different provisions regulating marriage and divorce for each of the six official religions. Some states have incorporated religious[4] laws and courts into the official legal system.

4. The legal orders within legal pluralism may be categorized as *state*, *non-state*, or *quasi-state*, when the nation-state is used as the paradigm of the domestic political and legal order. *Non-state legal orders* could encompass a broad range of legal orders within the state's jurisdiction, from indigenous norms and institutions in communities that continue to regulate relations and perform dispute resolution functions without state sanction, to the rule-making and enforcing power of corporations and universities, to community associations that engage in community regulation. Sometimes, the state legal order recognizes non-state legal orders or incorporates them into the justice system without assuming control over them. This is also referred to as a *quasi-state legal order*.[5]

5. The categories of state and non-state legal orders are not always clear-cut. They may overlap or their demarcation may be blurred. They also sometimes interact and cooperate with each other, either formally or informally. The non-state legal orders or mechanisms may be (a) not state-recognized and ignored, (b) not state-recognized but tolerated, (c) state-recognized but unregulated, (d) state-recognized and regulated, or (e) state-integrated as part of the formal justice system but with non-state personnel and using norms and procedures beyond state law.[6]

6. Bearing in mind that what exists in legal pluralism may not be a 'legal order' when compared to the paradigmatic state legal order, the examination may involve simply *state*, *non-state* or *quasi-state justice mechanisms*, referring to mechanisms used in a well-defined community for the resolution of disputes or the delivery of justice. *State justice mechanisms* are those established, maintained or operated by the state and its agents, or to mechanisms where state authority is directly involved in their creation, constitution, composition or accountability. On the other hand, *non-state justice mechanisms* are those existing in indigenous, customary or religion-based systems that operate independently of or autonomously from the state and have not been officially incorporated into the state justice system. Again, recognizing that the line

3. UNDP 2010, p. 14.
4. UN Women 2011, p. 67.
5. UN Women 2011, p. 68.
6. See UN Women, UNICEF & UNDP 2012, pp. 35-36, 54.