

Independent Reporting Mechanism (IRM): South Korea Progress Report 2016–2017

Jee In Chung, PhD Candidate at Seoul National University

Table of Contents

I. Introduction	8
II. Context	9
III. Leadership and Multistakeholder Process	13
IV. Commitments	21
1. 1a. Expand coverage of information disclosure system	23
2. 1b. Improve disclosure of public information	26
3. 1c. Standardize pre-release of information	28
4. 3a. Citizen participation in policy development	35
5. 4a. Remove ActiveX	38
6. 4b. Integrate e-government service portals	41
7. 5a. Improve anti-corruption survey	44
8. 6a. Disclose international aid information	47
9. 6b. Improve information on ODA projects	50
V. General Recommendations	53
VI. Methodology and Sources	56
VII. Eligibility Requirements Annex	58

Executive Summary:

South Korea Year 1 Report



Action plan: 2016–2018
Period under review: 2016–2017
IRM report publication year: 2018

South Korea's third action plan saw an inclusive co-creation process and addressed some priority areas such as open data and access to information. However, the action plan was vaguely formulated and included commitments with low ambition. The next action plan would benefit from clearly defining commitments' objectives and intended results, and addressing issues such as conflict of interest and money in politics.

HIGHLIGHTS

Commitment	Overview	Well-Designed? *
2a. Disclose high-demand data	This commitment resulted in the government's collaboration with civil society to select and disclose impactful areas of open data, such as financial information and national procurement data. This commitment seeks to disclose datafiles within these areas.	No
3a. Citizen participation in policy development	This commitment aims to expand the operation of the Citizen Design Group, which is an award-winning model that allows for direct citizen participation in the development of policy.	No

*Commitment is evaluated by the IRM as specific, relevant, and has a transformative potential impact

PROCESS

South Korea had a consultation process with an active, but limited number of CSOs. While the newly established OGP Forum Korea is made up of diverse CSO representation, it was established 11 months after the implementation of the action plan and had little influence on it.

Who was involved?

		Government		
Civil society		Narrow/ little governmental consultations	Primarily agencies that serve other agencies	Significant involvement of line ministries and agencies
	Beyond “governance” civil society			
	Mostly “governance” civil society		✓	
	No/little civil society involvement			

The Ministry of Interior and Safety (MoIS) is the lead institution for 11 out of 14 commitments in the 2016–2018 action plan. Ten institutions took part in the development process and four, including the MoIS, are responsible for implementation. Involvement from civil society was limited to three CSOs with expertise on access to information and open data. Eleven months after the implementation of the action plan, the government created the OGP Korea Forum, which diversified CSO participation, but the forum has had little to no influence in implementing OGP activities.

Level of input by stakeholders

Level of Input	During Development
Collaborate: There was iterative dialogue AND the public helped set the agenda	
Involve: The government gave feedback on how public inputs were considered	✓
Consult: The public could give input	
Inform: The government provided the public with information on the action plan.	
No Consultation	

OGP co-creation requirements

Timeline Process and Availability Timeline and process available online prior to consultation	No
Advance notice	Yes

Advance notice of consultation	
Awareness Raising Government carried out awareness-raising activities	No
Multiple Channels Online and in-person consultations were carried out	No
Documentation and Feedback A summary of comments by government was provided	No
Regular Multi-stakeholder Forum Did a forum exist and did it meet regularly?	Yes
Government Self-Assessment Report Was a self-assessment report published?	Yes
Total	3 of 7

Acting Contrary to OGP process A country is considered to have acted contrary to process if one or more of the following occurs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The National Action Plan was developed with neither online or offline engagements with citizens and civil society The government fails to engage with the IRM researchers in charge of the country's Year 1 and Year 2 reports The IRM report establishes that there was no progress made on implementing any of the commitments in the country's action plan 	No
--	----

COMMITMENT PERFORMANCE

Nearly all commitments are substantially or fully implemented. Commitments could, however, be better defined to clearly identify the commitments' objectives and intended results.

Current Action Plan Implementation

2016–2018 Action Plan	
Completed Commitments (Year 1)	4 of 14 (29%)
OGP Global Average Completion Rate (Year 1)	18%

Previous Action Plan Implementation

2014–2016 Action Plan	
Completed Commitments (Year 1)	0 of 5 (0%)
Completed Commitments (Year 2)	1 of 5 (20%)
2012–2013 Action Plan	
Completed Commitments (Year 1)	4 of 16 (25%)
Completed Commitments (Year 2)	N/A

Potential Impact

2016–2018 Action Plan	
Transformative Commitments	0 of 14 (0%)
OGP Global Average for Transformative Commitments	16%
2014–2016 Transformative Commitments	0 of 5 (0%)
2012–2013 Transformative Commitments	2 of 16 (13%)

Starred commitments

2016–2018 Action Plan	
Starred Commitments* (Year1)	0 of 14 (0%)
Highest Number of Starred Commitments (All OGP Action Plans)	5
2014–2016 Starred Commitments	0 of 5 (0%)
2012–2013 Starred Commitments	1 of 16 (6%)

* Commitment is evaluated by the IRM as specific, relevant, has a transformative potential impact, and is substantially complete or complete

IRM RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Include highly specific, ambitious and relevant commitments
2. Improve co-creation during the development and implementation of the next action plan
3. Leverage the OGP platform to advance ongoing reforms initiated by the Moon administration
4. Develop strong commitments on addressing conflict of interest and money in politics
5. Modernize existing open government policies and practices

COMMITMENT OVERVIEW

Commitment Title	Well-designed (Year 1)*	Starred (Year 1)	Overview
1a. Expand coverage of information disclosure system	No	No	All but six private universities transitioned into using the integrated system, which provides a standardized procedure for the disclosure of information. The website (www.open.go.kr) and the instructions provided to request information are convenient and user-friendly.
1b. Improve disclosure of public information	No	No	This commitment is vaguely formulated and does not specify what information will be selected for disclosure or how best practices will be promoted to improve publication.
1c. Standardize pre-release of information	No	No	The targeted percentage of local governments (55 percent) now use the standardized model for the pre-release of information. The government should establish a platform for citizen feedback, given the proliferation of system errors.

2a. Disclose high-demand data	No	No	Although the government did not specify the 22 highly-demanded areas to be disclosed, datafiles on all areas have been disclosed on the Open Data Portal and the number of total downloads has increased.
2b. Open data quality management	No	No	Although substantially complete according to the self-assessment, the commitment activities largely address an internal government quality control process, and the text does not specify which datasets will undergo quality evaluation or what the baseline for evaluation is.
2c. Expand provision of open format	No	No	This commitment's objective to increase the current share of disclosed data in open format from 38.9 percent to 70 percent has been fully implemented. Representatives from CODE agreed that this expansion benefits data-users.
2d. Common standards for data disclosure	No	No	MoIS developed additional standards for data disclosure and an automatic self-assessment tool. To improve the tool, the government needs to gather user feedback through workshops or surveys.
3a. Citizen participation in policy development	No	No	This commitment aims to expand the innovative Citizen Design Group, an award-winning participatory policy model. However, the commitment text is vaguely formulated and does not specify intended changes of the existing model.
4a. Remove ActiveX	No	No	The government developed Government24, a user-friendly service portal, that integrates the online services of central government ministries and public agencies. While this improves citizens' access to public services, it is not related to OGP values.
4b. Integrate e-government service portals	No	No	The government developed Government24, a user-friendly service portal, that integrates the online services of central government ministries and public agencies. While this improves citizens' access to public services, it is not related to OGP values.
4c. Develop public services application	N/A	N/A	The need to develop a service notification application to access government services became obsolete after the government implemented Government24's mobile application (Commitment 4b). This commitment has been officially withdrawn by the government.
5a. Improve anti-corruption survey	No	No	The ACRC added an additional question on their anti-corruption survey to evaluate the experiences of public officials regarding improper solicitation. Due to the limitations of this method in measuring corruption in the public sector, other methods must be sought to actively fight corruption.
6a. Disclose	No	No	The government has fully disclosed program

international aid information			information required by all IATI member countries. However, stakeholders have stated that the disclosed information is basic and does not effectively promote transparency of Official Development Assistance (ODA) activities.
6b. Improve information on ODA projects	No	No	There is a disparity between the action plan text and the activities implemented by the government, as stated in the self-assessment report. The government should clearly state the aim of its commitments and, more specifically, make the ODA statistics system accessible to the public.

*Commitment is evaluated by the IRM as specific, relevant, and has a transformative potential impact

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Jee In Chung is a PhD candidate in public administration at Seoul National University. She received her Masters in Public Administration with a specialization in finance from New York University and a bachelors from Columbia University. Her studies focus on politics, governance, private-public partnership and human rights.

The Open Government Partnership (OGP) aims to secure concrete commitments from governments to promote transparency, empower citizens, fight corruption, and harness new technologies to strengthen governance. OGP's Independent Reporting Mechanism (IRM) assesses development and implementation of national action plans to foster dialogue among stakeholders and improve accountability.



I. Introduction

The Open Government Partnership (OGP) is an international multistakeholder initiative that aims to secure concrete commitments from governments to their citizenry to promote transparency, empower citizens, fight corruption, and harness new technologies to strengthen governance. OGP provides an international forum for dialogue and sharing among governments, civil society organizations, and the private sector, all of which contribute to a common pursuit of open government.

South Korea began its formal participation in September 2011, when Han Duk-Soo declared his country's intention to participate in the initiative.¹

In order to participate in OGP, governments must exhibit a demonstrated commitment to open government by meeting a set of (minimum) performance criteria. Objective, third-party indicators are used to determine the extent of country progress on each of the criteria: fiscal transparency, public official's asset disclosure, citizen engagement, and access to information. See Section VII: Eligibility Requirements for more details.

All OGP-participating governments develop OGP action plans that elaborate concrete commitments with the aim of changing practice beyond the status quo over a two-year period. The commitments may build on existing efforts, identify new steps to complete ongoing reforms, or initiate action in an entirely new area.

South Korea developed its third national action plan from June 2016 to October 2016. The official implementation period for the action plan was October 2016 to June 2018. This year one report covers the action plan development process and first year of implementation, from July 2016 to December 2017. Beginning in 2015, the IRM started publishing end-of-term reports on the final status of progress at the end of the action plan's two-year period. Any activities or progress occurring after the first year of implementation, December 2017, will be assessed in the end-of-term report. The government published its self-assessment in both the administrative language and English in December 2017.²

In order to meet OGP requirements, the Independent Reporting Mechanism (IRM) of OGP has partnered with Jee In Chung, who carried out this evaluation of the development and implementation of South Korea's third action plan. To gather the voices of multiple stakeholders, the IRM researcher attended monthly OGP Korea forums and conducted individual interviews with various government officials as well as civil organization leaders, activists, experts and business leaders that are closely involved with the work outlined in commitments of the third national action plan. The interviews took place in offices of various civil organizations, coffee shops, offices of Ministry of the Interior and Safety and meeting rooms in the National Information Society Agency. The IRM aims to inform ongoing dialogue around development and implementation of future commitments. Methods and sources are dealt with in Section VI of this report (Methodology and Sources).

¹ <https://www.opengovpartnership.org/documents/south-korea-letter-of-intent-join-ogp>

² <https://www.opengovpartnership.org/documents/south-korea-mid-term-self-assessment-report-2016-2018>

II. Context

The development and implementation of the third action plan took place during the unexpected impeachment of President Park Geun-Hye and subsequent election of President Moon Jae-In. The Moon administration announced a five-year policy agenda that emphasizes open government reforms. While current commitments focus on improving access to information and open data, the scope does not adequately address anti-corruption reforms.

2.1 Background

South Korea is a developed democracy with a systematic and structured democratic system in place. The President is directly elected for a single five-year term, which translates to a consistent turnover of power and robust political pluralism.¹

South Korea generally ranks well on a variety of good governance indicators and is an OECD leader country on open government data. Since becoming a member in 2011, South Korea has consistently met OGP's eligibility criteria (budget transparency, access to information, asset declaration, and citizen engagement).

Reforms derived from President Park's impeachment

In October 2016, a local TV channel, JTBC, exposed a corruption scandal that directly involved President Park and a long-time friend, Choi Soon Sil. President Park allegedly allowed Choi to gain access to confidential, undisclosed governmental information, and Choi was accused of using her presidential connections to pressure conglomerates, including Samsung and Lotte, to donate millions of dollars to two non-profits she controlled.² Choi was arrested and sentenced to 20 years in jail.

Despite President Park's two public apologies, national-scale protests over the next three months drew millions of participants demanding the president's resignation and impeachment.³ In December 2016, for the first time in South Korea's history, the National Assembly voted to impeach an elected president, pursuant to Article 65 set out by the Constitution of the Republic of Korea. The Constitutional Court of Korea upheld the decision to impeach President Park in March 2017.⁴ In May 2017, South Koreans elected Moon Jae-In as their new president.

Since then, transparency and public accountability have gained particular prominence for many civil society organizations and the general public. Open government is part of the federal government's institutional agenda, as demonstrated by President Moon's five-year policy agenda. Most recently, the Korean Anti-Corruption and Civil Rights Commission (ACRC) successfully implemented the Improper Solicitation and Graft Act (colloquially known as Kim Young-ran Act), which establishes stiff punishments for those convicted of accepting bribes.

The Kim Young-ran Act introduces limits on acceptance of gifts by government officials⁵ and aims to prevent conflict of interest by targeting the common practice of gift giving. Arguments have been made by some lobby organizations, such as the Federation of Korean Industries, that this law will negatively impact the economy.⁶ However, in a 2017 survey of 300 domestic companies, 74 percent of respondents said the business environment had improved since the law came into force.⁷

President Moon has also taken steps to structurally reform the South Korean Prosecutor's Office, which has long been criticized for its excessive power and political bias.⁸ President Moon appointed a new justice minister, Park Sang Ki, who is tasked to ensure the separation of the judicial branch from politics. The establishment of an independent agency to investigate graft among senior public officials is also under way.

According to the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development's (OECD) Government at a Glance 2017 Report,⁹ South Korea scores below the OECD average in citizens' confidence level in their national government. According to the report, successfully implementing public sector reforms is the first step to restoring public trust and confidence in the government.

Civil Liberties

According to Freedom in the World 2018,¹⁰ an annual report published by Freedom House, Korea has an aggregate score of 84, where 0 represents a score that is "least free" and 100 is "most free." The assessment notes that the government respects personal freedoms but could improve on the protection of rights for minorities, such as North Korea defectors, the LGBT community, migrant workers and immigrants.

The constitution guarantees freedom of peaceful assembly and prohibits the licensing of assembly and association. In practice, however, authorities have exerted tight control over peaceful demonstrations and used excessive force and arbitrary arrest to disperse protesters.¹¹ In August 2016, a student-led protest against the Ewha Womans University met with a deployment of 1,600 security forces and reported excessive use of force, leading to multiple injuries.¹² In September 2016, the activist Baek Nam-gi died after being struck on the head by a water cannon operated by security forces in an anti-government demonstration back in November 2015.¹³

Despite this trend, the series of protests calling for President Park's resignation at the end of 2016 indicated an improvement in the conditions for freedom of assembly. On 3 December 2016, 2.3 million people nationwide protested on the streets, which is the largest on record in Korea's history.¹⁴ These mass mobilizations have been viewed as a watershed moment for improved civic freedoms in the country.¹⁵

Although the news media is generally free and competitive, there are still constraints to press freedom. In response to the criticism of President Park's handling of the Sewol Ferry incident in 2014, a criminal defamation law was passed, which authorizes sentences of up to seven years in prison.¹⁶ Another limitation on the freedom of political expression is the National Security Act¹⁷, which states that citizens with pro-North beliefs, ways of thinking and activities, will be subject to legal consequences.

Freedom of Information and Open Data

The Act on Disclosure of Information by Public Agencies protects the right of citizens to access public information. However, the Global Right to Information Rating gave South Korea's Freedom of Information (Fol) law a score of 82 out of 150,¹⁸ and concluded that the "law contains serious problems," including its allowance of other acts to exempt information from disclosure. While the government has since started initiatives and made commitments to transform this policy area, there is still room for improvement.

On the other hand, South Korea is an OECD leader in open government data. The OECD's Government at a Glance 2017 Report¹⁹ stresses the importance of institutionalizing open government reforms and policies on transparency, accountability and participation through data. Many countries, including South Korea, which was an early adopter, have implemented national strategies and initiatives strictly for successful open government reforms. In 2017, South Korea has retained its top position on the OECD's Open-Useful-Reusable Government Index (OURdata) which measures data availability, data accessibility, and government support for re-use.²⁰

Family Conglomerates with Embezzlement and Tax Evasion

One of the cornerstones of President Moon's election campaign was chaebol reform. "Chaebol" refers to conglomerates of affiliated companies that are usually dominated by a wealthy family. The sales revenue of the 10 largest chaebols, including Samsung and Hyundai,

account for approximately 70 percent of the country's GDP.²¹ Recently, however, scandals surrounding Samsung²² and Lotte Group²³ have led to increasing levels of public scrutiny.

Getting minority shareholders and board members to put pressure on improving corporate governance is key to the chaebol reform policy.²⁴

2.2 Scope of Action Plan in Relation to National Context

The third national action plan builds on the commitments from the previous action plan (in areas such as proactive disclosure of public information and citizen participation) and also introduces new topics, including public open data disclosure, improved accessibility to public services through technology and innovation, public service ethics, and improved financial transparency. Specifically, these commitments aim to improve the Act on Promotion of the Provision and Use of Public Data and former President Park's Gov 3.0 Initiative, which emphasized open government reforms and higher engagement with citizens. In addition, some of the commitments in the third action plan have a large overlap with the five-year policy agenda officially outlined by Moon's administration, regarding the issues on corruption, open data and civic participation.

Moving forward, the next national action plan could benefit from widening the scope of commitments by addressing participatory policy making, anti-corruption, reforms, and greater whistleblower protections. A future OGP action plan should consider establishing a formalized, official platform through which citizens can engage with public officials and openly suggest new policy ideas or reforms. Such a platform could be based on Gwanghwamoon First Street,²⁵ an official communication channel established for the first 50 days of the Moon administration. Citizens were invited to propose social and political ideas, and approximately 170 were selected and then incorporated into the five-year policy agenda.²⁶

Additionally, a future action plan could include more anti-corruption commitments and align OGP activities with the Moon administration's chaebol reforms and the implementation of the Kim Young-ran Act.

Finally, although South Korea's Act on the Protection of Public Interest Whistleblowers is considered one of the world's most comprehensive whistleblower laws²⁷, in a culture that upholds loyalty to the organization, the stigma attached to whistleblowing continues to act as a deterrent to effective implementation. Whistleblowers still face termination, financial straits and discrimination as a result of exposing corruption in their workplace.²⁸ While protections for personal confidentiality are addressed in the Act²⁹, there is still a need for greater assurances of anonymity for whistleblowers.

¹ Freedom House, South Korea 2017 profile, <https://freedomhouse.org/report/freedom-world/2017/south-korea>

² 'South Korea jails Choi Soon-sil, friend to Park Geun-hye for corruption', BBC, <http://www.bbc.com/news/world-asia-43042862>

³ The Korea Herald: Candle revolution, <http://www.koreaherald.com/view.php?ud=20161209000458>

⁴ Republic of Korea, "Constitutional Court Act" (English translation) (1991), http://elaw.klri.re.kr/kor_service/lawView.do?hseq=33354&lang=ENG

⁵ New York Times: Anti-graft law, https://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/30/world/asia/south-korea-bribery-law.html?_r=0

⁶ Ja Ser Mo, Korea Joong Ang Daily, 29 July 29 2016, <http://koreajoongangdaily.joins.com/news/article/article.aspx?aid=3021918>.

⁷ Freedom House, South Korea 2018 profile, <https://freedomhouse.org/report/freedom-world/2018/south-korea>

⁸ Kang J, "New Era, old problems" Asian Legal Business, 6 October 2017, <http://www.legalbusinessonline.com/features/new-era-old-problems/74973>.

⁹ OECD, "OECD Government at a Glance 2017", <https://www.oecd.org/gov/government-at-a-glance-2017-highlights-en.pdf>.

¹⁰ Freedom House, Freedom of the World (2018), South Korea 2018, <https://freedomhouse.org/report/freedom-world/2018/south-korea>

¹¹ Tracking Civic Space, <https://monitor.civics.org/newsfeed/2016/10/14/conditions-protest-deteriorate-south-korea/>

¹² The Korea Herald, <http://www.koreaherald.com/view.php?ud=20160801000724>

-
- ¹³ New York Times, 'Activist dies of injuries from police water cannon', <https://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/26/world/asia/activist-in-south-korea-dies-of-injuries-from-police-water-cannon.html>
- ¹⁴ Ock. H.J, "Candle revolution: how candles led to Park's impeachment", The Korea Herald, 9 December 2016, <http://www.koreaherald.com/view.php?ud=20161209000458>.
- ¹⁵ Tracking Civic Space, <https://monitor.civicus.org/newsfeed/2016/11/01/south-korea-overview/>
- ¹⁶ <https://www.nytimes.com/2016/03/06/world/asia/defamation-laws-south-korea-critics-press-freedom.html>
- ¹⁷ Republic of Korea, "National Security Act" (English translation) (1948), http://elaw.klri.re.kr/eng_service/lawView.do?hseq=39798&lang=ENG
- ¹⁸ Global Right to Information Rating, Act on Disclosure of Information by Public Agencies South Korea, <http://www.rti-rating.org/>
- ¹⁹ Government at a Glance 2017, <https://www.oecd.org/gov/government-at-a-glance-2017-highlights-en.pdf>
- ²⁰ The Korea Times, http://www.koreatimes.co.kr/www/tech/2017/07/133_233592.html
- ²¹ 'South Korea's Conglomerates', <https://scholar.harvard.edu/files/frankel/files/skorea-conglomerates2017sage.pdf>
- ²² The Washington Post, 'South Korean Scandal May Force Change of Chaebol Ways', https://www.washingtonpost.com/business/south-korean-scandal-may-force-change-of-chaebol-ways-quicktake/2017/12/24/6fb9b040-e887-11e7-927a-e72eac1e73b6_story.html?utm_term=.01c6a64584b2
- ²³ New York Times, <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/12/22/business/korea-lotte-corruption-conviction.html>
- ²⁴ Reuters Business News, <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-southkorea-politics-business/chaebol-reform-at-forefront-of-south-korea-presidential-campaign-again-idUSKBN16Z0AU>
- ²⁵ Gwanghwamoon First Street, <https://www.gwanghwamoon1st.go.kr/>
- ²⁶ Sohn JiAe, "Gwanghwamoon first street draws global attention" KoreaNet, 2 June 2017, <http://www.korea.net/NewsFocus/policies/view?articleId=146804>
- ²⁷ Breaking the Silence, <https://blueprintforfreespeech.net/wp-content/uploads/2015/10/Breaking-the-Silence-Strengths-and-Weaknesses-in-G20-Whistleblower-Protection-Laws1.pdf>
- ²⁸ New York Times, <https://www.nytimes.com/2016/11/09/business/international/south-korea-whistle-blower-corruption.html>
- ²⁹ Anti-Corruption and Civil Rights Commission, <http://www.acrc.go.kr/en/board.do?command=searchDetail&method=searchList&menuId=020312>

III. Leadership and Multistakeholder Process

The Ministry of Interior and Safety conducted three meetings with a limited number of CSOs to develop the third national action plan. However, only some of CSO-proposed commitments were reflected in the action plan. 11 months after the start of the implementation, the government developed a new multistakeholder group called the OGP Korea Forum. It has had little influence on the implementation of the action plan.

3.1 Leadership

This subsection describes the OGP leadership and institutional context for OGP in South Korea. Table 3.1 summarizes this structure while the narrative section (below) provides additional detail.

Table 3.1: OGP Leadership

I. Structure	Yes	No
Is there a clearly designated Point of Contact for OGP (individual)?	✓	
	Shared	Single
Is there a single lead agency on OGP efforts?		✓
	Yes	No
Is the head of government leading the OGP initiative?		✗
2. Legal Mandate	Yes	No
Is the government's commitment to OGP established through an official, publicly released mandate?		✗
Is the government's commitment to OGP established through a legally binding mandate?		✗
3. Continuity and Instability	Yes	No
Was there a change in the organization(s) leading or involved with the OGP initiatives during the action plan implementation cycle?	✓	
Was there a change in the executive leader during the duration of the OGP action plan cycle?	✓	

Legislative authority in the Republic of Korea (South Korea) is vested in an elected, unicameral National Assembly, while executive political power is exercised by the Cabinet, led by the President.

The Ministry of Interior and Safety (MoIS) is the leading office responsible for coordinating South Korea's OGP Commitments, after changing its name from Ministry of Interior during the first year of implementation. In June 2017, Kim Boo-Kyum became the Minister of MoIS, and thus the new executive leader of OGP. The point of contacts at MoIS are Han Duk-soo and Yu Jin Lee. (See Table 3.1 on the leadership and mandate of OGP in South Korea).

MoIS is responsible for the general coordination of public service in the country, including national administration, government organizations, personnel management, e-government and disaster safety. It also offers support to local governments for administration, finance and regional development. The extent of MoIS's coordinating powers is limited: municipalities have a level of autonomy and are not entirely subordinate to national or provincial governments. Although MoIS is responsible for setting norms and administrative planning for public service, local government departments manage and supervise their own

administrative affairs, except when provided by law. Under the Constitution, they may, within the limit of the law, “enact provisions relating to local autonomy regulations.”¹ National and provincial governments, however, have a legal duty to offer support to municipalities. Unless otherwise noted, references to “the government” are specific to MoIS in its lead role for OGP in South Korea under this Section.

In comparison to previous years, MoIS has expanded the team with additional human resources to more effectively coordinate OGP-related activities. There is a total of 16 staff dedicated and directly involved with the activities listed under the third action plan. There is no overall budget specifically set aside for OGP activities. The third national action plan specified all government bodies that were responsible for the implementation and the relevant points of contact were fully listed and accessible.

3.2 Intragovernmental Participation

This subsection describes which government institutions were involved at various stages in OGP. The next section will describe which nongovernmental organizations were involved in OGP.

Table 3.2 Participation in OGP by Government Institutions

How did institutions participate?	Ministries, Departments, and Agencies	Legislative	Judiciary (including quasi-judicial agencies)	Other (including constitutional independent or autonomous bodies)	Subnational Governments
Consult: These institutions observed or were invited to observe the action plan but may not be responsible for commitments in the action plan.	9 ²	0	1 ³	0	0
Propose: These institutions proposed commitments for inclusion in the action plan.	6 ⁴	0	1 ⁵	0	0
Implement: These institutions are responsible for implementing commitments in the action plan whether or not they proposed the commitments.	3 ⁶	0	1 ⁷	0	0

In South Korea, participation in OGP was limited to a handful of executive ministries and agencies, and several independent commissions. Of the 14 commitments, there was one judicial commitment, which involved the Anti-Corruption & Civil Rights Commission (ACRC). Table 3.2 above details which institutions were involved in OGP. The Ministry of Interior and Safety (MoIS) was responsible for 11 of the 14 commitments. The National Information Society Agency (NIA) directly supported and assisted many of the tasks and activities MoIS carried out.

Early participation in developing the third action plan was ad hoc. During the consulting period, MoIS sent out an invitation letter (“OGP Action Plan Cooperation Request”) to the relevant ministries and governmental agencies prior to the creation of the third national action plan. The letter briefly explained the values and the mission of OGP and provided a list of previous commitments, seeking inputs and collaboration from others. It is difficult to say that any of these institutions proposed commitments for the inclusion of the national action plan; however, MoIS have solicited feedback, positive and negative, from six ministries and public agencies regarding the drafted list of commitments. The agencies were invited to respond to MoIS in writing. The MoIS point of contact responsible for coordinating OGP-related matters changed in August 2016, during the phase of consultation and proposal period. It is difficult to confirm whether any meetings took place in-person for intragovernmental collaboration.

The three institutions responsible for the implementation of commitment activities in the final draft of the action plan are MoIS, ACRC, and the Office for Government Policy Coordination. Although it is clear the MoIS and NIA met on a regular basis for meetings regarding OGP commitment activities, there was no formalized interagency group that met regularly to discuss OGP activities and relevant matters.

3.3 Civil Society Engagement

Countries participating in OGP follow a set of requirements for consultation during development, implementation, and review of their OGP action plan. Table 3.3 summarizes the performance of South Korea during the 2016–2018 action plan.

Table 3.3: National OGP Process

Key Steps Followed: 3 of 7						
Before	1. Timeline Process & Availability			2. Advance Notice		
	Timeline and process available online prior to consultation	Yes	No	Advance notice of consultation	Yes	No
			✗		✓	
	3. Awareness Raising			4. Multiple Channels		
	Government carried out awareness-raising activities	Yes	No	4a. Online consultations:	Yes	No
			✗	4b. In-person consultations:	Yes	No
				✓		
5. Documentation & Feedback						
Summary of comments provided				Yes	No	
					✗	
During	6. Regular Multistakeholder Forum					
	6a. Did a forum exist?	Yes	No	6b. Did it meet regularly?	Yes	No

		✓			✓	
After	7. Government Self-Assessment Report					
	7a. Annual self-assessment report published?	Yes	No	7b. Report available in English and administrative language?	Yes	No
		✓			✓	
	7c. Two-week public comment period on report?	Yes	No	7d. Report responds to key IRM recommendations?	Yes	No
✓					✗	

There were several online communications between the representatives of civil society organizations (CSOs) and government officials⁸ to plan the meeting schedules and agenda, and to form a list of participants. The method for consultation was an open discussion: the government point of contact asked for feedback on MoIS-proposed commitments and opened up the discussion to suggest new commitments. CSOs were invited to share their ideas during in-person meetings and via email.

MoIS held a total of three in-person meetings with Open Net, the Center for Freedom of Information and Transparency Society, IndiLab and other CSOs.⁹ All three meetings took place in Seoul and the group of participating CSOs was fairly small, limiting the diversity of views represented.

CSOs initiated the first in-person meeting on 10 June 2016. In addition to representatives from OpenNet, IndiLab, and The Center for Freedom of Information and Transparent Society, representatives from MoIS and the National Information Society Agency (NIA) were present. At the meeting, the government gave an overall view of the government policies, activities and programs that were currently under way or in the planning stage in promoting transparency, open government and accountability. The government also discussed some key recommendations in the 2014–2016 end-of-term report and laid out general plans to create the third national action plan.

The second meeting took place on 25 July 2016. The government presented a list of drafted commitments and solicited active feedback from the CSOs. CSOs proposed a total of seven commitments and three were incorporated into the final action plan: commitments 6a and 6b on ODA Korea, proposed by Indi Lab, and commitment 4a, proposed by Open Net. The other five CSO-proposed commitments were subject to additional review and put on hold given the context and timeline of the commitment.

The third meeting between government and CSOs was held on 22 September 2016. According to the self-assessment, CSOs discussed whether they felt their feedback had been adequately reflected in the action plan. Based on the information provided in the self-assessment, it is not clear what conclusion the participating CSOs came to or how the government responded.¹⁰

In October 2016, MoIS disseminated a final draft of the action plan among relevant government ministries. Once the ministries approved the timetables and content of the commitments, MoIS incorporated written feedback from CSOs into the final plan.

Overall, the IRM researcher has assessed the level of public influence to be “involve” during the development of the action plan. Other than the government self-assessment, there is no publicly available information and CSOs have not commented on this process.

Table 3.4: Level of Public Influence

The IRM has adapted the International Association for Public Participation (IAP2) “Spectrum of Participation” to apply to OGP.¹¹ This spectrum shows the potential level of public influence on the contents of the action plan. In the spirit of OGP, most countries should aspire for “collaborative.”

Level of public influence		During development of action plan	During implementation of action plan
Empower	The government handed decision-making power to members of the public.		
Collaborate	There was iterative dialogue AND the public helped set the agenda.		
Involve	The government gave feedback on how public inputs were considered.	✓	
Consult	The public could give inputs.		
Inform	The government provided the public with information on the action plan.		✓
No Consultation	No consultation		

3.4 Consultation During Implementation

As part of their participation in OGP, governments commit to identify a forum to enable regular multistakeholder consultation on OGP implementation. This can be an existing entity or a new one. This section summarizes that information.

In August 2017, after the development of the third action plan, the government developed a new multistakeholder working group called the OGP Korea Forum. The new forum could deepen communication between stakeholders and the government during the development and implementation of the next action plan. The forum is scheduled to have a regular meeting on a monthly basis where all members will have the opportunity to voice opinions on the content of the commitment activities, its progress, further recommendations, and limitations, if any.

The forum was invitation-only and all the participants were subject to formal procedures for participation. The government held an online application from 24 July 2017 to 4 August 2017, inviting CSOs to officially join the forum. The forum consists of 11 CSOs¹² and 11 government officials. There are two chairmen leading the forum, one governmental official and one CSO representative. CSO representation is diverse, ranging from Open Net to Solidarity for Justice and the Korea Association for Local Government and Administration Studies. All meetings take place in Seoul, the capital city. The current members will be holding their seats until the final assessment of the fourth national action plan in September 2020.

According to the government self-assessment, the OGP Korea Forum held two meetings, on 28 September and 19 October 2017. During these meetings, government officials responsible for each commitment updated members on the status of implementation, distributed the self-assessment report, and asked CSOs to comment on the report and raise any questions or concerns. At a later meeting, the government official collected responses from all CSOs and presented the findings to the Forum members. Although meeting notes are not publicly available, the IRM researcher was invited to the forum and has attended all meetings, from August 2017.

The government is currently working to activate a new website dedicated to OGP activities. The current website (<http://www.gov30.go.kr/ogp/ogp.jsp>) exists; however, it is not well-updated. In November 2017, CSOs discussed the need for their own website, which could represent the opinions of the CSOs and document the meeting schedule, notes, agenda and content. The CSO-specific website (<http://ogpkorea.org/>) is now up and running.

The forum was formed 11 months after the start of the implementation period and, at this stage, has provided little to no opportunity for CSO members to provide input or influence the implementation of OGP commitments. The OGP Korea Forum will be evaluated further in the end-of-term report.

3.5 Self-Assessment

The OGP Articles of Governance require that participating countries publish a self-assessment report three months after the end of the first year of implementation. The self-assessment report must be made available for public comments for a two-week period. This section assesses compliance with these requirements and the quality of the report.

The Ministry of Interior and Safety (MoIS) submitted the final copy of its self-assessment report in the administrative language on 17 November 2017 and in English on 11 December 2017. At the request of the IRM researcher, MoIS made a draft of the self-assessment available in early November.

The public comment period was open for two weeks and it was publicized on the official MoIS website¹³, the MoIS Twitter account, @withyou3542¹⁴, and OGP’s temporary website.¹⁵ Although it was advertised on the Ministry’s various platforms, its scope in reaching a wide audience was limited. Emailing the OGP point of contact was the singular channel for public feedback. During the public comment period, six OGP Korea Forum members provided 23 comments. The organizations that provided the feedback were CODE, Korea NGO Council for Overseas Development Cooperation (KCOC), Open Net, Solidarity for Justice, Transparency International Korea, and The Center for Freedom of Information and Transparent Society. In November 2017, the government held a meeting to recapitulate progress made and provide responses to feedback received during the public comment period. The government provided written responses to all 23 comments and also provided the opportunity for CSOs to raise questions and concerns after the public comment period had ended. Many of the comments were not reflected in the final version of the self-assessment report.

The self-assessment report in the administrative language¹⁶ includes a review of the consultation process during the action plan development with a list of dates, names, organizations, and locations, which has been cross-checked with involved CSOs. The IRM researcher has received internal documents of invitation letters and meeting agendas as evidence. The report also reviewed the creation of the OGP Korea Forum, past IRM recommendations and future plans of the forum working group. In addition, the self-assessment report provided details of commitments’ progress, government officials in charge (since many had changed since the creation of action plan) and next steps. An additional information section was provided for each commitment. Moreover, it included updated dates and changes to the commitments since the creation of the action plan.

3.6 Response to Previous IRM Recommendations

Table 3.5: Previous IRM Report Key Recommendations

Recommendation	Addressed?	Integrated into Next Action Plan?
<p>I. Develop an OGP specific stakeholder forum and include a diverse array of stakeholders in the drafting and implementation of the National Action Plan. Stakeholders should include civil society groups, businesses and other stakeholders in a wide range of sectoral areas and regular</p>	✓	✓

	citizens with a stake in open data.		
2	2. Identify and address core national open-government challenges rather than focusing solely on Government 3.0 commitments. Pertinent areas may include: 1) Defamation laws and the National Security Law, State secrecy and future directions for the National Intelligence Service. 2) Vague provisions for declining the release of information in the Freedom of Information Act 3) E-government programs clearly respond to OGP values of participation, accountability and transparency.	×	×
3	Participate in the IRM process in a timely manner and follow the general membership guidelines of the OGP.	×	×
4	Include more ambitious and measurable commitments to stretch current practices.	×	×
5	Write the National Action Plan with the intention of circulating and promoting it in Korean and among national stakeholders.	✓	✓

Out of the five recommendations made by the previous IRM report, the government addressed all of them in their self-assessment report and integrated two of them in the current action plan. With regards to the first recommendation, the government created the OGP Korea Forum as a multistakeholder working group for collaborative purposes. However, the government must step up its efforts to include a wider range of views in the forum. The second recommendation was partially integrated as one e-government commitment (Commitment 4a) was included. The third action plan, however, does not include a commitment that address challenges in defamation laws and the national security law or the declining release of information in the FOI act. The IRM researcher is unaware why e-government was the only area to be integrated in the current action plan. The third recommendation was not fully integrated into the current action plan. While the self-assessment report was fully submitted in both the administrative and English language, both versions were delayed. However, the point of contact at the Ministry of Interior and Safety¹⁷ was consistently responsive and provided replies within 24 hours of contact.

As for key recommendation four, the government carried forward many commitments from the previous action plan without modifying them to be more ambitious and measurable. For the fifth key recommendation, the third national action plan was written in the administrative language and English, which was then made available on the OGP homepage. Action plans, self-assessment reports, and other OGP-related matters were distributed in-person for all members at the OGP Korea Forum. However, the reach and circulation of these materials has been limited.

¹ Republic of Korea, "Constitution of Republic of Korea" (English translation) (2010), <http://www.moleg.go.kr/english/korLawEng?pstSeq=54794>

² Ministry of Interior and Safety, Ministry of Personnel Management, Ministry of Employment and Labor, Ministry of Government Legislation, Ministry of Education, Ministry of Strategy and Finance, Ministry of Foreign Affairs,

Ministry of Government Legislation, Office for Government Policy Coordination, National Information Society Agency

³ Anti-Corruption & Civil Rights Commission

⁴ Ministry of Education, Office for Government Policy Coordination, Ministry of Interior and Safety, Ministry of Personnel Management, Ministry of Government Legislation, National Information Society Agency

⁵ Anti-Corruption & Civil Rights Commission

⁶ Ministry of Interior, National Information Society Agency, Office for Government Policy Coordination

⁷ Anti-Corruption & Civil Rights Commission

⁸ Representatives included Park Ji Hwan from Open Net, Professor Park from Korea University, Chung Jin Im from The Center for Freedom of Information and Transparent Society, Chun Ji Eun from Indi Lab, and officials from MoIS.

⁹ The IRM researcher reached out to the MoIS point of contact to gather a full list of participating CSOs, however the PoC was unable to provide this information.

¹⁰ OGP Mid-Term Self-Assessment Report, https://www.opengovpartnership.org/sites/default/files/South-Korea_Mid-Term_Self-Assessment_2016-2018_EN.pdf

¹¹ http://c.ymcdn.com/sites/www.iap2.org/resource/resmgr/foundations_course/IAP2_P2_Spectrum_FINAL.pdf

¹² A full list of CSO members in the OGP Korea Forum include the following: CODE, Open Net, Transparency International Korea, the Center for Freedom of Information and Transparent Society, Citizens' Coalition for Better Government, Korea NGO Council for Overseas Development Cooperation, Community for Improvement of Information Society Problem, Citizens' Action Network, Right to Know Institute, Solidarity for Justice, and the Korea Association for Local Government and Administration Studies.

¹³ Ministry of the Interior and Safety, publicity of the two-week public comment period, http://www.mois.go.kr/frt/bbs/type013/commonSelectBoardArticle.do?bbsId=BBSMSTR_000000000006&nttId=60133

¹⁴ Ministry of the Interior and Safety Official Twitter account, publicity of the two-week public comment period, <https://twitter.com/withyou3542>.

¹⁵ Ministry of the Interior and Safety Official Twitter account, publicity of the two-week public comment period, <http://gov30.go.kr/ogp/ogp/jsp>.

¹⁶ Open Government Partnership, South Korea Mid-Term Self-Assessment Report 2016-2018 (2017) <https://www.opengovpartnership.org/documents/south-korea-mid-term-self-assessment-report-2016-2018> 7

¹⁷ Han Duk-soo and Yu Jin Lee, Deputy Directors of Innovation Planning Division at the Ministry of the Interior and Safety.

IV. Commitments

All OGP-participating governments develop OGP action plans that include concrete commitments over a two-year period. Governments begin their OGP action plans by sharing existing efforts related to open government, including specific strategies and ongoing programs.

Commitments should be appropriate to each country's unique circumstances and challenges. OGP commitments should also be relevant to OGP values laid out in the OGP Articles of Governance and Open Government Declaration signed by all OGP-participating countries.¹

What Makes a Good Commitment?

Recognizing that achieving open government commitments often involves a multiyear process, governments should attach timeframes and benchmarks to their commitments that indicate what is to be accomplished each year, whenever possible. This report details each of the commitments the country included in its action plan and analyzes the first year of their implementation.

The indicators used by the IRM to evaluate commitments are as follows:

- **Specificity:** This variable assesses the level of specificity and measurability of each commitment. The options are:
 - **High:** Commitment language provides clear, verifiable activities and measurable deliverables for achievement of the commitment's objective.
 - **Medium:** Commitment language describes activity that is objectively verifiable and includes deliverables, but these deliverables are not clearly measurable or relevant to the achievement of the commitment's objective.
 - **Low:** Commitment language describes activity that can be construed as verifiable but requires some interpretation on the part of the reader to identify what the activity sets out to do and determine what the deliverables would be.
 - **None:** Commitment language contains no measurable activity, deliverables, or milestones.
- **Relevance:** This variable evaluates the commitment's relevance to OGP values. Based on a close reading of the commitment text as stated in the action plan, the guiding questions to determine the relevance are:
 - **Access to Information:** Will the government disclose more information or improve the quality of the information disclosed to the public?
 - **Civic Participation:** Will the government create or improve opportunities or capabilities for the public to inform or influence decisions?
 - **Public Accountability:** Will the government create or improve opportunities to hold officials answerable for their actions?
 - **Technology & Innovation for Transparency and Accountability:** Will technological innovation be used in conjunction with one of the other three OGP values to advance either transparency or accountability?²
- **Potential impact:** This variable assesses the *potential impact* of the commitment, if completed as written. The IRM researcher uses the text from the action plan to:
 - Identify the social, economic, political, or environmental problem;
 - Establish the status quo at the outset of the action plan; and
 - Assess the degree to which the commitment, if implemented, would impact performance and tackle the problem.

Starred commitments are considered exemplary OGP commitments. In order to receive a star, a commitment must meet several criteria:

- Starred commitments will have “medium” or “high” specificity. A commitment must lay out clearly defined activities and steps to make a judgement about its potential impact.
- The commitment’s language should make clear its relevance to opening government. Specifically, it must relate to at least one of the OGP values of Access to Information, Civic Participation, or Public Accountability.
- The commitment would have a "transformative" potential impact if completely implemented.³
- The government must make significant progress on this commitment during the action plan implementation period, receiving an assessment of "substantial" or "complete" implementation.

Based on these criteria, South Korea’s action plan contains no starred commitments.

Finally, the tables in this section present an excerpt of the wealth of data the IRM collects during its progress reporting process. For the full dataset for South Korea and all OGP-participating countries, see the OGP Explorer.⁴

General Overview of the Commitments

The action plan consists of 14 commitments in six key areas—proactive disclosure of public information, public open data disclosure, citizen participation, improved accessibility to public services through technology and innovation, anti-corruption and public service ethics, and improved financial transparency. There are overlaps between some of the OGP commitments and the Moon administration’s five-year policy agenda. Interviews with more than 30 stakeholders, ranging from NGOs, councils, law firms, academia, and civil society, concluded that the commitments were not co-created and are not ambitious enough.⁵ Interviewees see the OGP platform as a step forward in transparency and public accountability, but are unsure what changes or improvements can be expected. All interviewees were very hopeful of the government’s strong willingness⁶ to co-create the fourth national action plan.

One commitment (4c) has been officially withdrawn by the government. The intent of this commitment was to develop a service notification application which would allow citizens to easily access government services. Since the integration of Government24, the integrated government service portal, and the development of its mobile application, the need for a separate application (as envisioned by this commitment) became obsolete.

¹ Open Government Partnership: Articles of Governance, June 2012 (Updated March 2014 and April 2015), https://www.opengovpartnership.org/sites/default/files/attachments/OGP_Articles-Gov_Apr-21-2015.pdf

² IRM Procedures Manual. Available at: https://www.opengovpartnership.org/sites/default/files/IRM-Procedures-Manual-v4_Sept2017.docx

³ The International Experts Panel changed this criterion in 2015. For more information visit: <http://www.opengovpartnership.org/node/5919>

⁴ OGP Explorer: bit.ly/IKE2WII

⁵ Representatives included but are not limited to Park Ji Hwan from Open Net, Yoon Jong Soo and Lee Won Suk from CODE, and Yang Gun Mo from Solidarity for Justice, discussion with IRM researcher, December 2017.

⁶ Government officials have provided official statements, in writing and verbally at the OGP Kick-off Forum on 15 March 15 2018 and in January (New year meeting), signalling their willingness to co-create the fourth national action plan. The Korean government has also established a new platform called “Citizen Thinking Box” (www.idea.epeople.go.kr) open from March 15-April 15 to collect suggestions, ideas and recommendations for the next action plan.

Ia. Expand coverage of information disclosure system

Commitment Text:

Title: Proactive Disclosure of Public Information – Increasing the number of organizations disclosing information online

Currently, citizens can request the central and local governments and most of the public institutions to open up their information via online. However, some institutions like private universities, even though being subject to the Public Information Act, still cannot handle information disclosure through the online system, which causes substantial inconvenience to the citizens. Against such backdrop, NAP3 expands online information service to 290 private schools starting from October 2016, and also provides education and training on information disclosure to the faculties of private schools.

Coverage of the integrated information disclosure system will be expanded each year to institutions that are subject to the law but have not yet introduced the system. The first target for 2016 will be 290 private universities that have been established based on the Higher Education Act.

Responsible institution: Ministry of the Interior

Supporting institution(s): Central government ministries, local governments, educational offices, public institutions, etc.

Start date: 1 July 2016

End date: 31 December 2017

Editorial Note: While the commitment text refers to 290 private institutions, the targeted number of institutions is 286. The reason for this discrepancy is due the closing of private universities since the development of the action plan. The report refers to 283 institutions as the official benchmark for completion. For full commitment text, please refer to https://www.opengovpartnership.org/sites/default/files/South-Korea_NAP3_2016-2018.pdf.

Commitment Overview	Specificity				OGP Value Relevance				Potential Impact				On Time?	Completion			
	None	Low	Medium	High	Access to Information	Civic Participation	Public Accountability	Tech. and Innov. for Transparency and Accountability	None	Minor	Moderate	Transformative		Not Started	Limited	Substantial	Complete
Ia. Expand coverage of information disclosure system			✓		✓			✓		✓			Yes			✓	

Context and Objectives

To aid the process of online information disclosure, the government introduced the Integrated Information Disclosure System¹ to public institutions, including central ministries, local governments and public universities. Prior to this commitment, only 1 percent of private universities were using the integrated system.² Since private universities do not meet the definition of a “public institution” under the freedom of information legislation³, each institution receives requests and releases information subject to its own discretion and timeframe.

Out of approximately 330 higher education institutions in South Korea⁴, this commitment aims to expand the coverage of the Integrated Information Disclosure System to all 286 private universities operating in South Korea, and connect the system to the Open Data Portal. Private universities, as referred to in this action plan, include four-year private institutions and two to three-year private colleges. The commitment text provides a clear benchmark and timeframe for completion, however, it does not specify how the transition to the integrated system will occur. While this commitment encourages all private universities and a majority of higher education institutions to use the online disclosure system, universities, due to their autonomous status, cannot be legally required to use the online system. Since take-up of this system is largely dependent on the voluntary participation of private universities and does not stretch government practice, the potential impact is minor even though the scope of the coverage is quite broad.

Completion

This commitment is substantially completed. According to the government self-assessment report, Ministry of Interior and Safety (MoIS) has worked with the Ministry of Education to promote online information disclosure requests among private universities.⁵ The government has worked with media and newspaper companies to encourage private institutions to adopt the system.⁶ In July 2016, the government partnered up with The Center for Freedom of Information and Transparent Society⁷, to create an advisory manual for university staff. In September 2016, the government also conducted a training workshop for 215 private university staff responsible for information disclosure, where government explained methods and shared best practices in using the system.

At the time of midterm evaluation (June 2017), 98 percent (280 out of 286) of private universities had transitioned to the Integrated Information Disclosure System. The six exceptions are Korea University, Wonkwang University, Nonghyup University, Yonsei University, Sogang University, and Sungkyunkwan University.

Early Results (if any)

Of the 15 interviewed students⁸, more than 50 percent were aware that their schools had adopted the integrated system but none had ever used it. Through independent verification, the IRM researcher found that both the website (www.open.go.kr) and the instructions provided to request information were convenient and user-friendly.

A staff member from Kyunghee University explained that the number of users requesting information has increased. However, administrative staff have also stated that the content of the request and the target organization is often unclear. Staff often have to conduct research to clarify what information is being requested, whether or not the information can be disclosed, and whether the school is obligated to respond to the request.

Next Steps

Since the commitment is nearly completed, the IRM researcher does not recommend taking this commitment forward in the next action plan. However, it is recommended that the government continue to work with the ICT division of the institutions to address the administrative burden caused by handing information disclosure requests. One way the government can build on their ongoing work is to hold regular training sessions for administrative staff so that they can incorporate feedback and ensure that information is released in a timely manner.

With regard to the remaining six universities, MoIS could hold workshops with the schools and research ways the transition could be made easier if they are facing any logistical limitations. Chung Jim Im, coordinator at The Center for Freedom of Information and Transparent Society⁹, stressed the need for the six schools to join the Integrated Information Disclosure System as those schools are highly selective and influential in the nation.

-
- ¹ Information Disclosure Official Homepage, <http://Open.go.kr>
- ² OGP Mid-Term Self-Assessment Report, https://www.opengovpartnership.org/sites/default/files/South-Korea_Mid-Term_Self-Assessment_2016-2018_EN.pdf
- ³ Official Information Disclosure Act, http://elaw.klri.re.kr/eng_mobile/viewer.do?hseq=29982&type=part&key=4
- ⁴ 대교연통계 March 12 2018. 대학교육연구소 (Korea Higher Education Research Institute) <http://khei-khei.tistory.com/category/%EB%8C%80%EA%B5%90%EC%97%B0%ED%86%B5%EA%B3%84>
- ⁵ OGP Mid-Term Self-Assessment Report, https://www.opengovpartnership.org/sites/default/files/South-Korea_Mid-Term_Self-Assessment_2016-2018_EN.pdf
- ⁶ Jun J.E. “입학금 용도 알고싶어도 정보 틀어막은 사립대” 21 December 2016. KookMin Ilbo, <http://news.kmib.co.kr/article/view.asp?arcid=0923663393&code=11131300&cp=nv>
- ⁷ The Center for Freedom of Information and Transparent Society Official Homepage, <http://www.opengirok.or.kr/>
- ⁸ Students at a top 10 prestigious University located in Seoul, discussion with IRM researcher, March 2018.
- ⁹ Jung, Jim Im. (Coordinator at The Center for Freedom of Information and Transparent Society and a member of Open Government Partnership), discussion with IRM researcher, November 2017.

Ib. Improve disclosure of public information

Commitment Text:

Title: Proactive Disclosure of Public Information – Constantly developing and providing useful information in original form

As the amount of disclosed information is increasing quantitatively, citizens are showing more interest in the quality of the information, calling for constant development and provision of useful information in its original form. To satisfy such demand from citizens, the Korean government plans to collect and select useful information from the government and public institutions in 2016, and further develop, share, and promote best practices of disclosing information in its original form.

Useful information for citizens will be collected and selected from government and public institutions in original form and the best practices of such efforts will be widely publicized.

Responsible institution: Ministry of the Interior

Supporting institution(s): Central government ministries, local governments, educational offices, public institutions, etc.

Start date: 1 July 2016

End date: 30 June 2018

Editorial Note: For full commitment text, please refer to https://www.opengovpartnership.org/sites/default/files/South-Korea_NAP3_2016-2018.pdf.

Commitment Overview	Specificity				OGP Value Relevance				Potential Impact				On Time?	Completion			
	None	Low	Medium	High	Access to Information	Civic Participation	Public Accountability	Tech. and Innov. for Transparency and Accountability	None	Minor	Moderate	Transformative		Not Started	Limited	Substantial	Complete
Ib. Improve disclosure of public information		✓			✓					✓			Yes			✓	

Context and Objectives

According to the action plan, this commitment broadly aims to improve disclosure of public information in its original form and involves researching and selecting original information that is useful to citizens, disseminating best practices, and carrying out public information campaigns. However, the commitment text is vaguely formulated and does not specify how research will be conducted, what types of information will be selected, and how best practices will be promoted. It is also not clear how useful it is to citizens in disclosing information in its original form. Due to the low specificity of the commitment text, the potential impact cannot be assessed any higher than minor.

Completion

According to the government self-assessment, the 10 best original texts (or information) have been selected through citizens' voting and two expert review sessions. The 10 texts include plans to promote collaborative learning in primary education (Daegu Metropolitan Office of Education), to operate visiting classes on air pollution (Gyeonggi Province), and to increase the number of national and public childcare centers (Seoul Metropolitan Government).¹ The results were made available on the Open Information Portal.²

In addition to promoting the texts on banners and pop-ups on the Information Disclosure Portal, the 2017 results were also covered by various media outlets, such as Yonhap News Agency³, Digital Times⁴, Mail News⁵, and Daily News⁶ in July. The survey results and 10 best texts are still available on the official Ministry of Interior and Safety (MoIS) homepage.

As of writing, there is no evidence that the government has carried out promotional campaigns. When the IRM researcher reached out to the government PoC for more information, she was told that the government does not currently have a budget to carry out a nationwide campaign.⁷

Next Steps

The IRM researcher recommends the government to include clearly formulated, specific commitments that clearly articulate the intended result and expected change in government practice when it comes to information disclosure.

Jung Jim Im, Coordinator of The Center for Freedom of Information and Transparent Society,⁸ noted the importance of focusing on the quality of information disclosed rather than simply expanding the number of original texts disclosed each year. Although the original text disclosure system may have its advantages, many of the files disclosed were those in the Ministry of Education regarding elementary, middle and high schools. Rather than providing statistical information, in the next action plan, the government could focus on disclosing datasets that are in high demand from the public.

¹ For full list of 10 best original texts, https://www.opengovpartnership.org/sites/default/files/South-Korea_Mid-Term_Self-Assessment_2016-2018_EN.pdf

² The Open Data Portal, https://www.data.go.kr/e_main.jsp#/L2IhaW4=

³ Yonhap News Agency,

<http://www.yonhapnews.co.kr/bulletin/2017/07/25/0200000000AKR20170725140800004.HTML?from=search>

⁴ The Digital Times, http://www.dt.co.kr/contents.html?article_no=2017072502109960053005

⁵ Mail News, <http://www.m-i.kr/news/articleView.html?idxno=329507>

⁶ Daily News, <http://www.idailynews.co.kr/news/article.html?no=33673>

⁷ Jeong Yeong Gun, (Deputy Director of Information Disclosure Policy Division in the Ministry of Interior and Safety), email exchange with IRM researcher, December 2017.

⁸ Jung, Jim Im. (Coordinator at The Center for Freedom of Information and Transparent Society and a member of Open Government Partnership), discussion with IRM researcher, November 2017.

Ic. Standardize pre-release of information

Commitment Text:

Title: Proactive Disclosure of Public Information – Facilitating use of the standard model for pre-release of information

The Public Information Act mandates public institutions to release information that is closely related to citizens' life, large-scale budgetary program information, and administrative monitoring information on a regular basis. However, each institution has selected and released information based on its own subjective viewpoint without any common standard and complaints have been raised that this causes inconvenience to citizens. To find solutions to this issue, the Korean government developed and distributed the standard model for pre-release of information that specifies the list of information to be released and sub-categories, which can be commonly applied when releasing information. Even though it aims to increase the amount of released information and improve its quality, the rate of information release using the standard model is still low at around 49.6% on average (as of December 2015).

Efforts will be made to gradually increase the rate of public institutions' information pre-release based on the standard model so that citizens can find categories and contents of the disclosed information in a consistent manner. In particular, the information pre-release rate of primary local governments will be improved from 49.6% in 2015 to 55% by the end of 2016.

Responsible institution: Ministry of the Interior

Supporting institution(s): Central government ministries, local governments, public institutions, etc.

Start date: 1 July 2016

End date: 30 June 2018

Editorial Note: For full commitment text, please refer to

https://www.opengovpartnership.org/sites/default/files/South-Korea_NAP3_2016-2018.pdf.

Commitment Overview	Specificity				OGP Value Relevance				Potential Impact				On Time?	Completion			
	None	Low	Medium	High	Access to Information	Civic Participation	Public Accountability	Tech. and Innov. for Transparency and Accountability	None	Minor	Moderate	Transformative		Not Started	Limited	Substantial	Complete
Ic. Standardize pre-release of information		✓			✓					✓			Yes				✓

Context and Objectives

Public institutions are mandated by the Public Information Act to release information, such as large-scale budgetary program information. However, each institution releases information based on its respective practices (including format, template and style), which is inconvenient for readers accessing public information.¹ The South Korean government has developed and distributed a standard template for the pre-release of information, prior to the development of the action plan, which specifies the list and subcategories of information to be released.²

The government aims to increase public agencies' compliance with the information disclosure standard, especially among local governments. By utilizing this tool to disclose information in a useable and accessible fashion, this commitment meets the OGP value of access to information. The language of the commitment provides a clear target for completion (55 percent by 2016) for local governments but does not specify the activities the government plans to pursue to increase the rate of usage among public agencies, making completion difficult to measure. The limited coverage of local governments using the standardized template, as envisioned by this commitment, also factors into the assessment of potential impact as minor.

Completion

This commitment is complete. In September 2016, the government held an inspection and consultation session with five central government ministries, 11 local governments and nine public agencies regarding the use of the standard model for pre-release of information. A government official³ provided the IRM researcher with documentation of meeting timelines, participating ministries and public agencies, meeting agenda, and images as evidence of the inspection reviews and consultations. According to the self-assessment, the government carried out an inspection review in November 2017 with 30 underperforming local governments and provided consultation in using the standard model for pre-release information.⁴ The self-assessment does not list the 30 governments, nor does it specify what it defines as underperforming.

According to the government self-assessment, the rate of use of the common standardized model reached 55 percent for local governments in late 2016.⁵ Although this was not specified in the action plan, the compliance rate for central administrative agencies also increased from 80 percent in late 2015 to 91 percent in October 2017.⁶ For regional governments, the compliance rate increased to 87 percent.⁷

Next Steps

If this commitment is taken forward into the next action plan, the government should consider the following modifications, as expressed by civil society: address the system errors and establish a clear platform for citizen feedback⁸, and evaluate whether the standardized template needs to be applied to all disclosed information.⁹

¹ OGP third national action plan, https://www.opengovpartnership.org/sites/default/files/South-Korea_NAP3_2016-2018%5B1%5D.pdf

² As a clarifying note, the aim of this commitment is to create a standard for the disclosure of information rather than instituting an open by default approach.

³ Koh, Jun-Seok (Deputy Director of Information Disclosure Policy Division in the Ministry of Interior and Safety), email exchange with IRM researcher, December 2017.

⁴ OGP Mid-Term Self-Assessment Report, https://www.opengovpartnership.org/sites/default/files/South-Korea_Mid-Term_Self-Assessment_2016-2018_EN.pdf

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ Ibid.

⁷ Ibid.

⁸ Jung, Jim Im. (Coordinator at The Center for Freedom of Information and Transparent Society and a member of Open Government Partnership), discussion with IRM researcher, November 2017.

⁹ Park, Soo Jung (Secretary General of Citizens' Coalition for Better Government and a member of the Open Government Partnership Korea Forum), discussion with IRM researcher, November 2017.

2. Public Open Data Disclosure

2a. Disclose high-demand data

Title: Public Open Data Disclosure – Disclosing high-demand and high-value national data first

The Open Data Strategy Council has selected 36 areas having substantial impact on the society and economy to be the focus of national movement for open data, and it is concentrating efforts from the nation-wide level to ensure provision of useful data to users. Information of 11 areas, including construction, local government permits and licenses, and market areas and real-estate have been completely open by 2015. More information in 22 areas including food and drugs will be open by 2016. 3 areas – national tax, social security, and written judgement – will be disclosed in stages. There will also be more efforts in the way for open data in 42 areas which have been identified through citizen demand survey – university entrance rate, radioactivity levels in food, patent-product information, intellectual property rights, etc.

(Ministry of the Interior; Central government ministries, local governments, educational offices, public institutions, etc. | July 2016 – 31 December 2017)

2b. Open data quality management

Title: Public Open Data Disclosure – Evaluating public open data quality management

Quality management level evaluation will be conducted on massive public data having large social and economic impact. The evaluation will cover 21 datasets in 2016, 42 datasets in 2017, and key data in 2018. Considering the life cycle of data, the evaluation will be conducted in 36 categories of each area and procedure; follow-up measures for improvement based on the evaluation result will be reviewed and consulting or technical support provided for improvement. In addition, a quality management grade system will be introduced along with guidelines for evaluation and improvement procedures for stable operation and early stabilization of the system. Talented human resources with expertise and experiences will be selected and trained to become specialized evaluators for quality management evaluation.

(Ministry of the Interior; Central government ministries, local governments, public institutions, etc. | July 2016 – 30 June 2018)

2c. Expand provision of open format

Title: Public Open Data Disclosure – Expanding provision of open format for free processing and use

The share of open format applied in the disclosed data will be gradually increased from 38.9% in 2015 to as much as 70% in 2017. As part of the plan, the government will induce data registration after converting to open format for data which are impossible to process (PDF) or run on certain software (Hangul, Excel, etc.) only. As for new open data, it will tighten screening so more data will be registered in open format. In addition, it will develop and provide a tool which automatically converts data in the Open Data Portal to an open format (XLS->CSV), and induce voluntary data disclosure in open format by measuring and evaluating the format of data disclosed by each institution.

(Ministry of the Interior; Central government ministries, local governments, public institutions, etc. | July 2016 – 30 June 2018)

2d. Common standards for data disclosure

Title: Public Open Data Disclosure – Developing or revising open data standards and widening their application

Key data which should be disclosed based on the common standards will be selected and 100 standards developed by 2017 in order to enable the private sector to better use data which is commonly owned by many institutions. In addition, an automation tool will be also developed for self-assessment when registering the standard data in the Open Data Portal

(Ministry of the Interior; Central government ministries, local governments, public institutions, etc. | July 2016 – 31 December 2017)

Editorial Note: IRM staff have clustered commitments 2a through 2d due to their common theme to adequately reflect the ambition of South Korea’s open data commitments. For full commitment text, please refer to https://www.opengovpartnership.org/sites/default/files/South-Korea_NAP3_2016-2018%5B1%5D.pdf.

Commitment Overview	Specificity				OGP Value Relevance				Potential Impact				On Time?	Completion			
	None	Low	Medium	High	Access to Information	Civic Participation	Public Accountability	Tech. and Innov. for Transparency and Accountability	None	Minor	Moderate	Transformative		Not Started	Limited	Substantial	Complete
2a. Disclose high-demand data		✓			✓	✓				✓			Yes			✓	
2b. Open data quality management		✓			✓					✓			Yes			✓	
2c. Expand provision of open format				✓	✓			✓			✓		Yes				✓
2d. Common standards for data disclosure			✓		✓						✓		Yes				✓

Context and Objectives

In 2013, President Park announced an initiative called Government 3.0, which aimed to transform South Korea’s system of information disclosure. This cluster of commitments builds on that initiative in four distinct ways: 1) disclose 22 highly demanded datasets and promote the disclosure of national tax and social security information; 2) evaluate the level of data quality management in 22 datasets in 2016, 42 in 2017, and key data in 2018; 3) increase the share of disclosed data in open format to as much as 70 percent in 2017; and 4) develop 100 total standards to facilitate the use of data by the private sector.

Overall, the specificity of this cluster of commitments is medium. While the commitment text goes into detail on the types of high-value datasets that will be released, the specificity of commitments 2a and 2b have been downgraded because there is very little detail on *how* the datasets will be released beyond the listed end date. Furthermore, the action plan text does not clearly indicate the 22 areas to be disclosed and what the “quality management” evaluation of the datasets entails. This ambiguity inevitably affects commitment 2a and 2b’s potential impact because the IRM researcher is subsequently unable to measure how these activities will alter government practice and improve upon the status quo.

Overall, however, these combined efforts to significantly disclose, improve and convert data into open format represent a major step forward in open data practice. Ultimately, these commitments will improve public access to highly demanded, high-quality, machine-readable data, and are relevant to OGP values.

Completion

2a. Disclose high-demand data

This commitment has been substantially completed. According to the Open Data Portal¹ and documents provided by a government official², as of October 2017, the South Korean

government has disclosed 23,084 datasets, which include the datasets and datafiles of the 22 areas. It is not clear which of the 22 areas these disclosed datasets fall under. The areas include, but are not limited to, road name-based address data, regional financial information, food waste data, national spatial data, and real-estate transaction data.³

The government official⁴ in charge of the commitment noted that the South Korean government is still working towards disclosing information related to national tax information, social security information and written judgement information. The government official⁵ noted that these areas contain sensitive personal information and will be difficult to disclose.

While not explicitly specified in the action plan, the government has proactively taken steps to achieve this commitment that also entail elements of civic participation.⁶ MoIS conducted an annual survey with citizens to determine the level of demand, in accordance with the Act on Promotion of the Provision and Use of Public Data.⁷ MoIS also reviewed 304 recommendations proposed at the start-up contest they co-hosted with the National Information Society Agency. The government also hosted members of Open Data 500 Korea, a joint project between the Governance Lab and the National Information Society Agency (NIA) that encourages the development of new open data companies. Open Data 500 Korea presented their current analysis of the high-demand data. After having evaluated the results of this feedback, the key datasets were selected.

2b. Open data quality management

The commitment is substantially complete. According to information provided by the government⁸, the South Korean government completed quality control and evaluation of 21 high-capacity public datasets by December 2017. The list of datasets covers air pollution (Korea Environment Corporation) and traffic accidents (Korean National Police Agency). In 2017, the government selected 42 high-capacity public datasets that underwent quality control and evaluation, such as education administrative information (Ministry of Education) and local finance information (Ministry of Interior and Safety).

The government also introduced a quality control grading system by incorporating the results of the evaluation into the Public Data Management Guidelines. Due to the lack of publicly available information around these guidelines, however, the IRM researcher is unable to assess completion as higher than substantial.

MoIS, in partnership with the National Information Society Agency, selected and trained a group of professional auditors with expertise in evaluating public data. In 2016, 29 professional auditors received the certification of training and 21 have successfully passed the exam. In 2017, 58 professional auditors received the certification of training and 24 successfully passed the exam. As of August 2017, there is a total of 45 professional auditors. The IRM researcher has received internal government documents verifying the training of auditors.

2c. Expand provision of open format

The commitment has been fully completed. According to the self-assessment, the government has disclosed 34,004 out of 45,155 datasets, reaching a 75.3 percent share of its open data at a level of 3 or higher in open format on the Open Data Portal (<http://www.data.go.kr/>). According to the five-star deployment scheme for open data, level 3 refers to open data that is made available in a non-proprietary open format (e.g. CSV instead of Excel).⁹ The self-assessment also reports that uploading PDF files has been prohibited and an automatic conversion tool (.xls to .csv) has been developed and is provided on the Open Data Portal.¹⁰ In 2016, the government has fully completed modifying its PDF datafiles.¹¹

2d. Common standards for data disclosure

This commitment is fully complete. As of August 2017, the government exceeded the

intended target by developing an additional 79 standards (for a total of 122 standards). The standards include areas such as bid announcements, contract information and successful bids.¹² An automatic self-assessment tool¹³ was developed in 2016.¹⁴

Early Results (if any)

Overall, the IRM researcher was unable to thoroughly assess the early results of these commitments. With regard to Commitment 2a, the number of webpages that use open public data has grown from 1,056 in 2016 to 1,401, as of December 2017.¹⁵

Two representatives from CODE Korea^{16,17} have noted some positive improvements as a result of quality evaluation, such as improved readability of datasets and the proposed standard of quality control management (Commitment 2b). Additionally, interviewed entrepreneurs find that datasets are useful and easily accessible. However, none of the interviewees noticed a difference or improvement in the datasets after government evaluation.¹⁸ Yoon Jong Soo¹⁹ and Oh Won Suk²⁰ from CODE agreed that converting and expanding public data to open format is a great help for those who use the data.

Next Steps

The IRM researcher recommends the government take these commitments forward into the next action plan, provided the government clearly define the goals and intended actions. More specifically, the government should focus on the following recommendations:

Commitment 2a:

- Transition datasets into machine-readable files, rather than simply expanding the number of databases disclosed each year.²¹
- Develop a channel where citizens can provide feedback on the quality of the data and ask questions.²²
- Consider publicly disclosing datasets that have been requested by an individual or organization through Gwanghwamoon 1st Street.²³ 1st Street is an expedited process by which citizens can request open data on the Open Data Portal (www.data.gov.kr). Due to the strict procedure and timeline associated with this process, relevant ministries are legally obligated to respond to citizens. Currently this process only discloses the data to the requester.²⁴

Commitment 2b: If this commitment is taken forward into the next action plan, the IRM researcher, and representatives from CODE, recommend MoIS incorporate end-user feedback when selecting criteria for quality control of data.²⁵

Commitment 2c: Hold informational workshops with ordinary citizens, experts and business leaders on the need to convert datafiles into a machine-readable format.

Commitment 2d:

- Hold in-person workshops or surveys with ordinary citizens, experts and business leaders to improve the self-assessment tool and to develop and select standards for data disclosure.^{26,27}

¹ Open Data Portal, https://www.data.go.kr/e_main.jsp#/L21haW4=

² Song, Hee Ra, (Deputy Director in the Public Data Policy Division at the Ministry of Interior and Safety), discussion with IRM researcher, December 2017.

³ The list of the 22 disclosed areas is as follows: road name-based address data, regional financial information, food waste data, national spatial data, real-estate transaction data, spatial data open platform, , urban planning data, shipping and port integrated data, national law data, food and drug integrated data, export and import statistical data, national integrated online procurement data, industrial property rights data, health insurance review data, marine spatial data, national pension data, labor insurance data, employment insurance data, Korean statistical data service microdata, weather forecast data, national disaster data/Korean safety map, national education data system, national science and technology data and industrial technological data.

⁴ Song, Hee Ra, (Deputy Director in the Public Data Policy Division at the Ministry of Interior and Safety), discussion with IRM researcher, December 2017.

⁵ Song, Hee Ra, (Deputy Director in the Public Data Policy Division at the Ministry of Interior and Safety), discussion with IRM researcher, December 2017.

-
- ⁶ Information in this section was provided to the IRM researcher in the form of communication with the government PoC and internal documents that are not available for public consumption.
- ⁷ Act on Promotion of the Provision and Use of Public Data, http://elaw.klri.re.kr/kor_service/lawView.do?hseq=37882&lang=ENG
- ⁸ Lee Yujin. (Deputy Director of Innovation Planning Division, Ministry of Interior and Safety), email correspondence between South Korea OGP Government point of contact on behalf of MoIS and IRM Staff. May 2018.
- ⁹ 5 Star Open Data, <http://5stardata.info/en/>
- ¹⁰ OGP Mid-Term Self-Assessment Report, https://www.opengovpartnership.org/sites/default/files/South-Korea_Mid-Term_Self-Assessment_2016-2018_EN.pdf
- ¹¹ Kim Soo Jin, Deputy Director at the Ministry of Interior and Safety, discussion with IRM researcher, March 2018.
- ¹² OGP Mid-Term Self-Assessment Report, https://www.opengovpartnership.org/sites/default/files/South-Korea_Mid-Term_Self-Assessment_2016-2018_EN.pdf
- ¹³ Open Data Portal, <http://gooddata.go.kr>
- ¹⁴ Song, Hee Ra, (Deputy Director in the Public Data Policy Division at the Ministry of Interior and Safety), discussion with IRM researcher.
- ¹⁵ Song, Hee Ra, (Deputy Director in the Public Data Policy Division at the Ministry of Interior and Safety), discussion with IRM researcher, December 2017.
- ¹⁶ Yoon, Jong Soo (Chairman of CODE, Chairman of OGP Korea Forum and Chairman of Open Data Strategy Council), discussion with IRM researcher, December 2017.
- ¹⁷ Yoon, Jong Soo (Chairman of CODE, Chairman of OGP Korea Forum and Chairman of Open Data Strategy Council), discussion with IRM researcher, December 2017.
- ¹⁸ Start-up entrepreneurs using Open Data Portal, discussion with IRM researcher, March 2017.
- ¹⁹ Yoon, Jong Soo (Chairman of CODE, Chairman of OGP Korea Forum and Chairman of Open Data Strategy Council), discussion with IRM researcher, December 2017.
- ²⁰ Oh, Won Seok (Director of the Board at CODE, member of OGP Korea Forum), discussion with IRM researcher, December 2017.
- ²¹ Oh, Won Seok (Director of the Board at CODE, member of OGP Korea Forum), discussion with IRM researcher, December 2017.
- ²² Oh, Won Seok (Director of the Board at CODE, member of OGP Korea Forum), discussion with IRM researcher, December 2017.
- ²³ Data.go.kr, <https://www.data.go.kr/participation/openReqst/index.do>
- ²⁴ Oh, Won Seok (Director of the Board at CODE, member of OGP Korea Forum), discussion with IRM researcher, December 2017.
- ²⁵ Yoon, Jong Soo (Chairman of CODE, Chairman of OGP Korea Forum and Chairman of Open Data Strategy Council), discussion with IRM researcher, December 2017; and Oh, Won Seok (Director of the Board at CODE, member of OGP Korea Forum), discussion with IRM researcher, December 2017.
- ²⁶ Yoon, Jong Soo (Chairman of CODE, Chairman of OGP Korea Forum and Chairman of Open Data Strategy Council), discussion with IRM researcher, December 2017.
- ²⁷ Oh, Won Seok (Director of the Board at CODE, member of OGP Korea Forum), discussion with IRM researcher, December 2017.

3a. Citizen participation in policy development

Commitment Text:

Title: Citizen Participation – Facilitating operation of the citizen groups for government service design

The citizen group for government service design is a new type of citizen participatory model, where design elements are applied to policies in 2014 and citizens directly participating in policy development. It is a policy driving group where public officials, citizens, and service designers all collaborate throughout the entire process of policy-making from agenda setting to policy decision, implementation, evaluation, and to feedback, to develop and improve public services using the method of service designing. Under the aim of facilitating citizen participation in policy-making through the design group, the Korean government increased the pool from 1,300 to 2,000. It will also encourage the central government ministries to develop and improve design tasks for each area including life and safety and local governments to join hands with universities or use talent donation schemes to strengthen participation of the local communities, select special tasks that are closely related to everyday life of citizens, and focus working on them.

Citizen Design Groups have been organized and design tasks are being carried out (382 tasks in total by December 2016). The government plans to publish and distribute the manual for local governments’ operation of Citizen Design Groups and expand its pool.

Responsible institution: Ministry of the Interior

Supporting institution(s): Central government ministries, local governments, etc.

Start date: 1 July 2016

End date: 30 June 2018

Editorial Note: For full commitment text, please refer to https://www.opengovpartnership.org/sites/default/files/South-Korea_NAP3_2016-2018%5B1%5D.pdf.

Commitment Overview	Specificity				OGP Value Relevance				Potential Impact				On Time?	Completion			
	None	Low	Medium	High	Access to Information	Civic Participation	Public Accountability	Tech. and Innov. for Transparency and Accountability	None	Minor	Moderate	Transformative		Not Started	Limited	Substantial	Complete
3a. Citizen participation in policy development		✓				✓				✓			Yes				✓

Context and Objectives

In 2014, the South Korean government introduced the pilot operation of the “Citizen Design Group”, a participatory policy model whose membership includes public officials, citizens and service designers. This model aims to promote a bottom-up approach, and was created to ensure citizens actively participate during the formation and implementation of policy making, and to enhance the quality of public services and policies. The government has collected feedback from participants on an annual basis and, according to the government, the Citizen Design Group has been improved by announcing plans, visiting policy sites for monitoring, meeting with participants and conducting interviews and surveys.¹ However, the feedback was not collected in a consistent or continuous manner and did not represent the needs of many citizens.²

To build on these efforts, the government plans to implement 382 citizen design tasks (44 in central ministries, 338 in local governments), organize a performance sharing event in 2016, and expand the number of Citizen Design Groups. The government also plans to publish and distribute a manual for the operation of Citizen Design Groups among local governments. (This activity was not listed as one of the key deliverables.) While the commitment includes several verifiable deliverables, it is not clear what the citizen design tasks entail or if a “task” refers to a particular service or procedure. The language also does not specify how the performance event will be organized and how it is relevant to the commitment objective. Furthermore, the target number of Citizen Design Groups is not mentioned, raising ambiguity about the scale of this commitment.

This commitment is relevant to citizen participation. While the listed activities and their concepts are vague, they partially address the broader operating environment that enables greater participation in civic space. While this model represents an innovative way of increasing civic participation in the policy-making process, as evidenced by its gold award for its service design and results in the iF World Design Guide³, the formulation of this commitment is too unclear to assess potential impact as any higher than minor.

Completion

Overall, this commitment is complete. In 2016, the government implemented 382 projects (or design tasks) and a total of 3,800 people participated, compared to 2,500 people in the previous year.⁴ The self-assessment states that central ministries were involved in a diverse range of tasks such as social welfare, safety in everyday life, and culture and tourism, but does not specify the tasks the central ministries and local governments were involved in. The self-assessment reported that 273 new tasks have been developed in 2017, including 39 in central ministries and 234 in local governments.⁵ The government regularly uploads progress reports and outcomes on its Facebook feed⁶ and the online platform, cafe.naver.com/govservicedesign.

In 2016, the Ministry of Government Administration and Home Affairs hosted an Awards Ceremony for Citizen Design Groups.⁷ The event highlights exceptional central ministry and municipal projects, such as “Let’s Beauty Factory” implemented by the Incheon City national design team.⁸ In February 2017, the Ministry of Government Administration and Home Affairs published a “Citizen Design Group’s case learning Manual.”⁹

The government also completed activities outside the scope of the commitment, as written in the action plan. There has been a revision to the Enforcement Decree of the Administrative Procedures Act¹⁰, which legally establishes the use of the public service method as a form of civic participation in the overall policy-making process. The government established a helpdesk to address the issues and support the operations of the Group. The government provided customized training and workshops for the Group in each operational stage of the tasks: exploration, implementation and capacity-building.¹¹

Early Results (if any)

Civil society representatives have noted several areas for improvement. Solidarity for Justice¹² notes that the tasks carried out by the Citizen Design Groups have not been widely publicized. There is no platform where government officials and citizens can provide feedback and evaluate the progress of the design tasks. Citizen’s Action Work¹³ stated that the Citizen Design Group has not instituted the bottom-up approach in practice. Although this commitment targeted non-expert citizens, a sizeable number of participants consisted of experts (e.g. public officials and designers).

Yoon Sung Won, Public Service Design Project Director at the Korea Institute of Design Promotion¹⁴, noted that the number of design tasks have expanded so dramatically and there are not enough resources to support this expansion. He also emphasized the innovation of this model and gave a successful example. The ChungCheong Regional Bureau of Statistics developed a traffic flow service.¹⁵ This service analyzes the traffic volume data

between Sejong City and neighboring areas and the data of getting on and off the bus system (BRT) between Sejong and Daejeon using traffic big data provided by Sejong City. It is provided as statistical geographic information service (SGIS Plus) so that it can be visualized on the map.

Next Steps

The IRM researcher recommends this commitment be taken forward into the next action plan with some modification:

- Conduct a mid-term or end-term evaluation of the tasks in progress or completed, rather than solely focusing on enlarging the pool of participants;
- Establish an official platform in which citizens can access, provide feedback and evaluate the design tasks;
- Actively promote the workings of the Citizen Design Group (i.e. recruitment procedures, planning and selection process, publicity efforts) on a nationwide scale;
- Gather demographic information such as gender, age, occupation and title to make sure the Citizen Design Groups represent a wide range of people.¹⁶
- Present a step-by-step roadmap focusing on the larger picture rather than zooming in on participation.¹⁷

¹ Lee Yujin. (Deputy Director of Innovation Planning Division, Ministry of Interior and Safety), email correspondence between South Korea OGP Government point of contact on behalf of MoIS and IRM Staff. May 2018.

² Stakeholder feedback, Government self-assessment report, p 56

³ Gov. 3.0 Design Group, <https://ifworlddesignguide.com/collection-2016-if-gold-award-winners#/pages/page/entry/180925-gov-30-design-group/>

⁴ <http://cafe.naver.com/govservicedesign/633>

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ <https://www.facebook.com/govservicedesign>

⁷ Yoon, Sung Won (Public Service Design Project Director at Korea Institute of Design Promotion), discussion with IRM researcher, November 2017

⁸ <http://www.kgnews.co.kr/news/articleView.html?idxno=468941>

⁹ Korea Institute of Design Promotion Official Website, Korea Institute of Design Promotion Manual (2017), <http://kidp.or.kr/index.html?menu=1132&bbsno=14009&boardno=622&ztag=rO0ABXQAMzjYwXsIHR5cGU9ImJvYXJkIiBubz0iNjlyliBza2luPSJraWRwX2Jicyl%2BPC9jYWxsPg%3D%3D&siten=16&act=view>

¹⁰ Enforcement Decree of the Administrative Vicarious Execution Act, https://elaw.klri.re.kr/eng_mobile/viewer.do?hseq=37058&type=sogan&key=15

¹¹ OGP Mid-Term Self-Assessment Report, https://www.opengovpartnership.org/sites/default/files/South-Korea_Mid-Term_Self-Assessment_2016-2018_EN.pdf, p 58

¹² Yang, Gun Mo Young-Kun. (Director at Solidarity for Justice and a member of OGP Korea Forum), discussion with IRM researcher, November 2017.

¹³ Park, Joon Woo (Secretary General at Citizen's Action Work and a member of the OGP Korea Forum), email exchange with IRM researcher, November 2017

¹⁴ Yoon, Sung Won (Public Service Design Project Director at Korea Institute of Design Promotion), discussion with IRM researcher, November 2017

¹⁵ Jang J.S “대전~세종권역 교통정보 ‘한눈에’” Choong Chung Il Bo, 30 August 2017. <http://www.ccdailynews.com/news/articleView.html?idxno=936924>

¹⁶ Park, Joon Woo (Secretary General at Citizen's Action Work and a member of the OGP Korea Forum), email exchange with IRM researcher, November 2017

¹⁷ Park, Joon Woo (Secretary General at Citizen's Action Work and a member of the OGP Korea Forum), email exchange with IRM researcher, November 2017

4a. Remove ActiveX

Commitment Text:

Title: Improved accessibility to public services through technology and innovation – Improving environment for e-government service use

Korea's e-government provision has maintained its level at the world's top, as introduced in UN E-government Survey results. As the e-government user environment has recently changed from PC to web browsers on various devices, issues have been raised that e-government services provided through non-standard technologies like Active-X or certain browsers cause inconvenience and limit accessibility. In this regard, Korean government plans to continue revising the 'Guidelines for E-Government Service Compatibility' to enhance citizens' universal access to services while at the same time extend its efforts to remove non-standard technologies and secure interoperability in mobile services.

In particular, should there be any alternative technology to replace Active-X, one of the major non-standard technologies used in Korea, the government will gradually remove it by 2017 and promote replacement with the web standard technology to ensure web compatibility and step up security. Considering the safety and security of the alternative technology, Active-X will be removed starting from G4C services. The Active-X free rate will reach as far as 95% by 2017, with Active-X in internal websites of the government gradually removed as they are not directly related to citizen inconvenience.

In order to first remove Active-X in citizen services, the government plans to remove 3,321 Active-X's from 1,638 websites in 2016, making the share of Active-X free websites reach 88.1%, and remove 2,161 from the remaining 844 websites by 2017, reaching 95.1%. Active-X in websites for government's internal use will be also gradually removed for improvement.

Responsible institution: Ministry of the Interior

Supporting institution(s): Central government ministries, local governments, public institutions, etc.

Start date: 1 July 2016

End date: 30 June 2018

Editorial Note: For full commitment text, please refer to https://www.opengovpartnership.org/sites/default/files/South-Korea_NAP3_2016-2018.pdf.

Commitment Overview	Specificity				OGP Value Relevance				Potential Impact				On Time?	Completion			
	None	Low	Medium	High	Access to Information	Civic Participation	Public Accountability	Tech. and Innov. for Transparency and Accountability	None	Minor	Moderate	Transformative		Not Started	Limited	Substantial	Complete
4a. Remove ActiveX			✓		Unclear					✓			Yes			✓	

Context and Objectives

Although South Korea scored in the top 10 countries in the UN's E-Government Development Index¹, the continued use of ActiveX hinders accessibility to public services. ActiveX is a software framework developed by Microsoft to load applications in its web browser. South Korea adopted ActiveX in 1996 to control functionality within Windows applications; however, it is incompatible with platforms other than Internet Explorer²,

hindering e-commerce activities. Internet security laws, dating back to the 1990s, require citizens to make their purchases using Internet Explorer.³ The government also required citizens to install a state-issued digital certificate as a proof of ID. Users shopping on other browsers, such as Safari or Chrome, receive a pop-up warning. As online financial transactions became more widely used, hacking became a serious issue in the banking industry with phishing scams and cyberattacks. Although ActiveX is recognized as an obsolete and inconvenient technology, the government has faced challenges removing the system due to the difficulties in finding a replacement technology and the high costs associated with the transition.

This commitment aims to remove ActiveX from government websites and apply alternative technologies. This commitment entails gradually increasing the share of ActiveX-free websites and completely removing it by 2017, and support the development of an application to replace ActiveX. The second commitment activity does not provide enough detail to measure completion, nor does it specify what actions the government will take to support the application's development. This commitment is not relevant to OGP values.

Despite the positive changes in the e-government environment of South Korea this commitment could bring about, the potential impact is minor. Based on the commitment text, this is a technical adjustment. It is not clear how removing ActiveX will greatly increase the ease of online transactions and e-government, without specifying the functionality of the replacement technology.

Completion

This commitment is substantially completed and is on time. According to evidence provided by the government, the rate of Active X-free websites was 87.3% in December 2016.⁴ By June 2017, the rate of ActiveX free public service webpages was 93.1%.⁵ The rate of ActiveX-free websites falls slightly short of the benchmark provided in the action plan.

The IRM researcher was unable to assess completion of the second commitment activity any higher than substantial due to the low specificity of the action plan text. The following government actions are relevant to supporting a replacement application but were not clearly specified. According to the self-assessment, the government held a briefing session on website level diagnoses, removal of ActiveX and other non-standard technologies in March 2016.⁶ The government conducted evaluation of web compatibility and accessibility of some 450 administrative and public agency websites from October 2016 to December 2016.⁷ In April 2017, the government made a revision to "Guideline for Establishment and Operation of Administrative and Public Agencies" to ensure people fully understand the need for removing non-standard technology such as ActiveX. The government also held a special symposium on the topic of removal of ActiveX where web-standardization experts were invited to share knowledge in May 2017.⁸

Next Steps

The IRM researcher does not recommend including commitments that are not relevant to OGP values. Although not relevant to OGP values, the government should continue the process of removing ActiveX and developing its replacement technology outside of its partnership with OGP.

¹ UN E-Government Knowledge DataBase, UN E-Government Survey (2016), <https://publicadministration.un.org/egovkb/en-us/Reports/UN-E-Government-Survey-2016> accessed in November 2017.

² Cho M.H "South Korea to remove 90 percent of ActiveX by 2017" 2 April 2015, ZDNet, <http://www.zdnet.com/article/south-korea-to-remove-90-percent-of-activex-by-2017/>

³ Harlan C. "South Korea is stuck with Internet Explorer for online shopping because of security law" 3 November 2013, The Washington Post, https://www.washingtonpost.com/world/asia_pacific/ue-to-security-law-south-korea-is-stuck-with-internet-explorer-for-online-shopping/2013/11/03/ffd2528a-3eff-11e3-b028-de922d7a3f47_story.html?utm_term=.e74d9ec8b909

⁴ Lee Yujin. (Deputy Director of Innovation Planning Division, Ministry of Interior and Safety), email correspondence between South Korea OGP Government point of contact on behalf of MoIS and IRM Staff. May 2018.

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ Ibid.

⁷ Ibid.

⁸ Kim D.W. “액티브 X 없는 세상 만들자... 전문가 좌담회” 28 May 2017, CIOBIZ, <http://ciobiz.etnews.com/20170526120002>

4b. Integrate e-government service portals

Commitment Text:

Title: Improved accessibility to public services through technology and innovation – Integrating service portals for citizens

The service provision framework for citizens, currently being separately operated in each area of welfare, employment, SME, and more, will be interconnected and integrated based on user-centric perspectives. Each ministry developed a portal using its own service categorization method and users found it inconvenient to pay a visit to each different site to receive the services they need. This calls for unification of online windows of the government for citizens as well as an integrated and open service platform for stronger interconnection among different ministerial systems. As the first step, Minwon24, Government Portal, and customized service portals will be integrated in 2016 and the movement will further expand to integration with portals of other ministries including Bokjiro (welfare portal) and WorkNet (employment portal) after 2017.

The three major systems (Government Portal, Information Page on Customized Benefits, and Minwon24 – G4C service portal) representing Korea’s online government services for citizens will be first integrated, followed by its integration and linkage with the service portal of each area such as Bokjiro (welfare) and WorkNet (employment) from 2017.

Responsible institution: Ministry of the Interior

Supporting institution(s): Central government ministries, local governments, public institutions, etc.

Start date: 1 July 2016

End date: 30 June 2018

Editorial Note: For full commitment text, please refer to https://www.opengovpartnership.org/sites/default/files/South-Korea_NAP3_2016-2018.pdf.

Commitment Overview	Specificity				OGP Value Relevance				Potential Impact				On Time?	Completion			
	None	Low	Medium	High	Access to Information	Civic Participation	Public Accountability	Tech. and Innov. for Transparency and Accountability	None	Minor	Moderate	Transformative		Not Started	Limited	Substantial	Complete
4b. Integrate e-government service portals			✓		Unclear					✓			Yes			✓	

Context and Objectives

Currently, all ministries operate their own portals when providing services to the public. According to the action plan, each ministry has its own unique “categorization method”, which makes it difficult for users to navigate these differences and find the right site to meet their needs. There is growing demand for an integrated online government service channel. According to the National Public Administration Survey¹, conducted by MoIS, 71 percent of respondents agreed that there is a need for an integrated administrative services website where they could access information and services, and 88 percent said that they desired proactive and customized services.

This commitment aims to provide user-friendly, customized services by forming an integrated online portal that would include three major systems under the purview of the Ministry of Interior and Safety: a Government Portal, an Information Page on Customized Benefits, and Minwon24. Once the government builds this administrative portal, the second activity is to integrate and link the service portals of other ministries (e.g. Bokjiro and WorkNet). Although a unified and integrated Government24 service portal will improve the ease of citizens accessing public services, this commitment is not relevant to any OGP values.

This commitment's specificity is medium as the language of the commitment specifies the three government portals and the timeframe for integration. However, the commitment does not include the exhaustive list of service portals that will be linked to the integrated portal.

This commitment is limited in scope, since it aims to integrate the online services of central government ministries and public agencies but does not cover the 100+ ministries providing online services. While this commitment will increase the convenience for citizens accessing government services, a more transformative commitment would seek to link the service portals of more (or even all) ministries, and thereby reaching a larger audience. As such, even if fully implemented, this commitment will have a minor potential impact.

Completion

As of July 2017, Minwon24 (complaints issuance web), Korean Government Portal (policy information portal), and a customized services portal (benefit service portal) were integrated into a single online portal called Government24.² According to the government self-assessment, Government24 provides information on more than 70,000 government services offered by 13,900 central government ministries, municipalities and other public agencies.³ In addition to this, 22 key government services, such as income verification (Hometax), information on health insurance entitlement and change in national pension entitlement, are provided to the public on a pilot basis. With regards to the second activity, 22 government institutions are part of the integrated system, including Korea Post, National Tax Service, National Pension Service, National Health Insurance Service, Korea Workers' Compensation & Welfare Services, Korean National Policy Agency, Korea Land & Housing Corporation, Korea Housing-Finance Corporation, Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs.⁴ The IRM researcher has been informed that MoIS is still in the process of encouraging the integration of other ministries and service portals.⁵ Given the scope as stated in the action plan, however, this commitment has been marked as fully complete.

While not under the scope of this commitment, MoIS conducted a series of events called National Government24.⁶ In March 2017, prior to the official launch, MoIS collected feedback on how to improve the current system from 40 university students. From April to May 2017, when Government24 was temporarily open, MoIS collected feedback from 2,832 citizens to understand their preferences in using the system. In August 2017, after the official launch, MoIS held an event with former members of Minwon24 to transition users' accounts to the new integrated portal and to raise awareness.

Early Results (if any)

The IRM researcher finds the integrated service portal to be user-friendly and easy to navigate. The portal displays various manuals on the homepage, which are accompanied with easy-to-follow instructions.

According to a representative from the National Information Social Agency⁷, Government24 has made it more convenient to create a single account, rather than creating an account for each separate government portal.

Next Steps

Although this commitment has led to positive changes for accessing government services online, it is not clearly relevant to OGP values, therefore the IRM researcher does not recommend carrying it forward into the next action plan.

¹ The survey results were presented to the IRM researcher as an internal government document. It is not publically accessible at this time.

² Government24 Official Website, <https://www.gov.kr/portal/main> ⁷

³ OGP Mid-Term Self-Assessment Report, https://www.opengovpartnership.org/sites/default/files/South-Korea_Mid-Term_Self-Assessment_2016-2018_EN.pdf

⁴ Progress and plan of administrative service integration and linkage (government internal document)

⁵ Public official at the Ministry of Interior and Safety, discussion with IRM researcher, December 2017.

⁶ Ku Eun Jung, (Deputy Director of Government Service Integration Task Force in the Ministry of Interior and Safety), discussion with IRM researcher, December 2017.

⁷ Park Won Jae (representative from National Information Social Agency), discussion with IRM researcher, December 2017.

5a. Improve anti-corruption survey

Commitment Text:

Title: Anti-Corruption and Public Service Ethics – Reinforcing research and evaluation on public sector corruption

Since 2002, the Korean government has conducted researches on transparency level and causes for corruption in public institutions using related data and surveys on public service users with the aim of improving public sector transparency. Though this saw substantial improvement in the integrity and transparency level of the public sector, there is constant demand that more efforts be made to enhance the integrity further by enacting and enforcing the anti-corruption law, conducting researches on anticorruption activities taken in public institutions, and developing the legal basis for evaluation. Therefore, the category of ‘improper solicitation’ will be included in the research and procedures will be developed in detail and enforced to disclose the research and evaluation results on the Internet.

The category of ‘improper solicitation’ will be included in anti-corruption surveys as the anti-corruption law has been enacted and enforced along with researches on anticorruption activities in public institutions and establishment of legal basis for evaluation. The government will develop and enforce procedures on how to disclose the anti-corruption research or evaluation results on the Internet.

Responsible institution: Anti-Corruption and Civil Rights Commission

Supporting institution(s): Central government ministries, local governments, educational offices, public institutions

Start date: 3 March 2016

End date: 30 June 2018

Editorial Note: For full commitment text, please refer to https://www.opengovpartnership.org/sites/default/files/South-Korea_NAP3_2016-2018.pdf.

Commitment Overview	Specificity				OGP Value Relevance				Potential Impact				On Time?	Completion			
	None	Low	Medium	High	Access to Information	Civic Participation	Public Accountability	Tech. and Innov. for Transparency and Accountability	None	Minor	Moderate	Transformative		Not Started	Limited	Substantial	Complete
5a. Improve anti-corruption survey		✓			✓					✓			Yes				✓

Context and Objectives

South Korea has conducted research on public sector transparency and corruption since 2002. Following President Park’s impeachment, citizens also called for greater transparency within the inner workings of the government. A part of this commitment, the Anti-Corruption and Civil Rights Commission (ACRC) will add the category, “improper solicitation,” to their annual anti-corruption survey and ask an additional question to evaluate the perception of anti-corruption in the public sector. Since ACRC will publish the results of their anti-corruption survey on their website, this commitment is relevant to access to information.

Due to the low specificity of the commitment text, the IRM researcher had to interpret what the actual change would be in anti-corruption surveys. A board member at Transparency International Korea¹ agreed that this commitment lacks specificity.

This commitment will have a minor potential impact. The Director at Solidarity for Justice² noted that the changes implemented by this commitment are limited in scope. While adding this question to the survey will help to measure the level of corruption in public institutions, other methods must be sought to actively fight corruption. According to a representative of Transparency International Korea³, this survey is an effective method to measure and assess corruption in the public sector. Based on an interview with a former public official⁴, the IRM researcher has concluded that while the additional question aims to capture the public official's experience of any observed corruption, survey respondents may not feel comfortable answering the question honestly.

Completion

According to the government self-assessment, the ACRC added the new question in their survey when evaluating 733 public agencies in 2016.⁵ The new question measures the perception of corruption by asking, "Do you think civil servants (public employees) have worked unfairly on the request of a person or a third party?" As of September 2016, heads of public agencies are required to disclose the survey results on their webpages as a result of the Act on the Prevention of Corruption and the Establishment and Management of the Anti-Corruption and Civil Rights Commission.⁶ The results must be posted for at least a month.

In 2017, the ACRC added two new questions to the survey to ask civil servants about their experiences with corruption and their thoughts on the effectiveness of anti-corruption programs.⁸ An ACRC official⁹ stated that a briefing on the survey results was held on 6 December 2017 and the results are now posted on the official homepage of ACRC, as confirmed by the IRM researcher.¹⁰

Next Steps

Despite fully completing this commitment, it is clear that this survey is a limited method to both measure and discourage corruption. If the government carries this commitment into the next action plan, measures should be taken to address the corruption within public institutions or encourage its reduction. Alternatively, the government could consider developing a more ambitious and relevant commitment such as strengthening the Whistleblower Protection Act, by providing higher incentives and greater protections for whistleblowers.

¹ Lee Sang Hak, (Transparency International and a member of OGP Korea Forum), email exchange with IRM researcher, November 2017

² Yang Gun Mo (Director at Solidarity for Justice and a member of OGP Korea Forum), discussion with IRM researcher, November 2017.

³ Representative from Transparency International, discussion with IRM researcher, March 2018

⁴ Former public official in Korean government, discussion with IRM researcher, March 2018.

⁵ OGP Mid-Term Self-Assessment Report. https://www.opengovpartnership.org/sites/default/files/South-Korea_Mid-Term_Self-Assessment_2016-2018_EN.pdf

⁶ Act on the Prevention of Corruption and the Establishment and Management of the Anti-Corruption and Civil Rights Commission, <http://www.acrc.go.kr/en/data/1.0.ACRC%20Act.pdf>

⁷ OGP Mid-Term Self-Assessment Report, https://www.opengovpartnership.org/sites/default/files/South-Korea_Mid-Term_Self-Assessment_2016-2018_EN.pdf

⁸ The two new questions are as follows: Has any of your colleagues, seniors or juniors, been unfair in the past one year in dealing with a case at the solicitation of the person concerned or a third party? Do you think your institution runs anti-corruption programs well? (The programs refer to consultations, whistleblower protection, education and promotion).

⁹ Won Hyeon Sim, Deputy Director of Anti-Corruption Survey & Evaluation Division in Anti-Corruption and Civil Rights Commissions.

¹⁰ Lee K.H Anti-Corruption & Civil Rights Commission “2017 년 공공기관 청렴도 7.94, 전년 대비 0.09 점 상승”, 6 December 2017,
<http://www.acrc.go.kr/acrc/board.do?command=searchDetail&method=searchDetailViewInc&menuId=050505&boardNum=67788>

6a. Disclose international aid information

Commitment Text:

Title: *Improved Financial Transparency – Disclosing information on international aids*

As a member of the International Aid Transparency Initiative (IATI), Korea has Korea International Cooperation Agency (KOICA) as an institution providing grants and Korea Export-Import Bank as an institution providing loans from the Economic Development Cooperation Fund (EDCF). Some 740 sets of information on the projects that are currently being carried out or planned as part of the initiative will be converted to meet the IATI format and opened to the public. Information in 13 required categories – institution name, project identifier, project name, project description and progress, participating institutions, beneficiary region and area, etc. – will be open first in 2016 and the rest will be gradually disclosed through consultations among related stakeholders. The range of ODA information disclosure and the number of participating institutions will be also expanded in stages.

Out of 39 categories selected by IATI for information disclosure, 13 required categories will be opened up first for 740 KOICA and EDCF programs, which are currently being carried out or planned to help developing countries. The rest of the information will be gradually disclosed through consultations between related institutions.

Responsible institution: Office for Government Policy Coordination (Export-Import Bank of Korea)

Supporting institution(s): Ministry of Foreign Affairs/Development Policy Division; Ministry of Strategy and Finance/International Financial Cooperation Division

Start date: 1 July 2016

End date: 30 June 2018

Editorial Note: For full commitment text, please refer to https://www.opengovpartnership.org/sites/default/files/South-Korea_NAP3_2016-2018.pdf.

Commitment Overview	Specificity				OGP Value Relevance				Potential Impact				On Time?	Completion			
	None	Low	Medium	High	Access to Information	Civic Participation	Public Accountability	Tech. and Innov. for Transparency and Accountability	None	Minor	Moderate	Transformative		Not Started	Limited	Substantial	Complete
6a. Disclose international aid information			✓		✓					✓			Yes			✓	

Context and Objectives

In 2015, the South Korean government voluntarily began disclosing information on Korea's Official Development Assistance (ODA) activities to the International Aid Transparency Initiative (IATI), a voluntary, multi-stakeholder initiative that publishes data on development cooperation activities used by donors, the private sector, NGOs, etc.¹ Information on ODA performance, future plans, and strategies are currently disclosed on the ODA and IATI websites.² South Korea's net ODA expenditures have been steadily increasing in the past decade³ and there is growing demand from citizens for the government to disclose the sources of ODA and relevant statistics.

This commitment outlines two key activities: to disclose information under 13 categories selected by IATI, including the 740 Korea International Cooperation Agency (KOICA) and Economic and Development Cooperation Fund (EDCF) programs in progress. Secondly, the government will expand the range of projects and information categories to be disclosed through consultations among related institutions. As such, this commitment is relevant to access to information. The commitment text specifies the 13 required categories but provides little information on the inter-institutional consultations that will be conducted to expand the range of categories to be disclosed.

This commitment is expected to have minor potential impact. All IATI member countries are required to disclose 13 categories at the very minimum and Korea is stepping up its effort in creating a more transparent environment that meets the internationally-accepted standard.

Completion

This commitment is on time and is substantially completed. As of August 2016, the government has fully released information on the 13 required categories on the 740 programs designed to support developing nations, which are currently in progress or are scheduled to take effect by KOICA and EDCF. The information is publicly accessible on the ODA website.⁴ The 13 categories are as follows: organization identifier, name, reporting organization, IATI identifier, reporting-organization, title, description, participating-organization, activity status, activity date, recipient country, recipient region, and sector. In addition to this list, the government has voluntarily expanded the list of categories from 13 to 18 and the number of institutions disclosing information has also increased.

According to the government self-assessment, the government has disclosed information on other ODA programs implemented by major government ministries and other non-ODA programs, under the expanded number of categories that are heavily involved with this work such as the Ministry of Strategy and Finance, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and Ministry of Health and Welfare.⁵ The self-assessment does not provide any information on the inter-institutional consultation that was planned to take place.

Early Results (if any)

Hanui Lee and Min Young Kim, from Korea NGO Council for Overseas Development Cooperation,⁶ commended government action but noted the disclosed information does not provide any added value beyond its disclosure. The information disclosed is very basic and easily collectable. It would be a stretch to say that the newly disclosed information will lead to greater transparency and reliability of ODA projects.

Jae Won Lee⁷, team leader from Professional Infrastructure Developers Association (PIDA), stated that she is happy with the commitment the government has made to increase transparency. However, she notes that it is very difficult to navigate and find necessary information on ODA projects.

The Korea Civil Society on International Development Cooperation, a network of Korean civil society organizations working to make development cooperation more effective⁸, formally published a report on the limitations of the 13 required categories and said it was disappointing at best as the kind of information included in the 13 required categories was very basic and elementary. The report emphasized that mere information disclosure does not promote transparency.⁹

Next Steps

The IRM researcher recommends this commitment be taken forward to the next action plan. The government should consider disclosing more information and expanding its scope by encouraging other ministries or agencies to release the information on their ODA work. It would also be helpful for the government to detail how it will gradually disclose more categories “through consultations between related institutions” and how it will seek

consultations. Specifically, the government should consider the following recommendations by CSOs:

- Disclose budget for the 40 agencies, other than KOICA and EDCF, carrying out ODA projects.¹⁰
- Provide a multi-year plan or roadmap that shows stages of participation of disclosure, starting with those that spend more than US\$10 million for ODA projects.¹¹ By improving the organization of the work, ministries and public agencies would be able to share best practices that are replicable or scalable.

¹ International Aid Transparency Initiative website, <https://www.aidtransparency.net/about> 7

² Korea Official Development Assistance, <http://www.odakorea.go.kr/index.jsp> 7

³ OECD, DAC Member Profile: Korea (2016) <http://www.oecd.org/dac/korea.htm> 7

⁴ Korea Official Development Assistance, http://www.odakorea.go.kr/ODAPage_2012/T02/L01_S02.jsp

⁵ The IRM researcher was given access to internal government documents listing the categories. The additional categories are as follows: collaboration-type, default-flow type, default-finance-type, default-aid-type and transaction.

⁶ Lee, Hanui and Kim, Min Young (Assistant Manager of Policy Center and Team Leader of Korea NGO Council for overseas development cooperation), discussion with IRM researcher, December 2017.

⁷ Lee, Jae Won, team leader from Professional Infrastructure Developers Association (PIDA), discussion with IRM researcher, December 2017.

⁸ Korea Civil Society Forum on International Development Cooperation, KOFID Brochure, <http://www.kofid.org/en/about.php>

⁹ Welford K., Publish What You Fund, “Korean Government’s Disclosure of ODA information is Disappointing at Best”, 30 August 2016, <http://www.publishwhatyoufund.org/korean-governments-disclosure-oda-information-disappointing-best/>

¹⁰ Lee, Jae Won, team leader from Professional Infrastructure Developers Association (PIDA), discussion with IRM researcher, December 2017.

¹¹ Lee, Jae Won, team leader from Professional Infrastructure Developers Association (PIDA), discussion with IRM researcher, December 2017.

6b. Improve information on ODA projects

Commitment Text:

Title: *Improved Financial Transparency – Improving citizens’ accessibility to ODA statistics*

The ODA statistics are currently provided mostly focusing on the progress and status of the projects with data on the supervising ministries, fund types, aid types, areas, and regional status. This will change through renovation of the ODA statistics system, where citizens will be able to find more information about the projects including their goals, descriptions, and periods.

The ODA statistics information system will be revamped to provide detailed information and statistics including the objective, description, and period of each ODA project.

Responsible institution: Office for Government Policy Coordination, Export-Import Bank of Korea

Supporting institution(s): Ministry of Foreign Affairs/Development Policy Division, Ministry of Strategy and Finance/International Financial Cooperation Division, OECD Development Assistance Committee (DAC), Working Party-Statistics (WP – STAT)

Start date: 1 July 2016

End date: 30 June 2018

Editorial Note: For full commitment text, please refer to https://www.opengovpartnership.org/sites/default/files/South-Korea_NAP3_2016-2018.pdf.

Commitment Overview	Specificity				OGP Value Relevance				Potential Impact				On Time?	Completion			
	None	Low	Medium	High	Access to Information	Civic Participation	Public Accountability	Tech. and Innov. for Transparency and Accountability	None	Minor	Moderate	Transformative		Not Started	Limited	Substantial	Complete
6b. Improve information on ODA projects		✓			✓					✓			Yes			✓	

Context and Objectives

Prior to the development of the third action plan, the ODA statistical information system provided statistical information on the supervising ministries, fund types, aid types, aid areas and regional status.¹ However, according to the action plan, the system mainly focuses on information such as aid status and it can be difficult for citizens to fully grasp the information provided.²

This commitment aims to reorganize the ODA statistics system and disclose more detailed information such as the purpose, description and period of each ODA project. As such, this commitment meets the OGP value of access to information.

The specificity of the commitment text is low. It does not clearly identify how this increased access to information would achieve the stated objective of “developing aid strategies or expanding overseas,” especially since the information is geared towards the general public. It also does not specify what kind of process or procedure this work would require and under whose charge.

If fully implemented, this commitment will have a minor impact as this commitment aims to reorganize a system that is already in place and provide access to a limited amount of new information.

Completion

Based on information provided by the government³, it has been clarified that the ODA statistics system is one component of the overall ODA management system. While the statistics system is publicly accessible and provides information such as the list of donor and implementing institutions, the ODA monitoring system (the second component), acts as an internal monitoring system and is only accessible to lead ministries and implementing institutions.

Overall, this commitment's completion is substantial: although the government has taken internal steps to revamp the ODA management system, no new information on ODA projects has been provided.

In April 2017, the government officially updated the integrated ODA management system.⁴ According to the government PoC⁵, implementing institutions are now able to upload project information, including an overview, duration and expenditure of each project. The platform standardizes the presentation of the project's budget and progress. Furthermore, the visualization of the platform's search page has been updated to increase user-friendliness. In May 2017, the Prime Minister's Office organized a workshop to help implementing institutions use the ODA management system.

A government official⁶ noted that both the monitoring system and the statistics system have since been modified. However, an NGO spokesman,⁷ who uses the ODA statistics system, says she was unable to observe any change after the reform.

When the IRM researcher reached out to one of the participating public agencies for additional information, the public agency stated that information could not be shared since it is considered "internal documents." The government has since clarified that the ODA projects are government to government (G2G), which means that they cannot disclose further information without the approval of recipient countries. Furthermore, recipient countries retain ownership of documents for EDCF projects. The government went on to say that once the OECD embargo is lifted, ODA statistics will be made available on the system.⁸

Early Results (if any)

An NGO spokesman⁹ stated the quality of the newly-disclosed information is "lacking." The information is too brief to give a clear idea of the project undertaken. The spokesman also said that the action taken by the government does not necessarily correspond to the title of the commitment.

Hanui Lee and Min Young Kim, from Korea NGO Council for Overseas Development Cooperation¹⁰ noted that they were unaware of the reform, despite the fact that they frequently work with ODA statistics. They also emphasized that the title of the commitment "Improving citizens' accessibility to ODA statistics" does not reflect the content of the commitment as addressed in the self-assessment report.¹¹

Next Steps

The government has indicated that preliminary ODA statistics will be released in April 2018, once the OECD embargo is lifted. In next action plan, the government should link the newly available information to the ODA statistics system. Additionally, the government should clearly state the aim and purpose of each commitment in the action plan that the government intends to implement.

¹ The third national action plan, https://www.opengovpartnership.org/sites/default/files/South-Korea_NAP3_2016-2018%5B1%5D.pdf

² Ibid.

³ Lee Yujin. (Deputy Director of Innovation Planning Division, Ministry of Interior and Safety), email correspondence between South Korea OGP Government point of contact on behalf of MoIS and IRM Staff. May 2018.

⁴ Official Development Assistance, ODA Statistics, www.stats.odakorea.go.kr

⁵ Lee Yujin. (Deputy Director of Innovation Planning Division, Ministry of Interior and Safety), email correspondence between South Korea OGP Government point of contact on behalf of MoIS and IRM Staff. May 2018.

⁶ Kim, Sulhui (expert adviser at ODA Bureau at the Office of Government Policy Coordination), phone discussion with IRM researcher, December 2017.

⁷ NGO spokesman, discussion with IRM researcher, December 2017.

⁸ Lee Yujin. (Deputy Director of Innovation Planning Division, Ministry of Interior and Safety), email correspondence between South Korea OGP Government point of contact on behalf of MoIS and IRM Staff. May 2018.

⁹ NGO spokesman, discussion with IRM researcher, December 2017.

¹⁰ Lee, Hanui and Kim, Min Young (Assistant Manager of Policy Center and Team Leader of Korea NGO Council for overseas development cooperation), discussion with IRM researcher, December 2017.

¹¹ Open Government Partnership, *South Korea Mid-Term Self-Assessment Report 2016-2018* (2017), <https://www.opengovpartnership.org/documents/south-korea-mid-term-self-assessment-report-2016-2018>

V. General Recommendations

The recent change in administration provides an important opportunity to pursue open government initiatives identified by stakeholders. It is critical that the government actively collaborate with civil society when developing and implementing the fourth national action plan and include highly specific and ambitious commitments.

This section aims to inform development of the next action plan and guide completion of the current action plan. It is divided into two sections: 1) those civil society and government priorities identified while elaborating this report and 2) the recommendations of the IRM.

5.1 Stakeholder Priorities

Some of the commitments covered in the current action plan overlapped with commitments outlined by the Moon administration's five-year policy agenda. Out of the 14 commitments, stakeholders identified the most important themes as access to public information, open data and improving e-government services.

The action plan's main shortcoming was the lack of meaningful CSO involvement and public engagement during the creation of the action plan and the implementation of its commitments. Although this current action certainly shows an increased opportunity for civic participation compared to the previous two action plans, it is clear from interviews that South Korea must improve in this area. Stakeholders expect the government to clearly and effectively communicate the co-creation timeline and process to allow for the exchange of ideas, which can later be reflected in the action plan. Although the current action plan has reflected some of the stakeholders' proposals, it only represented a few ideas by a small group of CSOs, and with limited feedback from the government. In addition, public CSOs stated the crucial need to promote OGP values and its activities to a wider audience, ensuring the process is not limited to the OGP Forum Korea.

5.2 IRM Recommendations

The IRM researcher identifies process-related recommendations to build on the current action plan, as well as content-specific suggestions to address conflict of interest in politics and modernize existing open government practices.

Include highly specific, ambitious and relevant commitments

Seven of the 14 commitments are found to have low specificity. The vague formulation of commitments makes it difficult to ascertain potential impact and resulting outcomes of implementation. The government needs to clearly identify intended changes for beneficiaries in the next action plan and list clear, verifiable activities for achieving intended results. It is recommended that the government send their action plan to the OGP Support Unit to get feedback.

Additionally, the current plan focuses mainly on information disclosure. The next action plan should also focus on OGP values of citizen participation and public accountability (i.e. specific mechanisms by which the public can hold public officials accountable).

Improve co-creation during the development and implementation of the next action plan

When developing the fourth national action plan, the government should adhere to the basic requirements outlined in the OGP Participation & Co-creation Standards.¹ Specifically, the Ministry of Interior and Safety (MoIS) needs to consider the following: 1) proactively communicate, with adequate notice, the process for action plan development; 2) publish regular updates on action plan development and carry out awareness-raising activities; 3)

discuss government priorities and the feasibility of adopting CSO-proposed commitments; and 4) review adopted commitments with civil society and clearly state the reasons behind their selection.

Furthermore, MoIS should make an explicit effort to expand the range of ministries and other state institutions involved with the national OGP process and the OGP Forum Korea. Out of 14 commitments, MoIS was the responsible organization for 11 of them. While MoIS is responsible for domestic public administration, government innovation and home affairs, it is crucial to broaden the ownership of the open government agenda and OGP. There are other public bodies with the mandate to provide crucial public services and carry out functions related to citizen engagement and anti-corruption, as well as other branches of government, such as the legislative and judiciary, which have important complementary roles in the open government agenda.

Finally, during action plan implementation, the government should utilize the OGP Forum Korea as a regular multistakeholder working group for monitoring the plan, publishing regular updates on the progress of commitments and raising public awareness on open government initiatives.

Leverage the OGP platform to advance ongoing reforms initiated by the Moon administration.

South Korea should use the forthcoming OGP national action plan to identify ambitious commitment activities and/or foster greater collaboration between government, civil society and citizens in implementing open government-related reforms initiated under the Moon administration's five-year policy agenda. This includes initiatives such as Gwanghwamoon 1st Street, the offline channel for citizens to propose policy, efforts to strengthen anti-corruption agencies, and other initiatives to promote greater transparency, accountability in governance and social innovation.

Develop strong commitments on addressing conflict of interest and money in politics

In light of recent corruption scandals, involving collusion and conflicts of interest between the government and business conglomerates, the IRM researcher recommends that the next action plan include commitments related to implementing the new conflict of interest legislation, regulating lobbying and political party financing, establishing public registers to disclose the beneficial or ultimate owners of companies, and strengthening the governance of large conglomerates and state-owned enterprises. The South Korean government could take advantage of lessons learned from other OGP countries in adopting and implementing similar reforms.

Modernize existing open government policies and practices

South Korea has been an early adopter in implementing far-reaching open government reforms and in using technology to strengthen governance. The IRM researcher recommends that government modernize their freedom of information legislation and budget processes in order to maintain their leadership on open government.

Furthermore, there are new frontiers related to public procurement, such as the open contracting data standard and transparency on provision of public services (as an increasing number of services are provided digitally). The government should consider ambitious reforms in these areas to demonstrate strong national and regional leadership as a member of OGP's global Steering Committee.

Table 5.1: Five Key Recommendations

1	Include highly specific, ambitious and relevant commitments
2	Improve co-creation during the development and implementation of the next action plan
3	Leverage the OGP platform to advance ongoing reforms initiated by the Moon administration
4	Develop strong commitments on addressing conflict of interest and money in politics
5	Modernize existing open government policies and practices

¹ OGP Participation and Co-Creation Standards, http://www.opengovpartnership.org/sites/default/files/OGP_Participation-Cocreation-Standards20170207.pdf

VI. Methodology and Sources

The IRM progress report is written by researchers based in each OGP-participating country. All IRM reports undergo a process of quality control to ensure that the highest standards of research and due diligence have been applied.

Analysis of progress on OGP action plans is a combination of interviews, desk research, and feedback from nongovernmental stakeholder meetings. The IRM report builds on the findings of the government's own self-assessment report and any other assessments of progress put out by civil society, the private sector, or international organizations.

Each IRM researcher carries out stakeholder meetings to ensure an accurate portrayal of events. Given budgetary and calendar constraints, the IRM cannot consult all interested or affected parties. Consequently, the IRM strives for methodological transparency and therefore, where possible, makes public the process of stakeholder engagement in research (detailed later in this section.) Some contexts require anonymity of interviewees and the IRM reviews the right to remove personal identifying information of these participants. Due to the necessary limitations of the method, the IRM strongly encourages commentary on public drafts of each report.

Each report undergoes a four-step review and quality-control process:

1. Staff review: IRM staff reviews the report for grammar, readability, content, and adherence to IRM methodology.
2. International Experts Panel (IEP) review: IEP reviews the content of the report for rigorous evidence to support findings, evaluates the extent to which the action plan applies OGP values, and provides technical recommendations for improving the implementation of commitments and realization of OGP values through the action plan as a whole. (See below for IEP membership.)
3. Prepublication review: Government and select civil society organizations are invited to provide comments on content of the draft IRM report.
4. Public comment period: The public is invited to provide comments on the content of the draft IRM report.

This review process, including the procedure for incorporating comments received, is outlined in greater detail in Section III of the Procedures Manual.¹

Interviews and Focus Groups

Each IRM researcher is required to hold at least one public information-gathering event. Researchers should make a genuine effort to invite stakeholders outside of the “usual suspects” list of invitees already participating in existing processes. Supplementary means may be needed to gather the inputs of stakeholders in a more meaningful way (e.g., online surveys, written responses, follow-up interviews). Additionally, researchers perform specific interviews with responsible agencies when the commitments require more information than is provided in the self-assessment or is accessible online.

Taking full consideration of the comments provided by the South Korean government for the 2014–2016 End-of-Term Report, the IRM researcher carefully chose to interview key stakeholders from both the public and government side to represent a fair and a balanced voice. All interviews took place from October 2017 to December 2017. The researcher interviewed 40 representatives, including 17 people from the government side: government officials who were in directly in charge of the commitments, government officials who were in the departments or divisions where the commitment was taking place, and public agency representatives who were involved with the process and the inner working of the commitments. The IRM researcher interviewed 23 people from the public side, including

civil society representatives or groups, academics and private sector representatives. Interviews were conducted through various methods, such as in-person meetings, one-on-one interviews, phone interviews, and email exchanges.

Key stakeholders who met the following criteria were selected in conducting the interviews:

- Government or public officials who were directly in charge of implementing the commitment
- Government or public officials who were assisting with the aims of implementing the commitment and had a good working knowledge of the process, stage and implementation level of the commitment
- Members who currently hold a seat on the OGP Forum Korea
- CSOs who had been referred by the OGP Forum Korea members who are heavily involved with the work of the commitment
- Other CSOs in which the IRM researcher determined as important as key stakeholders for specific commitments based on desktop research
- Suggested CSOs by government officials on an ad-hoc basis

About the Independent Reporting Mechanism

The IRM is a key means by which government, civil society, and the private sector can track government development and implementation of OGP action plans on an annual basis. The design of research and quality control of such reports is carried out by the International Experts Panel, comprised of experts in transparency, participation, accountability, and social science research methods.

The current membership of the International Experts Panel is

- César Cruz-Rubio
- Mary Francoli
- Brendan Halloran
- Jeff Lovitt
- Fredline M'Cormack-Hale
- Showers Mawowa
- Juanita Olaya
- Quentin Reed
- Rick Snell
- Jean-Patrick Villeneuve

A small staff based in Washington, DC, shepherds reports through the IRM process in close coordination with the researchers. Questions and comments about this report can be directed to the staff at irm@opengovpartnership.org.

¹ IRM Procedures Manual, V.3 : <https://www.opengovpartnership.org/documents/irm-procedures-manual>

VII. Eligibility Requirements Annex

The OGP Support Unit collates eligibility criteria on an annual basis. These scores are presented below.¹ When appropriate, the IRM reports will discuss the context surrounding progress or regress on specific criteria in the Country Context section.

In September 2012, OGP officially encouraged governments to adopt ambitious commitments that relate to eligibility.

Table 7.1: Eligibility Annex for South Korea

Criteria	2011	Current	Change	Explanation
Budget Transparency ²	4	4	No change	4 = Executive's Budget Proposal and Audit Report published 2 = One of two published 0 = Neither published
Access to Information ³	4	4	No change	4 = Access to information (ATI) Law 3 = Constitutional ATI provision 1 = Draft ATI law 0 = No ATI law
Asset Declaration ⁴	4	4	No change	4 = Asset disclosure law, data public 2 = Asset disclosure law, no public data 0 = No law
Citizen Engagement (Raw score)	4 (8.53) ⁵	4 (8.24) ⁶	No change	<i>EIU Citizen Engagement Index</i> raw score: 1 > 0 2 > 2.5 3 > 5 4 > 7.5
Total / Possible (Percent)	16/16 (100%)	16/16 (100%)	No change	75% of possible points to be eligible

¹ For more information, see <http://www.opengovpartnership.org/how-it-works/eligibility-criteria>.

² For more information, see Table 1 in <http://internationalbudget.org/what-we-do/open-budget-survey/>. For up-to-date assessments, see <http://www.obstracker.org/>.

³ The two databases used are Constitutional Provisions at <http://www.right2info.org/constitutional-protections> and Laws and draft laws at <http://www.right2info.org/access-to-information-laws>.

⁴ Simeon Djankov, Rafael La Porta, Florencio Lopez-de-Silanes, and Andrei Shleifer, "Disclosure by Politicians," (Tuck School of Business Working Paper 2009-60, 2009), <http://bit.ly/19nDEfK>; Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), "Types of Information Decision Makers Are Required to Formally Disclose, and Level Of Transparency," in *Government at a Glance 2009*, (OECD, 2009), <http://bit.ly/13vGtqS>; Ricard Messick, "Income and Asset Disclosure by World Bank Client Countries" (Washington, DC: World Bank, 2009), <http://bit.ly/1clokyf>. For more recent information, see <http://publicofficialsfinancialdisclosure.worldbank.org>. In 2014, the OGP Steering Committee approved a change in the asset disclosure measurement. The existence of a law and de facto public access to the disclosed information replaced the old measures of disclosure by politicians and disclosure of high-level officials. For additional information, see the guidance note on 2014 OGP Eligibility Requirements at <http://bit.ly/1EjLJ4Y>.

⁵ "Democracy Index 2010: Democracy in Retreat," The Economist Intelligence Unit (London: Economist, 2010), <http://bit.ly/eLC1rE>.

⁶ "Democracy Index 2014: Democracy and its Discontents," The Economist Intelligence Unit (London: Economist, 2014), <http://bit.ly/18kEzCt>.