

South Korea has made progress increasing data disclosures and engaging citizens to design data policies. Civil society are still concerned over the lack of transparency in government data disclosure. Moving forward, the government could improve transparency by publishing transcripts and minutes from stakeholder consultation activities to show how citizen's views are incorporated in policy planning.

The Open Government Partnership (OGP) is a voluntary international initiative that aims to secure commitments from governments to their citizenry to promote transparency, empower citizens, fight corruption, and harness new technologies to strengthen governance. The Independent Reporting Mechanism (IRM) carries out a review of the activities of each OGP participating country. This report summarizes the results of the period April 2014 to July 2016 and includes some relevant developments up to December 2016.

The Republic of Korea officially began participating in OGP in September 2011. South Korea's Ministry of the Interior (MOI) is the lead institution responsible for coordinating OGP activities. MOI is also responsible for the general coordination of public service in the country, including e-governance initiatives.

Commitments were carried out by a number of relevant bodies, including the Anti-Corruption and Civil Rights Commission (ACRC), the Ministry of the Interior, and the Ministry of Personnel Management's Government Officials Ethics Committee. Civil society groups attended ministry-organized meetings such as the Open Data Korea Forum, where they were informed of and held discussions on government policy, but direct influence on those policies appears to be limited.

South Korea published its third action plan in October 2016, and has carried forward three commitments from the second action plan.

Table 1: At a Glance

	Mid-term	End-of-term
Number of commitments	5	
Number of milestones	18	
Level of completion (Commitment level)		
Completed	0	1
Substantial	1	2
Limited	3	2
Not started	1	0
Number of commitments with:		
Clear relevance to OGP values	5	
Transformative potential impact	0	
Substantial or complete implementation	1	3
All three (☑)	0	0
Did it open government?		
Major	0	
Outstanding	0	
Moving Forward		
Number of commitments carried over to next action plan:	3	

Consultation with civil society during implementation

Countries participating in the OGP follow a process for consultation during development of their OGP action plan and during implementation. The consultation process during the implementation (April 2014 to July 2016) was a decentralized process, with forums held by the National Information Agency, Ministry of the Interior and various committees during early stages of implementation. However, information about these committees, such as how they selected their members, the contents of the meetings, and how they formed policy positions, remains limited. Meeting transcripts are generally not available through official websites, and often are not retrievable through major Korean search engines.

Nevertheless, stakeholders noted more government willingness to meet and discuss OGP commitments during the second half of implementation. Meetings were held between the Ministry of the Interior and four civil society representatives on June 10, 2016 and (beyond the implementation period) on September 22, 2016. The civil society groups, however, soon had reservations over whether the dialogue had been meaningful and if their opinions were effectively taken into account. In response, the government submitted its meeting minutes on the consultations between government and civil society throughout 2016. These notes, however, have not fully satisfied CSO concerns as many do not directly address issues raised by civil society. For example, in response to a stakeholder request that the government take more active measures in its OGP membership, MOI claims to have taken the stakeholder's views into account for future planning, but does not specify how input is to be used and whether it has led to any specific outcomes.

The Ministry of the Interior also submitted a Korean-language briefing report to the IRM and stakeholders in June 2016 which noted a number of stakeholder discussions with the government. In December 2013, before the implementation period, the government stated that it formed the Open Data Strategy Council (ODSC) (“공공데이터전략위원회”) consisting of 35 members from the Ministry of the Interior and private and public sectors, and that this was the foundation of much of its consultation work, particularly on open data commitments. Participating members of the ODSC are listed in an online directory for the ODSC on its MOI website.¹ This body formed a master plan² to guide open government policies related to open data commitments. The researcher had some difficulty locating the document, as it was published on the Ministry of the Interior website, and the Open Data Strategy Council website under various titles.³

Chung Chung-sik, a former adviser to the Ministry of the Interior and professor of information studies at Kyungshung University, wrote in an academic paper about his concerns that among 100 ODSC members, none are engaged in Strategy Council work full-time and the chairman of the council heads several other government committees in addition to this one.⁴ This could suggest that the ODSC is being conducted as “business as usual,” with the same inside figures trusted by the government, rather than being inclusive of a wider national civil society community. Furthermore, rather than mediating discussions between government ministries to facilitate policy-making or mutual collaboration, the council, he writes, in reality fulfills deliberative and executive functions and is little more than a messenger for government policies.⁵ Chung Chung-sik writes that before the creation of a dedicated Government 3.0 committee, there was administrative confusion about the direction of this initiative due to a preponderance of ill-defined committees, and says that civil servants complained about fatigue from the pressure to meet metrics-based goals.⁶ CSO consensus has indicated that while South Korea has progressive disclosure laws, its dearth of a strong, fundamental framework to implementing those laws has led to limited results for stakeholders, who have reservations about Government 3.0's effectiveness.

The government self-assessment report (Korean language version) notes that MOI and the National Information Agency introduced the Open Data Korea Forum in July 2013, “in order to promote use of public data in the service of corporate and social benefits,” and that the forum meets twice a year and consists of 300 citizens. The pre-existing Open Data Forum was used to consult with a select number of stakeholders involved in open data. Since minutes of the meetings are not publicly

available, it is unclear what OGP commitments were discussed, which stakeholders attended, and whether the consultation was open to the public. During implementation, MOI privately consulted experts and businesses on open data-related commitments. These meetings were not open to the general public and did not involve civil society. Since the role of the Open Data Forum is to “promote use of public data,” on the IAP2 spectrum it meets the criteria of “inform,” but cannot be considered a full consultation.

In addition to the ODSC and Forum, the government held townhalls and administered surveys during the implementation period to solicit feedback on open data specifically pertaining to Commitment 3e (Encouraging the Private Sector to Utilize Public Data).⁷ While the townhall meetings included question and answer sessions, there are no reports on the issues citizens raised or how feedback was used. The Feedback Survey commissioned by the Government 3.0 Committee in 2015 polled 400 people but posed only three questions (1) Have you heard of government 3.0? (2) If so, what do you know about Government 3.0? (3) Government 3.0 is a reform of administrative services intended to make citizens happy and trust the government. How would you summarize Government 3.0 in one sentence?⁸ Based on the nature of the questions, it does not meet IAP2 consultation standards to “obtain public feedback on analysis, alternatives and/or decisions.”⁹ Some consultation took place in regards to specific commitments. For example, in 2016 the MPSS (public safety agency) issued an “Open Data Demand Survey” that polled citizens about their open data requests and wishes. While representing a positive example of public consultation, this survey collected only a narrow subset of feedback relating to one commitment. Consultation with civil society for the overall implementation of the action plan was limited.

¹ Ministry of the Interior. “Open Data Strategy Council,” <http://www.odsc.go.kr/user/nd10191.do>.

² Open Data Strategy Council, “Master Plan on Public Data Disclosure Policies,” www.odsc.go.kr

³ The June 2016 report in Korean refers to “the master plan” (“마스터 플랜”), while the end-of-term self-assessment in September 2016 refers to its official title as “공공데이터 민간 활용 활성화 기본계획.” Later, the government’s follow-up response to the IRM draft report provided a third name: “공공데이터 개방 및 이용활성화 기본계획.”

⁴ “전자정부: 잃어버린 10년의 교훈”. 정충식, 경성대학교. 2016. 12. 한국행정학회. (“E-government: The Lost 10 Years”. Chung Chung-sik, Kyungsung University. December 2016. The Korean Association for Public Administration.), 25-26.

⁵ “전자정부: 잃어버린 10년의 교훈”. 정충식, 경성대학교. 2016. 12. 한국행정학회. (“E-government: The Lost 10 Years”. Chung Chung-sik, Kyungsung University. December 2016. The Korean Association for Public Administration.), 39.

⁶ “전자정부: 잃어버린 10년의 교훈”. 정충식, 경성대학교. 2016. 12. 한국행정학회. (“E-government: The Lost 10 Years”. Chung Chung-sik, Kyungsung University. December 2016. The Korean Association for Public Administration.), 39.

⁷ Open Data Townhall Talk <http://onoffmix.com/event/40686>

Open Data Startup Talk: <http://onoffmix.com/event/68448>

Open Data Feedback Survey: <https://goo.gl/Har3zZ>

⁸ Open Data Feedback Survey: <https://goo.gl/Har3zZ>

⁹ IAP2 Spectrum: https://c.ymcdn.com/sites/www.iap2.org/resource/resmgr/files/iap-006_brochure_a3_internat.pdf

Table 2: Action Plan Consultation Process

Phase of Action Plan	OGP Process Requirement (Articles of Governance Section)	Did the government meet this requirement
During Implementation	Regular forum for consultation during implementation?	No
	Consultations: Open or Invitation-only?	Invitation-only
	Consultations on IAP2 spectrum ¹	Inform

¹ IAP2 Spectrum of Political Participation, International Association for Public Participation, http://www.iap2.org/resource/resmgr/Foundations_Course/IAP2_P2_Spectrum.pdf.

Progress in commitment implementation

As part of OGP, countries are required to make commitments in a two-year action plan. End of term reports assess an additional metric, ‘did it open government?’ The tables below summarize the completion level at the end of term and progress on this metric. Note for commitments that were already complete at the midterm, only an analysis of ‘did it open government?’ is provided. For additional information on previously completed commitments, please see South Korea’s IRM mid-term progress report. South Korea’s plan focused on three key areas: improving public services, improving civil service integrity, and efficient management of public resources.

All of the indicators and method used in the IRM research can be found in the IRM Procedures Manual, available at (<http://www.opengovpartnership.org/about/about-irm>). One measure deserves further explanation, due to its particular interest for readers and usefulness for encouraging a race to the top between OGP-participating countries: the “starred commitment” (☆). Starred commitments are considered exemplary OGP commitments. In order to receive a star, a commitment must meet several criteria:

1. It must be specific enough that a judgment can be made about its potential impact. Starred commitments will have "medium" or "high" specificity.
2. 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.
3. The commitment would have a "transformative" potential impact if completely implemented.
4. Finally, the commitment must see significant progress during the action plan implementation period, receiving a ranking of "substantial" or "complete" implementation.

Based on these criteria, at the mid term report, South Korea’s action plan contained zero starred commitments.

Commitments assessed as star commitments in the mid term report can lose their starred status if at the end of the action plan implementation cycle, their completion falls short of substantial or full completion, which would mean they have an overall limited completion at the end of term, per commitment language.

Finally, the graphs 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, see the OGP Explorer at www.opengovpartnership.org/explorer.

About “Did it Open Government?”

Often, OGP commitments are vaguely worded or not clearly related to opening government, but they actually achieve significant political reforms. Other times, commitments with significant progress may appear relevant and ambitious, but fail to open government. In an attempt to capture these subtleties and, more importantly, actual changes in government practice, the IRM introduced a new variable ‘did it open government?’ in End-of-Term Reports. This variable attempts to move beyond measuring outputs and deliverables to looking at how the government practice has changed as a result of the commitment’s implementation. This can be contrasted to the IRM’s “Starred commitments” which describe *potential* impact.

IRM Researchers assess the “Did it open government?” with regard to each of the OGP values that this commitment is relevant to. It asks, did it stretch the government practice beyond business as usual? The scale for assessment is as follows:

- **Worsened:** worsens government openness as a result of the measures taken by commitment.
- **Did not change:** did not change status quo of government practice.
- **Marginal:** some change, but minor in terms of its impact over level of openness.

- Major: a step forward for government openness in the relevant policy area, but remains limited in scope or scale
- Outstanding: a reform that has transformed ‘business as usual’ in the relevant policy area by opening government.

To assess this variable, researchers establish the status quo at the outset of the action plan. They then assess outcomes *as implemented* for changes in government openness.

Readers should keep in mind limitations. IRM End-of-Term Reports are prepared only a few months after the implementation cycle is completed. The variable focus on outcomes that can be observed on government openness practices at the end of the two-year implementation period. The report and the variable do not intend to assess impact because of the complex methodological implications and the time frame of the report

Table 4. Overview: assessment of progress by commitment

Commitment Overview	Specificity				OGP value relevance (as written)				Potential Impact				Completion		Midterm	Did it open government?						
	None	Low	Medium	High	None	Access to Information	Civic Participation	Public Accountability	Technology & Innovation for Transparency & Accountability	None	Minor	Moderate	Transformative	Not started	Limited	Substantial	Completed	End of term	Worsens	Did not change	Marginal	Major
Ia. Strengthening Public-Private Collaboration		✓				✓	✓		✓		✓				✓						✓	
Ib. Providing Customized Services		✓					✓				✓				✓					✓		
2c. Enhancing Information Disclosure			✓			✓	✓	✓				✓			✓						✓	
2d. Strengthening Public Service Ethics			✓			✓	✓	✓			✓			✓	✓						✓	
3.e Encouraging the Private Sector to Utilize Public Data			✓			✓	✓					✓				✓		✓			✓	

I. Improving Public Services

Commitment I. Strengthening Public-Private Collaboration

Commitment Text: Various channels, both online and off line, are planned to be used to communicate with a wide range of stakeholders and tap into the collective intelligence. Offline channels include expert group meetings and citizens' jury; online channels include social networking services, web discussions on policies, and mobile applications. In addition, the Korean government will present exemplary cases of the private public collaboration to government agencies at different levels, and continue to provide an online discussion platform on the e People websites of local governments throughout the country in earnest until 2015. Given that the private public collaboration is not the result of policy making but part of policy making process that engages public participation, the Korean government will focus on engaging a wider range of stakeholders in discussions and sharing best practices with various government agencies rather than setting out quantitative targets. In pursuing such a policy, the government will arrange a schedule for online debates for major projects, and any citizen or civic group is encouraged to participate in those online policy debates.

Editorial Note: Four milestones were derived from this commitment:

1. To improve public-private communication, the government will establish "offline channels" that include separate consultations for experts and regular citizens and "online channels" that make use of social networking services, web discussions on policies, and mobile applications;
2. Present strong examples of public-private collaboration to various government agencies;
3. Continue to provide an online discussion platform on the "e-People" websites of local governments until 2015;
4. Schedule online discussions of major government projects, encouraging any individual or CSO to participate without an invitation.

Responsible institution: Korea Anti-Corruption and Civil Rights Commission (ACRC)

Commitment Overview	Specificity				OGP value relevance (as written)				Potential Impact				Completion		Midterm		Did it open government?				
	None	Low	Medium	High	Access to Information	Civic Participation	Public Accountability	Technology & Innovation for Transparency & Accountability	None	Minor	Moderate	Transformative	Not started	Limited	Substantial	Completed	Worsened	did not change	Marginal	Major	Outstanding
I.a. Strengthening Public-Private Collaboration		✓			✓	✓		✓		✓				✓		✓			✓		
I.a.1. Establish channels of consultation		✓				✓				✓				✓							
I.a.2. Examples of public-private collaboration	✓				Unclear				✓					✓							

I.a.3. Online discussion platform		✓				✓		✓		✓			✓			
I.a.4. Online discussions of state projects		✓			✓	✓		✓		✓			✓			

Commitment Aim:

This commitment is aimed at informing citizens of government policies, such as through social media networks, forum meetings, and mobile applications. According to the government, this set out to improve collaboration and engagement between the civil service and outside stakeholders. At the time this commitment was adopted, the government provided information, data and petitioning services via its e-People website and Minwon24. More specifically, the commitment sets out to

1. Establish expert group meetings and “citizens’ juries” to keep the public informed.
2. Continue providing petitioning services on e-People. Though not explained in detail in the commitment text, this is a website that allows anyone to file a petition to improve government policies or administrative systems, or to report allegations of unlawful activity or civil rights infringements by the government.¹
3. Engage a wider range of stakeholders, such as through online and offline policy debates and discussions.

Status

Mid-term: Limited

Due to the lack of information and vague wording in all four milestones activities for this commitment, and the lack of a baseline to measure implementation against, it was difficult to assess completion status in the mid-term report. There was no evidence that the government used online platforms such as e-People for consultations during the period under review, and it was unclear whether existing forms were used for the purposes of the commitment. Completion therefore was limited. The commitment overwhelmingly built on past successes, such as attempting to expand South Korea's exemplary "e-People" website to include more two-way discussions. Because of this, the commitment was not considered ambitious and did not significantly stretch previous practice.

End of term: Substantial

The Korean government has produced two reports recording its progress implementing the action plan: one in June 2016 by the Ministry of the Interior, and a Self-Assessment report in September 2016. According to the final self-assessment in September, the government notes that cooperation with civil society has been limited throughout the establishment and implementation of the action plan. While the government cites many examples of improving public-private cooperation through online tools, and increasing online policy discussions with citizens, some CSOs felt that the activities described did not represent genuine civic participation. As written, the milestones in this commitment did not specify measurable requirements and metrics for assessment. While some can be considered substantially or fully complete as written, they remain difficult to assess provided that they do not specify how existing open government tools will be used to change current practice beyond business as usual.

Milestone 1.a.1 Establish channels of consultation (Substantial)

In the June 2016 government report, the Ministry of the Interior retroactively identified the Korea Network on Anti-Corruption and Transparency (KNAT) as the body implementing “offline channels” that include separate consultations for experts and regular citizens. This body, organized by the ACRC, was launched on September 3, 2014, and throughout the following year brought together 43

“public firms and civic groups” for workshops, discussions on “ethical lobbying culture” and anti-corruption campaigns. For online services, the government retroactively cited the Sinmungo mobile app among others, which allowed citizens to “participate in policy discussions,” beginning in May 2014. A total of 3870 cases were recorded in 2015 of government-public communication through “virtual public hearings, policy debates, and polls.”² Given that the commitment text did not provide specific requirements for how citizen’s views would be incorporated, this milestone is considered substantially complete based on the activities carried out.

Milestone 1.a.2 Provide Examples of public-private collaboration (Substantial)

Since 2015, MOI has expanded its online and offline services according to the self-assessment report, by including discussions of state projects and publishing examples of public-private collaboration. One example is the creation of Government 3.0 Design Groups, which were started in 2014 and consist of seven members each—a mixture of citizens, service designers and civil servants—who travel to various regions of the country and listen to residents give input on policy. One result of this effort was in Incheon, where the team designed a policy for renovating old abandoned houses and turning them into community centers. MOI says that in 2015, more than 1500 people took part in the activities, leading to 248 “policy design” projects; in 2016, the project received a gold medal in the “public service design” category at the iF Design Awards, one of the world’s most respected design competitions.³ This milestone was given a coding of “none” for specificity as written, and therefore completion is difficult to measure, but it is considered substantially implemented given the lack of any required metrics for providing examples of successful collaboration.

Milestone 1.a.3 Online discussion platform (Substantial)

The government self-assessment report describes the continuation and improvement of the e-People’s petitioning services through tools such as e-Public Hearing and opinion polls. In 2016, the government produced a White Paper on People’s Rights and Interests⁴ that included e-People usage statistics, listing a number of procedural and platform tweaks to improve the use, though it does not report ambitious or game-changing innovations. Some cited improvements include:

- From 2015 to 2016, the number of cases handled increased from 1,900,000 to 2,500,000.
- From 2016, the government began offering a service called ‘국민신문고 통합운영체계’ (“E-People Comprehensive System”) which allows citizens to file petitions regarding regional government affairs through a single central system. As of 2016, 54 such regional governments have joined this system.
- The report introduced the E-People “policy/issue participation system” (국민신문고 정책참여), which allows citizens to offer opinions on policymaking in a variety of formats such as polls and online discussions. A chart showing a small increase in usage between 2015 to 2016 is reproduced in the self-assessment report.

While the government provides examples in its self-assessment, many of these do not meet the OGP criteria for civic participation through a discussion mechanisms for citizens to influence decision making. In the September 2016 self-assessment report, MOI offered the example of “e-People ideas,” a mobile-friendly participation platform that allows citizens to make one-way suggestions for policies. However, this does not always include requirements for the government to inform citizens of how their proposals are considered and applied in the decision-making process. The researcher conducted an audit of three randomly chosen policy discussions on the e-people site and found government agencies promoting their policies, in which citizens could vote on proposals without a two-way debate and in which the comments sections were largely dead.⁵ While there is ample evidence that MOI provided citizens with online tools to share opinions and vote in polls, there is limited proof to show that genuine debate took place, or that citizens views influenced policy decisions. As written, this commitment is considered complete given that the government maintained and updated its e-people platform. However, it should be noted civil society stakeholders have

expressed reservations in considering commitment milestones complete⁶ (further details below). As it relates to the spirit of the commitment to increase two-way collaboration between citizens and policy makers, stakeholders do not consider the e-people platform updates a new or improved tool for policy debate.

Milestone 1.a.4 Online discussions of state projects (limited)

A key challenge in assessing the completion of this milestone is that the government has not drawn a verifiable distinction in the commitment text between collecting feedback through online surveys and providing citizens with opportunities to directly influence policy development for state projects. For example, according to the self assessment report, “In 2015, notable debates included ‘eradicating tax evasion via borrowed-name bank accounts (April)’”, and ‘Civic opinions on effective implementation of anti-corruption laws (July)’.⁸ The results were then analyzed and provided to relevant governmental offices for use in policymaking.” A poll of 608 citizens was carried out regarding tax evasion policies, and 7,216 citizens responded to the survey on anti-corruption laws. However, while the results of these polls were compiled for the relevant authorities, the researcher could find no evidence that the survey outcomes led to specific changes in policy as a direct result of citizen input. For instance, the *Sinmungo* website states that the survey results on tax policy from April 2015 are, as of May 1, 2017, still “under review” by the National Tax Service.⁹ In addition, the anti-graft legislation had already passed by the time the survey was completed. According to the *Sinmungo* page on development of the anticorruption law, citizen’s views were incorporated into government policy, but no specific details are provided.¹⁰ Given that the IRM is unable to verify evidence that citizens contributed to policy outcomes, this milestone is considered limited in completion.

The government self assessment report states that it is crucial to ensure that each department reflects public opinion in its policies, and declares that Korea’s annual government performance assessment includes efforts made by each department and agency to show how the results of the online discussions and opinion polls contributed to policy outcomes. However, the self assessment report did not provide evidence showing how citizens’ feedback has resulted in specific changes to specific policies.

Did it open government?

Access to Information: Marginal

Civic participation: Marginal

Civil society groups and academics interviewed individually and at stakeholder forums generally did not have strong expectations for this commitment. They believed the commitment did not clearly connect its proposal to hold forums and host mobile app-based discussions with the broader aim of improving open government.¹¹ While existing platforms such as e-people have improved under this commitment, stakeholders overwhelmingly agreed that most of the improvements have not been clearly relevant to civic participation and access to information, and thus completion and effect on opening government should be called into question.¹² While the government has made some progress improving the number and quality of platforms for citizens to post feedback, the activities carried out while implementing this commitment have not provided demonstrable examples of stakeholder’s influencing government decision-making in a major way. Therefore, changes to civic participation and access to information are marginal.

The expected potential impact for this commitment was minor, because it aimed at providing policy discussion platforms without clearly connecting these to influencing government decision making. The government self-assessment report and in the researcher’s own sample audit of e-people policy discussions have not provided significant evidence to indicate this commitment has allowed citizens to engage in shaping specific policy changes. Civil society groups disputed the government’s portrayal of its consultation groups and public-private sector collaborations as fulfilling the first two milestones of the commitment. Chung Chung-sik, Professor of Public Administration at Kyung Sung University and former Information Adviser to the Ministry of the Interior viewed the implementation of this

commitment as “a unilateral effort led by the government with very little collaboration with the civilian sector” and said that committee meetings “basically became dictation competitions” in which input from citizens “has been mostly absent.” He added that in the case of the Government 3.0 design groups, the government was more focused on “everyday residential life” and not the “public administration of civic needs” relevant to OGP values.¹

Stakeholders were able to access websites such as Minwon24 and e-People prior to the action plan, and it remains unclear whether or not the commitment led to changes in these tools that improved civic participation.¹³ There are few examples of fully completed and improved policies and projects that resulted from civic participation, and these were not enough to alter the concerns of stakeholders and the researcher that “vote-in” web services fell short of genuine public participation and collaboration. Documented and verifiable examples of public-private collaboration focus primarily on improving residential life, rather than open governance values. For example, 27,081 citizens participated in government surveys and online discussions about regulations to prevent secondhand smoke in residential apartment complexes. As a result the Housing Management Act will be amended to reflect issues raised by citizens in late 2017.”¹⁴

Other examples cited in the government White Paper include several incomplete projects such as use of online forums to improve an outdated regulation for library seats separating men and women¹⁵, discussion forums to design “the certificate system of organic cosmetics”¹⁶ and a forum to change the “confusing names of bus stop and stations.” The government states that approximately 300 feedback posts have been submitted online, and points out that the city of Daejeon changed the names of its bus stops. Neither the polls around gendered library seating and cosmetics standards have led to the implementation of policy so far; the ACRC has submitted recommendations to the relevant ministries and MOI states these will be finalized in late 2017, well after the end of the action plan implementation period.¹⁷

While the commitment provided for some new opportunities and tools for citizens to engage in policy and service design, many of the polls and surveys did not clearly demonstrate that citizens are able influence decision making through participation.

Carried forward?

This commitment has been carried forward to the third action plan, where activities included in commitment 3a include facilitating operation of the citizen groups for government service design. To improve implementation for this commitment, stronger efforts can be made to show how suggestions and feedback from experts and citizens directly impact policy. In addition, relevant government agencies could list the contact information for the civil servants in charge of reviewing specific petitions on the e-People website, so stakeholders may contact them directly and initiate a two-way conversation about the commitment. While most government ministries have published personnel directories, the majority of these directories do not delineate which officials are responsible for which petitions.

¹ Ministry of the Interior, Republic of Korea. “How to file a petition,” e-People.go.kr (English), http://www.epeople.go.kr/jsp/user/on/eng/HowPetition_USA.jsp.

² Ministry of the Interior, Republic of Korea. “열린정부파트너십자체평가보고서,” (Translation: Open Government Partnership Self-Assessment Report), June 2016, pp. 5-12.

³ Ministry of the Interior. “Public Participatory “Gov 3.0 Design Group” Recognized on the Global Stage,” February 29, 2016, <https://mogaha.go.kr/eng/bbs/type001/commonSelectBoardArticle.do;jsessionid=cTPNkIj8I0FLRnV4IZ4DK5zcFDYtYaWzg>

- [M7Y48FM7Lv8eQPagzaRrBjfUpWq8iNe.mopwas51_servlet_engine?bbsId=BBSMSTR_00000000019&nttId=48519](http://www.mopwas51.com/servlet/engine?bbsId=BBSMSTR_00000000019&nttId=48519). The official award entry can be read at <http://ifworlddesignguide.com/entry/180925-gov-30-design-group>.
- ⁴Ministry of the Interior. "White Paper on People's Rights and Interests" 2016, p.10.
<http://info.acrc.go.kr/acrc/board.do?command=searchDetailTotal&method=searchDetailViewInc&menuId=0102020101&boardNum=63254>
- ⁵ For example: Statistics Korea Poll asking users "what do you think of when you hear "population"?
<http://idea.epeople.go.kr/idea/ideaView.do?ideaCd=170406-00007>
- Ministry of the Interior discussion and poll for ideas on civilian/government collaboration projects:
<http://idea.epeople.go.kr/idea/pollView.do?ideaCd=170331-00003&ideaImproveSeq=0000000001>
- Statistics Korea Poll on Patent and Trademark Policy: <http://idea.epeople.go.kr/idea/ideaView.do?ideaCd=161123-00008>
- ⁶ Chung Chung-sik, professor of public administration at Kyungshin University and former MOI adviser, disputed the government's presentation of the commitment as a form of collaboration with the public, and documented in his December 2016 paper on the shortfalls of Government 3.0. He said: "During the course of Government 3.0, the government treated the citizen advisers like sidekicks, and so they failed to actually come up with ideas that matched public demand."
- ⁷ The Daum Agora online debate messageboard hosting the government poll for tax evasion/borrowed bank account legislation <http://bbs1.agora.media.daum.net/gaia/do/agora/participant/list?bbsId=C001&issueArticleId=438&issueBbsId=1001>
- ⁸ The Daum Agora messageboard hosting the survey for anti-corruption legislation:
<http://bbs1.agora.media.daum.net/gaia/do/agora/issue/read?bbsId=1001&articleId=440>
- The public poll can be found here: <http://www.epeople.go.kr/jsp/user/po/filterOff/suve/UPoSurveyView.jsp?txtSurNo=1AC-1507-001710>
- ⁹ http://www.epeople.go.kr/jsp/user/po/filterOff/forum/UPoForumView.jsp?app_no_c=1AC-1503-011373
- ¹⁰ http://www.epeople.go.kr/jsp/user/po/filterOff/forum/UPoForumView.jsp?app_no_c=1AC-1507-012735
- ¹¹ IRM stakeholder forum in Seoul, South Korea. September 23, 2015. The sentiment at this forum remains unchanged in e-mail correspondence and meetings with the same stakeholders from June 2016 to December 2016. Represented were Code for Seoul, OpenNet, Transparency International Korea and IndiLab.
- ¹² Ibid.
- ¹³ Ibid.
- ¹⁴ Ministry of the Interior correspondence, April 11, 2017.
- ¹⁵ E-people discussion on Library Seating Policy: http://idea.epeople.go.kr/idea/ideaThinkResult.do?idea_cd=160328-00019&seq=0000000001
- ¹⁶ E-people discussion on organic cosmetic regulations: http://idea.epeople.go.kr/idea/ideaThinkResult.do?idea_cd=160517-00003&seq=0000000001
- ¹⁷ Ministry of the Interior, supporting documents, April 11, 2017. Documents are in the possession of the IRM researcher.

I. Improving Public Services

Commitment 1b. Providing Customized Services

Commitment Text: *In order to provide customized services that address different public needs, the Korean government has divided public services with a high demand into four groups: general services (public safety, etc.), target group specific services (for mothers/newborn babies, elementary/secondary school students, college students/job seekers, and the elderly), services for vulnerable groups (people with disabilities, rural residents, and other underprivileged people), and business specific services (for small businesses, SMEs, and other general businesses). In 2014, the Korean government will select 50 flagship service projects for the central and local governments based on private sector expert groups' opinions and promote them in earnest. In doing so, in order to ensure transparency and accountability through public participation, an advisory committee, a national survey, and the private public task force for public service design will help make sure that those selected service projects are in line with the public's demand. In 2015, those flagship projects will be adjusted and further developed to address the public needs. Also, by holding multiple consultations and workshops intended for civil communities and citizens, the Korean government will reach out to people in need, and will come up with new public services that they need.*

Editorial Note: Three milestones were derived from this commitment:

- 1. By 2014, select and promote 50 flagship service projects for the central government and local governments based a consultation with "private-sector experts' groups."*
- 2. By 2015, develop these flagship projects in line with public needs.*
- 3. The Korean government will come up with new public services by holding multiple consultations and workshops.*

Responsible institution: Ministry of the Interior (MOI)

Supporting institution(s): Several ministries and government bodies, according to June 2016 government briefing to IRM

Start date: N/A

End date: N/A

Commitment Overview	Specificity				OGP value relevance (as written)				Potential Impact				Completion		Midterm		Did it open government?				
	None	Low	Medium	High	Access to Information	Civic Participation	Public Accountability	Technology & Innovation for Transparency & Accountability	None	Minor	Moderate	Transformative	Not started	Limited	Substantial	Completed	Worsened	did not change	Marginal	Major	Outstanding
I.b. Providing Customized Services		✓				✓				✓				✓		✓		✓			
I.b.1. Select and promote fifty flagship projects			✓			✓				✓				✓							
I.b.2. Develop flagship projects		✓				✓				✓			✓		✓						
I.b.3. New public services		✓				✓				✓				✓		✓					

Commitment Aim:

The commitment aimed at holding consultations and workshops to select and develop what MOI calls 50 “flagship service products,” such as public services for the vulnerable, disabled, students, elderly and others, aiming to advance the OGP value of public accountability. At the time this commitment was adopted, the government already had a strong set of public services, but was expanding on these successes in a more inclusive manner. More specifically, the commitment sets out to:

1. Select 50 flagship products through consultation with private stakeholders
2. Organize workshops, forums and a task force to improve those services throughout the implementation period
3. Expand these flagship products by 2015 in line with public needs

Status

Mid-term: Limited

According to the action plan, the government was already overseeing a large number of public services before the research period. These could be divided into four groups: general services like public safety; target group services aimed at new mothers, students, job seekers, and the elderly; services for vulnerable groups such as people with disabilities, rural residents, and underprivileged people; and business-specific services for small businesses, small and medium enterprises, and large businesses.

The progress on this commitment was limited at the time of mid-term report. During first half of the implementation period, the government selected twenty out of fifty planned flagship projects and published these online (I.b.1). This activity's completion is limited as fewer than half of the flagship projects have been selected and promoted. As such, development of flagship projects (I.b.2) did not begin on time. The government's plan to create new public services based on the outcome of consultations and workshops (I.b.3) had limited completion. Searches of MOI's online bulletin board, Google, and Naver (in Korean) revealed no public plans or meeting minutes of public-private collaboration for 2014, and the self-assessment did not shed significant light on the overall status of implementation.¹

End of term: Substantial

I.b.1. Select and promote fifty flagship projects (Complete)

According to a June 2016 summary report from the Ministry of Interior, the government made progress throughout the implementation period in engaging in public fact-finding and media monitoring to select the 50 flagship products in 2014. MOI provided a list of these 50 flagship projects²; interviewed stakeholders agreed the list was accurate. MOI continued to develop public information services in pharmaceuticals, telecommunications, crime and many others throughout the implementation period. All of these projects together stretch across multiple ministries and require sophisticated levels of inter-ministry cooperation and communication.³

I.b.2. Develop flagship projects in line with public needs (Substantial)

According to the self assessment report, "The government sought to improve the public perception and understanding of new services by organizing workshops and seminars with expert guests and lay citizens...participants were able to improve their understanding of the customized services. In addition, these occasions allowed the civil servants responsible for providing these services to have their voices heard." Based on this description of implementation activities, consultation took place among and between various government departments and agencies, but activities involving citizens were primarily information sharing. The commitment text is vague in regard to how public needs were to be determined. Open government-focused stakeholders, such as OpenNet Korea, initially reported an improvement in the government's willingness to meet and discuss related public data services during the implementation period.⁴ However, the same stakeholders later said that after meetings with the government in June 2016, they were concerned MOI is still using civic participation commitments to promote information-sharing policies.

I.b.3. Develop new public services by holding multiple consultations and workshops (Substantial)

While the government has been holding public discussions related to public service design, not all have been open and inclusive. According to the self-assessment report, 40 of these flagship projects were implemented with consultation from groups such as an advisory board consisting of private citizens, pregnant women, local residents, a panel of three professors, and through online surveys. The only participants identified were the panel of three professors⁵, whom the IRM researcher contacted in June 2016, and again in December, but received no response to questions regarding how the projects were carried out. The self-assessment report lists several specific examples of workshops carried out, but provides no details other than the date and hosting organization (eg: a workshop with pregnant women, hosted by Cheil General Hospital and the Women's Healthcare Center, September 21, 2015). Meeting agendas, lists of participants, minutes, and outcomes from discussions were not recorded or made available to the public, so it is impossible to verify how citizen's input was used to develop new services. Until a stronger systematic effort is made to include more voices and document progress online, implementation of this commitment as written is considered "substantial" based on the available evidence of 50 new projects, but not "complete" as it is unclear how citizen's views were included.

Did it open government?

Civic Participation: Did not Change

Flagship projects were selected based on the government's information-gathering. However, the IRM researcher could not identify any stakeholders that took part in the consultation process, and therefore could not find any significant improvement in civic participation as a result. The same view was reflected by stakeholders interviewed during the implementation of the action plan. Many key decisions to select flagship projects, according to the government's June 2016 report, came from a three-person panel of academic experts, which is in line with past government practice. The government wrote that citizen petitions and media reports were included in the decision-making process led by these panels, but did not demonstrate how these activities improved civic participation or were a change from past practice. Since minutes, participant lists, video, and summaries are not available for the consultations the government carried out in designing flagship projects, changes in civic participation are unverifiable. The government has pledged to be more inclusive of the public in the future, although specific plans were not mentioned in its June 2016 report.⁶

Carried forward?

This commitment has not been carried forward to the third action plan. Similar to commitment 1a, the government can improve completion by expanding the scope of civil society actors and independent citizens in the decision-making process, and being specific about how their opinions are making an impact.

¹ Open Government Partnership. "South Korea 2014-2015 IRM Progress Report," pp. 19-23.

² List of 50 Flagship projects included in Government Self-Assessment Report, September 2016, https://www.opengovpartnership.org/sites/default/files/South-Korea_End-of-Term_Self-Assessment_Report_2014-2016.pdf.

³ Ministry of Interior, Republic of Korea. "열린정부파트너십자체평가보고서," (Translation: Open Government Partnership Self-Assessment Report), June 2016, pp. 13-19.

⁴ Correspondence with Kyung-sin Park, Professor of Law at Korea University and Director at Open Net Korea, September 13, 2016.

⁵ Three professors were identified in the self-assessment report along with the dates of their consultation workshops: Prof. Kim, Youn -Sung of Inha University (February 27, 2014), Prof. Kim, Sang-Wook of Chungbuk National University (June 13, 2014), and Prof. Lee, Won-Suk of Yonsei University (June 27, 2014)

⁶ Ministry of Interior, Republic of Korea. "열린정부파트너십자체평가보고서," (Translation: Open Government Partnership Self-Assessment Report), June 2016, pp. 15-19.

II. Improving Civil Service Integrity

Commitment 2c. Enhance Information Disclosure

Commitment Text:

Since late March in 2014, any government documents signed by director generals or higher have been disclosed no matter whether they are requested to be disclosed or not. Those documents are uploaded on information disclosure portal (open.go.kr). However, in accordance with the Public Information Act, documents that contain private information (8 items) must not be disclosed. At the end of May, about 80,000 original documents were disclosed, and the range of documents to be disclosed will be expanded from 2015. To be specific, even those documents signed by directors will be disclosed, which will result in 100 million documents to be disclosed annually.

In order to make sure the shared information meet the demands of civil society, the Ministry of Security and Public Administration (MOSPA) will form a citizen watch group that oversees the process of information disclosure by the end of June 2014, and the watch group is composed of civil society members, experts, and other ordinary citizens. The watch group members were selected through an online contest among those who were interested in disclosure of information, and those who had most actively requested for disclosure of information became the members of the group. This group will be responsible for reviewing how disclosure of information is conducted in the central government agencies as well as local governments and monitoring the performance of each agency by requesting disclosure of information themselves.

Another goal to be met in 2014 is to improve the quality of disclosed information. To do so, the Korean government will announce in advance the list of to-be-disclosed information categorized under ten specific areas of high interest (health, welfare, food safety, child-rearing, finance, education, consumer protection, leisure, job, and housing).

Editorial Note: Three milestones were derived from this commitment:

1. Expand the number of disclosed documents in 2015 to 100 million documents disclosed annually.
2. A citizens' watch group, decided through an online contest, will oversee information disclosure.
3. Improve the quality of disclosed information by 2014 after announcing a list of data to be disclosed under ten "areas of high interest."

Responsible institution: Ministry of the Interior

Commitment Overview	Specificity				OGP value relevance (as written)				Potential Impact				Completion		Midterm		Did it open government?				
	None	Low	Medium	High	Access to Information	Civic Participation	Public Accountability	Technology & Innovation for Transparency & Accountability	None	Minor	Moderate	Transformative	Not started	Limited	Substantial	Completed	Worsened	did not change	Marginal	Major	Outstanding
2.c. Enhance Information Disclosure			✓		✓	✓	✓				✓			✓					✓		

2.c.1. Expand the number of disclosed documents			✓		✓						✓			
2.c.2. Form a citizen watch group		✓			✓	✓	✓			✓				
2.c.3. Announce list of data to be disclosed		✓			✓					✓			✓	

Commitment Aim:

This commitment aims to enhance information access by expanding the number of annually disclosed documents (milestone 2.c.1), creating a citizen watch group for oversight of information disclosure (milestone 2.c.2), and improving the quality of information disclosed (milestone 2.c.3).

At the starting point of the commitment, the government had already passed the Open Data Act of October 2013, which dramatically shifted disclosure rules to proactively release documents signed by director generals whether or not a Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) request had been submitted. More specifically this commitment set out to

1. Expand the quality and scope of government disclosures with an emphasis on ten areas of "high interest," such as health, food safety and education (milestones 2.c.1 and 2.c.3)
2. Improve citizen oversight over the process of disclosure through the establishment of a civil society watch group (milestone 2.c.2)

Note: There is some discrepancy related to “information disclosure” and “data disclosure.” According to the government, information disclosure regulations are enshrined in the Freedom of Information Act which defines information as “documents that public institutions write or acquire and manage for public affairs.” Data is separately categorized as “documents or information processed in an electronic manner that public institutions write or acquire and manage.” However, the Open Data Act (2013)¹ defines open data as “Any document/material or information produced or obtained and managed by a public institution for the purposes designated by the law, that has been processed electronically or photographically, such as a database, digitized file etc, including Administrative Information.”² While the government intended for commitment 2c to address disclosure of government documents and for commitment 3e to focus on improving data-sharing, this commitment is ambiguous as written and does not clearly define how documents will be managed and made accessible online to increase transparency.

Status

Mid-term: Limited

After announcing the Government 3.0 policy in June 2013 and subsequently passing the Open Data Act in October 2013, the government took a number of steps to improve information disclosure. Particularly welcome was the Park administration's decision to switch disclosure of non-sensitive information to be open by default. In its public data road map, the government planned to release 60% of source documents by 2017. However, progress on expanding the amount of information released (2.c.1.), was limited. While the government assessed that it was on track to meet the goal of 100 million disclosures annually by 2015, stakeholders such as OpenNet pointed out that the numbers may have been misleading. The government releases local and provincial datasets separately from national datasets, but all have similar content, allowing the government to essentially count the same dataset more than once. (Further information regarding this concern is also covered in commitment 3e.)

As of June 2015, the government stated fifty citizens had been chosen to be part of the citizen watch group (2.c.2). However, it was not clear how these citizens were selected or how the group exercised oversight on information disclosure. The IRM Researcher could not locate information in Korean or English on a government announcement of the information to be disclosed under ten planned areas (Milestone 2.c.3), resulting in limited completion.³

End of term: Limited

2.c.1 Expand the number of documents disclosed (Limited)

Completion for this commitment is difficult to verify, given inconsistencies in the government's reported goals and benchmarks. While stakeholders and the government self-assessment report agree that the government has improved transparency, reported numbers of documents containing previously undisclosed government information and datasets released vary widely. The Ministry of the Interior says that 9.71 million documents were disclosed by June 2016. In June 2016, the Ministry also informed the researcher that the original goal of 100 million documents had been lowered to 10 million, because an internal panel had concerns about the disclosure of private information such as addresses, phone numbers and contact information. MOI determined personal information, business secrets, confidential diplomatic and national security documents should not be automatically disclosed, and that the government should focus on releasing documents relevant to policymaking, signed by director generals or higher-ranking officials. One stakeholder, Kyungsin Park, Director at Open Net Korea and Professor of Law at Korea University at Korea University,⁴ expressed concerns that the Ministry appears to be posting repeat datasets on the same topic from individual administrative districts, rather than creating a single data portal to eliminate redundancies and to allow datasets from individual districts to be collated. With scattered data across hundreds of districts nation-wide, Kyung-sin estimates that the actual number of unique nationwide datasets released is low, perhaps not more than 100 nation-wide datasets, and that the government-reported figure of 19,500 data files (as of February 2017) obfuscates the real picture. Based on desk research, the IRM researcher concurs that a large number of datasets are not nationwide ones, and may include unnecessary redundancies because datasets are organized locally. While the choice to lower the target number of documents disclosed to 10 million during the implementation period made sense from a logistical standpoint, given concerns over the true amount of unique information disclosed, this milestone has "limited" completion.

2.c.2 Form a Citizen Watch Group (Unclear)

In fulfilling milestone 2.c.2, the government stated in its midterm self-assessment report that it formed a citizen watchdog group⁵, the "Open Data Civilian Monitoring Team" consisting of 50 private citizens, who convene to evaluate the "integrity of the open data portal [data.go.kr]." During the implementation period, the IRM researcher repeatedly attempted to locate members of the watchdog group but could not verify any names or obtain any contact information for participants. In the end of term self-assessment report, the government refers to the group by a new name, the "Information Disclosure Citizen Inspectors (IDCI), and states that 41 citizens, activists and scholars were recruited through a MOI web posting from 29 May to 9 June 2014.⁶ Both the Midterm Self-Assessment Report and page 29 of the June 2016 MOI report in Korean refers to a body called "정보공개 국민 모니터단" ("Open Data Civilian Monitoring Team) which made it difficult to locate information on monitoring activities.

The end of term government self-assessment report documents the IDCI findings that "that the organizations had failed to effectively sort and list the types of information to be disclosed, as well as allow the searching and browsing of information disclosed; that the organizations had failed to provide information of major interest to the public; and that the information disclosed contained significant amounts of irrelevant data."

Using information available to the public, the researcher could only verify that the government recruited participants for the watchdog group online, but the identities of the participants and their contact information were removed. Due to the fact that the watchdog activities of this group,

records of its meeting, and regular documentation about any issues raised is not available to the public this milestone is considered limited in completion.

2.c.3 Announce a list of data to be disclosed (Complete)

The government announced a list of data to be prioritized and disclosed. The categories are listed on South Korean government's the data portal at data.go.kr and consist of areas such as employment, welfare, housing, health, recreation, safety, women's development, financial administration, creative economy, and regulatory reform.

Did it open government?

Access to information: Marginal

Civic participation: Did Not Change

Public Accountability: Did not change

Before the National Action Plan, access to information was limited, particularly under the previous presidency of Lee Myung-bak (2008-2013) which was reputed for its practice of what South Koreans called "politics by public security," or prioritizing national security policies and using anti-communist rhetoric at the expense of transparency and the right to civic participation.⁷ Stakeholders from the beginning of implementation were optimistic about the potential impact of this commitment in the area of civic participation.⁸ By the end of the research period, however, public accountability and civic participation remain unchanged, as information, details, and outcomes from the citizen watch group, including verification of its activities, remain unclear.

Furthermore, stakeholders were generally optimistic at the beginning of the commitment with regard to access to information. As implemented, Open Net Korea expressed pessimism over the success of increasing information disclosures, as the amount of actual new data released is unverified.⁹ However, the government made progress during the research period in increasing the amount of data published, and changing previous data practices. This is partly due to the 2013 Open Data Law and its implementation through the data.go.kr website. The IRM researcher concurs with stakeholders that it is easier and more efficient as of September 2016 to gather basic information via document disclosures and open data sets on various aspects of government, such as public services.

Professor Sungsoo Hwang at Yeungnam University agreed there are still challenges, but added that South Korea's open data projects are nevertheless a positive step forward in practice since the Open Data Law was passed in October 2013.¹⁰ Sul Moon-won, professor of library, archive and information studies at Pusan National University, stated that "the impressive increase in the volume of advanced-notice disclosure information"—the kind referred to in the self-assessment as "information requiring prior release by theme/type"—is a "fruitful" outcome. However, he expressed concerns that "the quality of disclosed information has contrarily regressed." He stated that these releases are "rendered so rudely that the overwhelming impression is that they exist for the sake of the provider's statistics and outward performance metrics rather than a service mentality in the public interest." He also raised concerns about the independence and oversight of committees responsible for reviewing information to disclose, and questioned the lack of metadata to organize vast quantities of uploaded documents, particularly routine authorization documents.¹¹ Current lack of quality control on the open data portal can make locating specific information difficult.

Jennifer Kang, a member of the government's Open Data Strategy Council, echoed the concern that most of the uploaded data appears to consist of authorization documents and not always substantial policy documents of high value for the public interest. However, she noted that South Korea is one of only a few countries that release authorization documents to the public, and that this is a silver lining for transparency.¹²

Despite stakeholder concerns, the commitment resulted in a marginal increase in disclosure and a commendable step in the right direction for improving access to information.

Carried forward?

This commitment has been carried forward to the third action plan under commitment 1a, increasing the number of organizations disclosing information online. To continue the trend of making government information open by default, the researcher recommends setting more realistic targets for quantity of data released. Jennifer Kang, a member of the Open Data Strategy Council, recommended that the government instead aim for disclosing a set percentage of all documents produced annually, or publishing information on the percentage of document disclosed verses the total produced. Soliciting feedback from civil society to continually assess the quality of information and make improvements could also benefit future implementation practices.

¹ Ministry of Legislation, "Open Data Act," 2013, <http://www.law.go.kr/lsInfoP.do?lsiSeq=179039&efYd=20160407#0000>

² Ministry of Legislation, "E-government Act," Definition of Administrative Information:

<http://www.law.go.kr/%EB%B2%95%EB%A0%B9%EC%A0%84%EC%9E%90%EC%A0%95%EB%B6%80%EB%B2%95%EC%A0%9C2%EC%A1%B0>

³ Open Government Partnership. "South Korea 2014-2015 ORM Progress Report," pp. 27-31.

⁴ Interview with Kyung-sin Park, October 25, 2016.

⁵ Ministry of the Interior. Self-Assessment Report, June 2016, and End of Term Self-Assessment Report September 2016.

⁶ MOI online recruitment advert for IDCI citizen watchdog group volunteers: (<http://koreagov30.tistory.com/396>)

⁷ Jamie Doucette and Se-Woong Koo, "Distorting Democracy: Politics by Public Security in Contemporary South Korea," *The Asia-Pacific Journal*, Vol. 11, Issue 48, No. 4, December 2, 2013. <http://apjpf.org/2013/11/48/Jamie-Doucette/4042/article.html>

⁸ ORM stakeholder forum, Seoul, South Korea, September 2015

⁹ E-mail correspondence with Kyung-sin Park, Director at Open Net Korea and Professor of Law at Korea University, October 25, 2016.

¹⁰ Correspondence with Sungsoo Hwang, Associate Professor of Public Administration at Yeungnam University, November 29, 2016.

¹¹ Interview with Sul Moon-won, April 17, 2017.

¹² Interview with Jennifer Kang, April 21, 2017.

II. Improving Public Services

Commitment 2d. Strengthening Public Service Ethics

Commitment Text:

In order to discourage retired public officials from seeking lucrative positions outside the public sector, post-public employment will be more strictly inspected in 2014 with a target restriction rate of 9.7 percent. A detailed plan to strengthen the inspection is scheduled to be made available within the month of April 2014. The Korean government will hold regular advisory group meetings at least twice a year with retired officials, public administration professors, and experts to gain feedback constantly on the inspection process in place. The target restriction rate will be adjusted upward every year from 2015. Also, retired public officials will be provided with guidelines about post-public employment restrictions on the website for asset disclosure as soon as they sign in to declare their retirement status. In addition, from the second half of 2014, the result of inspections on post-public employment will be posted on the websites of government official ethics committees for the purpose of making the ethics committees more transparent and accountable and enhancing their reliability to citizens.

Editorial Note: Four milestones were derived from this commitment:

1. Develop post-employment inspection plan and carry out inspections in 2014 and 2015
2. Hold advisory group meetings at least twice a year with retired officials, public administration professors, and experts to gather opinions on the inspection process.
3. Post online guidelines for retired public officials on asset disclosures upon declaring retirement status
4. Post finding of inspection findings on post-public employment on the websites of government ethics committees.

Responsible institution: Ministry of Personnel Management

Start date: N/A End date: N/A

Commitment Overview	Specificity				OGP value relevance (as written)				Potential Impact				Completion		Midterm		Did it open government?				
	None	Low	Medium	High	Access to Information	Civic Participation	Public Accountability	Technology & Innovation for Transparency & Accountability	None	Minor	Moderate	Transformative	Not started	Limited	Substantial	Completed	Worsened	did not change	Marginal	Major	Outstanding
2d. Strengthening Public Service Ethics			✓		✓	✓	✓			✓			✓	✓					✓		
2.d.1. Develop plan and carry out inspections			✓				✓			✓			✓		✓						
2.d.2. Hold advisory group meetings			✓			✓	✓			✓			✓	✓							

2.d.3. Online guidelines on asset disclosures			✓		✓		✓			✓		✓		✓					
2.d.4. Post ethics inspections online			✓		✓		✓			✓		✓		✓		✓			

Commitment Aim:

This commitment aims to improve ethics and anti-corruption efforts for civil servants, and to advance beyond a system of gifts, exchanges and patronage that are a staple of South Korean politics, especially those that involve high-level conflicts of interest between government and business leaders.¹ It aims to advance values of access to information, civic participation and public accountability. At the time of adopting the commitment, the South Korean government had been suffering safety, regulatory, and corruption scandals on an alarmingly regular basis, and various new laws and regulations were continuously being put in place to allay future scandals.² More specifically, the commitment sets out to:

1. Develop a post-employment inspection plan and carry out inspections in 2014 and 2015
2. Hold advisory group meetings at least twice a year with retired officials, public administration professors, and experts to gather opinions on the inspection process.
3. Post online guidelines for retired public officials on asset disclosures upon declaring retirement status
4. Post finding of inspection findings on post public employment on the websites of government ethics committees.

Status

Mid-term: Not started

At the time of the mid-term report no verifiable evidence was available to determine the completion for any of the milestones, despite repeated requests by the IRM researcher, including the note sent by the OGP IRM support unit to the government. Desktop research and inspection of the relevant websites also did not reveal any information regarding implementation of post-employment restrictions (milestone 2.d.1). The researcher could not locate the meeting minutes or summaries of “advisory group meetings” (milestone 2.d.2). Relevant web searches did not reveal that any guidelines for asset disclosures of public officials had been posted (milestone 2.d.3). The IRM researcher could not find the specific “government ethics websites” that publish audit findings (milestone 2.d.4), and it was not clear whether that refers to the website of the National Anti-Corruption Commission or to a separate website.³

End of term: Limited

2.d.1 Develop plan and carry out inspections (Substantial)

In its June 2016 Korean-language report, MOI stated that amendments to the Public Service Ethics Act in December 2015 (a law passed shortly after the writing of the IRM mid-term report) fulfilled milestone 2.d.1. The amendments stated that public officials could only seek reemployment after a three year “covenant” period following retirement, expanded a list of prohibited conflict-of-interest employers (which is set to reach 14,214 barred employers in 2016), tightened standards for evaluating conflicts of interest, and required high-ranking officials to disclose their employment history, among other new requirements.⁴ The law itself cannot be considered a form of completion of this commitment, but the heightened inspections as a result of that law contribute to completion.

In 2014 and 2015, during the period under review, the government substantially stepped up enforcement of the new law in the form of tougher inspections, denying about 20 percent of applications for post-government employment from civil servants, up from 9.3 percent in 2013 and 5 percent in 2012.⁵ These legal revisions and toughened enforcement make completion of this milestone “substantial.”

2.d.2 Hold advisory group meetings (Limited)

The government held two meetings of a panel of independent experts, with a subcommittee called the “Ethical Work Advisory Committee,” in 2015. The government self-assessment report states that the Committee met multiple times during the implementation period, but also states that “details of meetings and proceedings are not disclosed to the public” although meeting dates are posted online.⁶ The government also provided a list of meeting titles and dates (as posted on the website) it carried out between 2014 -16. The researcher could not ascertain the names and contact information of the committee members, and cannot verify that advisory meetings were convened in a way that allowed stakeholders to monitor or raise issues with ethics compliance. During the Implementation of the action plan, it remained unclear from the government report, interviews, and web searches whether any meetings were held in 2016 that complied with the commitment. Provided that no meeting minutes, participant lists, summaries, or outputs are available to the public, the activities cannot be verified and this milestone is considered limited in completion.

2.d.3 Online guidelines on asset disclosure (Substantial)

The government has posted a “public official reemployment self-diagnosis program” on its ethics website (gpec.go.kr) and began sending out SMS reminders on ethical rules during the implementation period. This makes completion “substantial.”

2.d.4 Post ethics inspections online (Limited)

The 2016 government self-assessment report states that audit results are posted on the Government Public Ethics Committee website at www.gpec.go.kr/servlet/GpecServlet. The IRM researcher confirmed in June 2016 that the audit results had been posted on the website; however, upon subsequent visits to the webpage later in 2016, the audit information was not available. The IRM researcher, a research assistant, and IRM staff members have independently tried to access the audit information and at the time of writing this report (May 2017), all confirm that the website fails to load. Therefore, it remains difficult to verify what happened after June 2016, and if the audit results are still posted as required by this milestone. For this reason, completion is coded as limited.

Did it open government?

Access to information: Did not change

Civic participation: Marginal

Public accountability: Did not change

In the months and years leading up to the beginning of the implementation period, South Korea had suffered a number of public scandals arising from government-private sector collusion and “revolving doors,” most notably a nuclear power safety scandal in summer 2013 and allegations of widespread corruption and negligence in the “Four Rivers” infrastructure project.⁷

While tackling an important issue, the commitment had been evaluated as having a minor potential impact at the midterm. It did not set out to significantly stretch government practice, requiring only minor changes to current laws, and stakeholders generally did not see much new thinking in the area of anti-corruption from the previous cycle.

Despite these limitations, stakeholders initially believed the commitment was among the most pertinent and had substantial potential to improve public accountability if implemented well.⁸ The government followed through on many counts of the original commitment. In particular it began enforcing and implementing changes to the Civil Service Ethics Act in the form of inspections, and pro-actively provided civil servants with information on laws regulating their post-government

employment through SMS messages and websites.⁹ In 2015, MOI expanded the scope of prohibited employers and increased the number of declined applications for post-government employment to 20 percent, or 112 out of 538 applications. This is a slight improvement in 2014 from 19.6 percent, or 51 out of 260, but a significant improvement from 2013 and before, when the ratio was from 5 to 10 percent.

Despite the initial optimism, by December 2016 nearly all stakeholders and the researcher had abandoned the belief that the commitment and its implementation could be connected to any measurable improvement in public accountability. In November 2016, President Park Geun-hye and her closest aides came under investigation and parliamentary scrutiny in one of the nation's largest corruption scandals in its democratic history. The President's backdoor dealings occurred throughout the implementation period before being revealed in October 2016. Since the known extent of this political influence and alleged corruption is almost unprecedented in South Korea's democratic period, many stakeholders have dropped any remaining optimism around this commitment and believe that the national context has nullified any potential it once had.¹⁰

Carried forward?

This commitment has not been carried forward to the third action plan. To complete implementation, the researcher recommends publishing Ethical Work Advisory Committee meeting minutes, transcripts or summaries of those transcripts to the public. Stakeholders would benefit from having access to more transparency that shows how anti-corruption laws are enforced, rather than only what is being done to enforce them. For example, requiring the Blue House, prime minister's office and ministers to submit to stronger inspections by politically independent government bodies. Additionally, making results of post-employment inspections publicly accessible and easily searchable could improve government transparency.

¹ David C. Kang. 2002. *Crony Capitalism: Corruption and Development in South Korea and the Philippines*. Cambridge University Press.

² Major scandals include the 2013 nuclear plant safety scandal; the 2013 Four Rivers Project scandal; the sinking of the Sewol ferry partly because of a lack of enforcement of government safety regulations, leading to the deaths of more than 300 people; the second conviction for financial pardon and second presidential pardon of SK Chairman Chey Tae-won in 2015; and the convictions and pardons of at least six of South Korea's most prominent businessmen in the 1990s and 2000s; and the impeachment of President Park Geun-hye and investigation into her political allies and business CEOs for allegations of large-scale corruption. More information can be found at Transparency International's website on South Korea at <https://www.transparency.org/country/KOR>.

³ Open Government Partnership. "South Korea 2014-2015 ORM Progress Report," pp. 31-34.

⁴ Ministry of the Interior. "Open Government Partnership Self-Assessment Report" (열린정부파트너십자체평가보고서), June 2016. The government published a self-assessment report in English and Korean in October 2015, followed by a separate Korean report labeled a "self-assessment" in June 2016. The latter report has much of the same information, but many additions including the point cited here.

⁵ Ministry of the Interior, Republic of Korea. "열린정부파트너십자체평가보고서," (Translation: Open Government Partnership Self-Assessment Report), June 2016, pp. 23-25.

⁶ MPM webpage: <https://goo.gl/I6GaU6>

⁷ Chosun Ilbo. "Probe Finds Massive Underhand Dealings in Four Rivers Project," July 11, 2013, http://english.chosun.com/site/data/html_dir/2013/07/11/2013071101465.html, accessed September 8, 2016.

⁸ ORM stakeholder forum, Seoul, South Korea, September 2015.

⁹ Ministry of the Interior, Republic of Korea. "열린정부파트너십자체평가보고서," (Translation: Open Government Partnership Self-Assessment Report), June 2016, pp. 23-25.

¹⁰ E-mail correspondence with Open Net's Park Kyung-sin and Sungsoo Hwang at Yeungnam University.

III. Efficient Management of Public Resources

Commitment 3e. Encouraging the Private Sector to Utilize Public Data

Commitment Text:

“The Basic Plan for the Promotion of the Provision and Promotion of Public Data (2013 – 2017)” (Open Data Master Policy Plan) is the key policy plan for achieving OGP commitment and is an important component of Korea’s Government 3.0 policy.

The key components of the Open Data Master Plan are opening up of public data and building open data ecosystem. Regarding opening up public data, the total of 12,654 types of data are planned to be disclosed in order to achieve the open rate of 60%, a significant increase compared to 2013, which recorded only 3,395 types of data disclosed and the open rate of 16.1%. Relevant milestones for opening up public data are also set with 7,653 types of data and the open rate of 36.3% for 2014, 10,016 types of data and the open rate of 47.7% for 2015, and 12,654 types of data and open rate of 60% for 2016. Regarding open data ecosystem, one-stop open data provision framework is to be deployed through open data portal. In addition, government-wide and public-private open data ecosystem support framework is to be implemented.

The main implementing agency is the MOSPA, and the lead ministry on open data, and also a supporting agency, is the National Information Society Agency (NIA), which also operates the national open data portal (data.go.kr)....

At the second Open Data Strategy Council held in April 2014 and composed of enterprises, civilian experts, etc., the “Execution Plan for the Provision and Promotion of Public Data” was passed. According to the plan, 504 types of key public data (identified through agency assessment and public feedback, notably via consultative/advisory bodies and user communities which most central and local government organizations have, with examples such as Open Data Partnership of the Gyeonggi Provincial Government and open data user community of the Ministry of Education), which are expected to have high demands and relatively a bigger impact on the society, will be selected and disclosed first. Not only that, a private-public consultative body whose members include the companies that use public data for their business will be operated in order to get feedback from the private sector and reflect their views on data sharing policies.

In this regard, the “Grand Open Forum for Public Data” was held in May 2014 along with about 40 experts from the private and public sectors. At the Forum, a private-public data-sharing task force team for each of the 16 strategic areas will be officially launched. The 16 task force teams are expected to act as communication channels between the government and civil society. The task force teams are headed by chief open data officers of government agencies involved who are responsible for releasing open data and nurturing companies that use open data in collaboration with the “Open Data Ecosystem Group.” The task force teams are coordinated by the MOSPA, the lead ministry on open data, and they are expected to hold meetings periodically (e.g. bi-monthly) and conferences (at least once a year) in an effort to analyze demanded data from the private sector and to consider the private sector’s opinions.

In addition, the Korean government will continue to work on evolving the best practices of the use of public data among private enterprises such as Naver (Naver Map), Daum (Daum Maps), SK Planet (security cameras, public transportation information, etc.), and Solideo Systems (building information) in a hope that more and more companies will utilize public data for their businesses.

Editorial Note: Four milestones were derived from this commitment. The text of the commitment was abridged for ease of reading. Please refer to the action plan for the full text of the commitment.

1. Disclose 12,654 types of data by 2016, achieving an "open rate" of 60%, with yearly milestones until then, achieving an "open data ecosystem" and "open data framework."

2. Disclose 504 types of public data identified through a public-private consultative body and public feedback and prioritize high-demand and high-impact information first.

3. Sixteen task force teams will act as communication channels between the government and civil society, holding regular meetings and conferences to gauge public-sector opinion on which information should be disclosed.

4. Expand best practices of the use of public data among private enterprises.

Responsible institution: Ministry of the Interior

Supporting institution(s): Open Data Strategy Committee

Commitment Overview	Specificity				OGP value relevance (as written)				Potential Impact				Completion		Midterm End of term		Did it open government?				
	None	Low	Medium	High	Access to Information	Civic Participation	Public Accountability	Technology & Innovation for Transparency & Accountability	None	Minor	Moderate	Transformative	Not started	Limited	Substantial	Completed	Worsened	Did not change	Marginal	Major	Outstanding
3.e. Encouraging the Private Sector to Utilize Public Data			✓		✓	✓					✓				✓				✓		
3.e.1. Increase data disclosures by 2016				✓	✓						✓					✓					
3.e.2. Identify public data priorities			✓		✓	✓					✓					✓					
3.e.3. Consult task force teams on disclosures			✓		✓	✓				✓						✓					
3.e.4. Expand best practices		✓			✓					✓					✓						

Commitment Aim:

The commitment fell directly under the government's pre-existing Government 3.0 vision, first introduced in June 2013 and codified into law in October 2013 through the Open Data Act, and aimed to improve access to information, civic participation and public accountability. At the time the commitment was adopted, the government was already making strong progress in changing disclosure practices to favor the principles of transparency over secrecy. Specifically, the commitment aims to:

1. Disclose 12,654 types of data by 2016, achieving an "open rate" of 60%, with yearly milestones until then, achieving an "open data ecosystem" and "open data framework."
2. Disclose 504 types of public data identified through a public private consultative body and public feedback and prioritize high demand and high impact information first.
3. Sixteen task force teams will act as communication channels between the government and civil society, holding regular meetings and conferences to gauge public sector opinion on which information should be disclosed.
4. Expand best practices of the use of public data among private enterprises.

Mid-term: Substantial

Since late 2013, MOI had been implementing Government 3.0 through the release of the datasets in progressively larger numbers each year as specified in this commitment. It has also held forums and discussion with the private sector and CSOs, with an emphasis on locating disclosures that would be useful in business and technology, such as the Grand Open Data Forum. Milestone 3.e.1 to release 12,654 datasets by 2016 is complete; according to the OGP point of contact as of the end of November 2015 a total of 15,894 datasets had been released.¹

Milestone (3.e.2) was also complete. In 2014, the government released 504 of what it calls "key datasets," which it refers to in the action plan as "data types." According to the government point of contact, individual agencies in "consultations with the private sector" determined the 504 "key datasets."² However, it was unclear—from the self-assessment and follow up correspondence—the breadth and extent of the "consultations" with 16 stakeholder groups on identifying data priorities as pledged the commitment. As a result of the limited information provided, it has been difficult to determine how stakeholders were selected, how data priorities were identified, or whether consultations were open to the public.

The third milestone (3.e.3) had been verified as completed. The sixteen task force teams, launched in May 2014 at the Open Data Korea Grand Forum, were led by the relevant ministries and agencies in weather, transportation, land, food and medicine, agriculture and livestock, culture and tourism, disaster and safety, health and welfare, procurement, patent, maritime and fisheries, law and justice, science and technology, labor and employment, environment, and ICT.³

The fourth milestone (3.e.4) made progress expanding best practices for private use of public data. The government delivered a website with examples of private sector best practices in construction administration,⁴ and on fiscal data best practices.⁵ This is in addition to the Open Data portal, data.go.kr, which has thirty-nine examples of best practices as evidence of progress. The website lists a number of improvements in health, technology, and the environment—that show open data being used effectively.⁶

End of term: Complete

Completion at the end of term built upon strong advances leading up to the mid-term report. The commitment is substantially completed, despite some shortcomings in the process and transparency of disclosures that fell outside the commitment scope.

3.e.1 Increase data disclosures by 2016 (Complete)

The government surpassed its goals and hit 16,000 datasets opened by 2016, as evidenced by metrics recorded on the data.go.kr website that show live updates and indicate 15,894 datasets were released by November 2015.⁷ (The government originally pledged to release 12,654 datasets, or a 60 percent “disclosure rate,” by 2016).⁸ According to the 2016 self-assessment report, the government released data by category, focusing first on 11 types with “significant industrial demand and socioeconomic impact.”⁹ Examples included building information, licenses and permits issued by local governments, and real-time updates on water service. According to the government report, an additional 22 types of data including national disaster management, national spaces, and real estate transactions were yet to be disclosed but were planned for release in 2016.¹⁰ Implementation of this milestone has exceeded its targets as written and is complete.

Some CSOs were concerned over what they believed to be an excessive release of local datasets without consistently merging them into more representative national datasets. This means that there may be a relatively small number of national datasets when compared to the committed number of 16,000 unique datasets.¹¹ Some CSOs raised concerns during the stakeholder forum regarding the greater quantity of local as opposed to national datasets released, because local datasets are viewed as lacking the breadth and scope of data collected at the national level.¹² Kyung-sin Park of Korea University also expressed the concern that local datasets are crowding the platform, making it difficult to locate useful aggregate datasets from numerous local or redundant sets.

Milestones 3.e.2 and 3.e.3 were complete at the midterm.¹³

3.e.4 Expand best practices (Complete)

In its June 2016 report MOI listed numerous examples of mobile apps that made use of the datasets, and were developed either by the government or private firms. One strong example is the Korea Expressway traffic app, which offered live traffic information that reached 5,000,000 downloads during the implementation period, and was purchased by the software company Kakao.¹⁴ Another app, developed by the Ministry of Food and Drug Safety, allowed users to check the ingredients of cosmetics for safety purposes and to ensure it was the ideal type for their skin. Finally, the Everybody’s Parking Lot App offered a Seoul parking lot database, with 140,000 downloads, and is now being expanded nationwide.¹⁵ In addition to the projects completed at the time of mid-term, these additional and strong examples of government data services used in the private sector make the milestone “complete.”

Did it open government?

Access to information: Marginal

Civic participation: Did not change

At the starting point of implementation, large-scale efforts were already underway to improve open data access with the passing of the Open Data Act of October 2013, and stakeholders had high expectations for its implementation in the coming years.¹⁶ This commitment was focused primarily on the “access to information” side of open government; stakeholders were in agreement that impacts could be substantial, despite concerns over the occasional use of obscure file types, such as Hanword filetypes (.hwp, used by the South Korean word processor Hanword), rather than .docx or a similar, more globally accessible standard. Of concern was the possibility of degrading the quality of releases, since file conversions from .hwp to .docx could tamper with formatting and readability.

One stakeholder, Jennifer Kang, a member of the Open Data Strategy Council, said this challenge continues to limit the impact of this commitment. She cites as an example the data category, “city planning facilities information” (“도시계획 시설정보”), where a .CSV file should be available, but

instead the government website links to a non-readable PDF document. Kang believes this and similar examples¹⁷ illustrate that the data format continues to lack standardization, and points out many instances of .HWP or .PDF formats being used, rather than .CSV or readable Excel formats. She also called for a stronger system of eliciting user feedback, which she believes has been lacking on the current MOI web system.¹⁸ The government self-assessment report also indicates that improving data quality and standardization remains an ongoing challenge.¹⁹ The report states that “the shortage of quality data continues to impede the private sector’s productive use of public open data” and identifies next steps to introduce a quality management system for improving the usability of large-scale public data, creating standard formats, and introducing an automated tool for assessing the standardization of data uploaded on the Open Data Portal.²⁰

In practice, the changes were marginal in the area of access to information. Initial optimism was high when the government, implementing the Open Data Act of 2013, switched its disclosure policy from one of default secrecy to more openness, with more datasets tagged for release without first requiring a FOI request,²¹ and this point was universally lauded by stakeholders during both the first and early part of the second action plan implementation periods.²² Hwang Sungsoo, associate professor of public administration at Yeungnam University, believed that open data has seen “meaningful progress” throughout the action plan implementation period, although he admitted progress was slower than many hoped. While CSOs saw improvements in the release of high priority datasets in areas such as transportation, land use, and weather,²³ and an overall increase in data disclosure, challenges remain for improving standardization, organization, and usability of the data.

Carried forward?

This commitment has been included under commitment 1b in the next action plan for 2016-2018, which focuses on publishing more original information that is useful to citizens. Two CSOs, OpenNet Korea and IndiLab, believed that the government needs to more effectively coordinate resources to take a unified approach in implementing data disclosure. This could allow for more consistent data disclosures and standardization across categories.

¹ E-mail correspondence with the MOI point of contact, December 12-16, 2015.

² Ministry of the Interior, email correspondence, 7 December 2015.

³ Open Government Partnership. “South Korea 2014-2015 ORM Progress Report,” pp. 35-39.

⁴ <http://open.eais.go.kr/>

⁵ <http://www.openfiscaldata.go.kr/>.

⁶ Ministry of the Interior, email correspondence, 7 December 2015.

⁷ E-mail correspondence with the OGP point of contact, December 12-16, 2015. The researcher also kept track of the number of releases as regularly updated on the data.go.kr website.

⁸ This number is reported live on the data.go.kr website, tied to the actual updates being posted in the database, which is also accessible and transparent right below the number.

⁹ Ministry of the Interior, Republic of Korea, Open Government Partnership Self-Assessment Report, September 2016, p.44 https://www.opengovpartnership.org/sites/default/files/South-Korea_End-of-Term_Self-Assessment_Report_2014-2016.pdf

¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹ E-mail correspondence with Kyung-sin Park, Director of Open Net Korea and Professor of Law at Korea University, October 25, 2016.

¹² ORM stakeholder forums, September 2015.

¹³ Ministry of the Interior, Republic of Korea. “열린정부파트너십 자체평가보고서,” (Translation: Open Government Partnership Self-Assessment Report), June 2016, pp. 25-28. The researcher cross-checked the claims in this report by viewing the data on the data.go.kr website and doing searches for datasets in random fields such as bicycle paths and health-care services.

¹⁴ Ministry of the Interior. “Open Government Partnership Self-Assessment Report,” June 2016 (Korean).

¹⁵ Ibid.

¹⁶ First and second ORM stakeholder forums, Oct. 2013 and Sept. 2015.

¹⁷ Examples of non-machine readable .hwp files “보건복지부” <http://data.go.kr/dataset/3074575/fileData.do>, and “보건복지부” <http://data.go.kr/dataset/3033511/fileData.do>

¹⁸ Interview with Jennifer Kang, April 21, 2017.

¹⁹ Ministry of the Interior, Republic of Korea, Open Government Partnership Self-Assessment Report, September 2016, p.46
https://www.opengovpartnership.org/sites/default/files/South-Korea_End-of-Term_Self-Assessment_Report_2014-2016.pdf

²⁰ Ibid.

²¹ Republic of Korea. "Open Data Act of 2013." A copy of this legislation is in the possession of the IRM researcher.

²² First and second IRM stakeholder forums, Oct. 2013 and Sept. 2015.

²³ <https://www.data.go.kr/emphasisData/index.do>

METHODOLOGICAL NOTE

Commitments are clustered based on the original OGP action plan. This report is based on a desk review of governmental programmes, interviews and correspondence with civil society and other stakeholders, draft laws and regulations, governmental decrees, review of the two government reports: a midterm self-assessment report was submitted in October 2015 and a second informational assessment report in Korean was submitted in June 2016. In addition, a final self assessment report was published in Korean and English in September 2016. The IRM researcher also relied upon written consultation with the South Korean and international media to evaluate completion of the Action Plan.

Geoffrey Cain is an author, journalist and consultant based in South Korea. A former Fulbright scholar, he studied at London's School of Oriental and African Studies and South Korea's Yonsei University.

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 assesses development and implementation of national action plans to foster dialogue among stakeholders and improve accountability.

Open
Government
Partnership

