



NEW ANTI-CORRUPTION GOVERNMENTS: THE CHALLENGE OF DELIVERY

# CORRUPTION PREVENTION THROUGH EVALUATION IN KENYA

NAM, Yoo-Chin

Director General

Korea Independent Commission Against Corruption

Speech at the Kenya Meeting on New Governments, co-organised by the Government of Kenya, TI-Kenya and Transparency International, held in Nairobi, Kenya, in October 2004.

## **Introduction**

Ladies and gentlemen,

One year and five months have passed since the last 11th IACC and TI Annual Meeting were held in Seoul in May 2003. I am very pleased to meet all of you here once again.

As we have a lot of discussion on how to root out corruption, I am confident that we can contribute to making each country and furthermore the world free from corruption

And I am delighted to have an invaluable opportunity to present the Korean Government's efforts to implement and evaluate anti-corruption policy.

## **Recent Development of Anti-corruption Efforts in Korea**

Since the early 1990s, the Korean governments has made continued efforts to make institutional improvements including economic reform laws to eradicate corruption.

Such comprehensive and systematic anti-corruption initiatives have created a better environment to combat large-scale government and corporate corruption and significantly reduced petty administrative corruption.

However, despite the efforts made by the former governments, the public consider that corruption level in Korea is still serious. Furthermore, international community perceives Korea as a country with low Integrity Perception Index (IPI), which is a cause for dropping international credit rating.

Under these circumstances at home and abroad, the KICAC was launched as a way to address pressing issues: realizing people's desire to create a transparent and clean society and enhancing international confidence equivalent to that of the largest economy in the world.

The KICAC, since its establishment in January 2002, has set the direction for anti-corruption policy at the national level and laid the foundation for government-wide implementation system and public and civic cooperation system.

Based on these accomplishments, the KICAC has prepared to carry out 4 major functions such as policy formulation and institutional improvement, reporting and handling corruption cases, education and promotion and inspection & assessment. The KICAC now achieves tangible results.

Among tangible results, today, I will focus on Korea's evaluation system for corruption elimination.

### **Let Them Change Voluntarily**

The new Korean government has announced the government reform and corruption elimination as two major national challenges.

One of the biggest stumbling blocks was a lack of reform will among public officials who had been so used to unwillingness to move or be active. Some of public officials were worried that the introduction of performance-based promotion, restructuring plans and corruption elimination might threaten their vested interests.

The problem we faced was how to change the negative and passive attitudes against reform and anti-corruption prevailing among the public officials.

To tackle this issue, Korea Independent Commission Against Corruption(KICAC) has devised the evaluation method to achieve reform. This method is designed to change the attitude of public officials toward reform and thereby lay the foundation of corruption eradication. And today, I would like to introduce it briefly.

### **Two Weapons for Reform : Integrity Assessment & Task Evaluation**

Above all, it should be noted that it is almost impossible for an anti-corruption agency to reform the whole government institutions.

Therefore, the best way is to make each agency reform on its own. The role of anti-corruption agency should be limited to providing continuous stimuli of reform to the agencies.

In order to motivate public officials to participate in the efforts to prevent corruption, the Commission carries out two kinds of evaluation for government institutions, the one is 'Integrity Assessment', the other 'Anti-corruption Task Evaluation'.

#### **<Integrity Assessment>**

Let me start with 'Integrity Assessment' first.

The aim of the 'Integrity Assessment' is to examine the behavior and attitude of the public officials related to corruption and measure the perceived integrity of the government agencies.

The Assessment is carried out by telephone survey. The respondents are chosen among the citizens who had experiences of making a direct contact with public officials.

In 2003, the number of evaluated agencies was total 77 (20 central government agencies/commissions, 14 government offices, 15 local governments, 16 education offices, 11 public service related organizations).

In 2003, the average Integrity Score of 77 agencies was 7.71 points on a scale of one to ten. The figure, 7.71 points, means the surveyed agencies are in between "Clean" and "Relatively Clean." The Score increased by 1.28 point from 2002 score of 6.43.

The evaluation results are released to mass-media to give stimulus to the government agencies and induce competition of anti-corruption between them.

#### **<Anti-corruption Task Evaluation>**

Next, 'Anti-corruption Task Evaluation' is to evaluate the performance of anti-corruption measures undertaken by the government agencies.

By the Anti-Corruption Act, all the government agencies are supposed to set up comprehensive anti-corruption policies. The Commission inspects and evaluates how well government agencies perform them through 8 major categories.

In 2003, the number of evaluated agencies was total 87 (42 central government agencies/commissions, 16 local governments, 16 education offices, 13 public service related organizations).

But, please be careful not to consider 'Integrity Assessment' and 'Anti-corruption Task Evaluation' as two separate methods.

In actual reform process, however, the above two evaluation methods are closely related to each other as the result of the 'Integrity Assessment' necessarily leads to fostering of anti-corruption measures for the each government agency.

And in turn, implementing of anti-corruption policy by the agency will affect the result of the 'Integrity Assessment'. And then the Commission inspires them to improve the problematic situation by themselves and evaluates how much the vulnerable areas are improved at the end.

Accordingly, we can see that 'Integrity Assessment and Anti-corruption Task Evaluation' together constitute a sophisticated cycling system of anti-corruption for government institutions.

### **How Evaluation Results Actually Work**

The Commission released government specific IPI and the IPI ranking for the first time in March 2003. At that time, the Commission received a prompt and immediate reaction from the government agencies.

Investigation agencies such as the Prosecutor's Office and Police Office and influential government agencies such as the Ministry of Planning & Budget, the Ministry of Finance and Economy and the National Tax Service took the lower part of the IPI ranking. Those low-ranked agencies strongly accused of the Commission, giving doubts over objectivity and credibility of the IPI.

However, it didn't take a long time to see positive effects of the IPI release. Heads of the government agencies voluntarily came up with their own anti-corruption measures in fear of being labelled as corrupt.

The National Tax Service, for example, announced its plan to provide a certain amount of money to whistle-blowers in return for reporting acts of corruption by their co-workers.

Anti-corruption efforts didn't stop there. Korea Electric Power Corporation established a hotline to enable all employees to report corruption directly to the CEO, while the Ministry of Planning & Budget and the Ministry of Construction and Transportation established and carried out the internal code of conduct on their own.

Such a change of attitude demonstrated by the government agencies can not be imagined before. In the past, each head of the government agency claimed that his or her agency would be more clean and transparent than any other agencies, but showed reservations about the Commission's implementation of anti-corruption policy.

Against this backdrop, the IPI ranking published by the Commission is powerful enough to reverse the trend toward corruption-free government agencies. Recognizing the new trend, heads of the government agencies competitively plunged into corruption prevention campaign.

### **President's Strong Will for Anti-corruption**

We understand that the key to success of reform depends on how to mobilized the political resources. What is fortunate for Korea is that the President is putting the top priority on anti-corruption drive in his reform agenda.

For example, the President presides the "Anti-Corruption Meeting of Related Government Agencies," on a monthly basis to support the Commission's anti-corruption initiatives.

At the meeting attended by the heads of 11 relevant government departments and agencies, the President reviews the anti-corruption measures undertaken by the government agencies.

This kind of demonstration of anti-corruption will by the President also have helped change the government ministers' attitude toward anti-corruption initiatives of the new government.

### **Evaluation and Lessons**

Our reform process is at the initial stage, so it is too early to judge whether the reform process is a success or not.

Up to now, resistance to reform has been barely visible in relation to the government reform. This is because of both the president's willingness to reform and the public's demand for reform.

We are certain that our strategy, 'Reform Through Evaluation and Encouragement' is so far working well. We are seeing many good models of voluntary reform in several government agencies after IPI evaluation and announcement.

Korea has its own unique situation where political community and the government have been pushed by the strong demand for reform made by the public instead of voluntarily seeking a strong reform process.

The public's keen desire for reform mostly comes from a long-standing distrust and antipathy toward political corruption such as collusive ties between politicians and business men.

According to a public survey carried out right before the general election held in April this year, around 80% of respondents surveyed pointed out the elimination of political corruption as the most pressing issue.

At the present moment, reform-oriented environment is being created where any political party or politician labeled as anti-reform has no place to stand in the political arena.

Recent experiences tell us that a power to overcome a resistance to reform ultimately comes from the public. Therefore, reform drivers have to keep in mind that it is important to pull the public together to effectively pursue reform.

To do that, active participation of civic groups or NGOs is required more than anything else. Given this, the government needs to foster and support more civic groups and realize the civil society in the end.

It is also important to note that high internet penetration rate, in part, contributed more public participation into the political area in Korea.

Closing my presentation, I wish that our first-hand experience of anti-corruption initiative could be helpful for today's productive discussion.

**Thank you for your kind attention!**