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1. Introduction

Korean anti-corruption policies began in the early 2000s. It was the time when all the national economy was entering the mature stage. In fact, with the achievement of the most rapid and compressed economic growth and democratization only for 40 years from 1960s till 1990s, Korea could join the ranks of advanced economies. However, while pouring all national power into the economic development, we underwent the customary corruption and irregularity ignoring the procedure and the fairness of outcome which prevailing in private and public sectors. In order to increase the exports and accelerate the economic development, expedient or absurdity was tolerated to a certain extent. After all, in 2002 the Korea Anti-Corruption Commission was established to eradicate and fight against the officialdom corruption.

But after analyzing the causes of corruption in Korean society, we reached a conclusion that by rooting out the corruption of only public officials, we cannot wipe out the culture of corruption prevailing in this society. Therefore, the main target of current Korean anti-corruption policy includes politicians, businessmen, the financial, private organizations and even the foreign institutions as well as government officials. These anti-corruption targets also contain the Cheong Wa Dae (presidential office), the Prime Minister, all ministries, local governments, financial institutions, educational institutions, public enterprises, private investment companies including the civil societies which being aided by government.

In Africa, anti-corruption policy and the rule of law are the matter of concern at the same time, but in Korea, the public officials and public organizations have become the main target of anti-corruption policy. The corruption in the judiciary and the parliament, for the main target of the rule of law, is checked by the public opinion including the media. Their illegal activities shall be cracked down by the relevant laws such as the Criminal Code. Therefore, anti-corruption policy of the country is naturally concentrated on the public organizations, private business sectors and state-funded organizations, etc. Of course, it never means that Korean people always trust in the judiciary. There is a saying, “all mighty is the dollar”, or “one law
for the rich and another for the poor.” In other words, the richer entrepreneurs and the more powerful people are often released easily even though they commit serious crimes. On the contrary, the poor is often marginalized from the benefits of the law. Nonetheless, people tend to trust in the fairness of the judiciary.

Meanwhile, among many Korean anti-corruption policies, the remarkable best-practice is the ‘Integrity Assessment System (Anti-Corruption Survey and Evaluation)’ which is yearly conducted by the ‘Anti-Corruption & Civil Rights Commission of Korea’ (ACRC). The system was awarded with the UN Public Service Award (PSA) “in 2012 for ‘preventing and combating corruption in public service’. It is currently being offered to Asia for free. As well, there are many anti-corruption and integrity policies as follows.

The second one is the ‘Financial Registration and Disclosure System’ which is designed to screen whether the elected politicians and senior officials’ wealth matches their incomes. The third one is ‘auditing and inspection of duty’ which is yearly conducted by the ‘Board of Audit & Inspection’. The others are ‘Youth Ombudsman System’ and ‘the Integrity and Anti-corruption Education’ which are implemented by the Ministry of Public Administration and Security.

In addition, each province carries out its own unique anti-corruption policies. In particular, the degree of integrity of each local government acts as a major factor which influences the mayor’s success or failure at the next election because their political lives depend on the constituents’ support. Now I will introduce them one by one, and also look into the effectiveness based on the internal and external evaluation.

2. Anti-Corruption Policies in Korea

The watch-dog function of monitoring and watching corruption in Korea is mainly carried out by the ‘Anti-Corruption & Civil Rights Commission of Korea’ and ‘Board of Audit and Inspection.’ As well, ‘the Ministry of Public Administration and Security’ coordinates and supports the anti-corruption policy of each ministry and local government. Of course, each ministry and local government promotes its own anti-corruption policies.

‘The integrity assessment system, which is yearly conducted by the ‘Anti-Corruption & Civil Rights Commission of Korea,’ has got a lot of concerns from the senior officials as well as the chiefs of public organizations. Because the integrity level of the public organization is objectively evaluated by ‘the integrity assessment’. This is regarded as the major indicators that may affect the next election with the policy achievement.
The Board of Audit & Inspection (BAI) is the final and independent inspection agency who verifies the legitimacy and validity of all governments’ budget execution result. They conduct regularly the inspection of accounting documents. If they find out any illegal activities after auditing, the BAI can directly accuse the concerned public organization. As mentioned above, in addition to auditing, BAI conducts the thorough inspection on the legality and performance of duties, and functions curbing and eradicating corruption in officialdom as the best "watch-dog" organization. In fact, this BAI often makes all public organizations and officials very nervous and fearful. Meanwhile, the Ministry of Public Administration and Security chooses and awards the best-practice of anticorruption policies from all local governments every year. But I would like to more intensively introduce the anti-corruption system as well as the policy programs.

2-1 Integrity Assessment System of Public Organizations

A. Brief of the Integrity Assessment System

The ‘Integrity Assessment System of Public Organizations’ has been implemented for 13 years, which evaluates the level of integrity of public institutions and measures the corruption-causing-factors scientifically and objectively. To assess the Integrity is a series of comprehensive process. The degree of integrity shall be first measured by way of how much transparently and responsibly the officials conduct their duties in the customer’s shoes. The customers can sometimes become complainants, its employees, and policy clients etc. The next step is to examine the corruption cases and negative activities which affect harmful to public confidence. At last, the real integrity is the comprehensive assessment from which the negative result is reflected by deduction.

This integrity assessment system is surely effective to improve the fairness and transparency of the public sector, and also contributes to induce the voluntary participation of all public organizations. After all, it performs a key role in improving the Integrity in our society. The integrity assessment result is also used for the local government evaluation (Ministry of Public Administration and Security), the assessment of metropolitan education offices (Ministry of Education, Science and Technology), and the evaluation of public corporations (Ministry of Strategy and Finance), etc. The integrity is composed of a comprehensive integrity (total), external integrity, internal integrity, policy clients’ review, which are respectively 10-point in total. It means that the higher the integrity closer to 10 points, the better the integrity level.

B. Composition of the Assessment Model
More than 1,000 public organizations, including central ministries, local governments, and public corporations, shall be measured.
- The publicity and transparency of each organization shall be assessed.
- Integrity of public organizations is composed of an external assessment (+), internal evaluation (+), policy clients’ review (+), bribe case rate (-), entertainment offering rate (-), and convenience offering rate (-). And to put together all of them is the comprehensive integrity.

**C. Composition of the Measurement index**

1) External Integrity (0.601): Integrity of major civil petition affairs is assessed by the complainant and official’s posture.
   - Corruption Index (0.638): The degree of corruption being directly or indirectly experienced and recognized in receiving money & valuable, entertainment, convenience, offering preferential convenience, and in pursuing the illegal private interest (13 items)
   - Risk index (0.362): Degree of transparency and accountability in the course of the business processing (4 items)

2) Internal Integrity (0.250): Evaluating the integrity of the internal affairs and organizational culture in the employees’ position
   - Integrity Culture Index (0.433): Degree of corruption practice within organization and the effectiveness of anti-corruption system (9 items)
   - Duty Integrity Index (0.567): Degree of transparency and fairness in conducting personnel affairs and budget execution, and fairness in the job instruction and fair treatment of business (personnel affairs) (24 items)

3) Policy Clients’ Reviews (0.149): Integrity that the professionals, business stakeholders and residents evaluate the whole business of public organization
   - Corruption Perception (0.427): Degree of perception regarding the corruption such as awareness of ‘gratuities, entertainment, convenience offering, and waste of budget,’ transparency in ‘decision-making and business process, etc.’ (10 items)
   - Corruption Control (0.294): Exactness of discipline, and corruption preventing efforts, etc. (3 items)
   - Corruption Experience (0.279): Corruption experience regarding the gratuities, entertainment, convenience offering (1 item)

4) Occurrence of Corrupt Incidents (deduction subject)
   - Statistics of corruption officials: Being applied to the corruption incidents of general staffs in administrative organization (DB of disciplined corruption cases)
   - Index of corruption incidents: Being applied to the corruption cases which
created by the political affairs officials of public organizations, and senior officials of public service-related organizations.

5) Confidence-damaging-activity (deduction subject)
   - Exposed matters such as the discretionary change of measurement list, mistakes in writing, checking the number of responses to be induced favorable evaluation, and tips (Check list survey and on-site inspections)

※ Weight on the scale of the external integrity • Internal Integrity • Policy-clients’ Reviews are calculated through the Delphi survey of academic experts and auditors of target agencies.
※ In the primary local governments, public corporations and other government-related organizations which do not conduct policy-clients’ review, the external integrity (0.735) and internal integrity (0.265) are summed by the weight.

D. How to Measure the Integrity
   The integrity assessment consists of integrity survey and deduction for the corruption Incidents.

1) Integrity survey of public organizations
   - External Integrity: the survey shall be conducted about the citizens or civil petitioners who have an experience on public services of the public organization.
   - Internal Integrity: The survey shall be carried out about the employees of target organization.
   - Policy-clients’ Review: the main targets are experts, professionals (academics, reporters, lawmakers’ aides, etc.), business stakeholders (affiliated organizations, etc.), residents and parents

※ Residents may participate in the assessment of metropolitan local governments and parents can take part in the assessment of city and province education offices.

2) Deduction of corruption incidents
   - Corruption cases in public organization: If the corrupt officials received the disciplinary action, their number, position, bribery amount, and the quota of organization shall be reflected on the score of integrity assessment. As for the political affairs official’s corruption cases, the bribery amount, seriousness of corruption, corrupt practices, many people-related cases, and the negative influence shall be also counted by the experts.
   - Public corruption cases of public service-related organizations: As for the employees’ corruption cases, the seriousness of corruption incidents such as
bribery amount, corrupt practices, and number of people related to the cases, the negative influence shall be scored by the experts.

**E. The ordinary schedule of Integrity assessment of public organization and the assessment of anti-corruption policies**

1) submission of the demand on integrity assessment of the local authorities and each offices                                    March
2) Workshop for the working-level officials of the evaluation target-organizations                     March
3) Overseas’ anti-corruption education & training program for the officials of the excellent public organizations after the integrity assessment    May
4) Submission of the list of officials who will be the target of integrity survey of each public organization, and the relevant data                     July
5) Conducting the integrity assessment                                                                                              October
6) Submission of anti-corruption policy assessment                                                                             November

**2-2 Financial Registration and Disclosure System**

**A. Brief of the system**

Public officials should maintain the 'fairness' while they conduct their official duties. They should make efforts to prevent the conflicts between public and private interest. And they should establish the public service ethics as people’s servants. Therefore, this ‘Financial Registration and Disclosure System’ was introduced for the purpose of preventing what officials abuse their position or authority and pursue private interests.

In other words, the ‘Financial Registration and Disclosure’ means that public official registers his or her family’s property, and transparently exposes to the public. Thus, it can prevent the illegal intervention in advance, and strengthen the ethics of public society. It is also expected to help the officials do their duties fairly and uprightly.

**B. Obligator of property registration**

- The President, Prime Minister, members of the cabinet meeting, lawmakers, and political affairs officials
- Chief of local government (mayor), local council members, including civil servants and political officials of metropolitan governments.
- Central and local government officials in position of higher rank than director(grade 4), and the higher public officials in special service to be paid

---

1 Lineal ascendant and descendant (parent, grandparent, child, grandchild)
equivalently
- General public officials between 5th grade and 7th grade, and public officials in special service like the ‘Board of Audit & Inspection’, ‘Ministry of Justice’, ‘Public Prosecutors’ Office’, ‘National Tax Office’, ‘Korea Customs Service’, and ‘Anti-Corruption and Civil Rights Commission’
- Public officials between 5th grade and 7th grade who are responsible for the enforcement duties such as the license, approval, inspection, supervision and guidance of the construction, civil engineering, environment, food sanitation, etc.

- Superintendent, members of ‘Board of Education’, and civil servants in a certain position who work for University, Police station, Fire Department, Ministry of Defense, and the ‘Defense Acquisition Program Administration’
  - Chief of the public corporation, vice-chief, standing executive directors, and standing auditors
  - Chief of government funded/ invested / aided institutions and local government corporations
  - Officials of the National Parliament, officials stipulated in the ‘Supreme Court Rules’, officials of public service-related organizations

C. The scope of the lineal relatives for property registration
- The person (himself or herself), spouse (including de facto spouse), lineal ascendant and descendant
  - Except married women of a lineal descendant and mother’s grand and great-grand parents, and daughter’s children, and daughter’s grand children.

D. How to register property
- The first property registration report: at the time when official bears the ‘property registration duty’ by the appointment or promotion, etc.
  - The regular property change report: the obligators with existing property registration duty

E. Types of property for registration
  - Ownership of real estate, superficies and leasehold rights
  - Mining rights, fishing rights, the rights to which the real estate regulation is applied
  - Cash more than a certain amount by each owner (including checks), insurance, securities, receivables, liabilities, jewelry, antiques, works of art, and membership
  - Intellectual property by each owner with more than a certain amount of income
  - Automobiles, construction machinery, ships and aircraft
  - Investment shares of unlimited partnership, limited partnership, and the limited
company
- Stock options

2-3 Operation of ‘Board of Audit & Inspection’

A. Brief of the organization
The ‘Board of Audit & Inspection (BAI)’ is the nation’s supreme and independent watch dog which remarkably contributes to prevent fraud and corruption of public officials. The function of BAI is largely audit of accounting and inspection of duties. Accounting examination is to audit the accounts in terms of overall nation’s financial execution. The BAI covers the audit of all national institutions including the parliament and the courts, governments, public corporations as well as civil societies if they receive government subsidy. BAI conducts the ‘Inspection of duties’ of central and local governments, and state-funded institutions in order to upright and tighten discipline by reviewing the legality, effectiveness and efficiency of job performance, and improve the administrative innovation.

B. Personnel and Budget

Personnel As of 1 January, 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Political Appointees</th>
<th>Special Service</th>
<th>General service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorized Strength</td>
<td>1,035</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,025</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expenditure Budget As of 1 January, 2014 (Unit: Million KRW)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Personnel Expenditure</th>
<th>Basic Expenditure</th>
<th>Expenditure for Main Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>107,177 (USD 97.5 million $)</td>
<td>68,633 (USD 60.8 million $)</td>
<td>10,374</td>
<td>28,170</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* * * USD 1 $: 1,100 KRW

C. Main Function
1) Confirmation of Accounting Settlement: BAI verifies the nation’s revenue and settlement of expenditure account every year and report the results to the president and the national parliament.
2) Auditing: Accounting inspection is divided into the obligatory and the optional. The targets of the first one are the accounting of more than 38,700 public organizations of national and local governments. The optional check is applied to
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the accounting of more than 29,300 public institutions such as ‘National Treasury Collecting Agencies’ (banking institution) when being deemed necessary by the BAI or requested by the Prime Minister.

3) Inspection of Duties: BAI conducts inspection of whole business of the government office and its employees, such inspection includes the investigation of the officials’ illegal activities, and the research for improvement of contradiction and malfunctioned administrative problems in laws and ordinances system.

D. Follow-up measure of audit results

1) Determination of the compensation responsibility: In accordance with ‘the Act on the responsibility of staff in charge of accounting,’ BAI examines and judges whether the accounting official is responsible for compensation or not.

2) Request for the reprimand and disciplinary: BAI may request the relevant minister or chief of the concerned organization to take a measure of discipline of the officials who violate laws and regulations, refuse to submit the inspection document and delay inspection without any justifiable reasons.

3) Request for correction: BAI may request the minister, supervisory authority and the concerned organization to correct what BAI finds out any unlawful or unfair problems through inspection or audit.

4) Request for improvement: If admitted that there are any contradiction or anything to be improved in the relevant law, system and administration procedure, the BAI may request the prime minister, the relevant minister, supervisory authority, and the concerned organization to take some measures of the enactment/revision/nullification of legislation, and administrative reform, etc.

5) Request for accusation or investigation: In case that the audit results are suspected of criminal charges, BAI may accuse the relevant officials. Accusation shall be done through the resolution of the Audit & Inspection Committee. If there is any risk of escape or destruction of evidence, BAI may request the prosecutor to investigate without approval of ‘Audit & Inspection Committee. If it is difficult to request for prosecution or investigation because of restrictions of time and location, the BAI may also request the concerned organization to take an appropriate measure.

However, in Senegal, the verification regarding the budget execution and accounting settlement belongs to the Court. In consideration of lots of court work, it is very difficult for Senegal court to closely verify the government financial execution results. In particular, if necessary, the inspection or verification should be preceded at the site. But it seems difficult for the court to visit the real site for examination.
In this regard, MianPBG\textsuperscript{2} has ever reviewed the alternative plan for establishment of independent auditing body in 2014. I ever provided more detailed information of Korean BAI system. Of course, it will not be easy to create a new organization because it naturally requires a lot of experts and budget.

\begin{quote}
\textbf{2-4. Youth Ombudsman and Education for Integrity and Anti-Corruption (Ministry of Public Administration and Security)}
\end{quote}

\textbf{A. Youth Ombudsman System: 150 Honorary Citizen Comptrollers}
This ombudsman system is designed to identify the irrational system, customary practice and procedure of business by monitoring and transparent evaluation about the main national policies. They can suggest some improvement or innovative ideas to the government.

\textbf{B. Mandatory education for inspiring the anti-corruption and integrity spirit}
All the government employees should mandatorily complete the anti-corruption and integrity education. This education contributes to strengthen the officials’ spirit of anticorruption and integrity. It also helps public officials prepare for the assessment of anti-corruption measures.

\textbf{3. Anti-corruption Law and Penal Laws of Punishment}

\textbf{3-1. Sanction on the Solicitation}

1) The definition of solicitation: All expression of intention such as request which can affect conducting of the official’s fair job or decision-making for his (her) interests’ sake.

2) Requester of solicitation: family, relatives, friends, politicians, civil servants, retired seniors, the concerned organizations, including civil petitioners

3) Examples

- Request for rapid business treatment beyond the normal administrative procedure
- Request for undue convenience, preferential treatment, unlike regular civil petitioners
- Request for delay and waiver of various imposed obligations such as fines and

\textsuperscript{2} Ministere de l’Integration Africaine du Nepad et de la Promotion de la Bonne Gouvernance
penalties
- Request the authority to relax supervisory administration such as the checks and crackdown, etc.
- Request for weakening the various correction order
- Request for preferential treatments in personnel affairs such as award and promotion
- Request for special treatment of duties from the higher authority
4) The punishment regulations
- Criminal law, Special criminal laws on specific crimes, the Public Servant’s Ethics, and self-regulation of each administrative organization, etc.
5) Various reports / Operations of counseling center
- Corruption Report(Sinmungo): Report of the bribery or embezzlement for solicitation, irregularity, false and fraudulent construction, fraud construction accounting, corruption of ‘construction contracts and delivery of equipments’, etc.
- Complaint Center of Transaction inconvenience: Wrongful act and impartiality such as demanding money and valuables. Sometimes people can suggest any innovative ideas for improving integrity and anti-corruption
- Budget waste reporting center: Conclusion of purchase contract with significantly higher price, implementation of unnecessary construction, illegal expenditure of budget and funds, etc.
- Irrationality reporting center: Customary illegality and corruption cases
- Clean Report Center: Because officials inevitably received money and valuables on the occasion of the national festive holiday and cannot immediately return them, they can use this center.
- Whistle-blow and Report: ‘The Conduct Code’ violations of senior officials such as Influence peddling and solicitation, etc.
- Ethical Counseling Center: Ethical dilemma such as the sexual harassment, inappropriate business orders, influence peddling, and lobbying, etc.

3-2. Restriction on Re-employment of the Disciplinary Dismissal Officials

A. Procedure of operation
As for those who are dismissed because of the corrupt practices, their data shall be managed by DB system. Furthermore, the restriction system on re-employment of the disciplinary dismissal officials shall be more strengthened through close cooperation between the institutions.
Collection of statistics of the disciplinary dismissal officials

- The chief of each public institutions shall summit to the ACRC\(^3\) the data of disciplinary dismissal officials twice a year
  ※ within 1 month just after end of the half year

Check the employment of disciplinary dismissal officials

- On the batch basis of the occurrence data of disciplinary dismissal officials, it shall be confirmed to the ACRC whether those officials are employed or not.

Judgment of whether employment restrictions are violated or not

- In case that the employment of disciplinary dismissal officials is confirmed, whether the employment restriction is violated or not shall be confirmed by the comprehensive review of the business relevance and reemployment restricted organizations.

Sanctions of employment restriction violators

- As for the violators of employment restriction, the ACRC requests the concerned organization to sack and accuse the violating official in accordance with the resolution of the plenary committee on the basis of the on-site confirmation.

B. Promoting the amendment of the ACRC to improve the employment restriction system

(Expansion of employment restriction) in case that former official was sentenced to a certain punishment because of the corruption at the former public office, he (or she) shall be added to the employment restriction. The restriction condition is more intensified.

(Expansion of restricted organizations) institutions directly related to corruption are added to the employment restricted institution, regardless of the standard capital and external turnover.

(Creation of business relation) Creation of the new targets of the limited employment to be examined, to which ‘the Public Servant’s Ethics’ shall be applied.

---

\(^3\) Anti-Corruption and Civil Rights Commission
(Creation of judgment criterion for employment) Regardless of position and duty, and type of employment contract, if the former official works for business, advice, counseling at the employment restriction institutions, it shall be considered an employment.

(Creation of fines) Fines shall be imposed on the persons who refuse to submit the relevant inspection documents, who submit false document, and who do not follow the request for the measure of canceling the employment.

4. The trend of Korean public organizations’ integrity

Korea has consistently implemented the anti-corruption policies since 2000s. So far, many anti-corruption laws and regulations have been produced, and various mechanisms to combat corruption have been established.

Then, can we say that the corruption in Korean officialdom has been really reduced to the remarkable level? I cannot say “yes”. The result was not so much accomplishment as we had expected. It is why that while the new anti-corruption measures having been carried out, another types of corrupt practices occurred as a new irregularity, and the punishment cases have increased. In particular, as far as the corruption case is concerned, only public officials were punished before. But nowadays, the corruption instigating citizen and civic society as well as the concerned public officials are duly punished at the same time. Such a new trend of punishment has brought a change of perception of corruption. Thus the corruption perception of public institutions as well as public officials has become diversified and more sensitive.

Even though the evaluation index for the integrity of civil servants and public institutions have been more strengthened, the result of annual integrity survey of public institutions does not seem to be improved up to satisfactory level. It is why that the citizens’ satisfaction degree for the officials of public institutions went up so higher than ever. Nevertheless, it never means that the corruption in public institutions and public officials still prevail in officialdom and society as ever. Korea is the most advanced information-oriented society in the world. If even a small corruption is reported by the media, many people are apt to understand that all public society is still polluted with corruption. Citizens’ distrust of public organizations and officialdom may become more deepened owing to the Medias’ coverage competition.

4-1 The Trend of Public Organization Integrity
A. The level of the public organization integrity\textsuperscript{4} shows the declining trend which measures official’s corruption by way of surveying the people’s experience and perception of requesting for money and valuables, and entertainment, etc.

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{chart.png}
\caption{Chart showing the trend of public organization integrity over the years.}
\end{figure}

\textit{* In 2008 and 2012, because of changing the analyzing model, the time series are broken with the previous year.}

B. According to the result of 2014 integrity assessments, the corruption experience such as providing money and illegal and unfair execution of budget were exacerbated generally.

\textbullet{} Evaluation result of corruption experience
\textbullet{} Civil petitioners’ offering rate of the bribes, entertainment, special convenience (0.7\% → 1.7\%),
\textbullet{} Illegal and unfair budget execution (6.2\% → 7.7\%),
\textbullet{} unreasonable business orders by senior officials or higher authority (6.6\% → 6.8\%)

C. All integrity assessment results of each sector including the external integrity, internal integrity, policy-clients’ review have got worsen a little bit.

\textsuperscript{4} This integrity of public organizations was assessed by ‘Anti-Corruption and Civil Rights Commission’.
4-2. Peoples’ Perception and Experience of Corruption - Survey Results
(The Survey 2014 of the Perception of Corruption)

- (The Corruption level of Officialdom) As for the corruption of officialdom, the perception of all respondents including people, businessmen, foreigners and government officials, etc. was worsening.

- In particular, while the 69.4% of general public consider that public society is corruptive, and only 5.3% of officials recognizes that the public society is corruptive.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>&lt;Rate of officials’ corruption&gt;</th>
<th>&lt; Rate of public organizations’ corruption&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image" alt="Graph of officials' corruption rates" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Graph of public organizations' corruption rates" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4-3 Korean Integrity Assessment of the International Community
According to the data of the Transparency International (TI, Transparency International) 2014, the CPI\(^5\) of Korea was recorded 55 points (100 in total), ranking the 43\(^{rd}\) among 175 countries.

By comparison with 2013 results, the Korean integrity rank was slightly raised, but the integrity level is still low comparing to the Korean economic situation (the 46th among 177 countries in 2013).

< The CPI trends of Korea >

- Comparing to the situation of OECD member countries, the Korean integrity ranks 27\(^{th}\) among 34 countries, same as the previous year’s ranking. But the score (55 points) nosedived by 14.2 points than the OECD counties’ average point (69.2 points).

< CPI of OECD Countries >

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>year</th>
<th>Denmark</th>
<th>New Zealand</th>
<th>Finland</th>
<th>U.K</th>
<th>USA</th>
<th>France</th>
<th>Poland</th>
<th>Spain</th>
<th>Korea</th>
<th>Italy</th>
<th>Greece</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>1(^{st}) (92 Points)</td>
<td>2 (91)</td>
<td>3 (89)</td>
<td>13 (78)</td>
<td>16 (74)</td>
<td>20 (69)</td>
<td>23 (61)</td>
<td>24 (60)</td>
<td>27 (55)</td>
<td>32 (43)</td>
<td>32 (43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>1(^{st}) (91points)</td>
<td>1 (91)</td>
<td>3 (89)</td>
<td>13 (76)</td>
<td>16 (73)</td>
<td>18 (71)</td>
<td>24 (60)</td>
<td>25 (59)</td>
<td>27 (55)</td>
<td>32 (43)</td>
<td>33 (40)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^5\) CPI : Corruption Perception Index
- According to the ‘national competitiveness index’ 2014 of the World Economic Forum (WEF), Korea ranked 26th falling down by 1 place comparing to the previous year (25th). The 'transparency of government policies' related to the Corruption Perception Index ranked 133rd, Misuse of public funds 67th, the Unofficial and additional cost and bribery 52nd, all of which show that Korea is still on alert situation.

< WEF National Competitiveness Index >

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>'10</th>
<th>'11</th>
<th>'12</th>
<th>'13</th>
<th>'14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rank of national competitiveness index</td>
<td>22/139</td>
<td>24/142</td>
<td>19/144</td>
<td>25/148</td>
<td>26/144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Transparency of government policies</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Misuse of public funds</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Unofficial and additional cost &amp; bribery</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Conclusion

Han Fei Tzu⁶, Chinese philosopher, said, "A tree falls down because insect nibbled it’, and “the fence falls down because there must be a crack in it.” Gladstone, the former British Prime Minister, said, "the most obvious short-cut leading the nation and individual to downfall must be a corruption." There is a Korean proverb that "the corrupt official is more fearful than tiger."

Thus the corruption of officialdom and the derailment from the rule of law are the common challenges to be solved to all countries whether they are developed or developing countries. United States, United Kingdom, France, and Japan have also corruption problem in officialdom. Whether they are irregularity or customary practices or not, they may hinder the nation’s development and cause much inconveniences and disadvantages to the citizens. Only the developed countries

---

⁶ Han Fei Tzu, (? – 233 B.C.), one of representative philosophers in ancient Chinese history
are not seriously affected by the corruption. However the underdeveloped countries have been damaged more seriously by the political leaders’ embezzlement as well as corruption of officials. It is a matter of degree. In the meantime, we cannot overlook cultural differences for corruption. For example, the lobby in America may be legitimate, but in Korea, it will be a serious irregularity.

In developing countries, the legitimacy of the administration for anti-corruption is generally emphasized, but in the developed countries, they emphasize the achievement, effectiveness and efficiency in public execution in addition to legality as the criterion of anti-corruption and public officials’ ethics. Therefore, it must be an endless task to expel the corruption and irregularities in officialdom and civil society, because the corruption is deep-rooted into each unique culture. In order to uproot the social evil without any trial and error, the cultural diversification should be previously weighed.

According to the UNDP document, corruption and expedient of political leaders and senior officials in Africa has become a public enemy to undermine the national economic social development. Korea may be in a same situation. Even though the politician used to voice up the clean government, the top priority to combat corruption is how to purify the political world. In fact, they may be well aware that the targets to be cleaned up are actually themselves. Therefore, the government facilitates many anti-corruption and integrity policies to strengthen the officials’ sound spirit of serving people including lawmakers and local government councilors. All media also raise their voices to request the political leaders and senior officials to put into action the spirit of 'noblesse oblige'.

In this context, African countries had better find more innovative, but feasible anticorruption policy rather than any revolutionary ideas. On the other hand, political leaders and senior officials should take the lead in introducing the transparency and anti-corruption measures. I really hope that my introduction of Korean practice for anti-corruption measures or systems shall contribute to create integrity and clean public officialdom and to accelerate the economic development. End