

**Information Provision for the fourteenth session of the Working Group
on Prevention of Corruption
-Anti-Corruption and Civil Rights Commission(ACRC),
Republic of Korea(RoK)-**

Information in relation to good practices, lessons learned and challenges in periodically evaluating the efficiency and the effectiveness of anti-corruption measures and policies (resolution 9/6 of the Conference of the State Parties to the United Nations Convention against Corruption)

The ACRC has been implementing the Anti-Corruption Initiative Assessment in the public sector by evaluating and supporting anti-corruption efforts of public institutions (in accordance with Article 12.6 and Article 27-2 of the ACRC act). Also, the ACRC recommends improvement of laws and regulations using institutional improvement and Corruption Risk Assessment.

Since 2002, along with the Anti-Corruption Initiative Assessment, the ACRC has conducted the Integrity Assessment on public institutions to assess public institutions' integrity level. The Integrity Assessment measures the integrity level of public agencies based on a survey of ordinary citizens who had experience of the agencies' work and employees of public institutions. While the Anti-corruption Initiative Assessment measures public institutions' voluntary anti-corruption efforts and performance, such as integrity education and the implementation of anti-corruption measures, the Integrity Assessment measures overall integrity level which reflects effects of their anti-corruption efforts in the perception and experience of corruption.

The ACRC integrated the two assessments that had been conducted for the past 20 years into the **Comprehensive Integrity Assessment** that has been carried out since 2022. Accordingly, the existing survey on the perception and experience of corruption is reflected as **integrity perception**, and the assessment of anti-corruption performance and efforts is reflected as **integrity effort** in the Comprehensive Integrity Assessment.

< Comprehensive Integrity Assessment System (as of 2022) >

| | |
|--|---|
| Integrity Perception (60%) | √ Measuring perception and experience involving complainants and internal members regarding external duties and internal operation of the organization (survey) |
| Integrity effort (40%) | √ Assessing anti-corruption performance and efforts over the year based on the indicators developed in advance (performance evaluation) |
| (Deduction) Integrity realities (10%+α) | √ Reflecting the current status of corruption, such as disciplinary measures against corrupt behaviors and the results of audit, prosecution, and trial, as point deduction |

In the Comprehensive Integrity Assessment, integrity perception assessment is reflected as scores calculated according to the result of an extensive survey through a survey agency involving external complainants and internal members of the organization included in the list of people submitted by the assessed institutions. In 2022, about 220,000 people participated in the survey.

Integrity effort assessment is reflected in the Comprehensive Integrity Assessment as scores calculated by confirming the performance through written evaluation and on-site inspection conducted by external and internal expert groups concerning the performance results submitted by public institutions of each level regarding each anti-corruption indicator developed at the beginning of the year.

The result of the assessment is announced as grades by types of institution, and integrity perception and integrity effort by institutions are published as grades as well as the Comprehensive Integrity Assessment.

As of 2022, a total of 569 institutions of 15 types of institutions were subject to the Comprehensive Integrity Assessment.

<Number of Agencies subject to the 2022 Comprehensive Integrity Assessment >

| Total | Central Administrative | | Local Government | | | Office of Education | Public Service related agency | | | | | Government established university | Public Medical Institution | Metropolitan and provincial police agency (trial operation) | |
|------------|------------------------|----|------------------|-----------|-------------|---------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|---|---------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------|---|----------------|
| | I | II | Metropolitan | Municipal | | | I (State companies) | II (General quasi-governmental) | III (Small and medium sized quasi-governmental) | IV (Priority) | V (Local public corporation) | | | | |
| | | | | I (city) | II (county) | | | | | | | | | | III (district) |
| 569 | 25 | 21 | 17 | 75 | 82 | 69 | 17 | 35 | 57 | 36 | 30 | 37 | 33 | 17 | 18 |

The ACRC carries out the Public Institution Comprehensive Integrity Assessment every year pursuant to relevant law. (The Anti-Corruption Act art.12 subpara. 6 and art.27-2)

The Corruption Risk Assessment (CRA) analyzes and assesses corruption-causing factors inherent in laws and regulations. Based on the assessment results, improvement measures are recommended to the authority governing the assessed law, thereby preventing acts of corruption in the first place. The CRA is conducted under Articles 12.12 and 28 of the ACRC Act. CRA is conducted on (a) new and amendment bills by the ACRC to prevent corruption causing factors during the legislation stage; (b) current laws by the ACRC to analyze, review and remove corruption causing factors in them; (c) internal rules and regulations by each organization to deter corruption-causing factors; and (d) by-laws of public service-related organizations. The assessment was adopted under the amendment of the ACRC Act (December 29, 2005).

As for institutional improvement, in accordance with Articles 12, 27, and 29 of the ACRC Act, the ACRC discovers unreasonable laws, regulations, and practices that cause corruption (as described below), and conducts fact-finding surveys. The ACRC then issues recommendation measures to relevant agencies.

As for the procedure of institutional improvement, the ACRC analyzes and reviews corruption/public interest violation reports, civil complaints filed on e-People, audit documents, and media reports to identify tasks for improvement. Based on the documents submitted by the relevant authorities, fact-finding surveys, and expert advice and public opinions, the ACRC draws up an improvement measure which is issued to the related agency after consultation with it. The content of the improvement measure is made public through press releases and so on.

The ACRC conducts follow-up monitoring on the implementation of the improvement measures issued. The ACRC checks and reviews implementation reports submitted by the relevant authorities twice a year. Implementation of the improvement measures is reflected in the result of the Anti-corruption Initiative Assessment. To help agencies facing difficulties in implementing a recommendation, the ACRC holds an implementation strategy meeting and provides consultancy to the agency to promote the implementation and share best practices.