

2023

Summary of Research Papers 22



A study on Gender-mainstreaming Strategy in Korea: Towards an Integrated Approach

Tack-Meon Lee
Dool-Soon Kim
Yoo-Jin Choi
Young-Ju Cho
Do-Yeon Kwon
Jae-Won Lee
Hyeon-Suk Lyu



Korean Women's Development Institute

**A study on Gender-mainstreaming
Strategy in Korea: Towards an
Integrated Apporach**

©2023

Korean Women's Development Institute
225 Jinheung-ro Eunpyeong-gu
Seoul, 03367, Republic of Korea
www.kwdi.re.kr

Contents

I . Introduction	1
1. Research Background and Purpose	1
2. Research Contents and Methods	5
II . Consideration of Policy Evaluation Systems Based on Gender Perspectives	7
1. Cross-cutting Strategic Plans: A Comparison between the Strategic Plan for Gender Equality and Others	7
2. The Gender Impact Assessment System, the Gender Responsive-budgeting System, and Gender-disaggregated Statistics	8
III . The Government Performance Evaluation System and the Financial Performance Goal Management System	9
IV . Program Implementation and the Evaluation Systems of Local Governments	11
V . An Exploration of Ways for the Integration of Systems	13
VI . Conclusions	24
References	29

A study on Gender-mainstreaming Strategy in Korea: Towards an Integrated Approach

Tack-Meon Lee

Dool-Soon Kim

Yoo-Jin Choi

Young-Ju Cho

Do-Yeon Kwon

Jae-Won Lee

Hyeon-Suk Lyu

I . Introduction

1. Research Background and Purpose

- In the process of developing gender mainstreaming strategies, institutional systems on key implementation tools for gender mainstreaming (gender-responsive budgeting, gender impact assessment, gender-disaggregated statistics)¹⁾ have been designed and improved separately, leading to a relative lack of research encompassing the three systems from an integrated perspective.
- Institutional systems on gender-responsive budgeting and gender impact assessment have been developed based on separate laws and

¹⁾ Gender-mainstreaming strategies (Gender-responsive Budgeting, Gender Impact Assessment, Gender-disaggregated Statistics)

implementation systems as representative tools for gender mainstreaming. However, it has been continuously argued that integration and synergy between these tools need to be strengthened for effective gender mainstreaming. Meanwhile, it can be seen that the institutional systems on gender-responsive budgeting and gender impact assessment are in line with some other policy/program assessment systems (the Ministry of Economy and Finance's financial performance goal management system, the Ministry of the Interior and Safety's government performance evaluation system, the pan-governmental master plan evaluation systems of different ministries, etc.) to a certain degree, because they analyze and evaluate financial programs from the perspective of gender equality and attempt to reflect the results in the implementation of programs, performance management, and budget allocation, or utilize them in changing policies or institutional systems. Therefore, for the smooth operation of these two systems, it is necessary to carefully examine their compatibility with these performance management/evaluation systems in general.

- In addition, it is suggested that, in the process of these tools being adopted full-scale by central administrative agencies and local governments, the systems should be operated based on the role allocation between the central and local governments and their respective program implementation systems, and that the gender mainstreaming effect should be maximized through the operation of the systems in consideration of effective central-local integration in terms of programs and financial arrangements.

- For gender-disaggregated statistics to be actively used in evidence-based policymaking in the processes of gender-responsive budgeting and gender impact assessment, and for substantive, full-scale gender mainstreaming where the implementation of programs, budgeting, and system improvements are made continuously through the execution of gender-responsive budgeting and gender impact assessment by central ministries and local governments, a study should be conducted on the necessary conditions for the simultaneous realization of integration within the individual institutional systems related to gender mainstreaming, integration between institutional arrangements for gender mainstreaming and those for the evaluation of other policies, and inter-governmental integrations between the central and local governments.
- In this regard, the research on gender mainstreaming from an integrated perspective attempted here is centered on the simultaneous consideration of the integration among the three key implementation tools for gender mainstreaming, the integration among the implementation tools for gender mainstreaming and other governmental systems for policy evaluation (the Ministry of Economy and Finance's financial performance goal management system, the Office for Government Policy Coordination's government performance evaluation system, and the whole-of-government policy coordination systems including the strategic plan evaluation schemes of different ministries), and the integration among different levels of governments (central, state and local governments).

-
- The study is planned as a three-year project, through which the following research goals are to be achieved.:
 - In the first year, a theoretical model shall be developed on the three-level integration mentioned above, which is necessary for the integrated operation of the institutional systems for gender mainstreaming.
 - In the second year, the national basic livelihood security system, one of the strategic goals of the Ministry of Health and Welfare, shall be set as a specific policy area for application of the theoretical model, to identify gender equality issues in the systems and programs related to the national basic livelihood security system and seek ways for the application of the integrated gender mainstreaming approach, to establish concrete action plans for the effective and efficient application and realization of integrated gender mainstreaming in relation to the national basic livelihood security system, and to propose exemplary procedures and processes for the actual application of the theoretical integration model developed in the first year to the national basic livelihood security system. Ultimately, it is intended to demonstrate that the integrated gender mainstreaming model can be used successfully in the pan-governmental gender equality performance management by showing how integrated gender mainstreaming, where the three-level integration has been accomplished, can be applied to the Ministry of Health and Welfare's management of its strategic goals.

2. Research Contents and Methods

☐ Research Contents

- In the first year of the project, the possibility for integration of the following three levels will be explored by examining the tools for gender mainstreaming and relevant institutional systems from an integrated perspective:
 - ① Suggesting the way for the internal integration of gender mainstreaming in the discussion for ‘integration within institutional systems.’
 - ② Suggesting the way for the integration of gender mainstreaming and other governmental policy assessment systems in the discussion for ‘integration between institutional systems.’
 - ③ Figuring out the current status of role allocation among the central government, metropolitan governments, and local governments in implementing the three key tools for gender mainstreaming; identifying problems including overlapping and contradiction; and suggesting effective and efficient ways for cooperation in the discussion for ‘inter-governmental integration.’

☐ Research Methods

- Literature review.
- Consultation meetings with experts and seminars (debates) on the integration of institutional systems on gender mainstreaming.
- Surveys taken by relevant individuals and public officials to examine the status of integration between different levels:

- ① Questionnaire surveys taken by public officers dealing with gender impact assessment and gender-responsive budgeting as well as focus group interviews with researchers at support centers (gender-responsive budgeting centers, etc.) to understand the status of integration within institutional systems;
 - ② Focus group interviews with experts in research (assessment) centers related to the Korea Institute of Public Finance and the Korea Institute of Public Administration as well as questionnaire surveys taken by officers handling performance assessment and government performance evaluation in central and local governments to understand the status of integration between institutional systems;
 - ③ Questionnaire surveys taken by planning and budget officers and those handling gender impact assessment and gender-responsive budgeting in metropolitan and primary local governments to understand the status of inter-governmental integration. Among these surveys and interviews, the questionnaire surveys shall be conducted in an integrated way.
- Establishing expert task force groups, each consisting of five or fewer persons, to develop possible ways for the integration of the three levels.
 - Organizing a symposium to report the study results and share relevant information.

II . Consideration of Policy Evaluation Systems Based on Gender Perspectives

1. Cross-cutting Strategic Plans: A Comparison between the Strategic Plan for Gender Equality and Others

- The examination of the establishment and implementation of the inspection systems for leading inter-ministrial strategic plans, such as the basic plan for gender equality policies and its implementation plans, the social security master plan and its implementation plans, the master plan for the development of vocational education and training and its implementation plans, and the master plan for low fertility and aging society and its implementation plans, found that the selection of detailed tasks for the implementation of the master plan for gender equality is too focused on tasks of minor importance and the post-implementation evaluation system has less binding force than those of other pan-governmental master plans.
- It is clear that the master plan for gender equality does not have a sufficient basis, in terms of laws or contents, for the implementation and performance assessment of the master plan to enable its function as an effective and binding mid- to long-term strategic plan. Comparison with similar plans, including the social security master plan, the master plan for low fertility and aging society, and the master plan for the development of vocational education and training, revealed a lack of systematic ways for performance evaluation, the selection of detailed tasks too minor to assess the outcomes of the implementation of the master plan or to link the assessment results with the assessment of the major

tasks of the plan, and a failure to develop relevant performance indices properly.

2. The Gender Impact Assessment System, the Gender Responsive-budgeting System, and Gender-disaggregated Statistics

- Gender impact assessment and gender-responsive budgeting for different programs tend to be concentrated on individualized, microscopic program assessment without a strategic goal system. The gender-responsive budgeting system based on the National Finance Act is enforced by a different ministry from the one that operates gender impact assessment, which is also based on another law. Thus, there is a lack of effective linkage, resulting in a merely mechanical linkage between the two systems.
- For the two systems to be seamlessly linked, the mid- to long-term strategic goals for gender equality described in the master plan for gender equality should be appropriately supported by the government's activities on the level of individual programs (or on the level of policy tasks) and institutionalized in a complementary way to enable the assessment of the degree of achievement of the plan.
- However, the two institutional systems are linked only in the way they involve similar or identical analysis on similar or identical programs, writing documents in similar formats, and submitting them to different central administrative agencies (the Ministry of Gender Equality and Family, the Ministry of Economy and Finance).

- To overcome this problem, the two institutional systems need to be reformed so that they can play complementary roles for each other, serving the same purpose while targeting different targets and using different management methods.

III. The Government Performance Evaluation System and the Financial Performance Goal Management System

- Analysis of the outlines, implementation systems, status of operations, etc., of the government performance evaluation system of the Office for Government Policy Coordination and the financial performance goal management system of the Ministry of Economy and Finance.
- The Office for Government Policy Coordination's government performance evaluation system consists of mechanisms for performance evaluation by a central administrative agency of other central administrative agencies such as specific evaluations, self-evaluations, and individual evaluations; however, it was found that even these subsystems for evaluation do not reflect or incorporate evaluation or performance management from the perspective of gender equality. The individual evaluation system does not include the performance evaluation or gender impact assessment of the individual programs of the Ministry of Gender Equality and Family, although it does include the performance evaluation of the Ministry of Employment and Labor's financial support program for job creation and the Ministry of Health and

Welfare's social security master plan. Even if some indices proposed by the Ministry of Gender Equality and Family are included in the central administrative agencies' joint evaluation of the implementation of administrative affairs delegated by the nation to local governments, this can hardly be seen as an evaluation of overall tasks related to gender equality in local governments.

- Also, the Ministry of Economy and Finance's financial performance evaluation system and gender-responsive budgeting system are strictly separated from each other. Information from the gender-budgeting document or balance sheet is not reflected in the performance plan or performance report of the former system, even though the same unit program is included in the targets of gender-responsive budgeting, and vice versa.
- According to the amended National Finance Act, the targets of evaluation by other central administrative agencies and the Ministry of Economy and Finance's financial performance program should overlap as little as possible (Paragraph 2 of Article 85-8 of the National Finance Act), and the writing format of performance plans should be aimed at overall program-level performance management (avoiding unit program-level performance management); as a result, this separation is likely to be strengthened in the future.
- Likewise, evaluation and performance management from a gender equality perspective being carried out separately to the performance management systems of the two ministries responsible for evaluation and performance management fails to appeal to evaluation officers due to the lack of binding force and incentives, and, therefore, can hardly benefit from evaluation. In the case of

the evaluation systems of the Office for Government Policy Coordination and the Ministry of Economy and Finance, goal-oriented performance management is made possible through the establishment of the strategic goal system incorporating strategic goals and individual performance goals and the designation of programs or policy tasks aimed at achieving the goals as management targets. However, concerning gender impact assessment on different programs and gender-responsive budgeting, there is a lack of strategic goal systems (or imposition after implementation), making them difficult to be effectively used as tools for gender equality performance management.

IV. Program Implementation and the Evaluation Systems of Local Governments

- Analysis of the budgeting processes and procedures of local governments, contents and characteristics of local financial management systems, types and management of financial programs, key financial program evaluation systems, relationships between central and local social welfare finances, etc.
- A concrete examination of the budgeting and financial management processes of local governments and an exploration of the possibility of incorporating gender-responsive budgeting and gender mainstreaming measures in these processes.
- Notably, the programs of local governments are divided into discretionary programs and government subsidy programs; and

social welfare programs closely related to gender equality (and thus taking up the majority of the targets of gender impact assessment and gender-responsive budgeting) are mainly planned by central administrative agencies and then delegated to local governments for implementation, being financed by subsidies from central administrative agencies and matching by local governments. Therefore, local governments are free to demand budgets based on estimations of what is required, but there are limitations on changing the scope of beneficiaries, program goals, implementation methods, etc., and making improvements.

- In the case of government subsidy programs, various evaluations are made by different central administrative agencies, including the Ministry of Economy and Finance's evaluation for the retention of government subsidy programs, the Ministry of the Interior and Safety's joint evaluation of local governments, and individual evaluations by different central agencies; this increases the burden of program divisions in among primary local governments, where subsidy programs from multiple agencies are concentrated, in dealing with several different evaluations. Meanwhile, identical evaluation items and criteria are applied to gender impact assessment and gender-responsive budgeting regardless of government subsidy programs and local governments' discretionary programs, leading local governments to not only suffer from heavy workloads but also take responsibility for program improvements and performance growth in areas with very limited room for discretion or autonomy.

V. An Exploration of Ways for the Integration of Systems

- ☐ Concerning the number of fragmented measures aimed at solving these problems, questionnaire surveys and in-depth interviews were conducted with public officers actually handling relevant tasks and professional researchers in gender mainstreaming systems, government performance evaluations, and financial program evaluations to gather their opinions.
- ☐ The results of the questionnaire survey showed that more than 60% of respondents felt that “The analysis of the target program is mechanical and superficial,” “There is a lack of proper connection and synergy between gender-responsive budgeting and gender impact evaluation,” and “Performance management is concentrated only on individual target programs and fails to contribute to achieving gender equality goals on the ministerial (local government) level,” implying a general consensus among the respondents that these are the biggest problems with the gender impact assessment and gender-responsive budgeting systems.
- ☐ Regarding the question of whether it is necessary to transfer “the coordination work on gender impact assessment carried out by the Ministry of Gender Equality and Family according to the current laws and regulations on gender impact assessment” to another ministry or to leave it as it is, the answer that the largest number of respondents (41.7%) chose was to “leave it to the responsibility of the Ministry of Gender Equality and Family as in the present,” followed by the answer to “transfer to a central administrative

agency that deals with key government projects, policy evaluation, and policy coordination (the Office for Government Policy Coordination, the Ministry of Economy and Finance, the Ministry of the Interior and Safety, etc.) (39.7%), showing a very narrow margin between the two responses.

- Also, concerning the statement “As both the gender impact assessment system and the gender-responsive budgeting system are aimed at evaluating government projects and providing feedback on the results from a gender equality perspective, it is desirable to implement them in seamless connection with other government program evaluation systems (the Ministry of Economy and Finance’s financial program evaluation system or the Office for Government Policy Coordination’s government performance evaluation system),” 74.8% of the respondents agreed. On the question on the specific means for ‘seamless connection,’ the largest number of respondents (33.8%) answered that “operation of the systems within the Ministry of Economy and Finance’s financial program evaluation system by the financial program evaluation team” was desirable, followed by those who chose “operation by a central administrative agency other than the Ministry of Economy and Finance (e.g. the Ministry of Gender Equality and Family) in following similar procedures to its financial program evaluation system” (25.8%), and “operation by an organization that deals with government performance evaluation within the Office for Government Policy Coordination’s government performance evaluation system” (24.5%).
- Regarding the statement “The gender-responsive budgeting system

and the gender impact assessment system should be reformed in a way that establishes the strategic goals of individual ministries (local governments) related to gender equality, with the strategic goals and management tasks being autonomously chosen and performance management being made by concerned ministries (local governments),” 69.5% of all respondents agreed (‘tend to agree’ + ‘entirely agree’).

- Concerning the question on the “possibility of establishing strategic goals or performance goals related to gender equality on the whole organizational level,” the largest number of respondents (66.9%) answered that it would be “possible through external consulting and advice, although difficult solely based on the organization’s own capability,” followed by “more or less possible based on the organization’s own capability” (15.9%), and “fully possible based on the organization’s own capability” (9.3%).
- The results of in-depth interviews with experts showed that they were mostly negative about the introduction of performance management from a gender equality perspective as part of a specific evaluation within the Office for Government Policy Coordination’s government performance evaluation system. The reasons were that the operation method of the specific evaluation was inappropriate for evaluating various programs (key policies) of ministries by applying a gender equality perspective, and that different evaluation indices were focused on specific issues unlike the comprehensive theme of gender equality, even when the perspective is applied not to key policies but to different areas including government innovation and active administration.

- There were positive responses to the suggestion of building a system for the Ministry of Gender Equality and Family to assess the degree of effort made for gender equality by other central administrative agencies within the government performance evaluation system, along with some concerns and recommendations for concrete implementation measures. Notably, there was an individual researcher's opinion that the frequent implementation of individual evaluations should not be considered negatively based on the imperativeness of integrated evaluation and it is desirable to maintain individual evaluations that are necessary. More specifically, the researcher suggested that with improvements in the systems related to individual evaluation ongoing, the evaluation of central administrative agencies and local governments from a gender equality perspective may be performed in the format of individual evaluations based on consent between the Ministry of Gender Equality and Family and the Office for Government Policy Coordination.
- To the question addressing the idea of incorporating the systems in the Ministry of Economy and Finance's financial performance goal evaluation system or financial program evaluation system, negative responses indicated that it was inappropriate for the Ministry of Economy and Finance to implement an evaluation of financial programs that had not been planned for gender equality programs but for other purposes from a gender equality perspective while there exists the Ministry of Gender Equality and Family, whose roles include the implementation of evaluations from gender equality perspectives.

- Opinions on revising the performance management strategic plan and its implementation plan, which are key documents in the government performance evaluation system, from a gender equality perspective varied. Some argued for using them as effective tools for performance management based on the gender equality perspective, instead of using the gender impact assessment report and gender-responsive budgeting document as demanded by the gender-responsive budgeting system. However, most of the researchers in this field responded that it would be more effective to strengthen the existing basic plan for gender equality policies and its implementation plan and reinforce the parts on evaluation and performance management, rather than requiring additional performance management reports.
- Meanwhile, there was a suggestion to strengthen the evaluation and performance management of the master plan for gender equality and its implementation plan by linking them to individual evaluations in the government performance evaluation system. The suggestion also included preconditions for turning the post-implementation evaluation of the master plan for gender equality into an individual evaluation.
- Many researchers reacted negatively to the idea of building a separate gender equality performance management system (including a performance management strategic plan from a gender equality perspective, implementation plan, post-implementation evaluation, and feedback) benchmarking the self-evaluation system under the government performance evaluation system for the reason of impracticality. Instead, there was an opinion that it would

be desirable to incorporate evaluation elements based on gender equality perspectives within the self-evaluation system of the existing government performance evaluation system — including including the evaluation of environments related to gender equality in the strategic plan, adding strategic goals related to improvements in gender equality as well as relevant performance goals and management tasks — to supplement the performance management strategic plan and its implementation plan.

- Concerning the question of letting central administrative agencies or metropolitan governments carry out performance evaluations of central government subsidy programs and local government subsidy programs — where local governments have little discretion — regarding regarding gender impact assessment or gender-responsive budgeting, and letting local governments establish their own gender equality performance management systems only for discretionary programs, the majority of local government officers and experts responded positively. It was also opined that it is necessary to take into account that certain primary local governments with limited fiscal autonomy have few discretionary programs.
- Based on these quantitative and qualitative survey results, four scenarios for the reform of the relevant systems were proposed to solve the issues related to the integration of the three levels identified through the literature review.
- The first scenario is to modify the implementation and examination systems for the basic plan for gender equality policies and strengthen post-implementation evaluation and performance

management, which are currently insufficient. First, evaluation and performance management procedures similar to those of other master plans are to be established through the amendment of the Framework Act on Gender Equality and its enforcement decree, and when developing the master plan for gender equality, strategic goals for the plan period as well as performance indices are to be prepared based on in-depth analyses in key fields. According to this master plan, individual ministries are to establish yearly implementation plans and select management tasks (detailed tasks) for the supervision and follow-up of performances each year. Depending on the characteristics of management tasks, automatic selection will be made for programs targeted for gender impact analysis or gender-responsive budgeting for the management and reporting of results. Based on the amended Framework Act on Gender Equality and the gender impact assessment reports or gender-responsive budgeting documents, individual ministries will self-evaluate whether performance goals and high-level goals have been achieved and report the results to the Gender Equality Committee. Individual ministries are to be notified of recommended improvements and what should be reflected in establishing the implementation plan for the following year. The same principles are to be applied to local governments. The evaluation of the implementation plan for the master plan for gender quality and performance management is to be strengthened through the amendment of the Framework Ordinance on Gender Equality, and metropolitan governments are to develop yearly implementation plans and select management tasks according to the master plan for gender equality that has been established. Primary

local governments shall not develop their own implementation plans, but select management tasks among their own programs based on the yearly implementation plans of metropolitan local governments. Concerned local governments are to select management tasks among their own discretionary programs, whereas government subsidy programs or programs for mandatory spending are to be designated as management tasks and managed by central administrative agencies, with local governments being allowed to request relevant data and performance data if necessary.

- The second scenario is to link the evaluation of the implementation of the master plan for gender equality to the individual evaluation within the Office for Government Policy Coordination's government performance evaluation system, after the implementation system of the master plan for gender equality is reinforced according to the first scenario, thereby increasing the binding force of evaluations and the effectiveness of performance management. To evaluate the implementation results of the master plan for gender equality as an individual evaluation, the evaluation of the master plan for gender equality and performance management should be stabilized and firmly established systematically according to the first scenario. After that, the Ministry of Gender Equality and Family is to apply for individual evaluations to the Government Performance Evaluation Committee, satisfying all the requirements. The evaluation plan is to be notified to the target organization before the evaluation is performed. When the evaluation process is completed, the results are to be sent to the Government Performance Evaluation Committee, which is to continuously examine, manage, and evaluate whether individual

evaluations are aligned with their original purpose and being conducted efficiently. The Ministry of Gender Equality and Family is to prepare ways for policy improvements and other necessary measures, notify organizations targeted for evaluation, and provide feedbacks including offering incentives. As individual evaluations can be applied to not only central administrative agencies and their affiliates but also local governments, they can also be utilized in the evaluation of local governments' performances within the implementation plan for the master plan for gender equality. However, individual evaluations led by central administrative agencies can easily be focused on the central government's programs including government subsidy programs; therefore, it is necessary to encourage autonomous gender equality performance management by local governments. Consideration can be made for local governments to perform a self-evaluation along with an individual evaluation.

- The third scenario is to transfer evaluation and performance management related to gender equality from the Ministry of Gender Equality and Family, which plans and coordinates gender equality policy, to the individual evaluation system within the government performance evaluation system of the Office for Government Policy, which deals with pan-governmental policy evaluation and performance management. This scenario most closely aligns with the purpose of the Framework Act on Public Service Evaluation, which aims to integrate the evaluation of central administrative agencies and local governments and avoid the frequent implementation of individual evaluations. The Office for Government Policy Coordination and the Government Performance

Evaluation Committee are to develop the guidelines for establishing the performance management strategic plan and its implementation plan with the support of the Ministry of Gender Equality and Family, etc., by incorporating guidelines establishing the strategic goal system from a gender equality perspective. As individual central administrative agencies establish performance management strategic plans based on the guidelines, they are to include goals related to gender equality within their goal systems. They are also to establish yearly implementation plans and select management tasks based on these strategic plans. Concerning the management tasks serving the strategic goals related to gender equality, their implementation and performances are to be aggregated separately (in the case of general financial programs and information programs) through the Ministry of Economy and Finances's gender-responsive budgeting and (in the case of other policy tasks) gender impact assessment for programs, and relevant ministries are to sum up the results to include them in a self-evaluation report and write a strategic performance analysis report that reflects a gender equality perspective based on which it is to be submitted to the Government Performance Evaluation Committee. After screening by the Government Performance Evaluation Committee and reporting at a cabinet meeting, the results are to be sent to relevant ministries, who then reflect them in implementation plans or budget plans for the following year, offering compensations and imposing penalties through the internal incentive mechanism.

- The fourth and last scenario is to set up a separate evaluation category differentiated from the existing categories of self-evaluation (key policies; finance programs including general

finance, national R&D, disaster safety, and balanced growth; and administrative management capacities including organization, personnel, and information) to implement policy and program evaluations from a gender equality perspective. Programs and policy tasks related to gender equality carried out on the pan-governmental level will be incorporated into a strategic plan system for self-evaluation, under the direction of the Ministry of Gender Equality and Family (or another central administrative agency that may replace its role). This means the addition of another central administrative agency responsible for the self-evaluation of gender equality in competent ministries stipulated in the enforcement ordinance (the Office for Government Policy Coordination, the Ministry of Economy and Finance, the Ministry of the Interior and Safety, the Ministry of Science and ICT, the Presidential Committee for Balanced National Development, the Ministry of Personnel Management, etc.) for different categories of self-evaluation. However, this scenario needs amendment of the Framework Act on Public Service Evaluation and its enforcement ordinance, along with extensive reorganization and reinforcement of the Ministry of Gender Equality and Family (or an agency with equal capacity) and the Office for Government Policy Coordination as well as the strong executive ability of competent ministries to include the right to plan budgets related to gender equality.

VI. Conclusions

- ☐ Summary of the research results and recommendations for revisions of laws and regulations and guidelines as well as reform of implementation systems according to different scenarios.
- ☐ To realize the first scenario, it is necessary, first of all, to realign the legal basis related to performance evaluations and management regarding the Framework Act on Gender Equality. In doing this, amending the provisions of the Framework Act so that they comply with the legal stipulations of similar master plans such as the social security master plan or the master plan for low fertility and aging society is recommended. Gender impact assessment and gender-responsive budgeting systems, which are seen as key elements of integration within institutional systems, require extensive changes. The amendment of the ordinance on gender impact assessment and the guidelines on the writing of gender-responsive budgeting is proposed for full-scale revision of the existing laws and guideline systems that are presently focused on the writing of two separate documents: the gender impact assessment report and the gender-responsive budgeting document.
- ☐ The following policy tasks are related to the second scenario. This scenario is a subsequent step after a full realization of the first scenario, linking the evaluation system for the master plan for gender equality to the individual evaluation in the Office for Government Policy Coordination's government performance evaluation system, and, therefore, requires the same policy tasks and the same amendment of legal stipulations as in the first scenario.

In addition, the requirements for the new designation of individual evaluations should be fulfilled at the time of establishing the guidelines for the performance evaluation of implementation plans, and, notably, management tasks should be consistently and repetitively evaluated without changes during the plan period. Also, the evaluation guidelines should include all the items required under the government performance evaluation system, such as the target period for evaluation, evaluation cycle and evaluation period, executing organization, evaluation procedures, evaluation index system, methods for performance examination and analysis, methods for ranking including scoring and grading, applicable legal stipulations, and methods for the announcement and utilization of evaluation results.

- ☐ Concerning the policy tasks for the third scenario, this scenario intends to incorporate elements related to gender equality into the existing self-evaluation system of the government performance evaluation system, and, therefore, does not require extensive changes such as the amendment of legal stipulations; however, it requires revision of the existing guidelines for developing performance management strategic plans, adding instructions on how to establish strategic plans and implementation plans from a gender equality perspective and how to establish strategic goals or performance goals from a gender equality perspective in line with the ministerial strategic goal system. For this, the changes in the gender impact assessment system and the gender-responsive budgeting system recommended in the first scenario are still required. Through the amendment of the Gender Impact Analysis and Assessment Act, the gender impact assessment (including specific evaluation) on the

strategic goals and performance goals of various ministries and local governments should be promoted; the legal basis should be established on the implementation of gender impact assessment and gender-responsive budgeting for management tasks related to gender equality according to the Office for Government Policy Coordination's performance management implementation plan and not for management tasks according to the implementation plan for the master plan for gender equality. This is to ensure simplified gender impact assessment and gender-responsive budgeting targeting individual management tasks. For this purpose, an amendment is needed so that the relevant provisions in the various laws and guidelines described in the first scenario may be linked to the performance strategic plan and its implementation plan, and not the implementation plan for the master plan for gender equality.

- ☐ Lastly, concerning the tasks related to the reform of the implementation system, the first scenario attempts to strengthen the master plan for gender equality, which is the key mission of the Women's Policy Division of the Ministry of Gender Equality and Family, and, therefore, it is necessary to reinforce the ministry's organization that deals with this function. There is a need to integrate the Women's Policy Division, which handles the master plan for gender equality in the ministry, with the Gender Impact Assessment Division, which deals with gender mainstreaming, to form a higher bureau-level organization.
- ☐ The second scenario, which is basically an extension of the first scenario, appears not to need a separate reform in the implementation system. However, a regular channel for close cooperation and

communication between the Ministry of Gender Equality and Family (or a relevant organization in the Ministry of Health and Welfare or the Secretariat of the Gender Equality Committee) and the Office for Government Policy Coordination's organization dealing with individual evaluations in the government performance evaluation system. In the meantime, central administrative agencies or local governments need to establish, review, and handle performance management far more strictly and systematically, and, therefore, there needs to be an organization that exclusively handles collaboration with the organization that works on gender mainstreaming at the Ministry of Gender Equality and Family (or an agency with equal functions) and leads close cooperation with internal program teams.

- ☐ The third scenario attempts to incorporate the planning and coordination functions related to gender equality policy into the government performance evaluation system of a central administrative agency (the Office for Government Policy Coordination) that deals with the evaluation of pan-governmental policies and programs and performance management as its key roles, as these functions are sure to weaken if they are transferred to other ministries. Thus, to realize this scenario, the Office for Government Policy Coordination — not the Ministry of Gender Equality and Family or other agencies with equal functions — should be reinforced in terms of its functions and organization to add evaluations from a gender equality perspective to the government performance evaluation. Consideration can be made to set up a secretariat at the Gender Equality Committee currently in the Office of the Prime Minister or to hire staff members that will work on

self-evaluations from a gender equality perspective at the existing government performance evaluation organization, and it will be necessary to set up a subcommittee for evaluation and performance management from a gender equality perspective in the Government Performance Evaluation Committee. In this case, revision of the implementation system necessary for collaboration with other central administrative agencies and local governments is highly important. Concerning central administrative agencies, the cooperative relationship between gender equality officers and innovative administration officers in charge of performance management strategies and implementation plans (or an officer with equal functions), or in the absence of gender equality officers, the reinforcement of personnel who will deal with the establishment and evaluation of plans based on gender equality perspectives among innovative administration officers is essential. In the case of local governments, cooperation between innovative administration officers and women's policy divisions is required.

Thematic classification of research performance catalogue: Gender impact assessment, gender responsive-budgeting, gender-disaggregated statistics

Keywords: Gender mainstreaming system, gender impact assessment, gender-responsive budgeting, gender-disaggregated statistics, integration

References

In Korean

Yeong-Cheol Kang and Jung-hun Pak (2009). 『A Study of Ways to Improve the Special Evaluation System』. Korea Institute of Public Administration.

Yeong-Seon Goh, Hui-Sook Yun, and Ju-Ho Lee (2004). 『Performance Management in the Public Sector』. Korea Development Institute.

All Relevant Ministries (2022a). 『2022 Implementation Plan for the Second Social Security Master Plan (2019~2023)』.

All Relevant Ministries (2022b). 『2022 Implementation Plan for the Second Basic Plan for Gender Equality Policies (2018~2022)』.

Government Policy Evaluation Office of the Office for Government Policy Coordination (2022). 『2022 Results of Performance Management on Central Administrative Agencies and the Establishment of Self-evaluation Plans』.

Office for Government Policy Coordination (2022). 『2022 Implementation Plan for Government Performance Evaluation』.

National Assembly Budget Office (2020). 『An Evaluation of the Performance Management System on Financial Activities: With a Focus on Central Administrative Agencies』.

Ministry of Economy and Finance (2022). 『2022~2026 Basic Plan for Performance Management on Finance Programs』.

Gyeong-Hui Kim, Yun-Yeong Namgung, Je-Yeon Dong, Gyeong-Mi Ju, and Eun-Gyeong Lee (2015). 『Improving the Effectiveness of Institutions for Gender Mainstreaming in Enhancing Gender Equality』.

Korean Women's Development Institute.

Chang-Do Kim (2016). Operation Status and Possible Improvements for the Government Performance Evaluation System. 「2016 Winter Collection of Papers Presented at the Academic Conference of the Korean Association for Policy Studies」. 665-691.

Hyo-Ju Kim, Su-Beom Pak, and Hui-Jeong Gwon (2015). 『An Empirical Study for Linking Gender Budgeting and Gender Impact Assessments』. Korean Women's Development Institute.

The Government of the Republic of Korea (2020a). 『The Fourth Master Plan for Low Fertility and Aging Society (2021~2025): A Society That Works Together and Cares Together』.

The Government of the Republic of Korea (2022). 『2022 Implementation Plan for the Fourth Master Plan for Low Fertility and Aging Society』.

Hui-Mun Ra and Pyo-Hwan Han (1999). A Study on the Development of Performance Indicators for Local Government. 「The Korean Association for Policy Studies」. 8(2). 93-114.

No-Uk Pak (2009). Global Trends and Implications of the Financial Performance Management System: With a Focus on Key Issues. 「Public Finance Forum」. July issue. 8-25.

Hae-Yuk Pak (2007). On the Comparison and Integration of Performance Management Systems in Local Governments. 「Korea Local Administration Review」. 21(2). 117-149.

Ministry of Health and Welfare (2019). 『The Second Social Security Master Plan (2019~2023)』.

Ministry of Gender Equality and Family (2018). 『The Second Basic Plan for Gender Equality Policies (2018~2022)』.

- Geum-rok Yu, Byeong-Cheon Gong, Cheol-Ho Oh, Su-Jae Yun, Gwang-Hui Lee, and Hyeong-Deuk Hong (2012). 『Diagnosis of the Operation Outcomes of the Government Performance Evaluation System and Study for Development Plans』. Policy Analysis and Evaluation Office of the Office of the Prime Minister.
- Su-Jae Yun, Jeong-Seok Kang, Gwang-Hui Lee, and Do-Seok Lee (2019). 『A Study for the Government Performance Evaluation Capacity Building of Central Administrative Agencies and Ways for Improvement in Institutional Systems: With a Focus on the Examination of the Operation Status of the Self-evaluation Committee Based on a Questionnaire Survey』. Korea Institute of Public Administration.
- Sin-Jeong Lee, Jae-Won Lee, and Yeong-Sam Oh (2021). 『A Study on the Criteria for the Distribution of Social Welfare Affairs between Metropolitan and Primary Local Governments and Improvements in the Financial Allotment System』. Busan Social Welfare Development Institute.
- Yun-Sik Lee (2014). 『Policy Evaluation』. Daeyoung Moonhwas Publishing Co.
- Yun-Sik Lee and Yeong-Bin Seo (2015). A Study of the Integrated Public Service Evaluation System (IPSES) from a Perspective of the Evaluation Validity. 『Korean Journal of Policy Analysis and Evaluation』. 25(3). 171-197.
- Jae-Won Lee (2019). 『Local Finance』. Yoonseongsa Publishing Co.
- Jae-Won Lee, Byeong-Hui Park, and Jong-Ha Lee (2020). The Establishment of a Financial Management System on Social Welfare Subsidy Projects in View of Fiscal Characteristics. 『Korean Journal of Local Finance』. 26(1). 117-151.
- Taek-Myeon Lee, Dul-Sun Kim, Su-Beom Pak, Do-Yeon Gwon, Su-Ji

- Kim, Gyeong-hui Kim, and Eun-Ah Lee (2021). 『A Study on the Pilot Project for the Improvement of the Gender-Responsive Budgeting System』. Ministry of Gender Equality and Family.
- Hwan-Seong Lee, Jeong-Seok Kang, Hye-Sin Hwang, Do-Seok Lee, Eun-Jong Lee, and Mi-Hyeon Yu (2020). 『The Status of the Operation of Performance Management and Self-evaluation of Central Administrative Agencies and Suggested Improvements』. Korea Institute of Public Administration. Nonscheduled project 2020-01.
- Eui-Ryong Jeong (2019). A Feedback System in Government Performance Evaluation. 「Public Organizations and National Policies」. 2019(2). 259-287.
- Jeong-Gil Jeong, Gyu-tak Seong, Jang Lee, and Yun-sik Lee (2004). 『Policy Evaluation: Theories and Application』. Bubyoungsa Publishing Co.
- Jae-Seon Ju, Dul-Sun Kim, Jin-Yeong Han, and Geun-Tae Kim (2017). 『A Study on the Improvement of Gender-disaggregated Statistics for Enhancement of the Operation of Gender Impact Analysis and Evaluation and Gender-Responsive Budgeting』. Ministry of Gender Equality and Family.
- Bu-Yeong Han and Geon-Wi Kim (2018). 『Suggestions for the Innovation of the Performance Management of Local Governments』. Korea Research Institute for Local Administration.
- Ministry of the Interior and Safety (2019). 『2019 Implementation Plan for Joint Evaluation of Local Governments (proposed)』.
- Hye-sin Hwang and Mun-Seok Jo (2016). 『A Study on the Operation Effect of the Government Performance Evaluation System』. Korea Institute of Public Administration.

KWDI



KWDI

225 Jinheung-ro, Eunpyeong-gu (1-363, Bulgwang-dong) Seoul, 03367, Republic of Korea
TEL 02.3156.7000 FAX 02.3156.7007
<http://www.kwdi.re.kr>