

Central Lancashire Online Knowledge (CLoK)

| | |
|----------|--|
| Title | Network Governance and UN Sustainable Development Goals: A Case Study of Gyeongsangbukdo Province and Daegu Metropolitan City in South Korea |
| Type | Article |
| URL | https://clock.uclan.ac.uk/30123/ |
| DOI | |
| Date | 2019 |
| Citation | Lim, Sojin and Jung, Sang-Hee (2019) Network Governance and UN Sustainable Development Goals: A Case Study of Gyeongsangbukdo Province and Daegu Metropolitan City in South Korea. IKSU Working Paper, 2019 (2). |
| Creators | Lim, Sojin and Jung, Sang-Hee |

It is advisable to refer to the publisher's version if you intend to cite from the work.

For information about Research at UCLan please go to <http://www.uclan.ac.uk/research/>

All outputs in CLoK are protected by Intellectual Property Rights law, including Copyright law. Copyright, IPR and Moral Rights for the works on this site are retained by the individual authors and/or other copyright owners. Terms and conditions for use of this material are defined in the <http://clock.uclan.ac.uk/policies/>

International Institute of Korean Studies

IKSU Working Paper Series No. 2 / 2019¹

Network Governance and UN Sustainable Development Goals: A Case Study of Gyeongsangbukdo Province and Daegu Metropolitan City in South Korea

Sojin Lim and Sang-Hee Jung

International Institute of Korean Studies (IKSU) working paper series is a platform for research on Korean Studies. It provides an opportunity to share ideas, and to debate and develop subsequent publications. It includes first drafts of papers or reports intended for submission in journals or other forms of publication from ongoing or completed research projects, manuscript development, and from roundtable discussions.

Series Editors

Dr Sojin Lim – slim4@uclan.ac.uk

Dr Niki Alsford – njpalsford@uclan.ac.uk



¹ To cite this working paper:

Lim, Sojin and Sang-Hee Jung (2019). Network Governance and UN Sustainable Development Goals: A Case Study of Gyeongsangbukdo Province and Daegu Metropolitan City in South Korea. IKSU Working Paper, Vol. 2019 No. 2. Preston: International Institute of Korean Studies.

Network Governance and UN Sustainable Development Goals: A Case Study of Gyeongsangbukdo Province and Daegu Metropolitan City in South Korea

Dr Sojin Lim²
Dr Sang-Hee Jung³

I. Introduction

With the emergence of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), and its implementation process, one of the key words for the international development cooperation community has been ‘multi-layered partnership’ with wider scope of players at the scene (Lim, 2017). During the implementation process of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), which are the former set of global goals of the SDGs, it was officially admitted that various actors roles are equally important in development cooperation process, apart from traditional mechanism of government to government (assistance from donor to recipient). Accordingly, civil society organisations (CSOs) and non-government organisations (NGOs) have become critical part of the operation, while the private sector has been encouraged to be a part of development cooperation activities. During SDG establishment discussion, local governments were also included as important part of the process.

The forms of governance in this exercise have been changing as well. While MDGs were delivered by centrally controlled system by a group of dominant stakeholders such as donor governments and international organisations, SDGs are more voluntary based, and it is more interdependent between donors and recipients. For example, while MDG monitoring was centralised by the UNDP, SDG monitoring has been decentralised based on the Voluntary National Review mechanism (VNR). More detail about this change has been discussed in Section III. At the national level, decentralisation has been encouraged in a way to achieve more efficient and effective development cooperation activities between donor local governments and local governments in developing countries. In light of this, ‘network governance’ concept has been adopted in development cooperation discourse. However, there is very few existing literatures which discuss this recent norm change in international development cooperation governance with new players under the SDGs era. With this in mind, this paper examines recent international norms in relation with local governments and SDGs based on the research question of whether recent norm change from governance to network governance in SDG implementation has been realised with local governments at the level of donor government. It aims to look at whether official development assistance (ODA) policy and practice at the local government level commensurate with global norm changes, by employing network governance theory.

² Senior Lecturer, University of Central Lancashire, UK

³ Associate Professor, Keimyung University, South Korea

This research is organised with five sections. After the introduction, the second section reviews and compares theories of governance and network governance. The third section explores recent norm changes of international development cooperation in the context of SDGs by looking at how the traditional development cooperation governance system has changed into network governance. Based on theoretical analysis in these two sections, Section IV analyses two cases of local governments in South Korea. Gyeongsangbukdo Province and Daegu Metropolitan City cases have been selected in this paper as both local governments have provided the highest volume of ODA to developing countries, except Seoul, Gyeonggi Province and Incheon Metropolitan City and South Korea (Export-Import Bank of Korea, 2017). As such, this research has employed case study method within the qualitative research methodology. In order to conduct triangulation for data collection, both primary and secondary source analysis was conducted, along with interviews which were adopted from the data set of Jung, Ahn and Lim (2017)'s. As it is qualitative research, we do not intend to include a large number of interviews, but more focused on interviews from six key stakeholders included in Jung et al. (2017). The Section V finally provides discussion and concluding remarks of the research.

II. From Governance to Network Governance

Governance can be defined as a method of ruling communities as an alternative form of the government. It can be shown in the forms of new system, new institution, and new management methods (Kim, 2005). However, the concept of governance was not clearly understood, and thus, it was somewhat vague in its definition. Nevertheless, the concept of governance began to be used more widely since the 1990s when international development cooperation community considered governance as one of the main factors which can improve aid effectiveness in developing countries. Ever since then, the concept of governance evolved in the sense of diversity, complexity, and dynamics (Kooiman, 2003; Bae, 2010).

In comparison, the network governance can be defined as ‘a hybrid form of governance’ (Zander, Trang and Kolbe, 2016: 110), and can be understood in the context of pluralism. (Lee and Yoo, 2016). In other words, the network governance is decentralised by social powers, such as local governments, business, interest groups, and CSOs when power and influence spectrum within the concept of governance are more likely to be focused on central government (Hasler et al., 2016; Lee and Yoo, 2016). Accordingly, the concept of power in the network governance is defined as social problem-solving capability through cooperation amongst stakeholders (Lee and Yoo, 2016). In addition, the network governance can be understood in horizontal system, whilst governance is built upon the concept of vertical system. Because of this reason, the network governance focuses on interaction, collaboration, relationships, cooperation, connection system, and management of connection network of participants (Lee et al., 2014; Zander et al., 2016). Recently, a need for the network governance in policy area has been spotlighted as multiple actors tend to be engaged in policy-making process (Hasler et al., 2016; Lee, 2014; Zander et al., 2016).

In more detail, we have reviewed the differences between hierarchical governance and the network governance by reflecting Lee and Yoo (2016)'s analysis on power, distribution of resources, characteristics of the power, nature of politics, and policy implementation method, as in Table 1.

Table 1. Comparison of Governance and Network Governance

| | Governance | Network Governance |
|--|------------|--------------------|
|--|------------|--------------------|

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| Distribution of Authority and Resources | Centralised | Decentralised between central governments and local governments |
| Characteristics of Power | Controlling other power entities | Addressing current challenges of the local governments |
| Characteristics of Politics | Zero sum relations | Positive sum relations |
| Policy Management Methods | Unilateral order, control, instructions | Interdependent via compromise, negotiations, and cooperation |
| Means of Policy Management | Official legislation and regulations, along with other unilateral instructions | Unofficial dialogue and persuasion, along with other interdependent methods |
| Methods of Control | Input and procedure-based process-oriented control | Output and specific outcome-based result-oriented control |
| Discretion | Order by the central government | Depending on manager (or local government) |

Source: Authors' compilation based on Lee and Yoo, 2016: 88 & 90

As seen, the network governance emphasises horizontal connectivity between central government and local government. Its power and resources are decentralised between central and local governments by setting up participants' cooperation as its prerequisite. It is rather focused on how to address current challenges of the local governments than how to rule and control other power entities. When it comes to policy management, the means of interdependency, such as unofficial dialogue and persuasion, have been emphasised. Unofficial dialogue includes compromise and negotiations. In the network governance, the way of how to control mainly focuses on outputs and specific results.

According to Fawcett, Manwaring and Marsh (2011), contemporary policy regime does not solely rely on governance mechanism anymore, but rather tend to work with interactions between various actors. In this sense, hierarchical governance has been replaced by horizontal network governance. With this in mind, as traditional relations between central government and local governments, which was based on the hierarchical governance, has recently been changing to the forms of horizontal network governance, it is necessary to review recent changes in global development cooperation landscape of participants, and how the dynamics of actors have influenced the shape of governance types.

III. SDGs and Network Governance

The SDGs, which was endorsed by the member countries during the General Assembly of the United Nations in September 2015, is consist of 17 goals with 169 indicators to implement by 2030, compared to its predecessor, the MDGs were composed of 8 goals with 21 indicators. These SDGs were designed to overcome the limit of MDGs and reflect any unfinished business from the period of MDG implementation (2000-2015). While MDGs were more focused on social development and human development, there was a realisation that both economic and social developments are equally important for human development, and thus, SDGs now balanced both developments within those 17 goals. For example, when the MDGs tended to emphasise basic education and health issues, in SDGs, goals include infrastructure development for national economic growth (Goals 8 and 9), ensuring clean energy (Goal 7), dealing with climate change (Goals 13, 14, and 15), addressing peace and strong institutions (Goal 16), and promoting equalities (Goal 10) (Lim, 2017). 17 SDG goals and indicators are

basically interlinked, which covers most of the agenda to be addressed by human beings in this contemporary era, and it is developed in a way to be comprehensive between difference goals (see UN, 2015b).

The emergence of the role of local governments in SDGs implementation process lies in four pillars. First, SDG implementation should be based on various actors and stakeholders. During MDG implementation process, it was only a halfway of its implementation when the international society recognised stakeholders such as CSOs and NGOs. It was officially recognised that CSOs/NGOs are one of important actors in international development cooperation in 2008 during the third OECD DAC High Level Forum on aid effectiveness in Accra, Ghana (see OCED, 2008). This have influenced that the global goals need to be implemented by various actors and stakeholders, including new players as well as traditional players. In line with this, for SDG process, not only central government, but also local governments began to have its spotlight.

Second, as mentioned above, SDGs have much wider range of goals to deal with, which are based on 'no one behind' principle. In order to reach different groups of people at the various levels, SDGs cannot be implemented by the central governments only. Up until recently, it was mostly central governments, CSOs and NGOs, but now local governments have been included in this format (Lim, 2017). Having said that, not only the central governments but also local governments in both developing countries and OECD DAC member countries are equally responsible for implementing the SDGs as stakeholders of development.

Third, higher level of needs for the financial mobilisation has been required in order to expand SDGs at local levels as well as to accomplish these ambitious goals. As there are more goals with more to be considered, SDGs require higher level of finance. When it was said that MDGs costed billions of dollars, we need to invest trillions of dollars to achieve the SDGs (Kim, 2015). The Third International Conference on Financing for Development in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, in 2015, which is an international discussion forum for global goal achievement and finance, set out action points to contribute to successful SDG achievement, including domestic public resources, domestic and international private business and finance, international development cooperation, international trade as an engine for development, debt and debt sustainability, addressing systemic issues, science, and technology, innovation and capacity building (Addis Ababa Action Agenda, AAAA) (UN, 2015a). During the discussion, actors, such as local governments, were addressed in terms of finance mobilisation.

Finally, SDG Goal 11 (Sustainable Cities and Communities) directly addresses the role of local governments. SDG Goal 11 itself reveals the importance of urbanisation and human settlement at city level, by focusing on local capacity to achieve each target (UN, 2015b: 26). As aforementioned, in the 2015 AAAA, multi-stakeholder partnership, in particular with local authorities, was emphasised. Local governments are important actors as they need to bring up with appropriate local capacities for inclusive and sustainable development (UN, 2015a). For example, a local government in a donor country can have a twinning programme based on its comparative advantage of development with other local government in developing countries, so that they can exchange mutual benefit in development process and provide more tailored experience and technical cooperation at local level (Jung and Lim, 2018).

Here, when we discuss the role of local governments in SDGs, local governments have become important stakeholder as both donors and recipients (Lim, 2017). In other words, local government need to receive financial support for SDG implementation from the central

governments in order to enforce SDG mandate at the national level, but at the same time, local governments can become efficient donors for other local governments. While MDGs focused on development in developing countries, which led to a misunderstanding of that MDGs were responsible for developing countries, but not that of for OECD DAC donor countries. Based on this rationale, SDGs seem to happen based on the parallel approach between central governance (international and national levels) and decentralised approach (local governments, CSOs and NGOs) (AMEXCID, 2014). At the same time, local governments in donor countries can utilise existing partnership with partner local governments in developing countries. Based on the existing partnership and cooperation mechanism, donor local governments can provide more effective and efficient development cooperation and ODA to local communities in more sustainable and accountable manner (UCLG, 2015). Like twinning, donor local government-partner local government in developing countries activities can provide peer-to-peer learning (Jung and Lim, 2018).

As mentioned in the previous section, we have observed that traditional role of central governments and relationship between central governments and local governments have shifted. In this context, the era of SDGs has transformed the format of global goal implementation from top-down style of MDGs (hierarchical governance) to equally distributed and decentralised style (network governance) in many ways. In particular, in its implementation monitoring mechanism, SDGs rely on voluntary based monitoring approach on its progress, which is one of the typical features of the network governance. As mentioned in Introduction, while MDG progress monitoring process was centralised within the UN report system, the SDG implementation monitoring process has been set up based on the VNR mechanism (Lim, 2017). In the process of VNR, it emphasises the localisation of targets and indicators of the SDGs (Together 2030, 2017). While this can be interpreted and analysed in various angles to be studied, this paper intends to focus on the agenda of SDG implementation process between central government and local governments in donor country. The following chapter will lead us to see whether this is really a case or not. In other words, by exploring the cases of Gyeongsangbukdo Province and Daegu Metropolitan City in South Korea, this study attempts to examine whether localisation and network governance have been embedded at local level in ODA practice in South Korea, as the theory indicated.

IV. Network Governance and SDGs in Gyeongsangbukdo Province and Daegu Metropolitan City in South Korea

In this section, we analyse two local government authorities, which provide ODA to developing countries. Gyeongsangbukdo Province, Gyeongsangnamdo Province and Daegu Metropolitan City (hereinafter, Daegu City) are biggest three local governments in Southern East area of South Korea. While Daegu City is located within Gyeongsangbukdo Province, as a metropolitan city, it has its own dependent authority from the provincial administration. By analysing these two local government cases, we attempted to look at whether there have been any dynamics between central and local governments regarding to SDGs in South Korea.

(1) Gyeongsangbukdo Province

Gyeongsangbukdo Province has not developed any specific legal or institutional system about ODA; however, when it revised ‘Gyeongsangbukdo Province Ordinance for International Exchange Cooperation Promotion’ in 2016, it included that Gyeongsangbukdo Province pursues the value of humankind by development cooperation with developing countries. It also states that ODA activities of Gyeongsangbukdo Province are part of its ‘international exchange

cooperation' framework (MOIS, 2016). In terms of budget management, Gyeongsangbukdo Province has set up the Gyeongsangbukdo Province International Cooperation Fund under the 'Gyeongsangbukdo Province Ordinance for International Cooperation Fund Management'. The Fund is used for international exchange cooperation activities and international cooperation activities by CSOs/NGOs in Gyeongsangbukdo Province. ODA budget is included in this Fund (MOIS, 2017). ODA policy coherence between Gyeongsangbukdo Province and central government and the central-local government's interdependent system seem to be highly limited (Jung et al., 2017: Interviews C, D, E).

As Table 2 shows, most of ODA budget in Gyeongsangbukdo Province is provided to share Korea's 'Saemaul Undong (New Village Movement)' experience with developing countries. Saemaul Undong has its origina in the 1970s when South Korea had its momentum of rapid economic development under its national modernisation movement. Saemaul Undong is especially focused in rural areas as a balanced approach to both urban and rural development (Jung, 2016: 367-368). Gyeongsangbukdo Province set out 'Gyeongsangbukdo Province Ordinance for Establishment and Management of the Saemaul Undong Internationalisation Foundation' and 'Gyeongsangbukdo Province Ordinance for Saemaul Undong Support' so that it can provide Saemaul Undong related ODA projects more systematically (MOIS, 2012 & 2013). Under the Saemaul Undong Internationalisation Foundation's role, Gyeongsangbukdo Province established a mid- and long-term plan for Saemaul Undong Internationalisation and conducted research projects and organised internation forums about Saemaul Undong in order to provide scholarly platform for Saemaul Undong Internationalisation (MOIS, 2012). At the same time, activities such as volunteer dispatch, Saemaul Model Village development, local Saemaul leader training, project monitoring and evaluation, private-public cooperation in developing countries have been provided based on ODA budget (MOIS, 2013).

The reason why Gyeongsangbukdo Province focuses on Saemaul Undong activities is because it is one of the main regions in South Korea which benefited from the Saemaul Undong activities in terms of its successful rural development model. At the same time, previous President of South Korea, Park Jung Hee who created Saemaul Undong took this province as his model case when South Korea began Saemaul Undong in the 1970s (Lim and Lim 2013). Accordingly, based on its own development experience, Gyeongsangbukdo Province has provided its ODA to developing countries under the Saemaul Undong Internationalisation Project since 2005.

Table 2. Gyeongsangbukdo Province ODA Activities (2013 – 2019)

| Year | Provider Administration within Province | Activity Title | Recipient Country | Budget (KRW, million) |
|-------------|--|---|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| 2013 | Gyeongsangbukdo | Training and In-Kinds Support | Multiple Countries | 450 |
| 2014-16 | Gyeongsangbukdo | Saemaul Model Village Leader Training in Korea | Multiple Countries | 1,182 |
| 2014-16 | Gyeongsangbukdo | Saemaul Training in Korea | Multiple Countries | 515 |
| 2014-16 | Gyeongsangbukdo | Saemaul Student Training in Korea | Multiple Countries | 125 |
| 2014-16 | Gyeongsangbukdo | Local Saemaul Training | Multiple Countries | 222 |
| 2014-16 | Gyeongsangbukdo | Saemaul Training with Ministry of the Interior and Safety (MOIS). | Multiple Countries | 48 |

| | | | | |
|---------|-----------------|---|--------------------|-------------------|
| 2016 | Gyeongsangbukdo | Saemaul Leader Training in Korea | Multiple Countries | 171 |
| 2013 | Gyeongsangbukdo | Global Saemaul Pilot Villge | Multiple Countries | 150 |
| 2013-17 | Gyeongsangbukdo | Global Saemaul Pilot Villge | Ethiopia | 2,212 |
| 2013-16 | Gyeongsangbukdo | Global Saemaul Pilot Villge | Rwanda | 450 (MOIS budget) |
| 2013-17 | Gyeongsangbukdo | Global Saemaul Pilot Villge | Rwanda | 1,372 |
| 2013-16 | Gyeongsangbukdo | Global Saemaul Pilot Villge | Tanzania | 1,534 |
| 2013-18 | Gyeongsangbukdo | Global Saemaul Pilot Villge | Senegal | 1,204 |
| 2013-19 | Gyeongsangbukdo | Global Saemaul Pilot Villge | Philippines | 924 |
| 2015-20 | Gyeongsangbukdo | Global Saemaul Pilot Villge | Indonesia | 474 |
| 2014-19 | Andong-Si | Global Saemaul Pilot Villge | Uzbekistan | 450 |
| 2014-19 | Cheongsong-Gun | Global Saemaul Pilot Villge | Philippines | 450 |
| 2014-19 | Yecheon-Gun | Global Saemaul Pilot Villge | Vietnam | 450 |
| 2014-19 | Yeongcheon-Si | Global Saemaul Pilot Villge | Vietnam | 450 |
| 2014-19 | Cheongdo-Gun | Global Saemaul Pilot Villge | Vietnam | 450 |
| 2014-19 | Gumi-Si | Global Saemaul Pilot Villge | Sri Lanka | 450 |
| 2014-19 | Pohang-Si | Global Saemaul Pilot Villge | Sri Lanka | 450 |
| 2015-20 | Mungyeong-Si | Global Saemaul Pilot Villge | Indonesia | 300 |
| 2016-21 | Gmcheon-Si | Global Saemaul Pilot Villge | Indonesia | 150 |
| 2016-21 | Yeongju-Si | Global Saemaul Pilot Villge | Cambodia | 150 |
| 2016-21 | Sangju-Si | Global Saemaul Pilot Villge | Cambodia | 150 |
| 2016-21 | Gyeongsan-Si | Global Saemaul Pilot Villge | Laos | 150 |
| 2016-21 | Yeongdeok-Gun | Global Saemaul Pilot Villge | Philippines | 150 |
| 2016-21 | Chilgok-Gun | Global Saemaul Pilot Villge | Ethiopia | 150 |
| 2016-21 | Useong-Gun | Global Saemaul Pilot Villge | Vietnam | 150 |
| 2016-21 | Gunei-Gun | Global Saemaul Pilot Villge | Vietnam | 150 |
| 2016-21 | Bongwha-Gun | Global Saemaul Pilot Villge | Vietnam | 150 |
| 2016-21 | Uljin-Gun | Global Saemaul Pilot Villge | Vietnam | 150 |
| 2016-21 | Seongju-Gun | Global Saemaul Pilot Villge | Vietnam | 150 |
| 2011-15 | Gyeongsangbukdo | UNESCO Global Education Cooperation Support Project | Vietnam | 700 |
| 2014-16 | Gyeongsangbukdo | UNDP Nepal Project (Gyeongsangbukdo Style Green Energy Model Village Development) | Nepal | 110 |
| 2016-20 | Gumi-Si | Saemaul Undong Internationalisation Project | Ethiopia | 1,000 |
| 2014 | Useong-Gun | Mongolia Mandal Sum Saemaul Hall Construction | Mongolia | 30 |

Source: Authors' compilation based on Jung et al., 2017: 95-97

At the operational level, Gyeongsangbukdo Province does not have ODA specific team or department; however, most of ODA provided by Gyeongsangbukdo Province is dealt by Job Creation and Public Welfare Department and Administration Autonomy Department. Under the Job Creation and Public Welfare Department, Global Trade Cooperation Team is in charge of international exchange activities as well as ODA activities. In this team, general data and statistics about ODA activities are dealt with as well. Administration Autonomy Department, Saemaul Service Team works as a control tower for the Saemaul Undong Industrialisation. Considering the fact that most of ODA activities provided by Gyeongsangbukdo Province is Saemaul Undong related, it can be said that most of ODA budget in Gyeongsangbukdo

Province is executed by Local Autonomy Administration Bureau (Gyeongsangbuk-do, 2019). There have been few activities which engaged local private sector in Gyeongsangbuk-do Province's ODA as well (Jung et al., 2017: Interview A).

(2) Daegu Metropolitan City

Daegu City provides development cooperation as a part of its 'international exchange cooperation'. In other words, Daegu City as a local government cooperates with other countries' local governments or international organisations in its ODA activities (Daegu Metropolitan City, 2014). Accordingly, in its revised form of 'Daegu Metropolitan City Municipal Ordinance for the Global City Promotion', it defines Daegu City's 'international exchange cooperation' as 'all kinds of activities and processes which promote mutual cooperation, mutual understanding and friendship by human resources exchange, in-kind resources exchange, and information and knowledge exchange, based on the equal relationship that goes beyond borders between states' (see MOIS, 2015).

In order to enhance City's international exchange cooperation, the municipal ordinance provides a method of twinning between cities. That is, the municipal ordinance encourages for the City to set out twinning programme with other countries' local governments (MOIS, 2015). Twinning can be understood as an effective capacity development method which is based on technical cooperation between donor and recipient local governments in the context of development cooperation (Jung and Lim, 2018). At the same time, the municipal ordinance shows that City Mayor supports the full amount or a part of the budget when CSOs/NGOs, international development cooperation organisation, and universities conduct international exchange projects (MOIS, 2015).

However, Daegu City has not set out any specific contents about development cooperation and/or ODA itself in its municipal ordinance. Instead, it is stated in its ODA plan that Daegu City's ODA activities and development cooperation reflect central government's ODA policy (Lee and Kim, 2014). According to the 2017 Korea's ODA White Paper, the government of South Korea provides three main policy pillars of ODA - integrative ODA, substantive ODA, and collaborative ODA - by reflecting SDGs in the policy (CIDC, 2017: 70). However, it is unclear how specifically Daegu City has abided by the central government's ODA policy. According to the interviewees, ODA policy coherence between Daegu City and central government and the central-local governments interdependent system seem to be barely implemented in practice (Jung et al., 2017: Interviews B, C, D).

At the operational level, the International Cooperation Team within International Cooperation Department at the Daegu City Office used to deal with ODA activities. As of 2019, Job and Investment Bureau under the International Affairs and Trade Division plays the role of control tower for Daegu City's ODA activities and coordination, and statistics management, led by Vice Mayor for Economic Affairs (Jung et al., 2017: Interview B). At the same time, the municipal ordinance clearly states that City Mayor can create and manage the 'Daegu Metropolitan City Global Centre' in order to provide systematic and efficient international exchange cooperation activities in the City (MOIS, 2015). Accordingly, Daegu International Development Cooperation Centre was introduced in January 2015 at Kyungpook National University, as a local level ODA platform (DGIDCC, 2016), and it has been relocated to Keimyung University since 2019. However, it is not clear what is the roles and responsibilities and how the division of labour works between the International Cooperation Team and the Daegu International Development Cooperation Centre.

ODA amount in Daegu City has increased, and the profile has been also changed from training and technical cooperation to project types. However, resulting from aforementioned confusion at the operational level and a lack of clear management control, ODA statistics in Daegu City has not been systematically recorded or published in public. In accordance with this, we have analysed ODA activities as in Table 3 based on what we were able to access – a research by Jung, An and Lim (2017) that used a data set provided by the Daegu International Cooperation Department.

Table 3. Daegu Metropolitan City ODA Activities (2012 – 2017)

| Year | Activity Management Organisation | Activity Title | Activity Type | Activity Sector | Budget Source | Budget (KRW, million) |
|-------------|--|---|-----------------------|------------------------|--|------------------------------|
| 2015-17 | Keimyung University | Health Administration Capacity Development | Training in Korea | Public Administration | National and City Budget Matching Fund | 150 |
| 2016-18 | Korea Textile Development Institute | Textile Industry Development Strategy | Training in Korea | Industry and Energy | National and City Budget Matching Fund | 150 |
| 2016 | Daegu National University of Education | Vietnam Elementary School Teacher Capacity Development | Technical Cooperation | Education | City Budget | 50 |
| 2015 | Daegu Gyungpook International Exchange Association | Voluntary Activity in Laos | Volunteer Dispatch | Health | City Budget | 10 |
| 2015-16 | Daegu Gyungpook International Exchange Association | Medical Voluntary Activity in Almaty | Volunteer Dispatch | Health | City Budget | 30 |
| 2016 | Daegu Gyungpook International Exchange Association | Voluntary Activity in Developing Countries | Volunteer Dispatch | Health | City Budget | 10 |
| 2014-15 | Daegu City | Automatic Official Document Issue Machine in Da Nang, Vietnam | Project | Public Administration | National and City Budget Matching Fund | 150 |
| 2014 | Daegu City, Medicity Daegu and Others | Medical Voluntary Activity in Kathmandu and Dhulikhel, Nepal | Volunteer Dispatch | Health | City Budget | 120 |
| 2015 | Daegu City, Medicity | Medical Voluntary Activity in Ho Chi | Volunteer Dispatch | Health | City Budget | 150 |

| | | | | | | |
|---------|--|--|---------------------|-------------------------|-------------|-------|
| | Daegu and Others | Minh and Hanoi, Vietnam | | | | |
| 2016 | Daegu City, Medicity Daegu and Others | Medical Voluntary Activity in Karaganda, Kazakhstan | Volunteer Dispatch | Health | City Budget | 150 |
| 2015 | Kyungpook National University | Human Network Development for Agriculture University Exchange Students and Civil Servant from Developing Countries | Network Development | Agriculture and Fishery | City Budget | 30 |
| 2012-16 | Yeungnam University | Saemaul Expert Training | Training in Korea | Education | City Budget | 1,700 |
| 2014-15 | Daegu City Korea Saemaul Undong Centre | Voluntary Activity in Typhoon Areas in Philippines | Volunteer Dispatch | Humanitarian Assistance | City Budget | 60 |
| 2013-17 | Daegu City Korea Saemaul Undong Centre | Saemaul Undong Internationalisation (Supporting Cooperative University in Thanlyn Library in Yangon, Myanmar) | Project | Education | City Budget | 170 |
| 2016-18 | Daegu City Korea Saemaul Undong Centre | Saemaul Undong Internationalisation (Saemaul Model Village Development in Cambodia) | Project | Public Administration | City Budget | 150 |
| 2016 | Daegu City Quality Skilled Technical Association | International Vocational Voluntary Activity | Volunteer Dispatch | Others | City Budget | 20 |

Source: Authors' compilation based on Jung et al., 2017: 90 - 91

As seen above, between 2012 and 2017, Daegu City conducted only three project type ODA activities, while the majority (13 out of 16 activities) were performed as short-term training in Korea, voluntary dispatch and technical cooperation. Six activities were provided in health sector, which recorded as majority, while three activities were provided in education sector. Two activities were for public administration, and the rest of three activities were provided in industry and energy sector, agriculture and fishery sector, and humanitarian assistance sector. In terms of budget amount, Saemaul Movement Expert Training was the biggest activity. While the rest of activities did not exceed 170 million KRW, Saemaul Movement Expert Training itself recorded 1,700 million KRW. The reason why some of activities had matching fund format was because Daegu City budget for ODA activities was not sufficient to fund relative activities. However, it was hard to find the nexus between central government and local governments in terms of SDG nation-wide policy. It seems that Daegu City's ODA budget is

rather highly independent from the central government's ODA budget. At the same time, it seems that local NGOs involvement in Daegu City's ODA activities have been limited as well (Jung et al., 2017: Interview F).

V. Discussion and Conclusion

In this paper, we examined two local government cases in South Korea in relation with SDG localisation in the context of network governance. As seen above, both Gyeongsangbukdo Province and Daegu City provide ODA within the perspectives of the international exchange cooperation in general. While Gyeongsangbukdo Province seems to have longer experience of ODA than Daegu City, it has also provided its own unique ODA brand activity under the Saemaul Undong mechanism. However, both local governments have provided their ODA based on their general international exchange cooperation policy, not communicating with the central government's ODA policy, nor the SDG policy. In other words, we can conclude that SDG localisation has not been realised in South Korea with the cases of Gyeongsangbukdo Province and Daegu City.

Based on network governance theory, both Gyeongsangbukdo Province and Daegu City should have communicated with the central government in terms of 'decentralising' SDG policy and activities, especially by using comparative advantage of each local government in South Korea which can address challenges in partner local governments in developing countries when they provide ODA. Rather than using interdependent methods of ODA under SDG mechanism, both cases showed that they rather use dependent methods, such as Saemaul Undong, compared to the central government approach. In their ODA policy and/or strategy, neither of both local governments included clauses from central government's ODA policy or international norms from SDG agenda. As mentioned previously, one of the main reasons why local governments' ODA activities can be more effective and efficient towards partner local governments in developing countries is due to the twinning effect. However, from our analysis, it was unclear whether both Gyeongsangbukdo Province and Daegu City have provided their ODA based on peer-to-peer learning mechanism or comparative advantages. For example, when Gyeongsangbukdo Province provides Saemaul Undong ODA, it was because Saemaul Undong was successful at local level in South Korea in the 1970s, but it does not guarantee that it would work in the same way in different environment at partner's local level, especially when we are sitting in the 2010s. Yet, it is noteworthy that one positive feature was that both cases showed high level of discretion. In other words, rather than depending on central government order system, both local governments followed their own ordinances, which implicates that network governance can be developed further in South Korea.

As increasing number of research suggest the effectiveness and efficiency of network governance and as the global norms suggests that localisation of SDGs is something we need to pursue in development cooperation, the findings of this research show that two cases of local governments in South Korea do not commensurate with neither the theory nor the international norms. Therefore, we would like to provide policy implications for local governments in South Korea that interdependency needs to be considered at its forefront. Prior to it, both Gyeongsangbukdo Province and Daegu City need to set out ODA policy by revising existing international exchange cooperation ordinances. By doing so, both local governments need to communicate with central government and global norms. Both local governments need to analyse not only SDGs but also their comparative advantage of development so that they can better advise partner local governments. Based on its analysis both local authorities can take next step to map out their comparative advantage sectors and each of SDG goal. In this way,

they can prioritise their own SDG goal to support in their partner countries. Here, it would be equally important to analyse partner local governments' needs.

In terms of SDGs, most of goals have direct implications to local governments in development discourse. For instance, not mentioning SDG Goal 11 (Sustainable Cities and Communities) which directly stating role of local governments, SDG Goal 1 (No Poverty) will be benefitted by donor local governments activities at developing countries local level, where central government of donor country has limited access but where donor local governments have more efficient access to those in needs with better understanding (see UCLG, 2017). At the same time, SDG Goal 2 (Zero Hunger) emphasises food security and sustainable agriculture development, which are more relevant to the local governments' industry. Especially with our case of Gyeongsangbukdo Province, its own experience and know-how in agricultural industry development can be a good peer technical cooperation for partner local governments in developing countries. In light of this, it is critical to analyse and understand each SDG goal for local governments and make them mainstreamed in their ODA activities.

At the same time, it will be also required for local governments to invite various stakeholders at the local level. SDGs emphasise the importance of CSOs/NGOs as well as other actors, and thus, this should not be different at the local level. In addition, as mentioned above, under the SDG regime, it is required for the government sector to cooperate with more actors for resource mobilisation. Not only by the international finance conference series, but also through the SDG Goal 17 (Partnership for the Goals), engagement with the private sector as well as CSOs/NGOs in SDG implementation process has been put forward. However, from our analysis, we have found that both local authorities in South Korea tend to use their own budget for their own activities by lacking necessary cooperation and synergy effects with other stakeholders in development cooperation for developing country partners. Thus, local governments in South Korea need to develop strategy on how to mobilise other local partners in their ODA activities.

More communication and interactions need to be systematically established between Gyeongsangbukdo Province and Daegu City as well as central government and both local governments. They are interconnected geographically, and thus, this physical connectivity can bring synergy effect not only in terms of economy but also encouraging local private sector and CSOs/NGOs actors. One solution can be found with the Daegu International Development Cooperation Centre. The Daegu International Development Cooperation Centre is linked to the central ODA government body, the Korea International Cooperation Agency (KOICA), and thus, it can play the mediator's role between central and local policy and strategy (Jung et al., 2017: Interviews B & D).

In conclusion, network governance does not seem to happen in the context of South Korea's ODA policy and practice, especially within the SDG setting. More systematic cooperation and division of labours need to be implemented between central and local government communication system. However, on top of it, local governments need to enhance their development cooperation capacity so that they can adopt on-going international norms into their streamline so that both their communities and partner communities in developing countries can mutually benefit.

References

AMEXCID (2014). First High-Level Meeting of the Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation. Mexico City, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Mexico.

Bae, J. (2010). A Study of the Network Governance of Local Government: A Focus on A Busan River Protection Movement. Korean Journal of Public Administration. 38(3): 169-193.
[배재현 (2010). 지방정부의 네트워크 거버넌스에 관한 연구 : 부산시 하천환경개선 사업을 중심으로. 행정논총. 38(3) : 169-193.]

CIDC (2017). 2017 Korea's ODA White Paper. Sejong, Committee for International Development Cooperation (CIDC).

Daegu Metropolitan City (2014). Daegu Long-term Development Master Plan. [대구광역시 (2014). 대구장기발전종합계획.]

DGIDCC (2016). About Daegu International Development Cooperation Centre (DGIDCC). [Accessed: 5 May 2019] <https://dgidcc.modoo.at/>.

Export-Import Bank of Korea (2017). ODA Stats. [Accessed: 5 May 2019] <https://stats.koreaexim.go.kr/odastats.html>.

Fawcett, P. R. Manwaring, and D. Marsh (2011). Network Governance and the 2020 Summit. Australian Journal of Political Science. 46(4): 651-667.

Gyeongsangbuk-Do (2019). Main Organisations. [Accessed: 5 May 2019] <http://www.gb.go.kr/eng/page.jsp?largeCode=government&mediumCode=organ&LANGCODE=English>.

Hasler, K. D. Kubler, A. Christman and F. Marcinkowski (2016). Over-Responsibilised and Over-Blamed: Elected Actors in Media Reporting on Network Governance. A Comparative Analysis in Eight European Metropolitan Areas. Policy & Politics. 44(1): 135-152.

Jung, S, S. Ahn and S. Lim (2017). A Study to Promote ODA in Daegu-Gyeonbuk Region. Daegu Metropolitan City, Daegu International Development Cooperation Centre. [정상희, 안숙영, 임소진 (2017). 대구경북지역의 ODA 사업 활성화 방안 연구. 대구광역시, 대구국제개발협력센터.]

Jung, S. and S. Lim (2018). Twinning Method in Development Cooperation: A Case Study of EU-Peru and its implications for Korean Local Governments. The Journal of Contemporary European Studies. 36 (4):145-169. [정상희, 임소진 (2018). 개발협력의 트위닝 기법과 EU-페루 간 사례연구 : 한국 지방정부에 대한 시사점. 유럽연구 36(4): 145-169.]

Jung, Suhwan (2016). Korean Rural Development Challenge Against External Challenges in International Development. The Journal of Korean Cultural Studies, 64: 363-392.

Kim, J. (2015). Billions to Trillions: Ideas to Actions. Statement by President of the World Bank Group during the Third International Conference on Financing for Development. 13 July 2015, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.

Kim, Y. (2005). A Study on the Relationship of New Governance Between Local Government and Civil Society Organisation. *Korean Regional Sociology*. 7(1): 75-103. [김영래 (2005). 지방정부와 시민사회 단체간의 뉴거버넌스 관계 연구. *지역사회학* 7(1) : 75-103.]

Kooiman, J. (2003). *Governing as Governance*. London, SAGE.

Lee, S. and H. Kim (2014). *Daegu Metropolitan City ODA Strategy*. Seoul, Korea Research Institute for Local Administration. [이소영, 김현호 (2014). *대구광역시 ODA 사업 추진방안*. 서울, 한국지방행정연구원.

Lee, S. and J. Yoo (2016). Key Features of Central-Local Government Relations in South Korea: A Governance Perspective. *Chung-Ang Public Administration Review*. 30(2): 83-108. [이승모, 유재원 (2016). 한국의 중앙-지방정부간 관계의 특성 : 거버넌스 시각에서. *국가정책연구*. 30(2) : 83-108.]

Lee, M., K. S. Yoon, S. Cho and S. Won (2014). Designing the Collaborative Mechanism between Central and Local Governments: The Perspective of Collaborative Network Governance. *The Korean Journal of Local Government Studies*. 18(1): 121-146. [이민호, 윤광석, 조세현, 원소연 (2014). 중앙-지방간 효과적인 협력체계 구축방안의 모색 : 협력적 네트워크 거버넌스의 관점에서. *지방정부연구*. 18(1) : 121-146.]

Lim, Han-Sung and Jae-Kang Lim (2013). A Case Study of the Performance evaluation of Saemaul Undong Globalisation. *Chung-Ang Public Administration Review*. 27(4): 139-165. [임한성, 임재강 (2013). 경상북도 새마을운동 세계화사업의 성과평가. *국가정책연구*. 27(4) : 139-165.]

Lim, Sojin (2017). Multi-stakeholders, Multi-layered Partnerships of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). Presentation to the 2017 North-East Asia Development Cooperation Forum. 28-29 September 2017, Moscow, Russia.

MOIS (2012). *Gyeongsangbukdo Province Ordinance for Establishment and Management of the Saemaul Undong Internationalisation Foundation*. Sejong, Ministry of the Interior and Safety (MOIS). [Accessed: 5 May 2019] <http://www.law.go.kr/ordinInfoP.do?ordinSeq=890151&gubun=ELIS>. [행정안전부 (2012). 경상북도 새마을세계화재단 설립 및 운영 조례. 시행 2012. 5. 31. 경상북도조례 제 3343 호, 2012. 5. 31. 제정.]

MOIS (2013). *Gyeongsangbukdo Province Ordinance for Saemaul Undong Support*. Sejong, Ministry of the Interior and Safety (MOIS). [Accessed: 5 May 2019] <http://www.law.go.kr/ordinInfoP.do?ordinSeq=970983&gubun=ELIS>. [행정안전부 (2013). 경상북도 새마을운동 지원에 관한 조례. 시행 2013. 4. 11. 경상북도조례 제 3414 호, 2013. 4. 11. 제정.]

MOIS (2015). Daegu Metropolitan City Municipal Ordinance for the Global City Promotion. Sejong, Ministry of the Interior and Safety (MOIS). [Accessed: 5 May 2019] <http://www.law.go.kr/ordinInfoP.do?ordinSeq=1208969&gubun=ELIS>. [행정안전부 (2015). 대구광역시 글로벌도시 촉진 조례. 시행 2015. 12. 30. 대구광역시조례 제 4816 호, 2015. 12. 30. 일부개정.]

MOIS (2016). Gyeongsangbukdo Province Ordinance for International Exchange Cooperation Promotion. Sejong, Ministry of the Interior and Safety (MOIS). [Accessed: 5 May 2019] <http://www.law.go.kr/ordinInfoP.do?ordinSeq=1250316&gubun=ELIS>. [행정안전부 (2016). 경상북도 국제교류협력 증진에 관한 조례. 시행 2016. 9. 19. 경상북도조례 제 3813 호, 2016. 9. 19. 일부개정.]

MOIS (2017). Gyeongsangbukdo Province Ordinance for International Cooperation Fund Management. Sejong, Ministry of the Interior and Safety (MOIS). [Accessed: 5 May 2019] <http://www.law.go.kr/ordinInfoP.do?ordinSeq=1279651&gubun=ELIS>. [행정안전부 (2017). 경상북도 국제협력기금 운용 조례. 시행 2017. 3. 2. 경상북도조례 제 3891 호, 2017. 3. 2. 일부개정.]

OECD (2008). The Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness and the Accra Agenda for Action. Paris, OECD.

Together 2030 (2017). Voluntary National Reviews: What Are Countries Prioritizing? A Review of 'Main Messages' from Volunteer Countries Presented for the 2017 Session of the UN High Level Political Forum on Sustainable Development.

UCLG (2015). The Sustainable Development Goals: What Local Governments Need to Know. Barcelona, United Cities and Local Governments.

UCLG (2017). National and Sub-National Governments on the Way towards the Localisation of the SDGs. Local and Regional Governments' Report to the 2017 HLPF. Barcelona, United Cities and Local Governments.

UN (2015a). Outcome Document of the Third International Conference on Financing for Development: Addis Ababa Action Agenda. A/CONF.227/L.1. New York, United Nations.

UN (2015b). Transforming Our World: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. A/RES/70/1. New York, United Nations.

Zander, S., S Trang, L. M. Kolbe (2016). Drivers of Network Governance: A Multitheoretic Perspective with Insights from Case Studies in the German Wood Industry. Journal of Cleaner Production. 110(2016): 109-120.

Interviews extracted from Jung et al. (2017)

Interview A. Private Sector in Gyeongsangbukdo Province, 2016.

Interview B. Government Sector in Daegu Metropolitan City, 2016.

Interview C. NGO in South Korea, 2016.

Interview D. Aid Agency in South Korea, 2017.

Interview E. Government Sector in Gyeongsangbukdo Province, 2017.

Interview F. NGO in Daegu Metropolitan City, 2017.

International Institute of Korean Studies (IKSU)

AB144, Adelphi Building
School of Language and Global Studies
University of Central Lancashire
Preston, Lancashire
PR1 2HE, UK

<https://www.uclan.ac.uk/schools/language-global-studies/iksu/index.php>

