

영문요약

As the challenges of extreme poverty in the fragile states have been deteriorated despite the efforts of the international community, assistance for the fragile states has been highlighted as a key aid issue. Major donors such as the United States and the United Kingdom seeks to expanded the size and impact of aid for fragile states and implement aid project considering their fragilities. Against this background, the Korean government has established a strategy to support fragile states and Korea International Cooperation Agency (KOICA) formed 'Mid-term Implementation Strategy for Fragile States' in 2016. High risks and vulnerable environment in the fragile states make aid projects less effective and influential due to a poor governance and conflicts. Thus, performance management reflecting special conditions of the fragile states is critical. However, previous studies have focused much attention on how to prepare domestic policies and strategies to support the fragile states, and few studies have been conducted on the performance management for projects in fragile context. In addition, fragile context was not fully included in result frameworks of KOICA's Mid-term Sectoral Strategy as well as KOICA's Mid-term Implementation Strategy for Fragile States(2017-2019).

This study, as a foundation to develop KOICA's performance management process for fragile states, seeks to develop a pool of indicators that reflect the root causes of fragility focusing on the public administration sector. public administration and public reform can highly contribute to addressing the root causes of fragility. In order to develop a pool of indicators for managing performance in fragile states, the definition of fragile states was first suggested and the Korean government's strategies for supporting the fragile states were reviewed. Furthermore, Among the countries on the KOICA's list of fragile states, countries that were also selected as Korea's 2nd priority partner countries were analyzed to find out KOICA's current aid status providing for them.

A pool of indicators for KOICA's assistance to the fragile states was developed by

three steps in consideration of root causes of fragility, context of fragile states, and disaggregated beneficiaries. In the first step, fragility-related indicators, which were collected from international organizations and aid agencies, were reclassified in accordance with the indicators of the mid-term strategy in public administration. In order to categorize indicators that are not included under the strategy, 'Development of Democratic Monitoring Capacity for Government' and 'Development of Management Capacity of Natural Resource and Land' categories were added and thus 200 indicators were gathered. In the second step, 200 indicators were re-categorized as 'poor governance,' 'conflict,' and 'disaster' to find the root causes of the fragility. Among these root causes, the indicators of 'poor governance' and 'conflict' were focused since they are linked to the public administration indicators of the KOICA's Mid-term Strategy. In particular, as conflict-related indicators were not included in the mid-term strategy, conflict-related indicators were further derived using SIDA's Conflict Analysis framework as the third step.

Since the indicators classified into the 'poor governance' are related to the public administration indicators in KOICA's mid-term strategy, the indicator group is named as 'transformation indicators' group. On the other hand, given that the conflict-related indicators are not suggested in the strategy, they were named as 'additional indicators' group. When the fragility is caused by the poor governance, the transformed indicators' group would be used. When the fragility is fundamentally caused by conflict, the indicators of 'additional indicators' group can be employed.

The pool of indicators presented in this study was developed in order to help development practitioners get ideas on how to design the indicators towards addressing root causes of fragility and considering multidimensional fragility. Yet, they cannot be said completely cover all indicators that reflect the multifaceted fragility. In this regard, it is necessary for practitioners to tailor these indicators according to the context of each fragile states. Therefore, it is suggested that in order to increase the development effectiveness in fragile contexts, fragility-related indicators should be considered even from the initial step, which develops and designs ODA projects, with a high attention to reduce fragility.