

Development and Issue

Study on the implementation of KOICA's New Southern Policy

* This paper summarizes our "Study on the Implementation of KOICA's New Southern Policy in 2019."

Seok Woo Kim (University of Seoul)
Kyungyon Moon (Chonbuk National University)
Jinyoung Lee (Kyung Hee University)

I. Background

The 'ASEAN-ROK Commemorative Summit' and '1st Mekong-ROK Summit' held in November 2019 showed the possibility of expansion of New Southern Policy, which was established in November 2017. In this context, this study examines development cooperation in Southeast Asia, which is the focal area of New Southern Policy, especially the implementation of KOICA (Korea International Cooperation Agency)'s New Southern Policy and suggests points for its development in the future.

The New Southern Policy was announced during the keynote speech of 'the Indonesia-ROK Forum' on 9th November 2017. It adds a word "New" in front of the southern policy to emphasize ROK's foreign policies on India and ASEAN. '3Ps', the core of the New Southern Policy, is based on building communities of People, Peace, and Prosperity. Countries corresponding to the New Southern Policy are ten ASEAN member states and India. The New Southern Policy aims to improve the cooperation level with the countries as strong as one in the four countries (the US, China, Japan, and Russia). ROK government also establishes the Presidential Committee on New Southern Policy and 'New Southern Policy Implementation Strategy' for consolidating and effective implementation.

The background of New Southern Policy is analyzed largely in three levels. First, the change of international order, which is from the shift in the hegemonic balance of the US and China, competitions and conflicts from the change, India · Pacific strategy of the US and China's One Belt, One Road strategy, is the major variable from the view of international system change. Second, competitions among ROK, Japan, and China around ASEAN and ASEAN's economic · security · political importance increased from the view of regional change. Especially ASEAN's rapid economic development and stress as the passage of international trade stand out on the financial side. Therefore ASEAN is considered a focal area of the competition between the US and China. As economic and security importance increases in the exchange with ASEAN, the importance of contents and direction of diplomatic policies on ASEAN and political dialogue also increase. Third, it is necessary to have supports from regional partners for peace in the Korean Peninsula from the view of ROK. Above all, discussions and importance of the New Southern Policy and New Southern ODA (Official Development Assistance) are constantly raised. The New Southern ODA Policy readjusts aid policies on Asian countries along 3Ps of the New Southern Policy and increases ODA in the major countries of the New Southern Policy to strengthen the development cooperation capability of Korean companies. The New Southern ODA Policy is also a strategy to cope with the competitive composition of the US, Japan, and China in the Southeast.

ROK's ASEAN ODA Policy is not only a smaller volume than the one of the US, Australia, and Japan but also a lack of consistent and stable policies and strategies. The 32nd International Development Cooperation Committee (2019) stressed out to propose a comprehensive ODA roadmap to meet the global values and ROK's foreign policies and to show the direction of the business. In order for this, ASEAN community, united vision such as ASEAN Community Vision 2025, ASEAN Connectivity 2025, IAI (Initiative for ASEAN Integration), and direction of policies should be reviewed to find the possibility of cooperation with KOICA.

'ASEAN-ROK Commemorative Summit' and 'Mekong-ROK Summit' held in Busan in November 2019 inspected the achievements in sectors of the New Southern Policy and strengthened the policy. Specifically 'ASEAN-ROK joint vision statement for peace,

prosperity and partnership' was selected. The summit also mentioned that the ASEAN–ROK cooperation fund is increased double, and the volume of ODA in countries corresponding to the New Southern Policy is also increased double. Therefore this study examines KOICA's implementation of the New Southern Policy and finds strategies.

II. Analysis of the demands on ASEAN development

1. Development strategy and demands of ASEAN

ASEAN member states adopted 'ASEAN MPAC (Master Plan on ASEAN Connectivity) 2025' in order to review existing connectivity projects and complement problems. It is an optimized strategy document to strengthen cooperation and alleviate development gaps among ASEAN countries. This chapter examines MPAC 2025 strategies.

September 2016 MPAC 2025 was adopted in the 28th ASEAN Summit in Vientiane, Laos. It is composed more specific and practical than the existing MPAC 2010.

MPAC 2025 could be a comprehensive roadmap, including the demands on ASEAN development. MPAC 2025 refers to the physical, institutional, and people-to-people linkages that can contribute towards a more cohesive ASEAN (MPAC 2025, p. 15).

[Figure 1] ASEAN Connectivity 2025: An Integral Part of ASEAN Community Vision 2025



There is a high possibility to connect with KOICA's five areas to the five strategies in MPAC 2025 (sustainable infrastructure, digital innovation, seamless logistics, regulatory excellence, people mobility). Technical and Vocational Education and Training (TVET) can be the strength of KOICA with experiences. ASEAN's interest in TVET is also high. TVET's main goal is to improve techniques and education courses according to the process demand for new techniques and producing services. It is closely connected to SDGs' Goal 8 'decent work and economic growth.'

ASEAN endeavors to activate TVET in the level of regional institutions. A present case of it is the 9th regional political dialogue of TVET in Bangkok on 24th June 2019. There were discussions of improvement of TVET quality, image, and results in this meeting. There are other regular discussions such as a forum of Advancing TVET towards the Internationalization of Vocational Education Qualification and Standards for Sustainable Development in Thailand in August 2019.

2. Development strategies and demands of each ASEAN state: economic plans and development strategies of six countries

This paragraph reviews the economic development strategies of six countries (Indonesia, Philippines, Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia, and Myanmar) among ten ASEAN member states. National development plans or strategy documents are useful to form priorities and processes of national development and provide valuable directions for development cooperation (Carr 2018). Therefore this study draws development demands of each country and sounds out the possibilities of connecting KOICA's five cooperation areas onto it. Economic development strategies and development demands (cooperation field) of six countries can be summarized in the <Table 1>. The six ASEAN countries mainly deal with economic growth (reducing poverty and building infrastructure), conservation of the environment for sustainable development, and development of human resources.

〈Table 1〉 Economic development strategies of 6 ASEAN countries and possible areas of cooperation

Country	Economic development strategies	Main contents and key areas	Possible areas of cooperation
Indonesia	• Masterplan 2015–2035 • Joko Widodo 2nd Masterplan: 2019–2024	• 11 strategies • Infrastructure, human resources, investment, reformation of bureaucracy, effective implementation of the budget	Higher education, smart city
Philippines	• National vision 2040 • 0+10 Point Socioeconomic Agenda	• Middle class society without poverty • Healthy life • High level of trust in society	Rural development, poverty reduction, health
Vietnam	• SEDS(2011–2020) • SEDP(2011–2020)	• 12 development strategies • Establishment of socialist market economy, fostering high-quality human resources, infrastructure	Smart city, higher education, economic growth
Laos	• Vision 2030	• Economic growth • Minor tribes (gender) • Preservation of natural resources	Economic growth, gender equality, minor tribes, management of resources, infrastructure, management of water resources, rural development
Myanmar	• MSDP(2018–2030)	• Peace and stability • Prosperity and partnership • Human and the earth	Economic growth, definition of peace, management of resources and water resources, infrastructure, rural development
Cambodia	• Rectangular Strategy IV (2019–2023)	• Infrastructure • Electricity • Water resources • Human resources	Economic growth, infrastructure, vocational education (training), transportation, management of water resources, rural development, health and medical treatment

This paragraph draws KOICA's possible areas of cooperation in the future by reviewing ASEAN's demands of development and economic development strategies of six ASEAN countries. It is for examining the connectivity possibility with KOICA's

five main areas and increasing KOICA's New Southern ODA's mutual consistency. Indonesia, Philippines, Vietnam, Laos, Myanmar, and Cambodia are members of ASEAN, so it is hard to separate from ASEAN's integration. It will rather be a considerable synergy effect if KOICA projects graft onto ASEAN's efforts for reducing the development gap for integration. In order to enhance the effectiveness of ODA, it is necessary to pay attention to the change of recipient countries' governments. It already mentioned in this chapter, Indonesia had changes in its economic development strategies after introducing Joko Widodo's 2nd administration in 2019. For example, there are current development demands in tourism and building infrastructure. It is necessary to examine if KOICA's current support plans for these six countries are reflected in their existing economic development strategies, or it is possible to connect with a new government's development strategies. It is not necessary to revise the development strategy because of the change of the recipient country's government, yet it would be better to consider recipient countries' demands on development.

III. Analysis of ASEAN policies of significant donor countries (Japan, China, and Australia)

This chapter analyzes ASEAN strategies, volumes, and areas of aid, characteristics of donor countries (Japan, China, and Australia). It is to clarify the specialty and differentiation of KOICA's ASEAN strategies. Japan, China, and Australia are selected as examples of donor countries in this study; first, Japan and China are APT (ASEAN Plus Three) countries like ROK. Therefore a comparison of their ASEAN strategies would provide implications of APT member countries' ASEAN strategies. Second, it is to draw ROK's cooperation areas through analysis of Japan and China's foreign aid (charm offensive) in Southeast Asia. Lastly, Australia is an appropriate case as a middle power towards ASEAN since it has continuously strengthened cooperation in ASEAN. Hence, this chapter analyzes the ASEAN strategies of Japan,

China, and Australia to deduce implications to ROK.

Japan, China, and Australia are not only geographically close to ASEAN, but also major donor and partner countries in the politic, diplomacy and society. Japan, China, and Australia have recently enhanced their cooperation relations with ASEAN. It is a strategy for Japan and Australia to keep in check of China and its sudden rise in Southeast Asia. Also, the importance of ASEAN as an economic partner became stronger in Japan and Australia. Only ASEAN strategies of these three countries do not look mostly different from one of ROK. In other words, cooperation with ASEAN is because of the alleviation of security threat due to geographical proximity, activation of trade and securing resources along with ASEAN's economic development, enhancement of influence in international society and securing supports from neighbor countries. The following is drawn after reviewing ASEAN's geographic usefulness, ASEAN development cooperation strategies, and ODA status.

〈Table 2〉 Major contents of aid status in 6 ASEAN countries (Japan, China, and Australia)

Division	Japan	China	Australia
Key strategies and documents	• Quality infrastructure partnership(2015–2020) • New Tokyo strategy(2015)	• One Belt, One Road(2013) • Lancang–Mekong cooperation mechanism(2015)	• ASEAN · Australia cooperation program step 1 · 2(2002–2021) • ASEAN · Mekong program(2017–2020) • Sydney declaration(2018)
Major fund	• JAIF \$100,007,000	• Silkroad fund 6CNY 1,525 billion	• Smart city initiative(2018) \$23 million
Aid volume	• Total \$33.5 billion (2008–2017)	• Unable to check the statistic	• Total \$6.95 billion (2008–2017)
The most supported country	• Vietnam	• Indonesia (by the standard of AIB permitted projects)	• Indonesia > Philippines > Vietnam
Types and key areas	• Large scale supports for economic infrastructure as using credit assistance	• Supports for building infrastructure as using no interest loans under the BRI policy	• Supports for social infrastructure and services as using grant assistance

Source: author

First, ODA can be used as a soft power to enhance cooperation with ASEAN. Japan, China, and Australia all recognize ODA as a soft power and an effective way of leverage and utilize it acts as a foreign policy to enhance cooperation with ASEAN. Japan recognizes ASEAN as a market to pioneer to boost up its economic stagnation; therefore it focuses on building economic infrastructure in the ASEAN region. Japan recognized the strategic importance of ASEAN a long time ago, so it has focused on forming friendly relations with ASEAN and expanded its diplomacy and supports. Moreover, Japan actively carries out strategies to connect with ASEAN since it recognizes ODA as an essential leverage to advance its corporates into the market of developing countries. After the global financial crisis in 2008, there is a tendency to consider ODA as a way of national strategies and interest more strongly. Therefore not only Japan but also China see foreign aid as a way for its politic, diplomacy, and economic benefit. In fact, China recognizes the strategic importance of ASEAN and the value of ASEAN as a starting point of its economic development. For that reason, China strives for economic cooperation as well as economic diplomacy as utilizing foreign aid.

Korea has a more positive image in ASEAN in comparison with Japan, which attacked ASEAN in the past, or China, that has conflicts over territory. Especially the positive emotions formed by Korean pop culture, such as K-POP and drama in Southeast Asia, bring synergy effects to the improvement of the national image of ROK. ROK established ASEAN policies and strategies pretty late compared to Japan, China, and Australia. There is a significant gap in support volumes between ROK and these countries. However, the positive image would bring positive synergy effects to the enhancement of relations with ASEAN. Moreover, ASEAN is significant for the side of the national security and economic benefit of ROK, which is the key to the New Southern Policy. The study can deduce implications that ROK should utilize ODA more as a strategic soft power and leverage of national benefit as Japan, China, and Australia do.

Second, it is necessary that key areas such as digitization, higher education, rural development, and the smart city should be driven in a more strategic and integrated way with Korean ODA's strength. Since Korean ODA volume is minimal compared to

China and Japan, it is necessary to find a strategic approach to specialize in areas such as technical cooperation, vocational and higher education, rural development, health, and medical system (building basic health and national health care system). In this way, it is possible to have a comparative advantage over those countries.

Third, it is necessary to find ODA strategies that could discover branded model projects along with the norms of international society and bring national benefit. China gives massive amount of funds but has been criticized for its own way of implementation. Japan also has a negative side that it pursues its national benefit excessively. ROK is a last-mover but established ASEAN strategy. The New Southern Policy also announces that ROK will enhance politic, diplomatic, and economic cooperation with Southeast Asian countries since they are very important for our national security and economic benefit. There are two parts to take into account. The aim should be clear if ROK will use ODA as a tool of national interest like Japan and China or differentiated strategies unlike Japan and China, or like Australia, it is necessary to recognize ODA as global public goods and approach more comprehensively than a way of national benefit. ROK has built an image of a middle power; therefore Australia would be a more suitable model to carry forward.

Fourth, Australian cooperation strategies to ASEAN, the New Southern Policy, and KOICA's New Southern strategies have a lot in common. More specifically, Australia puts values on peace and mutual cooperation for development like our government. In the 2017 Foreign Policy White Paper, Australia recognizes threats of national security along with the change of international order, terrorism, and vulnerable nations as an essential challenge to address. 'Joint Declaration on ASEAN-Australia Comprehensive Partnership (2007)' stresses out supports regional peace, stability, security, development, and prosperity in the side of politic and security cooperation. In its strategies, Australia includes agendas that ASEAN wants such as reducing development gap and sustainable development through development cooperation programs among ASEAN countries to reflect its responsibility as a middle power. Australia also supports ASEAN policies in AADCP level 2, builds a close cooperation system with ASEAN secretariat, and includes agendas such as consistent ownership to secure its place as a cooperation partner of ASEAN.

Lastly, Australia advocates sustainable development, comprehensive economic growth, and human security of ASEAN countries to meet SDGs in the 'ASEAN-Mekong Program (2017-2020)'. There are agendas in 2018 'Sydney Declaration' that ROK can share: negotiation of denuclearization in DPRK (regional security), emphasis on multiple trade system not to promote protectionism (future prosperity), supports for smart and sustainable urbanization, supports on ASEAN MPAC 2025 implementation, expansion of cooperation in private sectors, expansion of MSME participation, supports for reducing development gap in ASEAN through IAI, expansion of personal interchange, spread of value of common ownership such as peace, harmonization, understanding of culture and rules. ROK government needs to take into account Australia as a strategic cooperation partner since it pursues strategies in a similar direction that the New Southern Policy and KOICA's New Southern ODA Policy pursue.

IV. Analysis of KOICA's New Southern ODA projects

Before analyzing KOICA's ASEAN CP (Country Program), the study examines issues of the direction of the Korean government's ODA and finds the direction of KOICA's New Southern ODA under the New Southern Policy. The study would like to mention the following issues based on existing studies, the government and KOICA strategic documents, and our field visit to the local organizations (Indonesia, Thailand).

The first issue is fragmentation among implementing organizations. It has been an issue in Korea's ODA system for a long while. Various agents such as KOICA, EDCF, government departments provide ODA, respectively. It is necessary to build an unofficial system in which each organization can discuss and cooperate, like 'Team Korea' in Indonesia. The second issue is a relative lack of experts and expertise in ASEAN ODA. Human resources for knowledge, logic, study, and field experience in ASEAN are not enough. Expertise that can connect with the region and development

cooperation is also not sufficient. There should be a medium-long term effort to overcome this issue.

The third issue is that there are so many ongoing projects in recipient countries. Small and short-term projects have problems such as excessive personnel expenses and administrative charges, low effectiveness, visibility, and sustainability. Therefore those projects should be converted to programs as following the current KOICA methods. Based on this, there is a need to conduct medium and demanded long-term programs in recipient countries. Since there is an expectation of a yearly 20% increased ODA volume in ASEAN, it is essential to use programs that can show visibility and effectiveness. Fourth, it is hard to find differences in KOICA's national strategies of each six ASEAN countries. KOICA's CP is composed of grounds of comprehensive development policies in each recipient country, main contents of development policies, the system of receipt, contents of ODA, achievements, and analysis of issues, and implementing programs. It is not necessary to summarize the CP of six countries in detail. However, CP has relatively missing parts in concreteness and validity, and it is hard to find differences among countries. Accordingly, it is necessary to review again if CP was made after considering each country's economic development plans and specific demands for foreign aid.

Fifth, the study finds after reviewing KOICA's plans and implementation that there are many contents related to Prosperity and People of 4Ps in the New Southern Policy and KOICA strategies, but relatively not enough contents related to Planet and Peace. Prosperity includes many specific issues such as rural development, transportation, smart city, and ICTs, and people are also related to diverse and specific matters such as higher education, empowerment, vocational education, and technology transfer. On the other hand, there are not enough contents related to Planet, and explanation and content of Peace are not clear. There is a need to provide a precise definition of Peace in the New Southern Policy and which policies would be carried out. KOICA's five main areas should be connected to Peace based on it.

Sixth, plans of increasing trade cooperation between ROK and ASEAN member

states are not explicitly included in the current plans. It is not necessary to strengthen it since KOICA is an agency of grant assistance. Yet it is not irrelevant from that Korean ODA to ASEAN pursues the national economic benefit considering the side of mutual national benefits. Also, considering that one of the major points in the New Southern Policy is increasing economic cooperation between ROK and ASEAN member states, it is necessary to connect ODA and national economic benefits of ROK. It is especially essential to connect ODA and economic cooperation when it comes to cases of Creating Shared Values or the development and sales of ASEAN agricultural products. These strategies meet the SDG goals (building a comprehensive partnership) as well as enhance the effectiveness of ODA.

Seventh, regulations of assessment and management should be reorganized along with the manual. Currently, KOICA intensifies assessment tasks. The assessment has dual purposes of improving accountability and learning effects. After the organization of it, it is expected to improve the transparency and effectiveness of ASEAN programs.

Lastly, KOICA should consider all competitions among ASEAN member states and donor countries. ASEAN member states, especially the major six recipient countries, make efforts to establish policies in ASEAN and turn major donor countries' policies along with their needs. ASEAN works to make major donor countries have competitions as well. Therefore, it is necessary to take into account of it and establish Korea's own ODA policies and strategies.

V. KOICA's ASEAN policy and strategy development

November 2017, the New Southern Policy was established. ROK Ministry of Foreign Affairs established 'New Southern ODA implementation strategy' in August 2018. KOICA established 'ASEAN-ROK Future Community (New Southern) ODA Strategy Implementation Plan (2019-2023)' in May 2019. The implementation plan announces

the background of New Southern ODA as ‘a need for conducting corresponding ODA to the government’s major policies.’ It recognizes the strategic direction of Korean ODA objectively since ROK has a smaller ODA volume compared to China or Japan, so it is necessary to approach ASEAN based on the economic development experiences and horizontal cooperation relations with ASEAN. Earlier it was studied that major donor countries implement large scale ODA programs to ASEAN countries along with their systematic strategic documents and a geopolitics view (Australia), a diplomatic security view (China), and a national economic benefit view (Japan, China).

KOICA’s implementation plan summarizes the development demands of ASEAN countries as education, urbanization, water sources, agriculture, and transportation. Education is a significant investment for politics, economy, and social development regardless of the economic level of a country. However, it is hard to support universal elementary and higher education at the same time since the ODA resources are limited. Normally universal elementary and vocational education becomes the major program in the poorest countries, and higher education for the next economic jump enhances once the economic level is improved. In this context, universal elementary and vocational education should be strengthened in Cambodia, Laos, and Myanmar and Vietnam, and Indonesia have a high demand in higher education.

ROK can heighten connectivity to higher education since its strength is education. The fast economic growth in ROK was possible because of concentrated investment and development in higher education. KOICA recently announced that it would carry out the Minnesota Project in ASEAN countries. Strategies focusing on higher education in Indonesia and Vietnam should be considered since there is a high demand for higher education in those countries. KOICA’s implementation plan also contains concerns about ASEAN’s urbanization. Urbanization in ASEAN countries has been rapid along with the fast economic growth that produces issues such as population overcrowding, traffic jam, environmental pollution, and gap between the rich and poor. Indonesia and Vietnam among six ASEAN countries especially have a serious level of such issues according to overcrowded cities and reckless development. The urbanization rate of other countries would be soared by 2040, so responses for it should be organized.

Lastly, KOICA's implementation plan mentions development issues along with climate change. For example, Myanmar and the Philippines are vulnerable to natural disasters such as storms and floods, so it is necessary to have plans to cope with it. Cambodia, Laos, and Myanmar have mainly primary industries as well as a high rate of small farmers, so the poverty rate is also relatively high. The plan emphasizes on transportation infrastructure for enhancement of connectivity in ASEAN and continuous development.

Based on these demands of ASEAN countries, KOICA's implementation plan supports themes in five areas such as increasing ODA volume, digitalization, higher education rural development, urban development and transportation and the New Southern ODA implementation plan that emphasizes on connected cooperation for discovering and implementing programs. Increasing ODA volume can be first noticed. The plan of increasing the current ODA volume double until 2023 is affirmative, considering that economic trade becomes stronger between ROK and Southeast Asian countries. Most of all, the importance of ODA is significant since six out of ten ASEAN countries are developing countries, and three out six (Laos, Cambodia, Myanmar) are the poorest developing countries. Chinese One Belt, One Road strategy intensifies competition between the US and China in the ASEAN region. The US requests a combination of India · Pacific strategies and Korean New Southern Policy in order to watch out China's influence in Southeast Asia. Consequently, increasing the ODA volume of the ROK government in ASEAN is positive on many levels.

However, there are factors to consider in order to increase ODA double in ASEAN. First of all, the increase of ODA to ASEAN should happen within increasing the total ODA volume. In other words, ODA to non-ASEAN countries such as Africa and Central/ South America should not be decreased because of the increase of ODA to ASEAN. Second, a yearly 20% increase in ODA volume and a 10% increasing in new projects can lead to issues of wasting the government budget and insolvency of ODA implementation considering our capacity for ODA implementation. In order to prevent it, enhancement of capacity and supplement of the personnel should be secured. Localization of programs through an expansion of dispatched personnel to KOICA offices in six ASEAN countries should be organized. Especially for synergy effects

among programs in six ASEAN countries, reinforcement of connectivity and professional personnel for key areas in ASEAN emphasized in ASEAN MPAC 2025 should be conducted simultaneously.

Afterward the tasks with classified approach should be noticed. Programs should be selected based on the demands of ASEAN development and our comparative advantage. It is a strategy to provide ODA along with themes in order to improve ODA effectiveness through choice and concentration. However, it is hard to finish or change existing programs on the site since the ROK government altered ODA policies. Generally, n-2 of time is necessary since, in the case of large scale ODA programs are discovered through meticulous preliminary and validity researches. In other words, the discovery of programs along with KOICA New Southern ODA implementation plan in May 2019 would be commenced around 2022 that is the end of the current administration. This is why existing outstanding programs are early discovered and enlarged. In case that validity is proved, a measure to shorten the generally taking n-2 preparation time should be counted. Above all, an organization that can support an effective program discovering system should be required.

Digitalization, higher education, rural development, urban development, and transportation are selected under the theme approach. These topics match with ASEAN connectivity, demands of six ASEAN countries on development, Korean CPS, and KOICA's CP. As well as they have suitability with our government's 3Ps and four key areas. The introduction of the KOICA New Southern ODA implementation plan indicates that it is conducted based on 'differentiated ODA with Korean strength', but the differences in rural development and transportation are weak compared to other donor countries. Rural development is not only a theme of ROK but also other countries, international organizations, and NGOs. Rural development does not have differences since KOICA conducts it the most (agriculture, forestry, and fisheries 27.8%, education 23.5%, technology environment energy 22.5%, health and medical treatment 13.1%, public administration 12.4%) among its implementation in six countries. In order to have differences in rural development programs, so-called Saemaeul movement, the volume should be enlarged, and the implementation system should be advanced. An innovative mechanism that creates social capital should also

be framed and systemized. The case of transportation, Japan and China dominate transportation infrastructure development in six ASEAN countries based on large scale capital. ROK should find another differentiated strategy in large scale transportation structure ODA since ROK has a very small volume on transportation infrastructure compared to those countries.

It is necessary to have an approach to focus on the development demands of each country in digitalization, higher education, rural development, urban development, and transportation. According to the strategy, the five themes match to six ASEAN countries. Higher education programs should be focused in Vietnam and Indonesia. In Myanmar and Laos, universal education and vocational training are required. In the same context, urban development is necessary for Vietnam, Indonesia, and the Philippines. Like this, it is necessary to use five themes in six ASEAN countries with choice and concentration.

The last issue related to support in themes in KOICA New Southern ODA implementation plan is that 'People' and 'Peace' of 3Ps (People, Prosperity, Peace) are not reflected in the implementation plan. Considering that personal interchange between ROK and ASEAN countries is a key in New Southern Policy, health and medical treatment areas should be included in the five themes. It is indispensable to prevent contagious diseases and diseases due to a low level of medical treatment, especially in Cambodia, Laos, and Myanmar from ROK considering the relations ROK with the countries. Although it is not included in the five themes, health and medical treatment should be included since significant parts of KOICA's innovation support programs (CTS and IBS). Moreover, it matches the New Southern Policy that focuses on the expansion of our market economy in ASEAN since CTS and IBS drag private enterprises into the area of international development cooperation.

'Peace' is also not included in the implementation plan. The New Southern Policy is a major plan of 'Peace' and suggests activating the exchange of summit and high-level officers, enhancing cooperation for peace and prosperity in Korean Peninsula, and expanding national defense and military business. However, it is not easy to connect these tasks with ODA strategies. On the other hand, the possibility of connecting with ODA programs is high with the task 'No. 15 Collective response to

anti-terrorism as well as cyber and maritime security', and 'No 16. Better resilience to regional contingencies'. KOICA has experiences of organizing and enhancing capability in developing countries as ODA programs. KOICA has also conducted landmine and unexploded bomb disposal programs and rural development programs ('Mekong-ROK peace rural community building') in Laos, Vietnam, and Cambodia since 2014. Therefore it is necessary to include these programs into the 'Peace' area and expand and develop frameworks that connect peace and local development.

Lastly, KOICA New Southern ODA implementation plan suggests integrated ODA expansion for connectivity and enhancement of cooperation, the connection of ODA, and non-ODA resources and inducing participation of private sector partners. There are around 40 acting departments in case of grant assistance. In this situation, the absence of coordination of various active departments brings fragmentation, which is a characteristic term of Korean aid. SDGs emphasizes on discovering various development resources in order to achieve 17 goals. Also, it highlights partnerships with diverse non-national actors in international development cooperation in order to form innovative development resources and raise the effectiveness of development. Practical efforts are necessary to enlarge integrated ODA, connecting ODA and non-ODA, the discovery of non-ODA resources, partnerships between the private sector, government, and aid organizations.

VI. Conclusion

Based on the earlier commented contents, the conclusion contains four types of proposals.

1) Proposals for the system

ROK's ODA to ASEAN is expected to expand based on the New Southern Policy and the government's consistent interest. Therefore it is necessary to expand resources

and have more human resources in development cooperation projects in Southeast Asia. Recently created an 'International Development Cooperation Program Committee' should be improved to be able to implement effective and efficient ODA to ASEAN. The effectiveness of ODA should be increased through comprehensive and integrated ODA planning and implementation with diverse organizations apart from KOICA. Close communities like 'TEAM KOREA' should be intensified. Especially KOICA offices in six ASEAN countries should have a regular meeting to discover programs and share information. Personnel in charge of the ASEAN region should be dispatched to the KOICA office in Jakarta in order to discover and implement regional joint projects or programs since the ASEAN Secretariat is located in Jakarta. The implementation of regional projects is limited due to administrative issues. However, it will be inevitable to establish regional development cooperation projects once the cooperation with ASEAN is enlarged and enhanced. Expansion of manpower is necessary as well as time to earn field experiences, and knowledge should be considered.

2) Proposals for strategies

Current KOICA's five main areas to ASEAN should have health and medical treatment and peace. It is for improvement of the policy response to the New Southern Policy. It is very important to consider health and medical treatment considering the economic and social underdevelopment of the four countries (Cambodia, Laos, Myanmar, and Vietnam). The promotion of health and medical treatment is essential to improve the quality of life and happiness of 'People.' It is also the ground of 'Prosperity' as well as contributes to 'Peace.' It is also closely connected to the quality of life among Koreans considering the fact that increasingly Koreans marry people from ASEAN, and various diseases move out of borders.

Peace is a key area in the New Southern Policy. ODA policies excluding peace are distant from the strategies of the current government. Peace issues are immensely comprehensive, so it is limited to contribute to peace and stability through ROK's restricted ODA volume. However, the symbolism of peace is very important. Removal of landmine and rehabilitation programs in Laos, possibly implementing peace

education and ocean programs is significantly meaningful. ROK's contribution to peace in ASEAN is practically meaningful with the symbolism since ROK would like to secure supports of ASEAN for denuclearization and peace in the Korean Peninsula. For this reason, active discovery and implementation of peace are necessary.

As formerly mentioned, KOICA should have health and medical treatment and peace on top of the five main areas. It is not necessary to conduct ODA programs to ASEAN identically. Differentiated country plans should be established through situations of each recipient country, the development demands of each country, ROK's strength and comparison with the strategies of other donor countries.

Also, there is a need to consider cultural tourism in the long-term. ASEAN countries work on forming a community and common policies. On the other hand, ASEAN nations also keep policies that protect their own culture, religion, racial character, and preservation of the environment. They have interests in culture, such as recently established 'ASEAN-ROK Film Organization'. It would rather need to have win-win policies that help for Koreans to understand ASEAN countries and use their culture, not to have one-sided policies that preach K-POP, K-MOVIE, K-DRAMA, and K-FOOD. Most of all, the comparative advantage of ASEAN countries is tourism. It is true that most ASEAN countries depend on income from tourism, and tourism is expected to be increased with globalization. Therefore cooperation in diverse areas such as developing tourism information, education of tourism manpower, building tourism infrastructure, and technology support is necessary.

3) Proposals for programs

Currently, KOICA selects ODA programs such as higher education cooperation, democracy-human rights related education, increasing capability as following Minnesota method, and acceptance of ILO (International Labour Organization) norms related to higher education. The Minnesota method cooperation has strengths such as fostering high-quality human resources and enhancing capability in ASEAN. However, it does not apply horizontally considering the communication language

(English), volume, and capability of Korean professors. Programs related to acceptance of ILO norms are also difficult to apply comprehensively due to the gap of human rights, governance, and democracy level among ASEAN member states. Specific measures should be found in order to implement these ideas. The following is currently conducted or possibly enlarged in the future: ASEAN Training Center, ASEAN Master-PhD program, electronic passport program for ASEAN connectivity, ASEAN railway and public transportation tickets, ASEAN SIM card. Possible new programs under the ASEAN Center can be the management of ocean and water resources, ICTs related programs, removal of landmine, and supports for victims of an unexploded bomb, which are the whole ASEAN interested in.

Another possible program can be education and national capability enhancement programs in which the ASEAN member states participate. For example, capability enhancement programs related to SDGs audit or programs to change the whole audit system corresponding to the international standards can be considered. This kind of programs includes the ASEAN and applies to other capability enhancement programs. It can find ways for other countries that have expertise in special subjects to participate in as well as can be proceeded as South-South Cooperation.

4) Proposals for modality

Lastly, the study takes a look at the convert of the modality of ASEAN ODA policy implementation. As formerly mentioned, trilateral or triangular cooperation can be considered. Indonesia and Thailand currently enlarge its ODA volume in order to become a middle-income country-donor country. Indonesia has increased ODA not only in ASEAN countries but also in the Middle East Asia and Africa. It also makes efforts in order to secure the status of a donor country as one of G20. On the other hand, Thailand has tried to become a donor country after Prime Minister Thaksin announced in 2004 that Thailand does not accept ODA from other countries. Thailand focuses on ODA contribution in ASEAN countries that are adjacent. Especially Thailand is the only country among ten ASEAN countries that established TICA (Thailand International Cooperation Agency) for South-South Cooperation. Through

this triangular cooperation, recipient countries improve ownership and strengthen cooperation with ASEAN donor countries.

The next proposal is to convert current KOICA's projects to programs. Projects have relatively small sizes but too numerous, so it is hard to manage them and increase their effectiveness and visibility. In order to complement it, it is necessary to convert it to a bigger-sized and visible system. Considering that the ODA volume to ASEAN would be increased in the future, the environment for big scale programs should be promoted as well as the capability will be improved. In order for this, the national portfolio assessment should be conducted as well.

There is a need to enlarge integration with private resources and PPP (Private-Public Partnership) with private enterprises. In order to create 'mutual benefits' between ROK and ASEAN recipient countries, it is necessary to contribute ODA in a mutual win-win way, create and distribute economic values. One of the key points of the New Southern Policy is conducting ODA policies for promoting national benefit. In order for it, it is necessary to cooperate with private enterprises. Recently discussed and conducted CTS (Creative Technology Solution), IBS (Inclusive Business Solution), and IPS (Innovative Partnership Solution) should be expanded. International society's norms and rules suggest ODA contribution for the political, economic, social development of recipient countries, but it has been clear that many countries pursue national interests through ODA. It is a general phenomenon that diverse national interests such as security, politics, economy, refugee, environment are pursued by different donor countries. ROK needs to consider this flow of international society and examine 'mutual benefits' meticulously and apply it.

References

- Akhmetov, D. (2010). Regional Disparities in the European Union. Essay for the Advanced Economics of European Integration–Microeconomic Aspects.
- Alavi, R. & Ramadan, A. A–A. (2008). Narrowing Development Gaps in ASEAN. *Journal of Economic Cooperation*, 29(1).
- ASEAN. (2016). Master Plan on ASEAN Connectivity 2025. Jakarta: ASEAN Secretariat.
- Asia Foundation. (2018). ASEAN as the Architect for Regional Development Cooperation: Advancing ASEAN Centrality & Catalyzing Action for Sustainable Development. Asia Foundation.
- Asian Development Bank. (2018). "Cambodia's Road Map for Sustainable Development: The National Environment Strategy and Action Plan."
- Australia. Plan of Action to Implement the ASEAN–Australia Strategic Partnership (2015–2019). Australia.
- Australian Aid. Narrowing the Development Gap. ASEAN Community Progress Monitoring System 2017.
- _____. (2017). ASEAN Community Progress Monitoring System. Jakarta: ASEAN Secretariat.
- Brooks, D. H. R. Hasan, J. W. Son J. Zhuang. (2010). Closing Development Gaps: Challenges and Policy Options. *Asian Development Review*, 27(2): 1–28.
- Caballero–Anthony, M. (2006). Bridging Development Gaps in Southeast Asia: Towards an ASEAN Community. UNISCI Discussion Papers No. 11.
- Cambodia. (2018). "Growth, Employment, Equity and Efficiency: Building the Foundation Toward Realizing the Cambodia Vision 2050." Cambodia: Royal

Government of Cambodia of the Sixth Legislature of the National Assembly.

Dreyer, J. T. (2006). Sino–Japanese Rivalry and Its Implications for Developing Nations. *Asian Survey*, 46(4): 538–557.

Giang, B. T. and Thanh, V. T. (2007). Approach to Development Gaps in ASEAN: A Vietnamese Perspective. *ASEAN Economic Bulletin*, 24(1): 164–180.

Green, D. J. (2007). Bridging the ASEAN Development Divide: A Regional Overview. *ASEAN Economic Bulletin*, 24(1): 15–34.

Hoa, T. V. & Limskul, K. (2017). Japan's ODA in Globally Integrated CLMV Economies: Aid Effectiveness and Political Economy. *Korea and the World Economy*, 18(3): 299–327.

Huat, Q. B. (year). CLMV Development Assistance Programmes: Background, Approaches, Concerns. Development Strategy for CLMV in the Age of Economic Integration, ERIA Research Project Report 4: 82–114.

Initiative for ASEAN Integration (IAI) Work Plan for the CLMV Countries: Progress Report. 2005.

https://www.bappenas.go.id/files/5013/5022/6033/d5__20081123070255__1022__27.pdf

Jain, P. (2015). Japan's Foreign Aid: Old and New Contests. *Pacific Review*, 29(1): 93–113.

Laos. "8th Five–Year National Socio–Economic Development Plan (2016–2020)."

http://www.la.one.un.org/images/publications/8th_NSEDP_2016–2020.pdf

Lee Hwok Aun. (2017) "Malaysia's Transformasi Nasional 2050 Brings Bold New Style, but to What End?" Singapore: ISEAS.

Myanmar. (2018). "Myanmar Sustainable Development Plan(2018–2030)." The Government of Republic of the Union of Myanmar: Ministry of Planning and

Finance.

Pitakdumrongkit, K. (2018). Addressing Digital Protectionism in ASEAN: Towards Better Regional Governance in the Digital Age. RSIS Policy Report.

Reilly, J. (2013). China and Japan in Myanmar: Aid, Natural Resources and Influence. *Asian Studies Review*, 37(2), 141–157.

Seesaram, N. D. (2016). Sustainable Development Goals and Smart Cities Development Engineering Opportunities in the Mauritian Context.

http://www.iemauritius.com/upload/files/article_v0_r.pdf

Severino, R. (2007). A Sense of Community for Southeast Asia.

<http://library.fes.de/pdf-files/bueros/singapur/04601/2007-3/severino.pdf>

Sinitsina, I. (2011). The Development Gap Between the CIS and EU. *EU Eastern Neighborhood*, 1–21.

TN50 Special Unit. (2018). “National Conference on Economic Corridors: Challenges and Prospects.”

Todaro, M. (1982). *Economic for a Development World*. New York & London: Longman.

Xing, L. (2019). *Mapping China's 'One Belt One Road' Initiative*. China, Switzerland: Palgrave macmillan.

Yoshimatsu, H. & Trinidad D. (2010). Development Assistance, Strategic Interests, and the China Factor in Japan's Role in ASEAN Integration. *Japanese Journal of Political Science*, 11(2), 199–219.

MEMO

MEMO

Lined area for writing the memo.

MEMO

연구자료

2019-30-140

※ This paper is also available at KOICA ODA Library Website (<http://lib.koica.go.kr>)

