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Note:
To understand participatory budgeting in Korea, it is important to understand its administrative and political divisions. South Korea is divided into 8 provinces (do), 1 special autonomous province (teukbyeol jachido), 6 metropolitan cities (gwangyeoksi), and 1 special city (teukbyeolsi). These provinces have different names but they are at the same level. These are further subdivided into a variety of smaller entities, including cities (si), counties (gun), districts (gu), towns (eup), townships (myeon), neighborhoods (dong) and villages (ri).

A province is divided into either cities (si) or, in the case of rural areas, counties (gun). Population centers with greater than 150,000 residents are considered cities (si); those with less, counties (gun). (Once the population of a gun reaches 150,000 it becomes a si).

Cities with more than 500,000 residents are further divided into districts (gu); those with less, into communities (dongs). Gus are then divided into neighborhoods (dong). Towns (eup) is under cities (si) or counties (gun) with more than 20,000 residents. Townships (myeon) and neighborhoods (dong) consists of more than two villages (ri).

1 Gijang county in Busan is an exception.
1. Introduction
Participatory budgeting is a way for citizens to be involved in policy decision-making and encourage municipalities to consider constituents’ opinions. Since its inception in Porto Alegre, Brazil in 1989, cities around the world have adopted this program. Wasteful budgets and inefficient operations had been attributed to public officials’ monopoly over the allocation of public resources; by decentralizing this power, participatory budgeting allowed a more efficient allocation of the budget, while increasing citizens’ political awareness. This study examines participatory budgeting as a solution to the problems and limitations of representative democracy.

The study first provides a brief overview of two well known international participatory budgeting cases: Porto Alegre, Brazil and Lichtenberg, Germany. Secondly, it provides an overview of the history and current conditions of participatory budgeting in South Korea (hereon referred to as Korea) and explains its legal basis. Next, the report focuses on a successful case of participatory democracy in the district of Yeonsu. Finally, it concludes with accomplishments and challenges of Korea’s participatory budgeting during its 10 years of existence.

2. Participatory Budgeting’s Advantages
Participatory budgeting involves citizens’ direct participation in the prioritization and allocation of the budget. It naturally requires the decentralization of power from municipalities, which previously monopolized budget allocations, to the local neighborhood. In the process, the energy, creativity, and insights of the neighborhood can be harnessed to create a more transparent, accountable, and effective budget. This participatory budgeting method is more effective than alternatives such as civil society’s budget monitoring campaigns: while with budget monitoring watchdog civil society organizations can only act once the wasteful or inefficient implementation of a budget item has occurred, participatory budgeting can intervene and prevent such inefficiency and wastefulness from occurring.

3. International Cases of Participatory Budgeting
The United Nations has hailed participatory budgeting as “one of the most innovative mechanisms to assure an administration’s transparency…by redirecting the budget towards human development.” It has spread to many countries around the world: Peru, Ecuador, and Bolivia in Latin America; and Spain, Italy, Belgium, and Germany in Europe. Of these, two international cases stand out: that of Porto Alegre, Brazil case and Lichtenberg, Germany.

1) Porto Alegre, Brazil
The roots of participatory budgeting in Porto Alegre can be traced back to the creation of the Union of Neighborhood Associations of Porto Alegre, an umbrella of neighborhood
organizations which was created to demand “popular participation in the discussions of the city’s local budget.” Adopted by the Worker’s Party as the heart of its political platform, participatory budgeting was first implemented in 1989 with the Worker’s Party victory in the municipal elections. Its guiding principles were direct participation of citizens in the budget, transparency to prevent corruption, improvement of people’s livelihoods with a focus on the poor, and politically empowering citizens.

At its inception, the system faced many problems, including the city’s lack of funds. This limitation made it difficult to realize people’s proposals, thus, disillusioning citizens with the process. However, after experimentation with the process and increased funds through tax reforms, a viable and robust participatory budgeting process emerged. And each success increased people’s energies and participation: in 1989 and 1990 less than 1,000 people had participated, in 1992 the number had increased to almost 8,000, and by 2003 there were 26,000. In addition, by 2000, the portion of the city’s budget which was allocated through participatory budgeting (its public investment portion, which includes housing, schools, hospitals, or public transportation) increased to 20%.

One of the strengths of participatory budgeting in Brazil is the distribution of local resources. As the program was born out of a need to create a more inclusive democratic society, resources are especially targeted towards neighborhoods with lower levels of infrastructure and higher poverty rates which had traditionally been excluded from budgeting decisions and benefits. The program uses the Quality of Life Index which is based on income, education, physical infrastructure and social services provided to determine where resources are best allocated.

2) Lichtenberg, Germany
Participatory budgeting in Lichtenberg, a borough in Berlin, Germany, was launched to counter waning political participation and interest in 2005. Rather than being a law or regulation handed down from the central government, the impetus for participatory budgeting emerged from its Mayor’s desire to implement such program. With 260,000 inhabitants at the time, the project faced many challenges, yet it was successful because of the Mayor’s dedication to its implementation and the various partnerships established with universities and research centers that provided theoretical support. One of the strengths of Lichtenberg participatory budgeting is that it allots sufficient time for input and deliberation by citizens as the process takes two years. Citizens can provide, review, and vote on proposals through district meetings, the Internet, and mailings. The collected proposals are then displayed in places easily accessible for voters. The proposals are voted on and those with the highest votes are reviewed and ratified by the district council. Before the prioritized proposals are reviewed, ten percent of the population is randomly selected and
their opinions surveyed in order to prevent the domination by special interest groups. Each proposal is also designated a unique number by which citizens can track its progress.

Constant improvements through trial and error have developed new mechanisms to increase citizen participation. One such mechanism is the ‘Kiezfond’ where each district is given 5,000 Euros annually which residents can decide how to spend. Kiezfond emerged from the need to address smaller scale more immediate local projects after such need was identified while evaluating the 2009 participatory budgeting program. It was then introduced in 2010 to complement the participating budget program: While the participatory budgeting program requires 2 years to implement, the Kiezfond only requires one year. Residents can submit proposals of up to 1,000 Euros to a jury of 10-15 people from the district. These juries are comprised of residents chosen at random who agree to serve as jurors for a two year tenure during which time they review these proposals and determine how to use the funds. Thus, the projects funded by Kiezfond, while smaller in scale, can be implemented even while the participatory budgeting process is in progress.

4. Participatory budgeting in Korea
1) The History of Korean Participatory Budgeting
Participatory budgeting in Korea evolved from civil society’s monitoring of local budgets. At its peak, this civil society movement created the Budget Monitoring Network in 2000; however, as the limitations of a budget monitoring approach became apparent, there began discussion for the need of participation in the budget allocation process itself. After meeting with the Worker’s Party in Brazil, the Democratic Labor Party introduced participatory budgeting to Korea through its campaign to “establish ordinance for participatory budget citizen committees” in Seoul in 2001. In the following year, participatory budgeting was adopted as the Democratic Labor Party’s main election pledge for the third local election.6

In 2003, Buk-gu of Gwangju Metropolitan City established a participatory budgeting operational ordinance; this made it the first district to establish a legal basis for participatory budgeting. As the Roh Moo-hyun Administration came into office (2003-2008) with promises of active citizen’s participation, the national government began promoting participatory budgeting as a way of increasing citizen participation within its decentralization and budget and tax system reform roadmaps.

In 2004, with the Roh Administration increased commitment to participatory budgeting; the Ministry of Government Administration and Home Affairs9 established “the basic guidelines for budget allocations in municipalities” which recommended that activities such as Internet polls, public hearings, and meetings be implemented to enable citizens’ participation in budget allocation. Also “the standard for budget allocations in municipality” and “an order of the Ministry of Government Administration and Home Affairs” were established and
announced to local governments. While the government established these guidelines as suggestions, ultimately they encouraged the municipalities to set their own criteria and to handle their own self-controllable expenses. At that time, Buk-gu’s (a district in Gwangju Metropolitan city) “Participatory budgeting ordinance” was attached to the new order as an example to enhance dissemination of participatory budgeting.

In 2006, more local governments adopted participatory budgeting after the Ministry of Government Administration and Home Affairs presented a “participatory budgeting ordinance model” that set the minimum requirements for the establishment of operational ordinance in each municipality. Since the Ministry of Government Administration and Home Affairs took participatory budgeting as one of its indicators in the evaluation of local budgets, this created an incentive for the adoption of participatory budgeting ordinances: Adoption of participatory budgeting would result in a positive evaluation which in turn would result in greater support from the central government.

The expansion of participatory budgeting stopped with the beginning of the Lee Myung-bak Administration (2008-2013) term. Discussion on participatory budgeting restarted (after the June 2010 local elections) when progressive and reformist elected district heads began to actively promote the implementation of participatory budgeting. Hence in 2010 the Ministry of Public Administration and Security issued “participatory budgeting application ordinance models” and sent them to the heads of local governments. In these models, detailed procedures for participation were laid out and the role of the municipalities was to provide educational, administrative, and financial support to participating citizens so as to enable effective participatory budgeting.

2) Current state of participatory budgeting in Korea
As of May 15, 2011, 120 local governments (out of the total 246) had established ordinances for participatory budgeting (310 out of 16 metropolitan cities, and 117 out of 230 basic municipalities). By August 21, 2012, the number of local governments (si, gun, gu) that adopted participatory budgeting ordinances increased by over 100 percent to 242. All but four local governments had the legal foundations for participatory budgeting. Such rapid expansion did not come without criticism. Critics point out that local governments adopted a one-size fits all ordinance rather than one customized to best involve local communities.

3) Legal Basis
In 2005, the Local Finance Act and its enforcement ordinance were fully amended and a legal basis for participatory budgeting was established. Article 39 of the new Local Finance Act states that local governments need to establish a “process of local budget allocations [which allow citizen participation] and implement it according to the presidential decree.” It also gives power to the head of the local government so that “after collecting citizen’s proposals in
the process of local budget allocations” he/she has the authority to attach these proposals to the “budget submitted to the district council.” Article 46 of the enforcement ordinance details the specific methods for citizen participation in the budget allocations of major projects – public hearings and discussions, written documents, Internet surveys, and participation in projects. Furthermore, it states that the “specific agendas regarding the criteria of budget, the procedure of collecting citizens’ opinions, and operation should be defined by local government ordinance.”

5. Case study: Participatory budgeting in Yeonsu-Gu, Incheon

While participatory budgeting in Yeonsu-Gu has a short history (begun in 2011), it is still regarded as one of the most successful cases of participatory budgeting in Korea. In July 2011, it won the Head of Local Government Manifesto award in excellence in managing participatory budgeting by fulfilling election pledge. Yeonsu-gu’s program contains three innovative features to increase public participation: the budget school, private-public governance, and neighborhood assemblies.

1) Origins of participatory budgeting in Yeonsu

Nam-Suk Go was elected head of Yeonsu-Gu after running as the sole candidate for head of Gu supported as one of the coalition of opposition parties. After his successful election, participatory budgeting, one of his election promises, was quickly implemented beginning with preparations to establish a participatory budgeting ordinance in 2010. Two government workers were put in charge of collecting information from other localities where such programs had been executed and of consulting with the civil society group Incheon Participatory Budgeting Network. It faced its first challenge when the implementation of the draft proposal was blocked by a few district representatives who argued that the process had been too hasty and would result in wasting the budget. However, after demonstrations by the public, the ordinance was approved in a plenary session through exercise of the Head of Gu’s authority to unilaterally enact an ordinance. Thus, Yeonsu became the first district to establish a participatory budgeting ordinance in Incheon City and by November 2010 enforcement regulations had been set up. In March 2, 2011, a civic organization was selected to run a participatory budgeting school to educate the public.

From the beginning, participatory budgeting in Yeonsu was promoted as a program where local government and civil society – business enterprises, citizens, NGOs, professionals, media groups – could work on an equal partnership setting policies to achieve common goals in the community. In April 2011 the Yeonsu-Gu office and the Network of Participatory Autonomous Citizens in Yeonsu-Gu (a network of civic groups, labor unions, children’s libraries) signed a Memorandum of Understanding. The agreement established a ‘promotion committee to vitalize participatory budgeting in Yeonsu and to help implement participatory budgeting’. The promotion committee was comprised of an executive committee (2 activists
and 2 government workers) and a working committee (12 heads of neighborhood council and 4 heads of subcommittee) which set operating procedures and gathered information pertinent to invigorating participatory budgeting.

2) Organization Structure and Process

The organizational structure of participatory budgeting in Yeonsu-Gu can be divided into two components: decision making and support bodies. The decision making bodies are organized into the neighborhood\textsuperscript{13}, district\textsuperscript{14} councils, and public-private council; the support bodies are composed of the budget school, participatory budgeting research group, and the supporters group.

The decision making process begins with the neighborhood councils, a third of which are mandated by law to be members nominated by civil society and other autonomous grassroots organizations and the rest made up of members of the general public. The group collects local residents’ budget allocation proposals by meeting people and civic groups. Then they discuss the proposals made by the group and by local citizens. Through the discussion they select five project proposals at the district level and five at the neighborhood level which are then voted on at neighborhood assemblies. In neighborhood assemblies, neighborhood members prioritize the proposed projects to come up with: 2 projects at the gu and 3 at the dong level. The neighborhood assemblies take various forms such as festivals and talent shows, in which residents can participate, or presentations on each proposed project, which deepen understanding of the projects. Neighborhood members can then vote on their favorite projects. Online voting is also included in order to involve more people in the decision making process. The neighborhood council continues to hold meetings to monitor citizen’s opinions. In addition, two of its members are assigned to the district council.

The proposals from the neighborhood assemblies then move on to the district council. The district council – composed of four subcommittees\textsuperscript{15} – discusses and reviews the proposals from the neighborhood assemblies as well as adding its own proposals. The district council is composed of roughly 100 members, while it varies slightly, its composition is usually made up of: 22 members from the neighborhood councils (a set number), 38 recruited from academia, and 60 residents interested in the issues covered in the subcommittees (e.g. urban administration). Discussion within the district council starts in each subcommittee, which reviews proposed projects from the neighborhood councils and consults with experts. The subcommittee checks for not only the legality and feasibility of the proposed projects, but also assesses its importance and budget. During this process, subcommittee councilors can also discuss projects proposed by their own subcommittees. After discussion, district councilors prioritize the projects. The list of prioritized projects must include those voted on by the neighborhood assemblies.
The government-public council is the final step in the decision making process. This council reviews citizens’ proposals for budget allocations, determines priorities, and allocates funding for projects initiated by the district. The council is composed of 5 members from the government (the head of Gu and 4 government workers) and 5 members from the public (the head of each subcommittee from the district council and one expert). The budget is decided on by majority vote and finalized with all the members signing on to it.

The support bodies for participatory budgeting are comprised of the budget school (education), the participatory budgeting research group (research), and supporters group (volunteer corps). The budget school is run by a private nonprofit organization, the Incheon Social Welfare and Health Association. Its responsibility is to provide participatory budgeting councilors and local residents with education on budgeting. The education process begins with discussion sessions in neighborhood groups (such as citizen autonomy groups and meetings of apartment resident representatives). Through this process the budget school instructors recruit neighborhood members to become district and neighborhood councilors while educating residents on participatory budgeting. After district and neighborhood councilors are chosen, the school provides them with basic and intensive courses on budgeting, as well as empowering them to become active agents of politics. In addition, the budget school offers a separate program that educates and collects budget proposals from women, the disabled, and the young. From March to May of 2012, the budget school educated 1,603 residents in addition to regional and district councilors. Education varied from lectures to two day-one night workshops and field trips. The purpose of the budget school is not just to disseminate information but also to empower citizens by drawing the connections between residents’ lives and politics and promoting the practice of direct democracy.

The role of the participatory budgeting research group is to investigate best practices and methodology and present them to the head of Gu.

The role of the supporters group (about 200 volunteers that include teenagers, women, and the disabled) is to supplement the work of the neighborhood and district councils. They are trained at the participatory budgeting school. And while they are neither part of the decision making or support bodies, they are still responsible in identifying and conveying the budgetary needs and opinions of vulnerable and neglected sectors in society such as the disabled, women, and youth. One project that emerged from this supporters group was the “making streets without barriers” project whose purpose was to build “ramps at the entrance of restaurants” and “toilets for the disabled.”

6. The Future of Participatory Budgeting in Yeonsu-Gu

1) Challenges and Limitations
One of the clear limitations and challenges for Yeonsu-Gu’s participatory budgeting is the
relatively small portion of the budget it commands and the scale of citizen participation. As of 2011 only 1% of its 250 billion won (~250 million dollars) budget was allocated for participatory budgeting and only 1.3% of the population was involved.

Another challenge that must be overcome is establishing mechanisms to ensure participatory budgeting irrespective of the political atmosphere. In its current state, the participatory budgeting program is very much dependent upon the political support of elected officials. Given its young history in Korea, participatory budgeting has yet to deepen its roots in residents’ consciousness. As a result, it is vulnerable to a “rebooting” of the system when elected officials with different political visions come into power or to be too focused on yielding short-term products rather than on developing within a long term trajectory. Yet, for participatory budgeting to deepen its roots in the community and truly become an inclusive and meaningful democratic practice requires long-term planning and constant education of residents. Thus, the participatory budgeting program needs to be given a more autonomous character able to set long term trajectories in its planning.

In addition, the process for determining the neighborhood and district councils are not fully transparent, open, and accountable to the residents. This is partly due to the scale of the project that does not cover all of a neighborhood. Instead, participation is determined by an individual’s time, resources, and will to participate; those that cannot often do not. However, this limitation must be understood in a broader societal context: the social infrastructure to encompass all residents in partaking in participatory budgeting is not present in an atomized society of individuals.

2) Accomplishments
Greater participation by residents naturally leads to greater understanding of residents’ needs and priorities and thus to a greater allocative efficiency of the budget in meeting the needs of neighborhoods and the district. The greater transparency also prevents deliberate misallocation of funds by making local governments more accountable in their budgeting decisions to the residents they serve. However, as mentioned before, both of these accomplishments are restricted by the still relatively small scale of the budget commanded by participatory budgeting. In order to address this limitation, a ceiling budget has been implemented since 2012. According to the ceiling budget, each neighborhood is given a budget ranging from 30 million won (30,000 dollars) to 50 million won (50,000 dollars) which citizens can allocate and use directly. While the budget amount is small relative to the total budget, it is a positive change since citizens are able to participate and use it to meet their needs.

Yeonsu-Gu’s participatory budgeting’s greatest accomplishment may be its potential for social transformation, not through greater allocative efficiency or transparency, but rather
through the awakening of residents to their role as society’s political agents. While, participatory budgeting provides a mechanism for people to become active participants in policy making rather than passive observers, in itself, this mechanism does not call forth a spontaneous transformation of people from passive to active participants. It is conscious effort to empower participants through education (i.e. the Budget school) that awakens people’s consciousness as active political agents in society. By awakening ordinary residents into political participation, the Budget School trains the populace to demand a more equitable society.

3 Ibid.
4 http://www.unesco.org/most/southa13.htm
6 http://www.unesco.org/most/southa13.htm
7 Berlin is divided into 12 boroughs, which are then divided into localities, which are then divided into statistical tracts. Only the boroughs have governmental bodies, the further subdivisions are used for statistical or planning purposes.
8 After about 30 years of being abolished, the local election was established again in 1991. Thus, the election mentioned refers to the third such election after the re-establishment of this system.
9 The Ministry of Government Administration and Home Affairs was reformed to the Ministry of Public Administration and Security in 2008
10 Gwangju, Daejeon, and Gyeongsangnam-do. For a complete list of district and metropolitan cities please refer to Appendix A.
11 The information is according to the Ministry of Public Administration and Security.
12 The opposition and ruling parties are determined by which party is in charge of the executive branch. The ruling party refers to the party of the president; the opposition party refers to the rest of the parties.
13 Officially, the neighborhood level is designated as “dong” in Korea. It is a division of “gu” (or district
14 The district level is designated as “gu” in Korea. It is a division of a city.
15 The four subcommittees are city management, culture and environment, welfare, and planning and administration.
16 In Korean this is translated as public-private partnership. However, in here we state government-public in order to highlight the difference in composition between members of the government and those from the public (non-governmental).
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### Appendix A: Local government that established participatory budgeting ordinance (as of December 2012)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metropolitan Cities</th>
<th>The number of municipalities (Including metropolitan cities)</th>
<th>The name of municipalities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Busan</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Busan Metropolitan City, Jung-gu, Seo-gu, Dong-gu, Yeongdo-gu, Busanjin-gu, Dongnae-gu, Nam-gu, Buk-gu, Haeundae-g, Saha-gu, Geumjeong-gu, Gangseo-gu, Yeonjae-gu, Suyeong-gu, Sasang-gu, Gijang-gun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daegu</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Daejeon Metropolitan City, Jung-gu, Dong-gu, Seo-gu, Nam-gu, Buk-gu, Suseong-gu, Dalseo-gu, Dalseong-gun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incheon</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Incheon Metropolitan City, Jung-gu, Nam-gu, Yeonsu-gu, Namdong-gu, Bupyeong-gu, Gyeyang-gu, Seo-gu, Gwanghwagun, Onjin-gun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gwangju</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Dong-gu, Seo-gu, Nam-gu, Buk-gu, Gwangsan-gu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daejeon</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Dong-gu, Jung-gu, Seo-gu, Yuseong-gu, Daeduk-gu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulsan</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Ulsan Metropolitan City, Jung-gu, Dong-gu, Buk-gu, Buk-gu, Ulju-gun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gangwon</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Gangwon-do, Chunchon-si, Wonju-si, Gangneung-si, Donghae-si, Taebaek-si, Sokcho-si, Samcheok-si, Hongcheon-gu, Hoengseong-gu, Yeongwol-gun, Pyeongchang-gun, Cheolwon-gun, Hwacheon-gun, Yanggu-gun, Injea-gun, Goseong-gun, Yangyang-gun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gyeonggi</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Suwon-si, Uijeongbu-si, Pyeongtaek-si, Donducheon-si, Ansan-si, Gwacheon-si, Guri-si, Namyangju-si, Osan-si, Uiwang-si, Hanam-si, Yangju-si, Yeoju-gu, Gapyeong-gun, Yangpyeong-gun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chungbuk</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Chungcheongbuk-do, Chunchu-si, Jaechoon-si, Cheongwon-gun, Okcheon-gun, Yeongdong-gun, Goesan-gun, Umseong-gun, Danyang-gun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chungnam</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Gungju-si, Boryeong-si, Asan-si, Seosan-si, Nonsan-si, Gyeryong-si, Geumjeong-si, Yeongi-gu, Buyeo-gun, Seocheon-gun, Hongseong-gun, Yaeasangun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeonbuk</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Jeollabuk-do, Jeonju-si, Jeongub-si, Namwon-si, gimje-si, Wanju-gu, Jinan-gu, Muju-gun, Jangsugun, Imsil-gun, Gochang-gun, Buan-gun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Province</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Cities and Counties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gyeongsangbuk</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Gyeongsangbuk-do, Pohang-si, Gyeongju-si, Gimcheon-si, Andong-si, Gumi-si, Yeongju-si, Yeongcheon-si, Sangju-si, Mungyeong-si, Gyeongsan-si, Gunwi-gun, Uiseong-gun, Cheongsong-gun, Yeongyang-gun, Yeongduk-gun, Goryeo-gun, Seongju-gun, Chilgok-gun, Yecheon-gun, Bonghwa-gun, Uljin-gun, Ulleung-gun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeju</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Jeju Special Self-Governing Province</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>** The table above was made with the information found in Enhanced Local laws and regulations Information System <a href="http://www.elis.go.kr">http://www.elis.go.kr</a>. **</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>