

Strategic partnership funded by Interreg Baltic Sea Region  
Programme  
Project: “Empowering Participatory Budgeting in the Baltic Sea  
Region – EmPaci”

## Documentation of 2<sup>nd</sup> PB pilot

**Suojarvi, Republic of Karelia/ (Russia)**

*(for the full report of all pilot municipalities, see main document)*

### GoA 2.3 Output 4



**December 2021**

**Status: Final**

Responsible for the content solely publisher/presenter; it does not reflect the views of the European Commission or any related financial body. Those institutions do not bear responsibility for the information set out in the material.

## Content

Content	2
<b>Municipality Suoyarvskoye Urban Settlement, Republic of Karelia/Russia</b>	<b>3</b>
1. Situation before the 2 <sup>nd</sup> PB implementation	3
2. Development of the 2 <sup>nd</sup> PB pilot	3
3. Implementation of the 2 <sup>nd</sup> PB pilot	8
4. Results of 2 <sup>nd</sup> PB pilot	12
5. Assessment of PB pilot and potential for enhancements	17

## Municipality Suoyarvskoye Urban Settlement, Republic of Karelia/Russia

### 1. Situation before the 2<sup>nd</sup> PB implementation

Compared to the 1<sup>st</sup> PB pilot of your municipality: Have there been any major changes in the key data about municipality-related or citizen-related factors?

☒ No ☐ Yes

#### PB process-related factors

7. PB is prescribed by law in the country / public authority:

☒ Yes ☐ No **Partly** (There are general requirements for the PB procedure, but there is no requirement for the mandatory presence of the PB itself)

7a. If yes, based on this law / regulation: (provide name and link):

Federal Law of 06.10.2003 N 131-FZ (as amended on 21.07.2020) "On the General Principles of Organization of Local Self-Government in the Russian Federation" <http://www.kremlin.ru/acts/bank/20035>

### 2. Development of the 2<sup>nd</sup> PB pilot

#### Citizen- and PB process-related factors

9. PB is implemented to realize the following objectives:

The main objective of introducing PB in Suoyarvi is to reduce the level of conflict between citizens and the municipality's leadership. (Not changed)

9a. Which objectives have changed compared to the 1<sup>st</sup> PB pilot? Have objectives been added or abandoned?

The first pilot initiated an ambitious project to create a point of growth for the city and attract tourists (the city's embankment of the lake). However, it was revealed that a significant part of the residents is not interested in strategic development but in solving momentary but acute problems. While maintaining the overall goal of the PB (reducing the level of conflict), the 2<sup>nd</sup> pilot focuses more on solving the issues of repairing and improving housing and yard areas.

10. The following target groups are aimed to be involved in PB, and why:

All interested adults in the municipality planned to be involved in the PB processes. Based on the need to achieve the above PB objectives, special attention will be focused on the following target groups:

- Citizens-Opinion leaders;
- Schoolchildren (senior) -fresh ideas generators;
- Owners and managers of small and medium-sized enterprises located in the municipality - pragmatic agents of influence

**11. In case an analysis of citizen satisfaction of the 1<sup>st</sup> PB pilot has been conducted before developing the 2<sup>nd</sup> PB pilot, these needs of citizens were taken into account for the 2<sup>nd</sup> PB pilot's implementation:**

An attempt to assess citizens' satisfaction with the results of the first PB pilot according to the methodology proposed by the project was made ([https://vk.com/wall-184761945\\_5739](https://vk.com/wall-184761945_5739), [https://vk.com/wall-184761945\\_5908](https://vk.com/wall-184761945_5908) ), but the number of answers was insufficient and their content was contradictory. Therefore, satisfaction was assessed by project experts based on the texts of posts and comments on the VKontakte social network and on the Otmetky.com (<https://moi-suoyarvi.ru/>) platform.

Key expert findings from this analysis:

- Citizens liked the implemented PB processes, but the reality of taking their opinion into account by the Administration continues to cause them doubts;
- Citizens liked the Otmetky.com platform, but they prefer to continue using their usual discussion groups on the social network VKontakte because "everybody is there";
- Many citizens believe that the finalist initiatives were proposed and promoted by the Administration.

Main conclusion: The decision to introduce PB is correct and leads to achieving the set goal, but it takes some time (several cycles) and tangible results of completed projects to achieve the necessary level of understanding between citizens and the Administration.

## **PB process-related factors**

**12. The following steps were undertaken to develop ideas and concepts for the 2<sup>nd</sup> PB cycle and the following changes were implemented compared to the 1st PB pilot:**

The 1<sup>st</sup> pilot results were discussed at an open joint meeting of the Municipal Council and the Administration with the invitation of active citizens and project experts. The previously developed and used concept was generally approved and a recommendation was made to strengthen efforts to attract citizens to use a single PB Otmetky.com platform instead of disparate discussion groups on social networks.

**13. Citizens were involved in the development of the 2<sup>nd</sup> PB cycle the following way and the following changes were implemented compared to the 1st PB pilot:**

Citizens were involved in the open joint meeting of the Municipal Council and the Administration with the invitation of project experts. At this meeting, among other things, the results of the citizens' satisfaction with the 1<sup>st</sup> PB pilot expert analysis were presented and discussed. The results of this open discussion formed the basis for deciding on the form and content of the second PB pilot. Changes in the 2<sup>nd</sup> PB concept concerned the activation of the schoolchildren involvement and additional efforts to attract citizens to the Otmetky.com platform.

**14. Citizens were informed about the initiation of the 2<sup>nd</sup> PB cycle in the following way and the following changes were implemented compared to the 1<sup>st</sup> PB pilot:**

As planned by the updated concept, the Otmetky.com platform became the main source of information about the start and progress of the 2<sup>nd</sup> PB pilot. All important and operational information was posted on its home page (<https://moi-suoyarvi.ru/>). Additionally, in order to attract citizens to the Otmetky.com platform, on April 24, 2021, a publication was made in the official group of the Suojärvi Administration on the VKontakte social network with a notification of a strategic session that launched the second PB pilot ([https://vk.com/wall-184761945\\_4569](https://vk.com/wall-184761945_4569)).

**15. These were the (internal and external) main promoters and success factors in the development of the 2<sup>nd</sup> PB cycle and the following changes appeared compared to the 1<sup>st</sup> PB pilot:**

The main promoters were:

- Council and Administration,
- Active citizens – volunteers,
- Otmetky.com platform team,

Among the main success factors are:

- The Administration and Council are interested in increasing of citizens' degree of satisfaction as result of their involvement in the decision-making processes in the PB framework.
- High level of IT readiness of citizens, which allowed the effective use of online engagement tools.

**15a. Has an Advisory Board been installed to develop the 2<sup>nd</sup> PB run?:** No.

**15c. These were the role models that were used as an inspiration for own PB:**

Previously, it was decided to form an own PB model that meets the very specific requirements of Suojärvi and the restrictions of Russian legislation. The implementation of the first and second PB pilots showed the acceptability of the model created and described in the PB Concept.

**16. These were the main opponents and hindrances in the development of the 2<sup>nd</sup> PB cycle and it was coped with these in the following way:**

In addition to the hindrances described in the previous report and which continue to have a negative impact, a new negative factor has appeared - the parallel existence of competing programs. In 2021, in parallel with participation in the EmPaci project, Suojärvi began to take part in three federal-level programs: Municipal Initiatives Support Program, People's Budget and Formation of a Comfortable Urban Environment. Unlike the PB, successful participation in these programs allows not to distribute money from the municipal budget, but to receive external subsidies of 5 to 50 million rubles (58 000 – 580 000 EUR). A prerequisite for receiving funding from all these programs is the active involvement of citizens in the submission of initiatives and voting for them. Thus, citizens begin to get confused in the abundance of calls for initiatives and for voting, and the Administration makes a choice in favor of those events that help attract external money to the municipality. In the end, the 2<sup>nd</sup> PB pilot was completed with relative success, but the result could have been much better in the absence of these competing programs.

#### 17. A project team for the 2<sup>nd</sup> PB development was formed:

☒ Yes ☐ No

##### 17a. If yes, the project team was composed of the following functions and it was organized as follows:

**Stakeholders** (apart the project team): main beneficiaries and regulatory authorities - Are the source of needs to be met through project implementation and regulatory constraints.

**Project Board:** Advisory and governing body, consisting of representatives of:

- Administration (funds manager - Head of Administration)
- Council (making key project decisions - Chairman of the Council)
- Citizens (mostly online) and Active citizens - Volunteers (mostly offline) (Formulation and clarification of needs)
- Suppliers of goods and services necessary for the implementation of the project (mainly representatives of local small and medium-sized businesses).

**Project Manager:** Day-to-day management of the project - Deputy Head of Municipality Administration.

**Project Support:** Expert support (EmPaci Project partners, Invited PB Experts) & Administrative support.

**Team Managers:** Consultants and implementers of approved initiatives (Suppliers, Architects, Specialists in engineering infrastructures...)

#### 18. For the IT part / online implementation of the PB, the following considerations and steps were taken and the following changes were implemented compared to the 1st PB pilot:

The following channels were used:

- Otmety.com platform (<https://moi-suoyarvi.ru/>) – the main IT tool with functions of informing, submitting ideas, discussing submitted ideas, rating voting for ideas;
- Official web portal (<https://suojarvi.ru/>), newspaper “Suoyarvskoe urban settlement” (<http://suojarvi-gp.ucoz.ru/>) and thematic group in the social network VKontakte

(<https://vk.com/raionsuo>) - auxiliary channels used to redirect citizens' attention to the main channel (<https://moi-suoyarvi.ru/>).

## Comparison with the 1<sup>st</sup> PB pilot:

### 19a. The following suggestions for changes were made from the EmPaci team to improve the process:

The main improvement in the second pilot was a greater effort to involve schoolchildren (senior) in generating fresh ideas.

### 19b. Of these suggestions, the following were implemented in the 2<sup>nd</sup> PB pilot:

These efforts toward senior schoolchildren involvement included: Directly and regularly inviting schoolchildren to participate in PB processes through phone calls from the Administration, Placing paper posters about project events on school premises, Using a “youthful” design for news published at the Otmetky.com portal.

### 19c. Of these suggestions, the following were not implemented in the 2<sup>nd</sup> PB pilot due to the following reasons:

All suggestions made have been implemented.

## 20. The following documents, manuals, regulations were developed and used during the development of the 2<sup>nd</sup> PB cycle:

The roles of the PB processes participants became part of their job responsibilities, and therefore it was decided not to continue the further development of the PB Concept as an official document.

With the active participation of the Otmetky.com portal team, a Brochure and Methodological Guide on Participatory Budgeting were prepared, printed, distributed in Suojärvi and made available online.

Brochure on PB in English - [http://www.empaci.eu/photo/Files/PB\\_Otmetky\\_ENG.pdf](http://www.empaci.eu/photo/Files/PB_Otmetky_ENG.pdf)

Study Guide on PB in Russian - [http://www.empaci.eu/photo/Files/PB\\_Otmetky\\_RUS.pdf](http://www.empaci.eu/photo/Files/PB_Otmetky_RUS.pdf)

## 3. Implementation of the 2<sup>nd</sup> PB pilot

### 21. These are the general steps of the PB process after final approval: Information phase

1. Proposal phase
2. Discussion phase
3. Voting phase
4. Implementation phase

**21a. Total annual PB budget (in EUR and %-change of 1<sup>st</sup> PB pilot):** 116 280,00 EUR<sup>1</sup> - 103%

**21b. Annual PB budget per citizen (in EUR and %-change of 1<sup>st</sup> PB pilot):** 13,50 – 103%

---

<sup>1</sup> 10 000 000,00 RUB, Exchange rate 86.00



**21c.** If applicable, **budget earmarked for related internal work, communications** etc.:

Volunteer work. Methodological and organizational support is carried out from the EmPaci project

**21d. The PB has been designed as direct democratic tool** (citizens' vote = final decision):

☐ Yes ☒ No

**21e. The PB is designed for**

☐ Region/City projects only ☒ **District projects only** ☐ Both

**21f. Persons eligible participating in the PB: 18 years and older**

Definition of persons (e.g. citizens only or residents, if necessary separately for proposals and votes): **residents only**

Number of eligible persons (in total): **6 972 (81% of 8 607)**

Number of participating persons (% of citizens): **81%**

**21g. The following actions were taken to ensure that only eligible persons made proposals / voted:**

All proposals were accepted only through the Otmetky.com portal which used two methods of authorization:

1. Built-in mechanism that uses VKontakte's social network authorization means. This method allows administrator to filter by city of residence and do a selective check of the VKontakte user's profile. The confirmed correctness of such filtering is about 97%, which meets the requirements of the municipality leadership.
2. Own registration mechanism using the user's e-mail address and contact phone number. This method implies authorization of the user at his/her request after a telephone contact of the Administration representative with him/her. This method is quite reliable but laborious, although it is quite suitable for such a small population of this municipality.

**22. These were the specific dates planned for the PB process after final approval of the PB development:**

- May 2021 - informing citizens about the beginning of the 2<sup>nd</sup> PB pilot through publications on Otmetky.com portal and social networks as supporting channels. An invitation to propose initiatives.
- June-July 2021 – Initiatives submissions, feasibility pre-check.
- August-October 2021 – Open discussion of submitted and pre-checked initiatives. Final feasibility check. Formation of a list of initiatives for voting.
- November 2021 - Final voting. Preparation and adoption of an official Municipal Council Decision for its execution by the Administration.
- April-June 2022 - implementation of the approved initiatives (once the 2022 budget becomes available).

**23. As key learnings from the 1<sup>st</sup> PB pilot, these aspects were considered when implementing the 2<sup>nd</sup> PB pilot:**

The initiatives proposed and voted by the most active citizens in the 1<sup>st</sup> PB pilot caused objections and rejection among less active citizens. In the 2<sup>nd</sup> PB pilot, more attention was paid to attracting more citizens and especially young people (senior schoolchildren). Difficulties associated with a large number of thematic groups in social networks used by citizens to discuss local problems were overcome by their active involvement in a single collection point - the Otmetky.com portal

**24. For citizen involvement in the PB-phases (e.g. information, proposal, voting phase), the following steps were taken and events organized:**

If applicable, please describe any changes that have been implemented compared to the 1<sup>st</sup> PB pilot and explain reasons:

**Information phase: April-May 2021**

Start of regular information materials publication about the start and progress of the second PB pilot on the Otmetky.com portal tailored for Suojärvi - <https://moi-suoyarvi.ru/> (>450 visits by the end of May)

Publication in VKontakte (social network) - <https://vk.com/raionsuo>:

- 24 Apr 2021 - [https://vk.com/wall-184761945\\_4569](https://vk.com/wall-184761945_4569) (>340 visits by the end of May)

Publication in VKontakte (social network) - [https://vk.com/portal\\_moi\\_suoyarvi](https://vk.com/portal_moi_suoyarvi) (>3 000 visits by the end of May)

**Proposal phase: June-July 2021**

Regular information materials publication about the progress of the 2<sup>nd</sup> PB pilot on the Otmetky.com portal tailored for Suojärvi - <https://moi-suoyarvi.ru/> (>450 visits in June-July)

Publication in VKontakte (social network) - <https://vk.com/raionsuo>:

- 30 July 2021 - [https://vk.com/wall-184761945\\_5256](https://vk.com/wall-184761945_5256) (>1 500 visits by the end of July)

47 initiatives submitted

**Discussion phase: August-October 2021**

Regular information materials publication about the progress of the second PB pilot on the Otmetky.com portal tailored for Suojärvi - <https://moi-suoyarvi.ru/> (>270 visits in August-October)

Publication in VKontakte (social network) - <https://vk.com/raionsuo>:

- 13 August 2021 [https://vk.com/wall-184761945\\_5347](https://vk.com/wall-184761945_5347) (>400 visits by the end of October)
- 16 August 2021 [https://vk.com/wall-184761945\\_5374](https://vk.com/wall-184761945_5374) (>500 visits by the end of October)
- 24 August 2021 [https://vk.com/wall-184761945\\_5420](https://vk.com/wall-184761945_5420) (>500 visits by the end of October)

Face-to-face meeting:

23 September 2021 – Public hearings on the results of the discussion of the submitted initiatives in the context of the development strategy of the urban settlement of Suojärvi: [https://vk.com/wall-184761945\\_5700](https://vk.com/wall-184761945_5700).

### **Voting phase: November 2021**

Online rating voting on the portal Otmetky.com 01-10 November 2021

- <https://moi-suoyarvi.ru/> (>273 votes)

Face-to-face meetings:

- 13 December 2021 - Strategic session with city activists and local businesses. Discussion of the voting results on the submitted initiatives, making a decision to include two winning initiatives in the program for creating a comfortable urban environment (yards of houses No. 3, 5 and 7 on Kaimanov Street and house No. 43 on Lenin Street). 24 participants.

### **Implementation phase: Spring-Summer 2022**

It is planned to periodically inform residents about the status of the approved initiatives' implementation. Also, active participation of citizens in monitoring works is expected and will be encouraged.

## **25. For the activation of specific target groups of the PB, the following steps were taken and events organized:**

The main improvement in the 2<sup>nd</sup> pilot was a greater effort to involve schoolchildren (senior) in generating fresh ideas.

These efforts toward senior schoolchildren involvement included: Directly and regularly inviting schoolchildren to participate in PB processes through phone calls to schools from the Administration, placing paper posters about the project events on school premises, using a “youthful” design for news published at the Otmetky.com portal.

## **26. The following actions were taken to provide information about PB in a citizen-friendly manner:**

If applicable, please describe any changes that have been implemented compared to the 1st PB pilot and explain reasons:

Due to the large distribution of a small population over a relatively large area of the municipality, poor transport accessibility (underdeveloped public transport and bad roads), and a good level of Internet accessibility, the local citizens are fluent in IT gadgets and prefers online tools for communicating with authorities and local governments. For this reason, in order to involve citizens in the PB process, a combination of their familiar social network VKontakte and platforms Otmetky.com (which allows a more systematic collection of proposals and their discussion and voting) was chosen. Also, in addition to the tools used in the first pilot, paper posters hung in public places were used to draw attention to key PB events and information about them posted online.

## 27. The following actions were especially taken to achieve a high participation rate:

The special attention was paid to the professional preparation of published texts and their optimal placement, design and promotion in different groups of the VKontakte social network. Also, efforts have been made to customize, localize and simplify the Otmetky.com platform interfaces and use a “youthful” design of publications.

## 28. The following steps were taken to train the own actors for PB:

Due to COVID19 restrictions, it was decided to hold only one special face-to-face training session besides regular telephone and online consultations with project experts.. At the same time, many interested citizens and representatives of the administration took part in a series of open online seminars prepared by the Russian partners of the project and later viewed their recordings:

- “Opportunities and limitations of citizens' involvement in the decision-making process”  
[https://youtu.be/zT3\\_mQPyoJU](https://youtu.be/zT3_mQPyoJU)
- “Urban laboratories as a mechanism for involving citizens” <https://youtu.be/BcSmEIYHYGI>
- “Instructions for use: mechanisms and practices of citizen involvement”  
<https://youtu.be/7gKpKQeV3ZY>
- “Dialogue between the municipality and citizens: questions and answers”  
<https://youtu.be/foEXrGreA3M>.

## 29. If applicable, the following steps were taken to train actors in other municipalities (outside the EmPaci-project):

The experience and specific knowledge gained by the project partners in Suojärvi were used by Russian partners in other pilot municipalities. Some of the most important and interesting results and lessons of PB implementation in Suojärvi were presented at the PBbase online event on December 9, 2021

## 4. Results of 2<sup>nd</sup> PB pilot

### 31. The PB was limited to certain areas of the budget or priorities of programmes:

☒ Yes ☐ No

#### 31a. Proposals and votes were limited to the following areas / priorities:

The powers of municipal self-government in the Republic of Karelia are legally limited only by issues of improvement of the inner-city territory and day-to-day maintenance of houses. All engineering networks, roads, home renovations, education, health care, forest and agricultural land and much more are outside the scope of the municipal government.

**Proposal phase:****32a. The proposal phase was implemented in the following way:**

Regular information materials publication about the Proposal phase beginning started in the June 1<sup>st</sup> and continued till the end of July on the Otmetky.com portal tailored for Suojarvi - <https://moi-suoyarvi.ru/> and in the social network VKontakte - <https://vk.com/raionsuo> as an auxiliary tool used to redirect citizens' attention to the main channel (<https://moi-suoyarvi.ru/>)

If the proposals were to be submitted online:

Number of Online Accounts (if applicable): 134 registered users of Otmetky.com + >2 000 anonymous visitors.

of interrupted proposal procedures (if applicable): N/A

**32b. Number of citizens participating: >134****32c. Participation rate: >1,7% (400% compared to 1<sup>st</sup> PB pilot)**

Percentage of females: 52% approx

**32d. Number of proposals received in total:**

Submitted online: 47 proposals, 100% online, 138% compared to 1<sup>st</sup> PB pilot

Submitted by paper-and pencil: 0 proposals

Submitted otherwise? How?: 0 proposals

**Innovativeness of proposals**

Number of "new" proposals: 30, 88% of 1st PB Pilot

Number of resubmitted proposals (previously submitted during earlier cycles, if applicable): 14

**Co-Creation of proposals**

If applicable, number of originally not feasible proposals that were reworked together with the proposer: N/A

If applicable, number of proposals that were reworked together with the proposer: N/A

**32e. Main categories of proposals:**

- Improvement of courtyard areas of apartment buildings,
- Improvement of water supply,
- Repair of roads and footpaths

**32f. Information provided to citizens after completion of the proposal phase:**

Information on the results of the proposal phase prior to the feasibility study was not disseminated

**Feasibility check:****33a. A feasibility check of proposals or voted projects was implemented:**

☒ **Yes, of the proposals** ☐ **Yes, of the voted projects** ☐ **No**

**Number of feasible proposals: 12**

**Percentage of feasible proposals (% of proposals received in total): 25%**

**33b. The feasibility check was implemented in the following way:** (describe tools, steps, responsibilities, time and resources needed and changes compared to 1<sup>st</sup> PB pilot)

The feasibility check was carried out by a commission formed from representatives of the Administration and interested citizens in several steps:

- Compliance with the powers of the local government and the territory of the municipality - Municipality clerks
- The absence of obvious contradictions with the interests of the majority of residents - Council
- Technical feasibility - architects and engineers invited by the Administration and EmPaci Project Partners
- Financial feasibility - financial department of the municipality and the Head of the municipality.

**33c. If applicable, political decision-makers were involved in the feasibility check in the following way:**

Member of the Legislative Assembly of the Republic of Karelia - a resident of Suojärvi took part in the work of the commission for assessing the proposals feasibility

**33d. If applicable, citizens making specific proposals were involved in the following way:**

All authors of the proposals were invited to participate in the feasibility check, but only 3 of them took part

**33e. The difficulties that became apparent through the feasibility check:**

The complexity of assessing the proposals implementation possible cost.

**33f. As a result of the feasibility check, the PB process should be changed as follows:**

Local entrepreneurs should be even more involved in the feasibility check process by all means. Their professional assessment and suggestions for optimizing the submitted proposals were extremely valuable.

**33g. As a consequence:**

**Number of feasible proposed projects /feasible voted projects 12**

**(Number of passed checks):12**

**Number of not feasible proposed projects /not feasible voted projects 35**

**(Number of failed checks): 35**

**Voting phase:****34a. The voting phase was implemented in the following way:**

To conduct a rating voting the built-in function of the Otmetky.com platform was used. Any registered and authorized persons could vote in support of no more than three items in the proposals list. As the votes were cast, the list was automatically ranked in the collected votes descending order.

The results of the e-voting were discussed and approved at the next meeting of the municipal council.

**Additional for online tools:**

**Number of Online Accounts: 134**

**Number of discontinued voting procedures: N/A**

**34b. Each citizen was given the following number of votes: 3** votes per citizen in e-voting (Each citizen could distribute 3 of his/her votes between 1, 2 or 3 voted initiatives);

**34b. Number of citizens voting (total and %-change compared to 1st PB pilot): 134**

**Ratio of females of total (%): 52% approx**

**34c. Participation rate (% of citizens): >1,7% (400% compared to 1<sup>st</sup> PB pilot)**

**34c. Number of votes received (total and %-change compared to 1st PB pilot): 134x3=402, 670% compared to 1<sup>st</sup> pilot**

**34d. Results of the votes (which projects with which amounts and votes were winning):**

Of the 12 proposals that passed the feasibility test and were put to the vote, 2 were selected:

- Repair of courtyard passages, installation of trash cans and benches near houses No. 5 and No. 7 on Kaimanov Street,
- Performance of work on lighting the courtyards of house No. 3 on Kaimanov Street and house No. 43 on Lenin Street.

**34e. Total PB budget realized / implemented: 116 280 EUR, 103% compared to 1<sup>st</sup> PB pilot**

**34f. Was part of the total PB budget unused?**

☒ **No**    ☐ Yes, unused

☐ Yes, otherwise designated (e.g. follow up costs or projects implemented in previous PBs)

**34f. Information provided to citizens after completion of the voting phase:**

Citizens could receive information about the progress and results of discussions and votes at any time on the Otmetky.com platform. The information is presented as follows:

- Submitted proposals for the selection of a territory for improvement;

- Arguments Pro and Contra of the proposed territory, submitted by any eligible citizen;
- Citizens' assessment of the proposed arguments (Average weight of the argument. Citizens had the opportunity to assess the weight of previously submitted arguments);
- The number of votes cast in favour of each of the proposed territories.
- Suojarvi map showing the selected territories and objects;
- Comments of the Administration and specialists.
- Decisions taken;
- Information on the progress of the approved improvement project (in the future)

**Number of delayed proposal implementations /feasibility checks: No**

**34g. Extent to which the approved projects can be realized:**

The Administration and the Municipal Council assure citizens that the project will be fully implemented by the spring-summer of 2022. (In the absence of global force majeure)

**34h. Timeframe planned to realize the approved projects:**

The Administration and the Municipal Council assure citizens that the project will be fully implemented by the fall of 2022. (In the absence of global force majeure)

**34i. Extent to which citizens were involved in the realization of the approved projects:**

The Administration and Council will monitor the implementation of the project at all key points and periodically inform citizens about the work progress. Citizens were invited to monitor the progress of the project and use all available communication channels to notify the urban community, Administration and Council about any violations and deviations identified.

**35. Citizens were informed about the completion of the 2nd PB pilot in the following ways:**

Information about the completion of the 2<sup>nd</sup> PB pilot cycle was published on the Otmetky.com platform (<https://bereg-moi-suoyarvi.ru/>) and on the social network VKontakte ([https://vk.com/wall-184761945\\_6381](https://vk.com/wall-184761945_6381), [https://vk.com/wall-184761945\\_6423](https://vk.com/wall-184761945_6423))

**36. Other actors involved (e.g. local council) were informed about the completion of the 1st PB pilot in the following ways:**

ITMO University, RANEPa (The Russian Presidential Academy of National Economy and Public Administration), Otmetky.Com LLC, , Architecture bureau 'Tsekh', RUBIQ startups and other actors were



informed through established communication channels, such as WhatsApp and Telegram chats, social networks and emails.

**36a. Number of increased contacts outside of the PB process:** N/A (Additional to previously existing contacts with Russian colleagues turned out to be uninteresting and with foreign partners are limited by lack of knowledge of foreign languages)

## 5. Assessment of PB pilot and potential for enhancements

**37. Objectives for PB as specified in Question 9 were reached as follows:**

The main objective of the 1<sup>st</sup> PB pilot in Suojärvi was to reduce the level of conflict between citizens and the leadership of the municipality. In the process of the 2<sup>nd</sup> pilot PB implementation, it is clear that some positive results exist. Residents' comments on social networks have become more friendly and constructive.

**38. Besides the objectives for PB as specified in Question 9, the following additional issues can be seen as a success for the PB pilot:**

As a result, the 2<sup>nd</sup> PB pilot failed to cover a wider range of issues to be resolved due to the strong competition of various federal programs that allocate money for the implementation of projects proposed by the involved residents.

**39. Some objectives for PB as specified in Question 9 were not reached due to the following reasons:**

The main objective was not achieved in desired extent due to the long history of the existing problem and inertia in changing the citizens' attitude toward the authorities. Full achievement of the main goal requires a systematic continuation of efforts in the chosen direction for a longer time.

**40. To our knowledge, the following elements of the PB process are innovative compared to other PB initiatives in the BSR:**

The use of Otmetky.com online platform that helps visualize citizens' initiatives, discuss and vote them through an easy and user-friendly mode may be considered innovative. Besides, we used emotional engagement and gamification practices (in offline mode used by the professional moderators invited) when discussing the substantial elements of the initiatives, including its functionality and core value they may create.

**41. The PB benefitted from the transnational approach of the EmPaci project in the following way:**

The relatively short history of the PB introduction in Russia has a clear tendency towards the introduction of PB in order to receive money for local territories improvement from the Ministry of Construction of Russia

and some other federal-level organizations and state programmes, where the involvement of citizens is a condition of receiving grants. The consequence of this practice is a formal attitude towards PB and its termination if the next contest has not been announced. The benefit from the international project and approaches is that the EmPaci project partners have the capacity (administrative, organizational, methodological, financial) to show more significant practical benefits from the implementation of best world PB practices for both citizens and municipal leaders from more efficient use of own resources. International cooperation and the methodological and educational materials collected, created and published on the EmPaci Project portal as the Project's results answer the question "How to do it?" better. Unfortunately, due to the poor knowledge of foreign languages by the residents and administration of the municipality, the flow of useful knowledge and positive experience to the municipality from outside may stop after the end of the project.

**42. These changes are recommended for future PB processes to better reach objectives of PB:**

It seems important to analyze the positive effects achieved as a result of the two conducted PB pilots and use the results of this analysis to strengthen the motivation of residents and the administration of the municipality to further use and develop the implemented PB practices.

**43. These changes are recommended for future PB processes to better involve target groups or to better represent the eligible persons:**

It is necessary to continue efforts to attract citizens to the Otmetky.com platform, making it the main platform for discussing the most pressing problems of the municipality and ways to solve them.

In addition to its active advertising, it is necessary to regularly update its content with important information for residents.

**44. The pilot municipalities plans to run PB also in the future**

☒ Yes ☐ No