

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

Participatory Budgeting (PB) Blueprint Guidebook

GoA 2.1 Output 3

Responsible Partner: Klaipeda University

May 2021



EUROPEAN
REGIONAL
DEVELOPMENT
FUND

EUROPEAN UNION

EmPaci

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.

Contents

I.	Document summary	4
II.	Introduction	5
III.	Small municipalities: Selected PB cases	7
1.	Eberswalde / Germany	7
	Fact sheet	7
	PB case highlights	8
2.	Cruz Alta/Brazil	11
	Fact sheet	11
	PB case highlights	12
IV.	Medium-size municipalities: Selected PB cases	13
1.	Olsztyn/ Poland	13
	Fact sheet	13
	PB case highlights	14
2.	Reykjavík/ Iceland	16
	Fact sheet	16
	PB case highlights	17
V.	Large municipalities: Selected PB cases	19
1.	Stuttgart/ Germany	19
	Fact sheet	19
	PB case highlights	20
2.	Lisbon (Portugal)	22
	Fact sheet	22
	PB case highlights	24
3.	Cluj-Napoca/Romania	26
	Fact sheet	26
	PB case highlights	27
VI.	Mega cities: Selected PB cases	30
1.	Chengdu/China	30
	Fact sheet	30
	PB case highlights	31
2.	Paris/France	33
	Fact sheet	33
	PB case highlights	35
3.	Toronto/Canada	38
	Fact sheet	38
	PB case highlights	40

Abbreviations

BSR	Baltic Sea Region
CFL	City Finance Lab
EIT	European Institute of Innovation & Technology
EmPaci	Empowering Participatory Budgeting in the Baltic Sea Region
IIL	Investissement d'Intérêt Local
LX-PB	Lisbon Participatory Budget
NGO	Non-governmental organisation
PA	Participatory Assembly/Association
PB	Participatory Budgeting
PS	Polling Station

I. Document summary

The aim of this document is to present a guidebook PB Blueprint: From successful PB projects, also beyond the Baltic Sea region (BSR), already existing approaches will be analysed and the best practices will be presented. As a result, a guidebook with role models will be complemented that serves as a blueprint or inspiration for future PB projects.

Since the design requirements and possibilities depend on the size of a municipality to a large extent, the cases presented in this document are structured according to the size of the municipalities in terms of inhabitants. As such, the following size categories have been set up:

- Small municipalities (up to 100 000 inhabitants)
- Middle-size municipalities (100 000 – 250 000 inhabitants)
- Large municipalities (250 000 – 1 million inhabitants)
- Mega cities (more than 1 million inhabitants).

Each case is **shortly characterized by a fact sheet** about the municipality, the PB and its basic structure and short history. However, it is not the aim to provide a detailed description, but the most important facts. Hints about where further and more detailed information can be found will be presented. The description of the case itself is guided by the following questions:

(1) Which specific problem does the PB case solve?

(2) Which ideas and design principles make the PB case innovative or successful compared to others?

(3) What could be potential challenges in adopting the approach of this PB case?

As such, it is not the purpose of this document to provide a full description of each case, but to highlight specific features, design principles or innovative ideas which make each PB case inspiring. This does not go without stating that of course there are also other PB projects internationally which are very successful and creative. However, in this document, we decided to present some hand-selected examples that the entire EmPaci team came across during their research to develop their own PB projects.

The final version of the document will be ready till the end of May 2021 and will stay as an open and working document, where changes will be accepted based on the suggestions of the partners.

II. Introduction

PB cases of the following municipalities will be introduced, structured according to size in terms of number of inhabitants:

Small municipalities (up to 100 000 inhabitants)

- Eberswalde (Germany) 41 833 inhabitants
- Cruz Alta (Brazil) 62 766 inhabitants

Middle-size municipalities (100 000 – 250 000 inhabitants)

- Olsztyn (Poland) 176 463 inhabitants
- Reykjavík (Iceland) 118 918 inhabitants

Large municipalities (250 000 – 1 million inhabitants)

- Lisbon (Portugal) 550 000 inhabitants
- Stuttgart (Germany) 610 000 inhabitants
- Cluj-Napoca (Romania) 706 905 inhabitants

Mega cities (more than 1 million inhabitants)

- Paris (France) 2,1 million inhabitants
- Toronto (Canada) 2,7 million inhabitants
- Chengdu (China) 16,3 million inhabitants

The municipalities were selected based on literature reviews of the project team with respect to interesting and inspiring PB cases. An overview with a comparison of the selected cases is shown in the table below.

Overview about PB Blueprints

Size category	Place	Country	Inhabitants	PB budget	Which specific problem is addressed?	What is innovative?
Small	Eberswalde	Germany	41 833	104 000 EUR	Participation rate for voting	Attractive voting event
	Cruz Alta	Brazil	62 766	~41 000 – 81 000EUR	Activation of civil society	Time for people debates
Middle-size	Olsztyn	Poland	176 463	1 433 914 EUR	Increase resident's participation	Voting through special web site
	Reykjavik	Iceland	118 918	3 600 000 EUR	Increase of people's influence to policy	Use of digital democracy tool
Large	Stuttgart	Germany	610 000	not determined (flexible)	Participation rates Feasibility check of proposals Rigid PB processes	Low barriers for making proposals and voting Feasibility check for large number of proposals Learning PB process with citizens' feedback
	Cluj-Napoca	Romania	706 905	150 000 EUR per project	Improvement of infrastructure	Unknown amount of money for PB Different categories for projects
	Lisbon	Spain	550 000	2 500 000 EUR	Solve climate change	Special platform that increases investment in low carbon, sustainable projects
Mega	Chengdu	China	16 330 000	~26 000 EUR per village	Raise the quality of public services and social governance	Villages set up councils and other groups for PB implementation
	Paris	France	2 150 000	100 000 000 EUR	Restore trust in democracy	Use of digital tool, special website (Consul platform)
	Toronto	Canada	2 700 000	~1 191 000 EUR	Implementation of capital projects	Simple structure, live meeting, simple voting by using advanced technologies

III. Small municipalities: Selected PB cases

1. Eberswalde / Germany

Fact sheet

Inhabitants	41 833 ¹
Location	Northeast of Germany, central to the federal state Brandenburg, around 60 km away from the German capital Berlin, rural: surrounded by large forest areas.
PB history	Established in 2008 based on initiatives by the local council as one of the first PB processes in Germany. Annual PB process, since 2012 as citizen budget.
Regulations	Designed as a citizen budget: direct democratic. By law, PB in Germany is consultative only, with the final decision taken by the local council. Through a PB statute, a specific budget is set aside for PB for which the highest voted proposals are directly implemented. ²
PB budget	Total amount of money spent in last process: 104 000 EUR PB budget per inhabitant: 2,49 EUR
Process	Three phases: proposals, feasibility check and voting. In the 1st phase, citizens submit proposals through different channels (e.g. in written, via online form, by phone, personally). The proposals are subject to predefined restrictions and may not exceed 15 000 EUR. Every citizen aged 14 and over is entitled to make proposals and vote. In addition, a beneficiary may not receive any funding from the citizen budget for the next 3 years. In the 2nd phase the proposals are checked for costs, responsibility of the city administration and feasibility. In the 3rd and last phase the citizens receive 5 votes to be placed (also cumulatively) on any of the eligible proposals. Voting takes place in person during one day only, except for 2020 for which online voting also was possible due to the COVID-19 pandemic. The proposals are implemented in descending order. If the residual budget for a project is not sufficient, the list will be processed until a smaller project, which can still be implemented with this budget, is funded. This process is carried out until the budget is exhausted. ³ Eberswalde has a separate budget of 15 000 EUR for costs of PB, promoting their PB and running special events for citizen information. ⁴

¹ City of Eberswalde: City information as of 31.12.2019, URL: <https://www.eberswalde.de/start/stadt/eberswalde-auf-einen-blick> (access date: 19.11.2020).

² First PB regulation of the City of Eberswalde, URL https://www.eberswalde.de/fileadmin/bereich-eberswalde/global/satzungen/16-07_Satzung_Buergerhaushalt_2012.pdf (access date: 19.11.2020).

³ PB Eberswalde, URL: <https://www.eberswalde.de/Buergerbudget.2159.0.html> (access date: 12.12.2020).

⁴ 9th Status report PB Germany 2019, URL: https://www.buergerhaushalt.org/sites/default/files/9._Statusbericht_Buergerhaushalt.pdf, (access date: 12.12.2020), p. 8.

Success (2020)⁵ Number of proposals: 103 (of which 73 valid/feasible)
Percentage of valid/feasible proposals: 71%
Percentage of female proponents of total: 50%
Number of realized projects: 12
Total budget realized: 104 000 EUR
Number of voters: 2 073 (+12 % in comparison with previous year)
Participation rate of voters/inhabitants: 5%
Percentage of female voters of total: 53%

PB case highlights

(1) Which specific problem does the PB case solve?

PB was implemented in 2008 as a consultative process for the expenditures to the city's investment budget. As such, citizens did not have direct democratic power and could only make proposals for investments. A voting did not take place. This consultative process, which could even be questioned to be a PB process, suffered from low participation of citizens. Thus, the local council aimed to increase the participation. In a meeting of the local council together with citizens in 2011, several process ideas were discussed. As a result, a PB statute for the citizen budget was created as a direct democratic PB process in which the best voted projects of the citizens are directly implemented without further approval by the local council.⁶ In order to make the voting highly attractive and particularly to attract the female citizenry and families to attend the voting, a special voting day has been created.

(2) Which ideas and design principles make the PB case innovative or successful compared to others?

The implementation of the voting phase can be seen as a particularly innovative element of the PB process of Eberswalde. The voting takes place on one day only, usually one Saturday in September of each year, during a so-called "decision day". It started as an event for a few hours, but nowadays the decision day is an event that lasts around 9 hours and is supported by around 30 voluntary staff members of the city administration.⁷ The decision day is organized in the "family garden" of Eberswalde, which also contains a playground for children and other recreational facilities. In addition, some local

⁵ Evaluation Report of PB in Eberswalde, URL: https://www.eberswalde.de/fileadmin/bereich-eberswalde/global/Buergerbudget/Evaluation_Eberswalder_Buergerbudget_-_Fortschreibung_Februar_2020_.pdf (access date: 20.11.2020).

⁶ Evaluation Report of PB in Eberswalde, URL: https://www.eberswalde.de/fileadmin/bereich-eberswalde/global/Buergerbudget/Evaluation_Eberswalder_Buergerbudget_-_Fortschreibung_Februar_2020_.pdf (access date: 20.11.2020), p. 9.

associations and initiatives arrange information booths and music, sports or other recreational activities to attract and entertain the citizens during the decision day. Even the catering during the decision day is organized in a family friendly way, since meals are also offered as vegan and vegetarian versions and serving alcoholic drinks is not permitted.⁸

Each of the citizens, who is eligible to vote, receives 5 voting coins (so called “Voting Thalers”) to vote on the proposals. The idea with the coins has been taken up because these have a low threshold, are analogue and haptic. As such, no complicated online voting system has to be explained to citizens. Each of the proposals has a specific vase (like a ballot box) into which the citizen can throw their voting coins, if they want to support a specific proposal. Each citizen is free to decide to assign all 5 voting coins to one proposal only or to allocate the votes to up to 5 proposals. Since 2013 the vases, in which the voting coins were freely visible in the first year of the citizen budget, were labelled with screens to ensure equal opportunities of the proposals.⁹ In order to make sure that one and the same person does not receive voting coins several times, each voter’s hand is marked with a stamp when receiving the voting coins. After completion of the voting, each proposer of a winning project receives a “Thank-you-coin” (Thank-you-Thaler) (see Figure 1). It is used as a symbol to show that it is worthwhile to participate in the citizen budget with ideas and projects.



Figure 1: Voting vases and voting coins¹⁰

⁷ The staff members however receive free time for the time invested during the decision day. See: Evaluation Report of PB in Eberswalde, URL: https://www.eberswalde.de/fileadmin/bereich-eberswalde/global/Buergerbudget/Evaluation_Eberswalder_Buergerbudget_-_Fortschreibung_Februar_2020_.pdf (access date: 20.11.2020), p. 21.

⁸ See: Evaluation Report of PB in Eberswalde, URL: https://www.eberswalde.de/fileadmin/bereich-eberswalde/global/Buergerbudget/Evaluation_Eberswalder_Buergerbudget_-_Fortschreibung_Februar_2020_.pdf (access date: 20.11.2020).

⁹ Evaluation Report of PB in Eberswalde, URL: https://www.eberswalde.de/fileadmin/bereich-eberswalde/global/Buergerbudget/Evaluation_Eberswalder_Buergerbudget_-_Fortschreibung_Februar_2020_.pdf (access date: 20.11.2020), p. 50.

¹⁰ Evaluation Report of PB in Eberswalde, URL: https://www.eberswalde.de/fileadmin/bereich-eberswalde/global/Buergerbudget/Evaluation_Eberswalder_Buergerbudget_-_Fortschreibung_Februar_2020_.pdf, p. 24.

The decision day and also the easily understandable voting process with the voting coins was very well received by the citizenry so that Eberswalde is one of the PB processes in Germany with a very high participation rate in terms of voters per inhabitants. Especially the proportion of female voters was targeted to be increased by offering many family-related activities together with the decision day. Except for the age groups of 77-91-year-old citizens, the voters very well reflect the different age groups across the citizenry. The highest participation was observed at the age groups from 32-42 years, which is even overrepresented.¹¹

(3) What could be potential challenges in adopting the approach of this PB case?

Personal voting only during the “decision day” bears the risk that some citizens are excluded from the voting. This refers to citizens, who for instance are not in their hometown during the decision day due to business trips, vacations or other reasons. Also, persons with a limited mobility cannot easily find access to the voting day in case transportation is not organized. An illness may also hinder participation in the voting on only one day. As mentioned previously, the elderly (people older than 77 years) are underrepresented in the voting, which might have to do with the need for a personal vote on the decision day. This challenge was also faced by the city of Eberswalde in 2020, when the outbreak of the COVID-19 pandemic hindered the organization of large events with many people attending. Therefore, in 2020, besides the voting day, the possibility for an online voting was offered several days ahead of the offline voting. Also, even though the participation rate in the voting phase is quite high compared to other PB processes in Germany, it was also declining in the years 2017 and 2018 (around -20% in each year).¹² Thus for each year new ideas on how to attract attendees to come to the decision day are needed. As such, offering an online voting option in addition to the voting day might be an option, which however in Eberswalde did not lead to an increase of the participation of the elderly.¹³

¹¹ See: Evaluation Report of PB in Eberswalde, URL: https://www.eberswalde.de/fileadmin/bereich-eberswalde/global/Buergerbudget/Evaluation_Eberswalder_Buergerbudget_-_Fortschreibung_Februar_2020_.pdf (access date: 20.11.2020), p. 50.

¹² Evaluation Report of PB in Eberswalde, URL: https://www.eberswalde.de/fileadmin/bereich-eberswalde/global/Buergerbudget/Evaluation_Eberswalder_Buergerbudget_-_Fortschreibung_Februar_2020_.pdf (access date 18.12.2020) p. 35.

¹³ See: Evaluation Report of PB in Eberswalde, URL: https://www.eberswalde.de/fileadmin/bereich-eberswalde/global/Buergerbudget/Evaluation_Eberswalder_Buergerbudget_-_Fortschreibung_Februar_2020_.pdf (access date: 20.11.2020), p. 50.

2. Cruz Alta/Brazil

Fact sheet

Inhabitants:	59 922 (2020)
Location:	North central region of the state Rio Grande do Sul, belongs to Northwest Mesoregion Riograndense and Microregion Cruz Alta.
PB history	PB began in 2004 when the Workers' Party (Partido dos Trabalhadores) won the election. It is said that the example of this municipality became an expression of the second generation of the participatory budget because here the main actor who proposed the participatory budget was not civil society but on the contrary the Workers' Party ¹⁴ . Since that the PB process continues in Alta Cruz, whereas the latest editions have been approved for the 2017-2020 reporting years. ¹⁵
Regulations	A city law legitimized the creation of the <i>Coordenadoria de Relações Comunitárias</i> and appointed this city committee with organizing PB ¹⁶ .
PB budget	The PB budget is not fixed for a special year and depends on the communities' chosen projects.
Process	The PB process consisted of different ways of involving the residents. One can single out the Regional Preparatory Meeting, which is open to the public and attended by community leaders. Community leaders hold debates and all those over 16 years old can vote, debate, present projects and choose the priority of projects that will be voted on and those that achieve the highest votes. Those will be part of the activities planned to be carried out in the following year. ¹⁷ The Regional Assembly is open to the public and attracts the same participants as a Regional Preparatory Meeting. The Participatory Budget Council is made up of 12 representatives from each region and 2 more representatives delegated by the city government.
Success	The success of the PB for Cruz Alta is considered to be the success of reloading the city's civil society. By 2006, only 60% of urban districts had residents' associations, but in 2009, there were already 90% ¹⁸ .

¹⁴ Participatory Budgeting in Cruz Alto, URL <https://participedia.net/case/2438> (access date 18.12.2020).

¹⁵ City of Cruz Alta, News: <https://cruzalta.atende.net/#!/tipo/noticia/valor/1443> (access date 02.02.2021).

¹⁶ Participatory Budgeting in Cruz Alto, URL <https://participedia.net/case/2438> (access date 18.12.2020).

¹⁷ Souto, R. B., & Bombacini, E. C. Em Busca da (re) Democratização do Estado: Analisando a Experiência da Participação Popular no Município de Cruz Alta/rs. Url: <https://home.unicruz.edu.br/seminario/anais/anais-2011/sociais/EM%20BUSCA%20DA%20%28RE%29%20DEMOCRATIZA%C3%A7%C3%83O%20DO%20ESTADO%20ANALISANDO%20A%20EXPERI%C3%82NCIA%20DA%20PARTICIPA%C3%A7%C3%83O%20POPULAR%20NO%20MUN.pdf> (access date 22.03.2021).

¹⁸ Participatory Budgeting in Cruz Alto, URL <https://participedia.net/case/2438> (access date 18.12.2020)

PB case highlights

(1) Which specific problem does the PB case solve?

The implementation of the participatory budget in this city is attractive for several reasons i.e., activation of civil society by changing political culture, fiscal transparency, improvements in the infrastructure of public services.¹⁹ The initiative for this did not come from civil society, but from political parties coming to power. The economic problems of the population continued to be addressed. In one federal program, a participatory budget was organized, in which 500 homes were built for the poor.

(2) Which ideas and design principles make the PB case innovative or successful compared to others?

The participatory budget process aimed to increase the time available for people to debate. A debate was created on last year's participatory budget process.²⁰ The Cruz Alta PB Initiative involves indigenous people.²¹

(3) What could be potential challenges in adopting the approach of this PB case?

Wide public participation was limited in the participatory budget process. The opposition could not take part in the process. In such ways, the process became closed without the involvement of the opposition and transparency was reduced.²²

¹⁹ Goldfrank, B. (2007). Lessons from Latin American experience in participatory budgeting. *Participatory Budgeting*, 143, 91-126.

²⁰ Participatory Budgeting in Cruz Alto, URL <https://participedia.net/case/2438> (access date 18.12.2020)

²¹ CRUZ ALTA – Orcamento Participativo realiza assembleia na Micro 2, URL <https://jeacontece.com.br/cruz-alta-orcamento-participativo-realiza-assembleia-na-micro-2/> (access date 22.03.2021)

²² Participatory Budgeting in Cruz Alto, URL <https://participedia.net/case/2438> (access date 18.12.2020)

IV. Medium-size municipalities: Selected PB cases

1. Olsztyn/ Poland

Fact sheet

Inhabitants: 176 463 (2020)²³

Location: In the north-east part of Poland in the region known as the "Thousand Lakes". The city is located in the Warmia-Mazury Voivodeship on the Łyna River.

PB history PB or Civic Budget (CB) is a long-term process with annual cycles. First PB in 2014 with 0,23 % of total budget.

Regulations The provisions of Polish law until 2018 did not encompass direct legal regulations concerning PB. The situation has changed with the Municipal Local Government Act of 31 January, 2018 recognizing PB as a special form of social consultations. PB is mandatory in local governments with county rights. The promotion of a participatory budget is an element of the global strategy of promoting the city and shall be part of its stages. PB is implemented in the same way in local governments, counties, and regions. The entry ticket is the Resolution of self-government council (art. 5a.7 ACT2, art. 3d.6 ACT3 and art. 10a.6 ACT4), which should consist of elements such as:

- 1) Formal requirements for submitting projects;
- 2) Number of signatures of people supporting the project, but not less than 0,1 % of inhabitants of the certain area
- 3) Rules, according to which the submitted projects will be assessed, such as: legal rules, technical requirements, process in case of rejection
- 4) Information on the voting process, considering the transparency of the procedure and equal right to vote. All funds which are devoted for PB can be divided into two parts.

The first one encompasses all self-government unit, but the second one is strictly connected with sub-primary unit or group of them (art. 5a.6 ACT2, art. 3d.5 ACT3 and art. 10a.5 ACT4). Implementation of the Olsztyn PB is based on a bylaw issued by the Mayor of Olsztyn concerning the process of public consultations.

PB budget 104 000 EUR²⁴ realised In 2020 and 1 433 914 EUR planned for 2021

PB budget planned per inhabitant: about 8 EUR in 2021.

Process Six phases: (1) submitting process, (2) assessment of applications, (3) appeals against the evaluation of applications, (4) announcement of the list of projects to vote, (5) voting, (6) official announcement of the results. All citizens from the age of 15 residing in the city Commune with the intention of permanent residence and non-governmental organisations with their main seat in Olsztyn can participate. Online,²⁵ paper form (ballot boxes placed in the Olsztyn City Council and at the District Council offices), by letter and

²³ <https://all-populations.com/en/pl/population-of-olsztyn.html>

²⁴ Urząd Miasta Olsztyna: Olsztynski Budżet Obywatelski URL: <https://glosujobo.olsztyn.eu/wszystko-o-budzecie> (access date 18.12.2020).

²⁵ Urząd Miasta Olsztyna: Olsztynski Budżet Obywatelski URL: <https://glosujobo.olsztyn.eu/projekty> (access date 18.12.2020).

via the *e-puap* vote²⁶. Every eligible voter casts two votes, one for a district project, and one for a city-wide project (a so-called “integrated project”). Selected (winning) projects ought to be realized in the subsequent year with no ability to be rejected by the Municipal Council. Participatory budgeting indicates the pursuit of all local governments to separate the common part for the whole city (general urban/urban projects) and conducting projects for individual districts/settlements/areas.

Success Launched for the first time in 2013, while preparing the budget for 2014. For its 7th edition, Olsztyn’s participatory budget tripled in comparison to the 1st edition, and collected 216 182 votes to choose nearly 900 projects. PB planned for 2021 amounts to 1 433 914 EUR. The basic amount includes a pool for municipal projects in the amount of 438 625 EUR and a pool for housing estate projects in the amount of 995 289 EUR²⁷. According to the survey held in 2017, about 90% of the respondents plan to participate in the next editions.²⁸

2020²⁹ Total budget realized: 104 000 EUR
Number of proposals: 146 (of which 50 rejected; 34%)
Percentage of valid/feasible proposals: 66%
Number of projects for implementation: 38 (26%)
Number of voters: 17 134
Participation rate of voters/inhabitants: 5%
Percentage of female voters of total: 57%

PB case highlights

(1) Which specific problem does the PB case solve?

PB encourages citizens to increase their participation in decisions on the allocation and redistribution of public funds; reduces their mistrust in politics; helps governments in the long run to better address the democratic deficit that is inherent in post-communist countries.

PB has an impact on local social environments as it expresses the need for change in citizens’ perception of local self-government. Introduction of PB in Polish cities has contributed to increasing the activity of residents in relation to local government and local issues, changing their often socially passive attitude

²⁶ Kocur-Bera, K. (2019), “Social participation in the aspect of smart city development”, *GeoScience Engineering*, Vol. 65 No. 3, p. 35-42.

²⁷ Urząd Miasta Olsztyna: Olsztynski Budżet Obywatelski URL: <https://glosujobo.olsztyn.eu/wszystko-o-budzecie> (access date 18.12.2020).

²⁸ Nowak-Rzasa, M. (2017). Budżet partycypacyjny terenów zieleni na przykładzie miasta Olsztyn. *Acta Scientiarum Polonorum Administratio Locorum*, 16(1), 29-33.

²⁹ Urząd Miasta Olsztyna: Olsztynski Budżet Obywatelski URL: <https://glosujobo.olsztyn.eu/wyniki> (access date 18.12.2020).

into an active one. The PB has great soft -power potential for the impact on the communities which are included in the decision-making process.³⁰

(2) Which ideas and design principles make the PB case innovative or successful compared to others?

Voting via the *e-puap* i.e., a website allows voting papers to be sent to the office without the need to visit the office personally, makes the application of PB in Olsztyn special.³¹



Submitted projects are either of a citywide nature, in which the needs of all residents of a given city are referred, or of a local nature, in which projects submitted serve the needs of specific groups of residents living in the area of a given auxiliary unit (i.e., region, district, neighbourhood, or precinct).

(3) What could be potential challenges in adopting the approach of this PB case?

- The complex nature of the procedure can eliminate the least educated social groups.
- Updating the procedures in order to adapt PB to the changing realities.
- The impact of the city mayor on the final decision for the winning projects (in post socialist countries in particular). Among the older strata of the population this situation might resemble a maxim that “it is not important who votes, but who counts the votes.”
- Domination of infrastructural projects with low attention to the intangible projects with the aim to strengthen social ties through participation (e.g., music festivals).³²
- Currently, PB is not focused on solving green issues as residents do not involve in selecting places with devastating urban greenery, officials are not trained on planting methods and protection of vegetation in cities.³³

³⁰ Kempa, J., Kozłowski, A. R. (2020). Participatory Budget as a Tool Supporting the Development of Civil Society in Poland. *NISPAcee Journal of Public Administration and Policy*, 13(1), 61-79.

³¹ Kocur-Bera, K. (2019), “Social participation in the aspect of smart city development”, *GeoScience Engineering*, Vol. 65 No. 3, p. 35-42.

³² Kurdys-Kujawska, A., Kwiatkowski, G., & Oklevik, O. (2019). Cities under participatory construction: Scale, dynamics, and constraints of participatory budgeting. *International Journal of Environmental & Science Education*, Vol. 14 (5), p. 251-267.

³³ Nowak-Rząsa, M. (2017). Budżet partycypacyjny terenów zieleni na przykładzie miasta Olsztyn. *Acta Scientiarum Polonorum Administratio Locorum*, 16(1), 29-33.

2. Reykjavík/ Iceland

Fact sheet

Inhabitants: 118 918 (2020)

Location: Reykjavík is located in south-western Iceland, on the southern shore of Faxaflói bay. Iceland is a Nordic island country in the North Atlantic Ocean.

PB history The world financial crisis in 2008 caused significant financial hardship that led to the decline of public trust in political and economic institutions. The three large commercial banks went bankrupt over 3 days. The “Better Reykjavík” website was launched in 2010 by two private citizens. Collaboration of the city Council with the “Better Reykjavík” initiative was later formalised and sparked the formation of the “My Neighbourhoods” forum,³⁴ that is the annual PB since 2011³⁵.

Regulations The “Better Reykjavik” platform is managed by the non-profit organization, Iceland-based Citizens Foundation.³⁶ Using “Your Priorities”, individuals, groups, and governments can create their own participatory web portals with various sub-forums called 'communities'. The project “My Neighbourhood” forum/ community is the flagship of PB projects³⁷, having been successfully executed since 2011 when formal collaboration with the City Council of Reykjavík has begun. One component of this partnership was a commitment by the City Council to address the top five priorities posted to the site each month, as well as the top priorities in each of the thirteen topical categories on this site.³⁸ Citizens participate in online consultation forums. There is no qualifying or disqualifying factors for participants on the “Better Reykjavík” platform. Participation in the “My Neighbourhood” final vote is more restrictive, requiring users to obtain verification by the Icelandic National Voter Registry.³⁹

PB budget A yearly allocation of 3,6 million EUR to PB initiative enables the public to spend approximately 5 - 6% of the city's capital investment budget.⁴⁰

PB budget per inhabitant: 30 EUR (self-calculation)

Process Model: (i) Citizens Foundation (a founder of the initiative, non-profit organization) writes the software, (ii) City of Reykjavík runs the election, (iii) the National Registry authenticates voters.

Actions by steps:

³⁴ My Neighbourhood: Online Participatory Budgeting in Reykjavik, Iceland URL: <https://participedia.net/case/4225> (access date 18.12.2020).

³⁵ Citizens.IS: My Neighbourhood URL: https://citizens.is/portfolio_page/my-neighbourhood/ (access date 18.12.2020).

³⁶ Citizens.IS URL: <https://www.citizens.is/> (access date 18.12.2020).

³⁷ Citizens.IS: Budget Voting & Civic Education URL: <https://www.citizens.is/budget-voting-civic-education/> (access date 18.12.2020).

³⁸ Lackaff, D. Better Reykjavik: Open Municipal Policymaking URL: <http://civicmediaproject.org/works/civic-media-project/better-reykjavik> (access date 19.12.2020)

³⁹ My Neighbourhood: Online Participatory Budgeting in Reykjavik, Iceland URL: <https://participedia.net/case/4225> (access date 18.12.2020).

⁴⁰ Bjarnason, R., Grimsson, G., Joerger, G. (2019). Better Reykjavik. Municipal Innovation. URL: <https://www.thegovlab.org/static/files/better-reykjavik.pdf> (access date 18.12.2020).

Every citizen in a period of one month can submit an idea for the projects to improve their neighbourhoods with authentication via Facebook or with email/password, allowing for richer participation.

The City of Reykjavík's Construction Board evaluates the cost of ideas and feasibility of each project. Transparency is key in this step. If the idea is too expensive, not on government owned land, already being constructed, or the organizational process will require more than 18 months, they are automatically disqualified.

Citizens vote on the ideas ("likes" and "dislikes" with dislikes deducted from likes) through an electronic, secure, and binding vote. One vote per person is ensured through strict authentication. An electronic ID or a password delivered through the voter's online bank is required for participation. In addition, advanced security measures are utilized to protect user and website information. The voters firstly choose a neighbourhood to vote within (there are 10 in total); secondly the projects they want to vote for. The minimum voting age is 16 years. All can vote as often as they like, with the last vote counting.

Reykjavík City's Internal Audit monitors the election with external experts conducting a security audit every year, before, during, and after the vote.⁴¹

Success (2018) More than half (70 000) of the city's population (120 000) have participated. While there were 40% in the first year (2011), which is still a very high participation are compared to other participatory budgets implemented worldwide. There is a small difference between the numbers of female and male participants. Households with children have been found to be more active than those without. University students and high-income earners are also much more active in terms of prioritizing ideas and voting for proposals compared to those with less education and lower income.⁴² The most successful innovation is the high-level debate system.⁴³

PB case highlights

(1) Which specific problem does the PB case solve?

The initiative aims to increase people's influence in policy and government. PB helps to connect the City to its citizens. The "Better Reykjavík" has three main democratic functions: provides citizen voice (opinion, proposals, demands) to the city council; involves citizens in PB and educates for policy outsourcing⁴⁴.

The initiative successfully makes the process transparent: every stage of the assessment is posted on the website; active discussions of citizens are available due high-level technologies.

⁴¹ Citizens.IS: My Neighbourhood URL: https://citizens.is/portfolio_page/my-neighbourhood/ (access date 18.12.2020).

⁴² Bjarnason, R., Grimsson, G., Joerger, G. (2019). Better Reykjavík. Municipal Innovation. URL: <https://www.thegovlab.org/static/files/better-reykjavik.pdf> (access date 18.12.2020).

⁴³ Gov. UK: Better Reykjavík URL: <https://openpolicy.blog.gov.uk/2014/10/15/better-reykjavik/> (access date 18.12.2020).

⁴⁴ Bjarnason, R., Grimsson, G., Joerger, G. (2019). Better Reykjavik. Municipal Innovation. URL: <https://www.thegovlab.org/static/files/better-reykjavik.pdf> (access date 18.12.2020).

(2) Which ideas and design principles make the PB case innovative or successful compared to others?

This model is greatly supported by the fact that most key software technologies are open-source, which support a grassroots development and participation model with very low upfront costs⁴⁵.

“Better Reykjavík” is an umbrella for many different projects. The initiative is named as digital democracy. PB is one part of the three components:

- (i) Agenda setting (Your Voice at The City Council),
- (ii) Participatory budgeting (My neighbourhood that is implementing direct democracy) and
- (iii) Policy crowdsourcing (“Reykjavík’s Education Policy”).

The “Your Voice at The City Council” project allows people to log in with their Facebook, Twitter, or email accounts. This integration with social media allows for easier diffusion of ideas and helps promote “Better Reykjavík”. Before writing a proposal, residents label their submission with one of thirteen predefined categories of urban life and services.

Presented ideas on the “Better Reykjavík” are automatically considered as the public property of the residents of Reykjavík in order to enable deliberation of and amendments to the original proposal and grant the City of Reykjavík the right to use the ideas.

At 12 noon of the last working day of each month, up to five top rated ideas as liked by registered participants, as well as the top ideas in each category, are collected by a project manager in the project management team at the mayor’s office. To qualify, these ideas must not only have the highest number of likes, but they must also have a minimum requirement of 25 or more “likes” than their total amount of “dislikes”.⁴⁶

(3) What could be potential challenges in adopting the approach of this PB case?

In “My Neighbourhood”, participation was highest in the age group 35-39 years at 19,5% with 40 - 44 years measuring 18,5%. This means that online participation and voting leaves young and older people underrepresented and requires attracting more citizens from the younger generation while using modern IT. The “Better Reykjavík” platform itself only requires an email and a name/pseudonym and does not collect much demographic or statistical data. Therefore, this aspect may be further improved.

⁴⁵ Lackaff, D. Better Reykjavík: Open Municipal Policy Making. URL: <http://civicmediaproject.org/works/civic-media-project/better-reykjavik> (access date 31.12.2020).

⁴⁶ Citizens.IS: My Neighbourhood URL: https://citizens.is/portfolio_page/my-neighbourhood/ (access date 18.12.2020).

V. Large municipalities: Selected PB cases

1. Stuttgart/ Germany

Fact sheet

Inhabitants	610 000 (2020). ⁴⁷
Location	Southwest of Germany, capital of the federal state Baden-Württemberg, urban.
PB history	Established in 2011: Brought into the political debate by one citizen and then approved as a formal process by the local council. Initially, it was seen as a response to an increased need for citizen participation in the aftermath of a major civil uproar in the years 2008-2010 against a large construction project called “Stuttgart 21”. Bi-annual PB process, in its 5th edition in 2019. The 6th edition for 2021 has been approved. ⁴⁸
Regulations	By law, PB in Germany is consultative only, with the final decision taken by the local council. A PB statute defines the steps of the PB process. The PB statute is adjusted for every PB edition in order to improve the process.
PB budget	Total amount of money spent in last process: not determined, flexible. PB budget per inhabitant: not determined, flexible.
Process	Three phases ⁴⁹ : (1) proposals, (2) voting (“likes” and “dislikes” are possible, but “dislikes” are not deducted from “likes”), and (3) feasibility check for best-voted projects. In the 1st phase (January/February) citizens have three weeks to submit proposals through different channels (e.g., on the online PB platform, in written, by phone, personally). Any Stuttgart resident of any age can make proposals. The proposals are not subject to any predefined restrictions. After the deadline for making proposals has expired, an external agency that also runs the PB platform, is in charge of moderating and summarizing the proposals within three further weeks. Voting takes place within a three-weeks period usually in March every second year. Any Stuttgart resident of any age can vote. It can be completed on an online platform or in written. For each proposal, each voter has one vote. That means that each voter can vote for unlimited number of proposals. Also negative votes (“dislikes”) can be cast to each proposal, but these are not considered for the total votes for a proposal (based only on “likes”). After the voting, the best 100 proposals plus x (assuring, that at least the two best voted proposals per city district are considered) (i.e., around 130 proposals) are examined by the administration from legal, technical, and financial perspectives and submitted to the city council for discussion. It is up to the city council to take these proposals into consideration or not. As such, it cannot be determined if and how many of the best voted proposals are finally implemented and what is the amount spent for PB proposals in a certain PB edition.

⁴⁷ City of Stuttgart: Statistics as of 31.10.2020, URL: <https://www.stuttgart.de/service/statistik-und-wahlen/stuttgart-in-zahlen.php> (access date 26.11.2020).

⁴⁸ Bürgerhaushalt Stuttgart URL: <https://www.buergerhaushalt-stuttgart.de/seite/54390> (access date 18.12.2020).

⁴⁹ Bürgerhaushalt Stuttgart URL: <https://www.buergerhaushalt-stuttgart.de/> (access date 18.12.2020).

From an organizational point of view, the Treasurer's Office of Stuttgart is in charge of the PB process. There is no own department for PB, however there are two employees, each with 0.5 FTEs, designated to the PB. In addition, the Stuttgart city administration has its own office for public relations. For each PB process, an order is given from the Treasurer's Office to the public relations office to promote and disseminate the PB. The public relations office uses different types of media (e.g., YouTube-videos, mailings by post, brochures, video screens in bus stops, etc.) in order to raise awareness of citizens.

Success (2019) Number of proposals: 3 753 (initially), 2 901 (after summarization).⁵⁰

Percentage of valid/feasible proposals: n/a (no feasibility check of all proposals).

Percentage of female proponents of total: not determined.

Number of realized projects: not determined.

Total budget realized: not determined.

Number of voters: 40 620 (- 22 % in comparison with previous PB edition).

Participation rate of voters/inhabitants: 6,3%.

Percentage of female voters of total: not determined.

PB case highlights

(1) Which specific problem does the PB case solve?

The design of the Stuttgart PB process tackles three issues that are highlighted here: (1) low participation rates of citizens, (2) high resource requirements for feasibility checks due to a large number of proposals, (3) inflexible PB process design. Often there are (1) low participation rates due to very rigid rules for making proposals and for voting, which hinder an easy-to-understand PB process and thus are not attractive to get involved. The city of Stuttgart uses a process with very low barriers for making proposals and for voting. Especially for larger cities, there are very (2) high resources needed for completing feasibility checks since a very large number of proposals has been submitted. To go through all of these proposals and assess their legal, technical, and financial feasibility takes a lot of time and effort by the city administrations. The city of Stuttgart found a way to cope with this challenge by assessing only a limited top voted proposal (roundabout 130 proposals). Finally, in some municipalities, (3) inflexible PB process design does not allow for an adjustment for the PB process or the PB statute in order to learn from previous PB experiences and to improve the process. The city of Stuttgart openly communicates that their PB process is a "learning process" that is assessed through a citizen survey after every edition.. The rules are then adjusted based on a joint communication and a series of evaluation meetings of a of a "PB Task Force" consisting of representatives of the city administration, politicians,

⁵⁰ See for all success criteria: Interim-Evaluation Report of PB in, URL: https://www.buergerhaushalt-stuttgart.de/d/grdrs_591_2019_anl_1_zwischenbericht_0.pdf (access date 05.12.2020).

and citizen volunteers so that a new PB statute is approved by the city council for every single PB edition.

(2) Which ideas and design principles make the PB case innovative or successful compared to others?

Low-entry barriers for making proposals and voting: To tackle the problem (1), i.e. low participation rates of citizens, the PB statute of the city of Stuttgart foresees rules for making proposals and for voting that are particularly designed to attract citizens to participate. On the one hand, there are no age restrictions for making proposals and for voting so that residents of any age can get involved. On the other hand, there are no predetermined requirements for the proposals. Citizens can submit any proposal at any topic, e.g., to spend, collect, or save money. Explicit guidance on how to write the proposal is not given. An estimation of costs is not necessary. As such, proposals can cover any topic, for example, city-wide topics, city-district topics and even topics that do not fall into the responsibilities of the city of Stuttgart. This way, the city of Stuttgart does not want to restrict citizens from making any proposals that come to their mind and is very successful in collecting a high number of proposals (e.g., 3 753 in the 2019 PB edition).

Furthermore, the voting process design is citizen-centred. Voting can be performed online and on paper, and proposers can also collect signatures, e.g., in the street on voting lists.

Limited feasibility check after the voting only: In order to cope with (2) high resource requirements for feasibility checks that would be needed to check all the proposals submitted, a verification of the sustainability and viability of the proposals is not done before the voting. The proposals are only thematically summarized. This step is done by an external agency authorized by the City of Stuttgart. Only after the voting is completed around of the 130 best proposals (the best voted 100 proposals as well as at least the two best proposals per city district) are evaluated by the city administration, so that in the end only 4% (i.e., 130 of around 3 700 proposals) need to be checked. Thus, resources are saved.

PB learning process: In order to allow for a flexible PB process that can be adjusted building on previous experiences and also changing requirements by citizens, PB in Stuttgart is understood to be a learning PB process. This means that for each implementation of PB, the process is approved with respect to experiences made in the previous PB edition. This also includes⁵¹ a citizen survey about their satisfaction with the latest PB edition and its internal evaluation. For example, since the second PB edition, negative votes do not lead to a degradation of votes anymore and information events and discussion evenings

⁵¹ See City of Stuttgart: Surveys about PB. URL: <https://www.buergerhaushalt-stuttgart.de/seite/14439> (access date 18.12.2020).

have been introduced in the fifth PB edition (at district level). Hereby, a PB working group of citizen volunteers is strongly involved in the internal evaluations of the PB editions and makes recommendations for improvement of the PB process. To this extent, around 10 citizens being engaged in the PB working group of volunteers, actively co-create in the PB process together with other actors. After an agreement between the city administration, representatives of the city council (i.e., politicians) and the citizen volunteers has been found, a new PB statute is developed and approved by the city council for every PB edition.

(3) What could be potential challenges in adopting the approach of this PB case?

The easy access to making proposals and votes has also raised some criticism that this might be prone for manipulations. For example, it might be questioned if children below the age of 6 years are able to submit a reasonable proposal or are able to decide about their vote on their own. Also, the fact that any proposal topic can be submitted, could lead to the result that many non-relevant proposals are made if these do not fall into the responsibility of the city administration or are too costly. This might end up in frustration by proponents. The same applies to the feasibility check which is only completed after the voting. If a proposal is voted very high, but in the end found to be not feasible and thus cannot be implemented, it might be difficult to communicate this to the voters. This was especially the case in the 2019 PB edition: the proposal that received the highest number of votes was in the course of the previous PB edition found to be not implementable. Finally, within the PB learning process, it needs to be ensured that there is a sound representation of citizens in the survey and the PB working group of volunteers.

2. Lisbon (Portugal)

Fact sheet

Inhabitants: About 550 000 inhabitants (2020).

Location: Lisbon is located on the right side of the Tagus river in the centre of Portugal.

PB history Portugal, as many European countries and EU member states, was affected by the 2007/2008 financial global crisis. In search of a solution the country took the experience of Brazil and became the first European country that invested public funds in PB. The primary test of PB took place in Lisbon, where PB was first adopted by Lisbon City Council on July 9th, 2008.⁵² Lisbon PB operates in an annual cycle with the democratic voting by every resident over 18 years of age. Lisbon PB (also called LX-PB) is open to

⁵² Participatory Budgeting in Lisbon, Portugal URL: <https://participedia.net/case/4967> (access date 18.12.2020).

officials, representatives of associations, companies, civil society, and NGOs in the city. Lisbon PB is a very open project, aiming to reach all people that live, work, study, or simply visit the city, at least for a larger amount of time⁵³.

Regulations	Lisbon was the first European capital city to implement PB at the municipal level and its announcement was inscribed within a wider political strategy of political and administrative reform. In 2011, a specific administrative division – Division for Organizational Innovation and Participation – was created with the appointment of a political councillor for its supervision. The City Council also enacted "Charter of Principles", a road map to PB for citizen participation. The PB is a truly binding budget, including all the territory and the different areas of competency. In 2017, December 28th, the Law № 42/2016 was set as legal rules applicable to the creation of Participatory Budgeting Portugal (PBP). In accordance with the referred law and in conformity with the Portuguese Constitution the implementation of the PBP is regulated by the Council of Ministers Resolution № 25/2017, 30th January.
PB budget	Amount of 5 million EUR (5,4% of Lisbon city's annual budget) was allocated to the first PB of the upcoming year. Later the amount allocated has been reduced by half (in 2012, the share was reduced to two and a half million EUR due to cuts from national to local governments (cf. Law 22/2012). For the edition of the PB for 2016/ 2017 2,5 million EUR were allocated. PB budget per inhabitant: about 1,18 EUR (if to calculate for Greater Lisbon area).
Process	Lisbon City Council has promoted the portal <i>Lisboa Participa</i> (https://op.lisboaparticipa.pt/home) that serves as the municipal space for participatory citizenship. Citizens get to know all information about municipal participation programs and initiatives as well as they may participate online in different programs or vote on their priority projects. They also may vote face-to-face in Participatory Assemblies/Associations (PAs). PAs allow the participants to provide new proposals, present them to the audience and discuss. In PAs a person can submit two proposals, while in an online portal they can only accept one proposal. Later citizens vote on proposals (converted to the projects by City Council) they want to see included in the Plan of Activities and Budget of the City. Developed Polling stations (PSs) serve as a space for casting votes for those who lack access to the internet facility. Since 2013, citizens can vote through SMS. Lisbon City Hall reviews all proposals and integrates them into solid projects as well as replies to the questions or complaints. Winning projects are integrated in the city council's plan of activities and budget. Lisbon's PB calendar cycle is as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none">● from January to March – evaluation and report are undertaken,● from March to April – The rules of the game and the amount allocated is made public,

⁵³ JoinUP: Where to better invest public money? City of Lisbon lets citizen decide URL: <https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/collection/eparticipation-and-evoting/document/where-better-invest-public-money-city-lisbon-lets-citizen-decide-lisboa-participa> (access date 18.12.2020).

- from May to June – proposals are submitted through internet as well as traditional means,
- from July to mid-September – technical analysis and transformation into projects,
- from mid-September to end of September – list of provisionally selected projects is announced,
- in October – review and analysis; projects that have won majority vote are finalized,
- between November to December – voted projects are presented for budget approval.

Since 2011, the Lisbon City Council has strengthened the commitment to meet the deadlines for the completion of projects, established in less than 2 years (12 months to complete the projects budgeted up to 150 000 EUR and 18 months for those of higher value).

Success More than 1 730 participants voted in BP 2008⁵⁴. Throughout the last 10 years (from 2008 to 2018) 6 743 proposals were submitted, 2 079 of them were selected and a total of 36, 310 688 EUR have been allocated to 139 projects⁵⁵.

Success of the project is revealed in: (i) greater democratisation of the process through its “de-digitisation” — promoting less digital and more face-to-face methods; (ii) greater commitment to sustainability through the award of a “Green Seal” to PB projects that contribute to a more environmentally friendly city.

The “Green” Participatory Budgeting 2020/21 will redirect the existing Lisbon PB exclusively to proposals that contribute to a more sustainable, resilient, and environmentally friendly city. A PB for Schools 2020/2021 will give students of five elementary schools in Lisbon the possibility to propose, vote on (and see realised) green ideas for a total amount of 10 000 EUR per school⁵⁶.

PB case highlights

(1) Which specific problem does the PB case solve?

- Since 2018 PB helps to solve climate change problems as it is turned to the development of innovative financing solutions that increase investment in low-carbon, resilient, and sustainable urban projects.
- Integration of diverse social groups: involvement of parts of the populations usually excluded from public participation, like young people, seniors, and migrants.

⁵⁴ Allegretti, G., Antunes, S. (2014). The Lisbon Participatory Budget: results and perspectives on an experience in slow but continuous transformation. *Field Actions Science Reports. The journal of field actions*, (Special Issue 11).

⁵⁵ Graca, M.S. (2019). Lisbon: A Decade of Participatory Budget URL: <https://progressivepost.eu/wp-content/uploads/Miguel-Silva-Grac%CC%A7a.pdf> (access date 18.12.2020).

⁵⁶ Graca, M.S. (2019). Lisbon: A Decade of Participatory Budget URL: <https://progressivepost.eu/wp-content/uploads/Miguel-Silva-Grac%CC%A7a.pdf> (access date 18.12.2020).

(2) Which ideas and design principles make the PB case innovative or successful compared to others?

First-ever 'green' participatory budget, an initiative supported and managed by South Pole and EIT Climate-KIC's City Finance Lab (CFL), has been allocated a 5 million EUR budget to support climate change mitigation and adaptation projects selected by local citizens. The Lisbon City Council's green PB was one of the first five innovative projects supported by CFL in 2018. The CFL is Europe's first dedicated platform supporting the development of innovative financing solutions that increase investment in low-carbon, resilient, and sustainable urban projects.⁵⁷ In Lisbon City's PB, some funds for projects with positive climate change mitigation and adaptation impacts (such as cycle lanes, tree planting to support heat reduction, or water capture and storage) were set aside and citizens decided how to allocate these PB funds. Now the green PB is realised in the frame of the common PB and structured accordingly (see link.⁵⁸ Within the framework of "Lisbon European Green Capital 2020", all the PB has been transformed into 'green PB'.

(3) What could be potential challenges in adopting the approach of this PB case?⁵⁹

- PB may not produce a ground-breaking political change. Lacks broader transformative goal such as "redistributive justice greater transparency and accountability"⁶⁰;
- Lack of supervision: over the procedure of registration of voters, voting mechanism, lack of clarity of web portals displaying proposals, and infiltration of fake emails and names;
- Limited deliberation: the lack of "real" discussion and serious debate on proposals.

⁵⁷ South Pole: Lisbon's City Finance Lab-backed green participatory budget awarded € 5 million budget next cycle URL: <https://www.southpole.com/news/lisbons-city-finance-lab-backed-green-participatory-budget-receive-5-million-budget> (access date 18.12.2020)

⁵⁸ URL:

<https://www.citiesoftomorrow.eu/sites/default/files/documents/Green%20Participatory%20Budgeting%20Lisbon%20-%20PT.pdf>

⁵⁹ Allegretti and Nunes 2013, p. 8: Participatory Budgeting in Lisbon, Portugal URL: <https://participedia.net/case/4967> (access date 18.12.2020).

⁶⁰ Participatory Budgeting in Lisbon, Portugal URL: <https://participedia.net/case/4967> (access date 18.12.2020)

3. Cluj-Napoca/Romania

Fact sheet

Inhabitants:	706 905 (2019).
Location:	North-western part of the country, 324 km from Bucharest.
PB history	Idea of a participatory budget was first proposed in Cluj-Napoca during the 2002 election campaign. However, it was only implemented in December 2013 that the municipal administration set up a working group of university experts and NGO representatives to prepare a document describing the principles, process, etc. of the participatory budget initiative. ⁶¹ In 2013, a pilot project for a participatory budget was implemented in the largest district of the city (Mănăştur). The process began in January 2013 and ended in December 2013 with the inclusion in the officially approved 2014 budget of the priorities and projects proposed by the residents of the Mănăştur district. ⁶²
Regulations	The proposed participatory budget approach was in line with the features of the Port-Allegro model. Although it was broadly approved by the city council, the delegation of direct residents' representatives to draw up a list of priority projects in next year's city budget was refused. ⁶³ Romanian legislation did not provide a legal basis for an initiative for citizen participation to give citizens the right to decide on the distribution of municipal funds.
PB budget	The maximum amount per project was 150 000 EUR.
Process	The PB process was organized by identifying categories into which residents can submit projects. Following the submission of projects, the city council checks the technical and legal eligibility of the projects through a special body set up for the participatory budget. Residents then vote for approved projects (in one or more stages).
Success	The total budget for the participatory budget initiative in 2013 was 4,3 million EUR, or 0,75% of the city's municipal GDP. ⁶⁴ It was one of the largest participatory budget initiatives in Europe in 2014. Additionally in 2015, the Youth Participatory Budget was implemented as part of the European Youth Capital program. ⁶⁵ Young people submitted 437 initiatives, of which 117 received funding. 100 small projects initiated by young people were funded.

⁶¹ Boc, E. (2019). The Development of Participatory Budgeting Processes in Cluj-Napoca. *Transylvanian Review of Administrative Sciences*, 15(58), 38-51.

⁶² IOPD Technical Secretariat: Participatory Budgeting in Manastur District, Cluj-Napoca URL:

<https://oidp.net/en/practice.php?id=925> (access date 18.12.2020)

⁶³ Boc, E. (2019). The Development of Participatory Budgeting Processes in Cluj-Napoca. *Transylvanian Review of Administrative Sciences*, 15(58), 38-51; Austrian Ministry of Sustainability and Tourism: Participatory budgeting in Porto Alegre URL: <https://www.partizipation.at/545.html> (access date 18.12.2020)

⁶⁴ Some Romanian municipalities (Floreşti, Deva) have allocated 2% of GDP to the participating budget.

⁶⁵ Boc, E. (2019). Participatory Governance Cluj-Napoca City Model URL:

https://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/conferences/citizens_good_governance/Emil%20Boc.pdf (access date 18.12.2020).

PB case highlights

(1) Which specific problem does the PB case solve?

Cluj-Napoca is the second largest city in Romania. It should be noted that the city has a strong tradition of civil society, as it has more than 2 000 NGOs. The urban development strategy imperatively states that citizen participation is one of the important factors for an effective community⁶⁶.

In 2013, a pilot project for a participatory budget was implemented in the largest district of the city (Mănăştur). This area has a population of 100 000. At that time, the district had specific problems: (i) very high population density (above 4 200 inhabitants/km²); (ii) unmet public service needs and low quality of life (lack of children's playgrounds, schools, car parks, recreation areas, public safety). The reason for this was outdated infrastructure built during communist industrialization in the 1970s and 1980s, which did not meet the needs, as the population grew at the same time.

The main goal of Cluj-Napoca's participatory budget was to develop and strengthen participatory governance by empowering the local community, while achieving transparency and coherence in decision-making. Specific objectives were also set. First, the aim was to reduce barriers to communication and cooperation between citizens and the municipal administration. Second, to increase the efficiency of public spending, the coherence of public policies and investment. Third, to create and promote a participatory culture between the population and the local government administration.⁶⁷

(2) Which ideas and design principles make the PB case innovative or successful compared to others?

The Cluj-Napoca participatory budget process is considered atypical. Firstly, it was not foreseen how much money would be allocated from the budget to the participatory budget initiative. Romanian legislation did not provide a legal basis for an initiative for citizen participation to give citizens the right to decide on the distribution of municipal funds. This area was a matter of competence for civil servants, and the participatory budget initiative could have given rise to legal disputes. In addition, there was a risk that the mayor and city council could be accused of "election bribery" and their willingness to use budget funds for a political campaign.⁶⁸

⁶⁶ Boc, E. (2019). The Development of Participatory Budgeting Processes in Cluj-Napoca. *Transylvanian Review of Administrative Sciences*, 15(58), 38-51.

⁶⁷ IOPD Technical Secretariat: Participatory Budgeting in Manastur District, Cluj-Napoca URL: <https://oidp.net/en/practice.php?id=925> (access date 18.12.2020).

⁶⁸ IOPD Technical Secretariat: Participatory Budgeting in Manastur District, Cluj-Napoca URL: <https://oidp.net/en/practice.php?id=925> (access date 18.12.2020); Boc, E. (2019). The Development of Participatory Budgeting Processes in Cluj-Napoca. *Transylvanian Review of Administrative Sciences*, 15(58), 38-51.

The PB process was organized by identifying categories into which residents can submit projects. The most commonly used categories are Smart City, Digitalisation, Mobility and Infrastructure, Green Spaces and Playgrounds, and Education. Following the submission of projects, the city council checks the technical and legal eligibility of the projects through a special body set up for the participatory budget. Residents then vote for approved projects (in one or more stages). Most of the projects selected for voting were implemented. True, the residents who proposed the winning projects usually played only a decorative role in their implementation.⁶⁹

The participatory budget process took place in March-December 2013. In 2014, it was decided to finance more than 57 small projects / ideas, 1 medium-sized project and 3 large public investments in Mănăstur PB. The total budget for the participatory budget initiative was 4,3 million EUR, or 0,75% of the city's municipal GDP.⁷⁰ It was one of the largest participatory budget initiatives in Europe in 2014. The maximum amount per project was 150 000 EUR. 723 residents participated directly; 11-12 thousand residents were indirectly involved.

Table 1. 2017-2019 indicators of submitted projects and voters

Year	Indicators	Number of projects	Number of votes	% of eligible voters
2017		338	40 637	10,49
2018		164	19 032	4,91
2019		202	17 168	4,43

Source: Compiled by Urs, N. (2020). Put Your Money Where Your Mouth Is-Participatory Budgeting in Romanian Cities. In Central and Eastern European eDem and eGov Days (pp. 303-312) URL: https://ibn.idsi.md/sites/default/files/imag_file/303-312.pdf (access date 18.12.2020)

In 2017-2019, the first e-PB process took place in Romania. 704 projects were submitted in 3 years (see Table 1). In total, 212 projects were declared eligible, with a total of 76 837 votes. Each year, 15 projects were recognized as winners.⁷¹

⁶⁹ Urs, N. (2020). Put Your Money Where Your Mouth Is-Participatory Budgeting in Romanian Cities. In Central and Eastern European eDem and eGov Days (pp. 303-312). URL: https://ibn.idsi.md/sites/default/files/imag_file/303-312.pdf

⁷⁰ Some Romanian municipalities (Florești, Deva) have allocated 2% of GDP to the participating budget.

⁷¹ Urs, N. (2020). Put Your Money Where Your Mouth Is-Participatory Budgeting in Romanian Cities. In Central and Eastern European eDem and eGov Days (pp. 303-312). URL: https://ibn.idsi.md/sites/default/files/imag_file/303-312.pdf (access date 18.12.2020)

Separate from the ordinary PB, the Youth Participatory Budget was set up in 2015 as part of the European Youth Capital program.⁷² The initiative was implemented within the framework of a project initiated by a local NGO. The main sponsor of the project was the European Economic Area Grants. The project aimed to increase the participation of young people and their direct contribution to community life⁷³. Young people submitted 437 initiatives, of which 117 received funding. 100 small projects initiated by young people were funded. The city administration has been actively involved in assessing the suitability of the initiatives for their implementation. During the project, 18 872 young people voted for the initiatives, giving a total of 48 609 votes.⁷⁴ In 2019, 137 ideas were submitted, 10 thousand votes were collected during the voting, and 37 projects were selected.

(3) What could be potential challenges in adopting the approach of this PB case?

The data from Cluj-Napoca (see Table 1) shows that nearly 30 000 people participated in the 2017-2019 e-participatory budget (over one or more years) and their average age was 37 years. Interestingly, 31,9% of the voters were university students (approximately 20% of the population of Cluj-Napoca are university students)⁷⁵. This shows that the adaptation of e-innovation leads to a declining number of participants in the participatory budget process and an increase in the exclusion of the elderly population.

⁷² Boc, E. (2019). Participatory Governance Cluj-Napoca City Model URL: https://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/conferences/citizens_good_governance/Emil%20Boc.pdf (access date 18.12.2020)

⁷³ Youth Participatory Budgeting in Cluj-Napoca, Romania URL: <https://participedia.net/case/5556> (access date 18.12.2020)

⁷⁴ Youth Participatory Budgeting in Cluj-Napoca, Romania URL: <https://participedia.net/case/5556> (access date 18.12.2020)

⁷⁵ Urs, N. (2020). Put Your Money Where Your Mouth Is-Participatory Budgeting in Romanian Cities. In Central and Eastern European eDem and eGov Days (pp. 303-312). URL: https://ibn.idsi.md/sites/default/files/imag_file/303-312.pdf (access date 18.12.2020).

VI. Mega cities: Selected PB cases

1. Chengdu/China

Fact sheet

Inhabitants:	16 330 000 (2019).
Location:	The city is 2 000 kilometres away from Beijing capital and 2 300 kilometres from Shanghai ⁷⁶ .
PB history	In 2008, the Chengdu local government began the reform process. The aim was to raise the quality of public services and social governance. For its part, Chengdu's participatory budget has focused on ensuring spatial justice and reducing rural-urban development disparities.
Regulations	<p>The regulation, promulgated by the Chengdu Communist Party Committee and the municipality, provided that the draft participatory budgets to be decided by the population were divided into four main categories:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Education and recreation infrastructure: rural radio and cable TV, rural library, entertainment and fitness arenas;▪ Basic services and infrastructure for local economic development, including construction and improvement of rural roads, drainage systems, horticulture, irrigation and water supply;▪ Agricultural training, e.g., agricultural and business training for local rural people;▪ Rural and community social welfare, which includes safe patrols, sanitation, collection of municipal solid waste.⁷⁷
PB budget	26 056 EUR per village.
Process	A three-step cycle. First, information is collected from all rural households on what projects are needed. The second step is decision-making at the level of the rural council (consisting of elected rural residents) voting on projects to be implemented this year, as well as the choice of the contractor to implement the project. The third step is project monitoring and evaluation.
Success	In a decade since the introduction of the participatory budget, the total annual budget allocated to PB has first doubled and then tripled. It costs 17,91 EUR/capita per year, which is globally considered a pretty good participatory budget rate. ⁷⁸

⁷⁶ Cabannes, Y., & Ming, Z. (2014). Participatory budgeting at scale and bridging the rural– urban divide in Chengdu. *Environment and Urbanization*, 26(1), 257-275.

⁷⁷ Zhuang, M. (2014). Participatory budgeting, rural public services and pilot local democracy reform. *Field Actions Science Reports. The journal of field actions*, (Special Issue 11). URL: <https://journals.openedition.org/factsreports/3585> (access date 18.12.2020).

⁷⁸ Frenkiel, E., & Lama-Rewal, S. T. (2019). The redistribution of representation through participation: Participatory budgeting in Chengdu and Delhi. *Politics and Governance*, 7(3), pp. 112-123.

PB case highlights

(1) Which specific problem does the PB case solve?

Chengdu is the capital of Sichuan Province. This area is considered the least developed in central China. Chengdu is the fourth largest city in China in terms of population. It has a population of 14 million inhabitants. Chengdu consists of 20 districts, of which 6 are urban and 14 are rural. The most populated areas have a population of more than 1 million. In rural areas, meanwhile, the population ranges from 1 000 to 40 000. In 2008, the Chengdu local government began the reform process. The aim was to raise the quality of public services and social governance. For its part, Chengdu's participatory budget has focused on ensuring spatial justice and reducing rural-urban development disparities. In order to launch the participatory budget initiative, the establishment of a system of rural-level public service funds was envisaged, which became the beginning of the participatory budget in Chengdu.⁷⁹ It has also succeeded in improving the daily living conditions of millions of people. From 2009 to 2014, 75 million EUR have been allocated in the participatory budgeting for 40 000 village infrastructure projects which were implemented in 2 300 villages.⁸⁰

(2) Which ideas and design principles make the PB case innovative or successful compared to others?

Under the participatory budget initiative, each village in Chengdu City has set up a village council. The council usually had about twenty members, elected by the local villagers. From the outset, the participatory budget has become a key function of rural councils. At the same time, a special budget monitoring group was set up to monitor and supervise the implementation of the participatory budget. The group consisted of 5 to 7 elected rural residents. It is seen as an innovation in China's budget system that increases the ability of the rural population to control spending and collective income⁸¹.

In 2009, the Chengdu local government directly shared the revenue with the villages, which received about 26 056 EUR per village.⁸² Regardless of the type of funds disbursed, there is a policy governing their permissible use. For example, costs related to infrastructure or culture are usually confirmed.

⁷⁹ Large Scale Participatory Budgeting in Chengdu (China) URL: <https://participedia.net/case/5969> (access date 18.12.2020).

⁸⁰ Cabannes, Y., & Ming, Z. (2014). Participatory budgeting at scale and bridging the rural– urban divide in Chengdu. *Environment and Urbanization*, 26(1), 257-275; Frenkiel, E. (2020) Participatory budgeting and political representation in China, *Journal of Chinese Governance*, DOI: [10.1080/23812346.2020.1731944](https://doi.org/10.1080/23812346.2020.1731944)

⁸¹ Zhuang, M. (2014). Participatory budgeting, rural public services and pilot local democracy reform. *Field Actions Science Reports. The journal of field actions*, (Special Issue 11) URL: <https://journals.openedition.org/factsreports/3585> (access date 18.12.2020).

⁸² Frenkiel, E. (2020) Participatory budgeting and political representation in China, *Journal of Chinese Governance*, DOI: [10.1080/23812346.2020.1731944](https://doi.org/10.1080/23812346.2020.1731944)

Meanwhile, the payment of debts for the removal of debts, real estate, or rubbish from private areas is strictly prohibited.⁸³

(3) What could be potential challenges in adopting the approach of this PB case?

The participatory budget in Chengdu consists of a three-step cycle. First, information is collected from all rural households on what projects are needed. This is done through a survey in which residents make suggestions for future rural projects. Project proposals are collected by the village committee and assisted by members of the village council. Subsequently, project proposals are classified; similar proposals are combined into one project. There is also an additional collection of proposals in red colour when there is a lack of suitable proposals for voting. The second step is decision-making at the level of the rural council (consisting of elected rural residents) voting on projects to be implemented this year, as well as the choice of the contractor to implement the project. In this step, the list of projects compiled in the first step is voted on. There is a heated debate and negotiation here, as elected rural representatives are usually under pressure to win a vote on the projects that will be most beneficial to their village. When the councils reach a compromise, they inform their village council so that the projects can be assessed as to whether they can be technically implemented or comply with the law. Villages can invite local experts, who can help them evaluate participatory budget proposals. Such experts may be local builders. The third step is project monitoring and evaluation. The Rural Council has a Democratic Financial Management Group and a Budget Surveillance Group composed of elected rural residents. They, together with the village council, review and monitor the draft participatory budgets. Once the projects are completed those groups will carry out an evaluation. If the project has passed the evaluation, the financing or similar financing is transferred to the contractor with whom the implementation of the project has been agreed⁸⁴.

⁸³ Large Scale Participatory Budgeting in Chengdu (China) URL: <https://participedia.net/case/5969> (access date 18.12.2020).

⁸⁴ Zhuang, M. (2014). Participatory budgeting, rural public services and pilot local democracy reform. *Field Actions Science Reports. The journal of field actions*, (Special Issue 11) URL: <https://journals.openedition.org/factsreports/3585> (access date 18.12.2020).

2. Paris/France

Fact sheet

- Inhabitants:** 2,15 million (2020).
- Location:** It is located in the northern part of the country.
- PB history:** Established in 2014 as a pilot project. Annual since 2015, with the allocation of 5% of the city's investment budget each year (approximately 100 million EUR since 2016).
- Regulations:** PB process is regulated under the *Charter of Participative Budget* (or, simply, *PB charter*) (*La Charte du Budget Participatif*). The rules of the PB are, therefore, set by the authorities (they are to be revised annually). Special commission (elected Committee under the rule of authorities) makes the evaluation of the projects proposed by the residents of Paris and provides the selected projects for the voting. From 2015 all the Parisians without any age and nationality requirements can annually vote on projects of Parisian scope proposed by the inhabitants themselves. In the case of district borough projects, each resident can vote in only one borough, that is either the place of residence or the place of work.
- PB budget:** Since 2016 the total amount of 100 million EUR is allocated annually for the participatory budget of Paris; it is around 45 EUR/capita (though depends on the winning projects and particular *arrondissements*). According the PB Charter, boroughs (*arrondissements*) (i.e., boroughs' mayors) may also decide to set aside a portion of their Local Interest Investment (*Investissement d'Intérêt Local – IIL*) to finance projects by locals under the participatory budget (under the regulation of the Charter of Boroughs (2010) / *La Charte des arrondissements* (2010) and the rules of PB Charter).
- Process:** The process has four main phases⁸⁵:

⁸⁵ Paris Participatory Budget: Good Practice Summary URL:
https://urbact.eu/sites/default/files/490_Paris_GPsummary.pdf (access date 18.12.2020).

Winter: January, February	Spring: March-May	Summer	Autumn
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposals made online • Neighbourhood workshops • Comments of the proposals online 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Co-creation process (bringing representatives of similar proposals together) • Development and refining of the ideas 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Selected projects shared online for public review • Need to meet min criteria (wide public benefit, technical feasibility, falling within the budget) • Selection of projects by the elected Committee • Support assisting people in promoting and campaigning 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • September: voting for the projects • Successful proposals are included in the December budget • Work starts next year

Success: The success story of the PB in Paris lies in several factors: (1) competitive leadership; (2) properly selected instruments for the implementation; (3) aid for the residents willing to participate; (4) diversification of the PB itself; (5) commitment to the PB.

As shown in the Table 2 below, a significant increase of people, participating in the PB process each year has been achieved.

Table 2: The number of voters and selected projects of the PB Paris 2015-2019

	2015 ⁸⁶	2016 ⁸⁷	2017 ⁸⁸	2018 ⁸⁹	2019 ⁹⁰
People voted (persons)	67 000	158 000	168 000	211 000	231 822
Selected projects (number)	188	219	196	180	194

⁸⁶ Budget Participatif Paris, URL: [Retour sur l'édition 2015 - Budget Participatif - Paris](#) (18.12.2020)

⁸⁷ Medium, URL: [Budget participatif Paris 2016. Voici la liste des 6 projets que j'ai... | by Duc Ha Duong | l'avenir appartient | Medium](#) (18.12.2020)

⁸⁸ Paris municipality / Official site, URL: [Budget participatif 2017 : tous les résultats - Ville de Paris](#) (18.12.2020)

⁸⁹ Paris municipality/ Official site, URL: [Budget participatif 2018 - découvrez les projets - Mairie du 5^e \(paris.fr\)](#) (18.12.2020)

⁹⁰ Paris municipality / Official site, URL: [194 projets gagnants pour le Budget Participatif 2019 - Ville de Paris](#)

PB case highlights

1. Which specific problem does the PB case solve?

Firstly, and mainly the purpose of the PB was to revive/restore the trust in democracy and to strengthen the empowerment of people. Anne Hidalgo is the person who introduced the PB in the City of Paris when firstly elected as the Mayor of the City in 2014. It was her goal to reach that the inhabitants of the Paris were able to have their voice in the allocation of at least 500 million EUR during her 1st term as the Mayor of the City. Created in 2014 as a long-term instrument, the participatory budget in Paris is the largest ever implemented in the world.⁹¹ The inhabitants of Paris are able to propose and vote for the projects according their needs, in the areas of their choice and under municipal competence.

While PB of Paris is usually associated with the name of Anne Hidalgo, she was not the only one to raise this idea. Quite many candidates, who ran to the Council and the Mayor position in 2014, included the pledge to foster the PB introduction in their electoral campaigns. As a matter of fact, the idea of the PB itself has been rooted more than a decade before its practical implementation. According to Pauline Véron (the Deputy Mayor of Paris in charge of local democracy, citizen participation, NGOs, youth and employment) the first efforts to increase citizen participation had already begun under the former mayor Bertrand Delanoë in his two mandates. The current mayor Anne Hidalgo was a part of Delanoë's team in charge of urban planning. Incidentally, meanwhile there was a nation-wide movement towards increased citizen involvement in decision-making⁹².

2. Which ideas and design principles make the PB case innovative or successful compared to others?

One of the most significant advances toward a more participatory form of democracy came in 2002 with the passing of the 'Law on Local Democracy' (*Loi relative a la démocratie de proximité*). Through this legislation citizens were granted the right to petition, and mechanisms were created for all levels of government to create referenda and hold public consultations.⁹³ The same year, according the above-mentioned law, the so-called Neighbourhood councils (*Council de quartiers*) were required to be established in every municipality with over 80 000 inhabitants.⁹⁴ These councils, composed of residents,

⁹¹ Participatory Budgeting in Paris, France URL: <https://participedia.net/case/5008> (access date 18.12.2020).

⁹² NewCities: What Paris is Building the World's Biggest Participatory Budget URL: <https://newcities.org/why-paris-is-building-the-worlds-biggest-participatory-budget/> (access date 18.12.2020).

⁹³ Participatory Budgeting in Paris, France URL: <https://participedia.net/case/5008> (access date 18.12.2020).

⁹⁴ NewCities: What Paris is Building the World's Biggest Participatory Budget URL: <https://newcities.org/why-paris-is-building-the-worlds-biggest-participatory-budget/> (access date 18.12.2020); Participatory Budgeting in Paris, France URL: <https://participedia.net/case/5008> (access date 18.12.2020).

elected officials, and community organizers and being under the direct control of the mayor, should be valued more as some kind of consultative bodies enabling people to discuss the important issues of local policy. In Paris, there are 123 such Neighbourhood councils; each of them receiving financial aid in the amount of 3 305 euros for operational expenses and 8 264 euros for public investments⁹⁵.

These new Neighbourhood councils, however, appeared to be insufficient for the new participatory democracy standards of inclusion and empowerment. The City of Paris, therefore, developed several other institutions for the purpose of citizens' participation, such as the Youth council (*Conseil Parisien de la Jeunesse*) and the Parisian students council (*Étudiant de Paris-le Conseil*). After the election of Anne Hidalgo even more participatory forums have been established, such as the Future Generation Council (*Conseil des Générations Future*), the Citizen council (*Conseil des Citoyens*), Citizen conferences (*Conférence de citoyens*), and the Nocturne Council (*Nocturne Council*)⁹⁶. It must be mentioned, that all these new participatory institutions and forums were followed by the citizen education initiatives, e.g., 'civic workshops' providing free courses in project management, digital tools, public speaking, and how the city works⁹⁷.

New digital tools (the so-called 'civic tech') were introduced as the way to increase the empowerment and participation of the citizens. Examples include:

"Jemengage.paris" (*"I engage"*) is an app and *"Jemengage.paris.fr"* a website connecting people with NGOs for short missions based on their location, interests, and availability.

"Dans Ma Rue" (*"In My Street"*) is a citizen reporting app letting residents alert the city about problems such as potholes, broken playgrounds, missing road signs, etc. Users can send pictures and receive notifications about the progress of their demands.

"Madame la Maire, j'ai une idée" (*"Madam Mayor, I have an idea"*) is a digital collaborative space where Parisians can submit ideas on different topics for review by the mayor's office. As of 2018, the platform serves as more of a directory with links to other forums (e.g., the Participatory Budget, the Citizen Councils) and upcoming events where citizens can participate.

"Budget Participatif" (*Participatory Budget*) is an online and offline platform for citizens to submit ideas and share decisions in the allocation of the municipal investment fund⁹⁸.

Participatory budgeting was tested in September 2014, just a few months after the election of Anne Hidalgo as the Mayor of Paris. The City Council proposed 15 projects and the amount of 20 million EUR

⁹⁵ Participatory Budgeting in Paris, France URL: <https://participedia.net/case/5008> (access date 18.12.2020).

⁹⁶ Participatory Budgeting in Paris, France URL: <https://participedia.net/case/5008> (access date 18.12.2020).

⁹⁷ Participatory Budgeting in Paris, France URL: <https://participedia.net/case/5008> (access date 18.12.2020)

⁹⁸ Participatory Budgeting in Paris, France URL: <https://participedia.net/case/5008> (access date 18.12.2020)

for funding. Citizens of Paris were invited to vote for the best projects online as well as using the ballot boxes for traditional voting. More than 40 thousand votes were received (60 % of them via online voting) and 9 projects out of 15 were approved, ranging from the vertical gardens to urban sports facilities to the renovation of outdoor „kiosks” for music and arts in public spaces. Their implementation started in April 2015.

In 2015, the PB was launched in its full: a special website (using the *Consul* platform) was created where the residents of the City of Paris (including international residents of the City) were invited to submit their project ideas and proposals. People suggested over 5 thousand ideas of which 3 thousand passed the initial basic criteria. More than 67 thousand residents voted and 188 projects were chosen for the implementation. The City Council allocated 65 million EUR⁹⁹. As there were no limits or restrictions for the projects (as long as they concern the general public interest and capital expenditure) the most popular topics included the re-design of public spaces, mobility, and the ways of combatting pollution, bringing the countryside to Paris, creating spaces for mixed generations and cultures, etc.¹⁰⁰. The general procedure for the projects’ application was established the same year as well.

In 2016, it was decided to set 30 million EUR exclusively for the most deprived sites of the city. An additional 10 million EUR has been allocated to youth and education projects. Thus, schools were encouraged to participate in the PB process - children / students were encouraged to decide for themselves how and to which projects to allocate money. The students participating in the PB, in turn, encouraged their families to get involved as well, telling them about the PB. In October 2016, more than 158 thousand people participated in the final vote, which is 39 percent more than in 2015. At the initial stage, 3158 projects were submitted, of which 1800 were acknowledged as eligible and 624 were selected further and put to the vote. The total of 219 projects were selected during the people’s voting. Even after excluding only those who voted in school projects, 93 thousand of adults participated in the PB¹⁰¹.

3. What could be potential challenges in adopting the approach of this PB case?

Although PB is widely perceived as a convenient tool while rebuilding the trust in democracy and democratic participation, the idea is not so popular in the rest of France. According the reports of the

⁹⁹ Paris Participatory Budget: Good Practice Summary URL:

https://urbact.eu/sites/default/files/490_Paris_GPsummary.pdf (access date 18.12.2020)

¹⁰⁰ Participatory Budgeting in Paris, France URL: <https://participedia.net/case/5008> (access date 18.12.2020)

¹⁰¹ Paris Participatory Budget: Good Practice Summary URL:

https://urbact.eu/sites/default/files/490_Paris_GPsummary.pdf (access date 18.12.2020).

organization 'Les Budgets Participatifs', PB is adopted in a mere 25 out of 36 thousand cities (i.e., 0,07%) across the country. Among those cities that have implemented PB, 13 have less than 20 thousand inhabitants, 4 have up to 50 thousand, 3 have more than 100 thousand, and Paris has more than 2 million. Almost all of them adopted PB after the municipal elections in 2014.¹⁰² The success story of the Paris is, therefore, more an exception to the rule than the universal practice in France.

3. Toronto/Canada

Fact sheet

- Inhabitants:** 2,95 million (2018).
- Location:** Located in the south-east part of Canada, bordering with the USA, situated north-west shore of Lake Ontario, Toronto city is not only the largest city of Canada, but the capital city of the Ontario Province as well.
- PB history:** Toronto piloted the PB 2015-2017 in three wards: the former Ward 33, and the two neighbourhoods of Oakridge (the former Ward 35) and Rustic (the former Ward 12)¹⁰³. The final evaluation of the PB Pilot was approved by the City council in 2019.
- Regulations:** The City council decision to initiate the PB pilot.
- PB budget:** Over the three-year pilot, residents of the respective wards voted for 37 projects and the total amount of 1,19 million EUR was allocated for their implementation. The detailed data of the sums allocated in each ward and the votes for the proposed projects are presented in the Table 3 below.

¹⁰² Participatory Budgeting in Paris, France URL: <https://participedia.net/case/5008> (access date 18.12.2020).

¹⁰³ [Participatory Budgeting Toronto – City of Toronto](#) Before the enactment of the Bill 5 in 2018, there were 47 wards in the city of Toronto. After the enactment of the Bill 5 – only 25 were left as the response to the population increase and the aim to achieve the similarity of wards according their number of inhabitants.

Table 3: Participatory budget in Toronto

Year	Ward	Oakridge ¹⁰⁴	Rustic ¹⁰⁵	Ward 33 ¹⁰⁶	Total
	Details				
2015	Projects won/applied	2/7	2/4	3/5	7/16
	Ballots/Votes	72/186	74/155	384/837	530/1 178
	Allocation (EUR)	122 239	122 239	110 015	354 494
	Per person ¹⁰⁷ (EUR)	1,87	1,13	1,78	
2016	Projects won/applied	4/8	6/8	6/10	16/26
	Ballots/Votes	75/206	52/150	653/1959	780/2 315
	Allocation (EUR)	203 732	191 508	199 657	594 898
	Per person ¹⁰⁸ (EUR)	3,12	1,77	3,24	
2017	Projects won/applied	5/6	4/8	5/6	14/20
	Ballots/Votes	45/136	53/149	277/722	375/1 007
	Allocation (EUR)	183 359	199 657	191508	574 525
	Per person ¹⁰⁹ (EUR)	2,81	1,85	3,11	
Total	Projects won/applied	11/21	12/20	14/21	37/62
	Residents involved (cast votes)	192	179	1 314	1 685
	Allocations (EUR)	509 330	513 405	501 181	1 870 000

¹⁰⁴ Population data for the former Ward 35 taken from the Population census of 2016. According the Census, Ward 35 population in 2016 was 65 240.

¹⁰⁵ Population data for the former Ward 12 taken from the Population census of 2016. According the Census, Ward 12 population in 2016 was 107 900.

¹⁰⁶ Population data for the former Ward 33 taken from the Population census of 2016. According the Census, Ward 33 population in 2016 was 61 500.

¹⁰⁷ Authors' calculations.

¹⁰⁸ Authors' calculations.

¹⁰⁹ Authors' calculations.

Process: The six phases cycle. A year-long promotion and outreach phase. Dissemination of information by the City Staff for the public engagement.

Phase 1: **2-3 months Idea collection.** Brainstorming of the community improvement ideas at local meetings, online, and at community events. The City Staff providing informational aid.

Phase 2: **1-month Idea review.** The proposed ideas were then reviewed by the City Staff. Eligibility criteria for the idea to become a project proposal for the PB voting are: location on the City-owned property in PB pilot areas; capitalization of the project (such 'things' as operating for staffing or programs were not eligible); alignment with the existing capital plans; ability to be built within 18 months after the vote; financial estimate up to 203 732 EUR (thereof up to 122 239 EUR in the first year); finally, technically more feasible to be funded through the PB-pilot project rather than through another program.

Phase 3: **1-week Ballot selection.** After the eligibility evaluation, each pilot area selected up to 10 ideas for the PB ballot. Residents selected the proposed ideas during various local meetings.

Phase 4: **2-3 weeks Voting.** Any resident of the pilot-area over the age of 14 was able to vote for up to three projects. Residents were not restricted to the citizenship of Canada or electoral registration. Voting took place in schools, libraries, and community centres on multiple days in each pilot area. Voters could choose up to three projects. The project with the most votes was declared the winner, and the cost of that project was deducted from the available funds. The next most voted project that could be funded with any remaining budget was then selected, and if there were any funds left, the next most voted project that could be fully funded with the remaining funds was selected.

Phase 5: **2 months Ballot allocation.**

Phase 6: finally, **12-18 months projects' implementation.**

Success: The success story of the Toronto PB pilot lies not in the level of participation (only about 0,8% of eligible residents voted in the pilot areas each year) or the novelty of the tools of civic engagement (as there are other successfully working tools of public involvement that are used in the Toronto city municipality). Its success lies in the thoroughness of the pilot. As there are lots of different tools of public involvement in the decision making, and especially, in the processes of budgeting,¹¹⁰ the PB pilot provided for the information about the usefulness of such an instrument of engagement in an environment rich of the other tools and instruments.

PB case highlights

1. Which specific problem does the PB case solve?

The Toronto PB pilot was used for the implementation of the capital projects and as an experimental tool along the other well-functioning tools of civic engagement.

¹¹⁰ See e.g., [2021 City Budget – City of Toronto](#) an instrument of public involvement in the decision making for the Toronto City budget 2021.

2. Which ideas and design principles make the PB case innovative or successful compared to others?

According to the provided information above we can summarize that the Toronto PB pilot is a good example for small communities how to introduce the PB and make it work. As the Toronto PB pilot covered only 3 wards from the then 47 wards, it could be valued as the BluePrint not for the megacities, but for the small neighbourhoods or parishes as the number of inhabitants in the wards ranged from 62 000 to 108 000 persons.

The other valuable point is the constant involvement of the City Staff providing aid for the inhabitants since the very first phase of the process till the very last.

The third valuable point is its simple structure. Live meetings and simple voting procedures were used instead of advanced technologies. It could be a useful strategy in those communities where the IT development is rather poor or there is a great share of elderly population.

3. What could be potential challenges in adopting the approach of this PB case?

It should be emphasized that the Toronto PB pilot complemented rather than replaces the other civic engagement methods. Its simple structure, therefore, could not be sufficient for those municipalities where public participation is weakly, or even poorly, developed.