

Strategic partnership funded by Interreg Baltic Sea Region  
Programme

Project: “Empowering Participatory Budgeting in the Baltic  
Sea Region – EmPaci”

## Participatory Budgeting (PB) Type Groups

Group of activities 2.1: Output 2

Responsible Partner: University of Rostock

November 2020



EUROPEAN  
REGIONAL  
DEVELOPMENT  
FUND

---

**EmPaci**

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

|   |    |
|---|----|
| List of tables  | 4  |
| List of abbreviations   | 5  |
| 1. Introduction   | 6  |
| 2. PB categorisation in literature                              | 7  |
| 2.1 Categorisation by process design elements                   | 7  |
| 2.2 Six ideal-types of PB                                       | 9  |
| 2.2.1 Participatory Democracy – Adapting Porto Alegre in Europe | 9  |
| 2.2.2 Community Development                                     | 10 |
| 2.2.3 Proximity Democracy and Participatory Modernization       | 10 |
| 2.2.4 Neocorporatism and Multi-Stakeholder Participation        | 11 |
| 2.2.5 Interim conclusion  | 12 |
| 3. Factors for PB-success                                       | 13 |
| 3.1 Introduction to success factors                             | 13 |
| 3.2 Citizen-related factors                                     | 14 |
| 3.3 Municipality-related factors                                | 17 |
| 3.4 PB process-related factors                                  | 18 |
| 3.4.1 General elements and stages of a PB process               | 18 |
| 3.4.2 Specifics for the administration                          | 20 |
| 3.4.3 Specifics of the proposal phase                           | 20 |
| 3.4.4 Specifics of the voting phase                             | 21 |
| 3.4.5 Specifics for the mobilisation (intermediation)           | 21 |

---

|     |   |    |
|-----|---|----|
| 4.  | Decision guidance for PB-design                             | 23 |
| 4.1 | Municipality-related factors                                | 23 |
| 4.2 | Citizen-related factors                                     | 25 |
| 4.3 | PB-process-related factors                                  | 27 |
| 5.  | Overview about PB design possibilities                      | 28 |
| 6.  | An example for the categorization of a PB design: Stuttgart | 32 |
|     | References  | 34 |

## List of tables

|  |    |
|--|----|
| Table 1: Success factors of CP based on Kubicek/Lippa (2011) | 13 |
| Table 2: Guidance of financial factors                       | 23 |
| Table 3: Guidance of regional factors                        | 23 |
| Table 4: Guidance for legal framework restrictions           | 24 |
| Table 5: Guidance for citizens' stage of life                | 25 |
| Table 6: Guidance for citizens' net income                   | 25 |
| Table 7: Guidance for the education level                    | 25 |
| Table 8: Guidance for different PB knowledge                 | 26 |
| Table 9: Guidance for duration of residence                  | 26 |
| Table 10: Guidance for political engagement                  | 26 |
| Table 11: Guidance for proposers                             | 27 |
| Table 12: Guidance for voters                                | 27 |
| Table 13: Guidance for proposal restriction                  | 27 |
| Table 14: Guidance for citizen desires                       | 27 |
| Table 15: Guidance for a project team                        | 28 |
| Table 16: Guidance for a feasibility check                   | 28 |
| Table 17: PB construction kit                                | 31 |
| Table 18: PB design example of Stuttgart                     | 33 |

## List of abbreviations

|        |   |
|--------|---|
| BSR    | Baltic Sea Region   |
| CP     | Citizen participation   |
| EmPaci | Empowering Participatory Budgeting in the Baltic Sea Region (Interreg Baltic Sea Region funded project) |
| NGO    | Non-governmental organisation   |
| PB     | Participatory budgeting   |

### 1. Introduction

Participatory Budgeting (PB) is a process of participation in which citizens are directly involved in decision-making about budget allocations of their local government or district. It was first implemented in the 1980s in Porto Alegre/Brazil in particular to increase transparency about the budget allocations and to cope with social inequalities and corruption. Since then, the concept of PB has been spread all around the globe and it became a success story in terms of public sector management innovations. Due to different starting conditions in each local government implementing PB, legal requirements but also out of experiences with respect to successful PB processes, the original Porto Alegre PB model has been adjusted several times. This even starts with the fact that there is no universal definition of PB.<sup>1</sup>

Since “there is no ‘one size fits all’ approach”<sup>2</sup>, each local government, which is willing to implement its own process, needs to consider different design possibilities and to make own decisions about how to design its own PB process. This, however, requires the implementers of local governments to collect plenty of information and to start “from scratch” with their process. In order to bundle capacities, this document is aimed at supporting implementers new to the field of PB in setting up their PB process. It reflects on factors for PB success from the perspective of citizens, the municipalities and also the PB process. The objective of this document is to give decision guidance on how the PB process can be designed based on specific preconditions of each local government.

The content of this document is compiled from different sources. On the one hand, academic and practitioner literature (see list of references) has been reviewed to identify existing categorizations of PB. Besides this, empirical data from two sources was used to enrich the perspectives. On the one hand, the University of Rostock as lead partner of the EmPaci project has conducted interviews with administrative staff in 12 German municipalities, which either have a long-standing PB tradition or discontinued PB. Thereby, factors making PB successful or susceptible to risks have been identified. These are reflected in the document. On the other hand, the entire EmPaci project team has completed citizen surveys in 18 districts or municipalities in 6 BSR countries to identify citizen-related needs for PB. Data of more than

---

<sup>1</sup> See e.g. Wampler (2007), pp. 21-24.

<sup>2</sup> Krenjova/Raudla (2013), p 24.

20,000 citizens was collected and also inspired the design principles laid down in this document.

In Chapter 2, categorizations of PB in the academic literature are briefly introduced. Since these categorizations are only of limited use for the implementation of PB by practitioners, Chapter 3 provides a decision support which is based on PB success factors identified in both academic and practitioner's literature. Thereby, it will be differentiated between citizen-related, municipality-related and PB process-related factors. For each of the factors, practitioners will face certain decisions to take. In Chapter 4, they can make their choice and are given advice and ideas on how to proceed with a certain PB design decision in a table format for each of the factors mentioned in the previous chapter. Finally, Chapter 5 provides an overview about the PB design principles, before Chapter 6 illustrates the application of the identified design principles using the participatory budget of Stuttgart as an example.

## 2. PB categorisation in literature

Mostly, existing research analyses different existing PB approaches all over the world. The examined Participatory Budgets are essentially a collection of best practices. Some researchers summarize the collected cases to extrapolate design characteristics like Cabannes (2004). A more specific categorisation is the model of ideal-types of Sintomer et al. (2012). These two categorisation models are presented in the following. But these types do not answer the question: "Which PB-process structure could fit to which municipality?" Therefore, this chapter identifies the relevant information and limitations for practitioners in the municipalities from the academic literature.

### 2.1 Categorisation by process design elements

Cabannes (2004) identifies criteria and questions, which differentiate PB processes. The four key dimensions to describe the PB process structure are:

- financial,
- participatory (population and local government),
- physical or territorial,
- regulatory and legal.

There are no combinations of the characteristics of these dimensions to build classifications. But the dimensions provide insights into PB process design elements. In the following, the

dimensions of this model are described and useful information as well as limitations are presented.

The financial dimension regards the amount of resources allocated to the Participatory Budget. The range varies from a low percentage to the full budget (100%). But to have a comparison, often the amount per inhabitant is used. Big cities tend to spend higher amounts on PB, but the relation to the inhabitants shows that even small municipalities can spend a high amount per citizen and have meaningful investments.<sup>3</sup> Further guidelines or ideas to structure the budget are not mentioned by Cabannes.

The participation dimension has two characteristics: direct (individual) participation and indirect (representative) participation. The questions behind are:

- “Who decides on the budget?”
- “Who is included?”
- “Who controls the implementation of the budget?”
- “What is the role of the local government?”

The model just shows the different possibilities and does not suggest solutions to potential problems and under given circumstances. Normally (especially in Europe), the budget is approved by the municipal council because of given legal structures and restrictions. The discussion about the usage can therefore only be done in the next step. The citizens are not involved in offsetting up the budget itself. Cabannes just describes this case and criticises this way as a dilution but leaves open, if there are alternatives and whether this path can still be a successful PB process.

The physical/territorial dimension focuses on allocation of resources to excluded areas. Specific districts can participate more in PB.<sup>4</sup> The guiding principle “as much as necessary, as less as possible” is not enough for practical users. Cabannes does not recommend a specific process design how to foster these excluded areas, e.g. district related budgets in Bielsko-Biała, which is one of the EmPaci partner municipality in Poland.

In the legal dimension the model warns to over-institutionalize the PB process, so PB loses its dynamic and can be instrumentalized. On the one hand, for Cabannes, the standardisation of PB is a big risk, because flexibility can be lost and therefore the PB process would not fit the

---

<sup>3</sup> Cabannes (2004), pp. 32-35.

<sup>4</sup> Cabannes (2004), p. 39f.

municipality.<sup>5</sup> On the other hand, Cabannes does not give some advice on minimum standards and for practitioners the lessons learnt of this dimension are very poor.

Although the questions asked by Cabannes are interesting for practitioners and useful to create awareness for certain problems, the answers are too open and the guidance provided by this model is too low for the operational application of PB.

## 2.2 Six ideal-types of PB

A more specific and most known classification approach is based on Sintomer et al. (2012). Their six types are differentiated by the level of deliberation, type of actors and the power that is given to the citizens.<sup>6</sup>

The so called 'ideal types' are:

1. Participatory Democracy,
2. Community-Development,
3. Participatory Modernization,
4. Proximity Democracy,
5. Neocorporatism,
6. Multi-stakeholder Participation.

These different types have some characteristics as well as strengths and weaknesses, which Sintomer et al. describe by analysing existing PB processes in different European countries. They discuss the implementation and challenges in the individual cities. The possible indications for practical users are shown, as well as the limitations.

### 2.2.1 Participatory Democracy – Adapting Porto Alegre in Europe

This type is most preferred by Sintomer et al. Individual citizens take part in open meetings at the neighbourhood level. At the beginning at this level, the citizens elect delegates to the special council. This council sets the rules for the upcoming budget. The next step is to discuss investment projects and to create a list of projects. At the next district and city level the delegates rank the proposals. The final list constitutes a participatory budget draft. The municipal council includes this into the municipality budget. The citizens have a de-facto

---

<sup>5</sup> Cabannes (2004), p. 40f.

<sup>6</sup> Sintomer et al. (2012), p. 11.

power in the decision making, because the council must approve the draft. After that a monitoring body (consisting of delegates from the districts/city) is formed.<sup>7</sup>

The implementation of this type is not possible everywhere. It is a description of an ideal type but the categorization does not give advice to what type of municipality it fits based on recurring factors and which actions might be useful. If country-specific legal restrictions prevent this type, then it cannot be implemented. Nonetheless there may be a way to integrate certain process elements (like the board of citizens). Still, if there are no legal restrictions, but the political engagement of the citizens is not high enough, the type does not fit to the population. These potential problems for practical users are not addressed in this model.

### 2.2.2 Community Development

What separates this type from the other five ideal-types of PB is the project implementation by local communities rather than by civil servants. A board of citizens and NGO-members supervises the implementation. It is independent from the municipal council to a higher degree. So, there are as much bottom-up as top-down dynamics. The influence of local politics and institutional bodies in the decision making is clearly limited and distinguishes this model from the Participatory Democracy. Deliberation is possible to a higher level. Often NGOs are involved in organizing the activities of an independent board. The success of this type is clearly linked to this NGOs, e.g. their ability to reach marginalized people and disadvantaged groups. This model stands for the chance of new process structures and influence on community activities besides the conventional ways via political party membership or local elections.<sup>8</sup>

To reach this, bottom-up and top-down activities are needed. This calls for a high level of citizen engagement and a willingness to share power by the local government. This general description of the type cannot provide instructions to set up a working board, that is capable of acting.

### 2.2.3 Proximity Democracy and Participatory Modernization

In contrast to the Porto Alegre in Europe-type, these two types are consultative. All decisions are made by the municipal council. The listening takes place via citizens' assemblies and in

---

<sup>7</sup> Krenjova/Raudla (2013), p. 24f.

<sup>8</sup> Krenjova/Raudla (2013), pp. 24-27.

forums. In the latter, participants are being invited through media, by mail or personal invitation.

The proximity-participation model involves districts as well as the whole city with the deliberation on investments in the former case and on general strategic goals in the latter. However, the citizens have neither influence on the proposal ranking nor the decision-making. The municipal council dictates the process, its representatives lead the forums and decide in the end.

The Participatory Modernization is all about increasing transparency (referred to as: consultation on public finance). Information is spread by brochures, internet and media reports. Additionally, citizens' forums are held for randomly selected and interested citizens.

Two versions are possible getting input on public services and ideas for rebalancing:

1. In the first version of the model the focus is on services delivered by public providers (e.g., kindergartens, public swimming pools and street cleaning). Information is presented to citizens and special forms for suggestions by the citizens are provided.
2. The second version is about proposals to rebalance the budget (reducing public expenditure, increasing taxes). The citizens are encouraged to come up with their own suggestions to save or raise resources. Ideas could be gathered via questionnaires and then be quantified. The local council announces its decisions after internal deliberation. Again, the municipal council controls the process and ultimately decides.

For practical users this type gives some idea to structure the PB and what could be requested from the citizens. They fit especially for a low level of participation and mobilization of citizens.<sup>9</sup> But it would be interesting to know e.g. what is possible in the PB process to foster participation and in which interval the meetings take place.

### 2.2.4 Neocorporatism and Multi-Stakeholder Participation

Both models target organized groups to co-decide on potential investments in social, cultural and environmental areas. Both models differ from the other types by including funds from outside the municipality. Resources can be provided by international organisations like the World Bank, NGOs, private companies or the national government. The stakeholders receive

---

<sup>9</sup> Sintomer et al. (2012), p. 14.

decision power in a board or committee. This body of representatives of NGOs and/or agents of private sector entities and local authorities take the decision collectively based on the proposals (co-governing partnership).<sup>10</sup>

These models focus on financial external resources, which could be interesting for certain municipalities, that have not thought about it. But it is questionable how to set up a frame for co-governing and how the power is distributed and how long-term interests of the community are safeguarded.

### 2.2.5 Interim conclusion

Even if the two classifications of Cabannes and Sintomer et al. come with limitations in terms of providing as much guidance as needed for practitioners, they show important dimensions and characteristics to focus on. As such the engagement of the citizens, the environment of the municipality or the structure of the PB process are crucial factors in both categorizations. In the following, these three dimensions are used for the development of a PB type group model:

- Municipality-related information, to incorporate the surroundings of the place where PB should be implemented.
- Citizen-related information, to make sure, that the characteristics of the people that live there are considered.
- PB-process-related information, to incorporate legal constraints and ensure that the PB process is consistent with the characteristics and wishes of citizens and communities.

---

<sup>10</sup> Sintomer et al. (2012), pp. 11-13.

### 3. Factors for PB-success

#### 3.1 Introduction to success factors

The literature marks some factors as crucial for CP success in general, which are transferable to PB, since PB is a special form of CP. Kubicek/Lippa (2011) identified 10 factors, which are illustrated by questions to give a better understanding. The goal is to address the questions properly in the context of the individual municipality considering the environment, the legal restrictions and the citizens, who live in it. For a better differentiation, they are subdivided in factors regarding the citizens, the municipality and the proper PB process:

| Success Factor  | Meaning   | Relation to the PB                         |
|---|---|--|
| Clear objectives  | Are the participation objectives clearly defined?   | PB-process related                         |
| Activities of the decision-makers in process                | Which role play decision-makers from the administration/politics in the PB process?   | Municipality-related<br>PB-process related |
| Mobilization of the participants                            | Which actions are taken to inform addressees? Are there any target-group-specific actions? Is there any focus on equal representation of all citizen groups?              | Citizen-related<br>PB process-related      |
| Transparency of the process and traceability of any results | Have interim results/results been published or made available?<br>Have there been information about goals, process, decisions and rules?                                  | PB process-related                         |
| Ensuring the connectivity of the participation              | Is there a process model for the perpetuation of PB?  | PB process-related                         |
| Binding force/commitment of political decision-makers       | Does a specific agreement in advance exists, that the decision-makers will take the results into account?   | PB process-related                         |
| Appropriate and target group-oriented participation formats | Is the information provided prepared in a citizen-friendly manner?<br>Are the intended media and channels of communication appropriate for the target group? (Acceptance) | PB process-related                         |
| Sufficient resources  | Are the resources sufficient for planning and implementing?   | Municipality-related                       |
| Urgency of the subject                                      | What is the scope of the topic?   | PB process-related                         |
| Professionalization   | Is the participation based on a process concept?<br>To what extent are (proven) external experts involved for supporting and facilitating the PB concept?                 | PB process-related                         |

Table 1: Success factors of CP based on Kubicek/Lippa (2011)

### 3.2 Citizen-related factors

Citizens are one crucial factor for setting up a successful PB. First, the participation rate is an often-mentioned indicator to measure if PB is successful or not.<sup>11</sup> In order to achieve a high participation rate, citizens need to be motivated and have to engage themselves.

To reach as many citizens as possible, the different types of citizens must be taken into account. Not all citizens have equal interest in participation. So far, academic studies and practitioners' reports show that PB usually mobilizes a typical type of citizen (predominantly male, politically active, well-educated, 35-65 years old).<sup>12</sup> Additionally, the commitment of citizens or residents seems important for their participation. As a general rule, the longer citizens live in the community the more they participate.<sup>13</sup>

Because of different interests and capabilities, some citizen groups are more likely to participate than others. This means that there is a risk of unequal representation of different citizen groups. The under-representation of some groups can lead to a privileged position of other groups, which can undermine the legitimacy of PB or end up in a misallocation of financial resources because a few well-connected citizens make decisions (e.g. citizens that are active in associations, parties, citizens' initiatives, NGOs).<sup>14</sup> It is therefore important to reach as many different groups of citizens as possible and to have as broad a view of opinions as possible.<sup>15</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup> Schneider (2018), p. 6.

<sup>12</sup> Schneider/Busse (2019), p. 267; Günther (2007), pp. 99-103.

<sup>13</sup> Schneider (2018), p. 99; Günther (2007), pp. 99-103.

<sup>14</sup> Schneider (2018), p. 99.

<sup>15</sup> Dahl (1998), pp. 37-43; Holtkamp (2006), p. 190; Geißel et. Al (2015), p. 160.

Following Verba/Schlozman/Brady (1995), Civic Voluntarism is an explanatory approach to determine the probability of participation. They examined the political participation in America.<sup>16</sup> Their research delivered the following three main answers to the question, why citizens do not participate:<sup>17</sup>

- „because they can't”, or
- “because they don't want to”, or
- “because nobody asked.”

The reasons behind these answers are four factors, that determine the probability of participating:

- Resources (including civic skills): the knowledge about municipality budgets and financial affairs in the public sector might be a crucial skill,
- Motivation/ political interest: e.g., to care, share opinions and debate,
- Recruitment: citizens' awareness to participate through networks (friends, co-workers), organisations and associations,
- Issue engagement: the feeling of being affected as a citizen.

Thus, the main factors are the resources and the motivation:

*“To summarize, interest, information, efficacy, and partisan intensity provide the desire, knowledge, and self-assurance that impel people to be engaged by politics. But time, money, and skills provide the wherewithal without which engagement is meaningless. It is not sufficient to know and care about politics”.*<sup>18</sup>

Depending on that quote, considerable factors are the attributes of the citizens like age, gender, education, net income or lifetime spent in the municipality (because born and raised citizens are more likely to participate than immigrants and newcomers). E.g. Verba/Brady mention education as the best predictor for participation. Additionally, citizens with a higher education level are likely to be “exposed to recruitment efforts.”<sup>19</sup>

---

<sup>16</sup> Verba/Schlozman/Brady (1995), pp. 38-40.

<sup>17</sup> Brady/Verba/Schlozman (1995), p. 271.

<sup>18</sup> Verba/Schlozman/Brady (1995), p. 354.

<sup>19</sup> Schlozman/Verba/Brady (1999), p. 446.

On the other hand, political engagement (participation in votes, involvement in forum groups, associations etc.) are not highly correlated with these resources. The attitude and trust of citizens in politics, CP or PB does not necessarily depend on their income. These individual characteristics are factors, that may outweigh such demographical information. It is important to search for and consider active citizens and their interests and motivations.<sup>20</sup>

One way of getting information about the citizen-related factors could be to implement a citizen survey. Thereby, the socio-demographic conditions, the attitudes and interests but especially their PB-specific needs could be collected and analysed. Such survey can be either conducted before even starting to develop the PB process or after some PB cycles have already been completed for a potential redesign of the process. A template for such questionnaire in 6 different languages of the Baltic Sea Region has also been developed by the EmPaci team and can be downloaded for further use.<sup>21</sup>

---

<sup>20</sup> Koehler/Koontz (2008), p. 144f.

<sup>21</sup> [https://empaci.eu/photo/Files/EmPaci%20GoA%202.2%20Output%201%20Citizen%20survey\\_final.pdf](https://empaci.eu/photo/Files/EmPaci%20GoA%202.2%20Output%201%20Citizen%20survey_final.pdf).

### 3.3 Municipality-related factors

For municipalities, the surrounding and the financial situation have major impacts on the success of PB. The geographical area, i.e. whether it is a rural region or a large city, may influence the characteristics of PB due to differing surrounding-specific topics. Also, the size of a city may affect the characteristics of a PB. A large city has other issues than a small village. What comes with that is the population density. A higher number of citizens in a small area has an impact on type and form of services provided or the appropriateness and the demand of those services. For instance, the availability of certain services like health care, broadband internet and employment and workplace security in the agriculture and food sector are more related to rural regions. Moreover, the administration will also be different at the urban level than in the countryside.<sup>22</sup>

Another factor to consider could be the legal framework. Laws or regulations may influence the PB type, like restrictions on citizens with regard to decision making or voting processes. To give examples, German laws and regulations require that the local governmental body (e.g. municipal or city council) has to make the final decision on financial issues. Thus, a PB has to be consultative in form and substance. In order to design a participatory budget that is only consultative in form, but not in substance, a special statute or regulation is needed to set up a citizen budget for example. Secondly, in Poland for larger cities (with poviats rights), PB is mandatory for a certain part of the municipal budget, while the amount cannot be altered at will.<sup>23</sup>

Different cultures and backgrounds of the citizens may positively influence a discussion and political engagement. Therefore, heterogeneity of citizens is another factor to consider in designing PB (see above).<sup>24</sup>

A bad financial situation is a risk factor in a variety of ways. It increases the challenges to handle the workload, to design a broad range of information, participation forms and activities and to set up an attractive participatory budget. Insufficient financial resources may lead to ineffectiveness. Such downgraded form of PB would be rather symbolic in nature without any

---

<sup>22</sup> Bednarska-Olejniczak/Olejniczak/Svobodova (2020), p. 8.

<sup>23</sup> See the PB map in the Baltic Sea Region with its status quo analysis for details:

<https://empaci.eu/photo/Files/EmPAci%20GoA%202.1.1%20Status%20Quo%20Analysis%20final-17092020.pdf>

<sup>24</sup> Ebdon/Franklin (2006), p. 439; Justice/Dülger (2009), p. 261.

possibility of material participation or impact.<sup>25</sup> The citizens would be disappointed. Thus, the PB would miss its objectives and achieve the opposite: less instead of higher participation and higher instead of less frustration.<sup>26</sup>

Summarizing, the following factors should be considered: financial situation, region, population density and legal framework.

### 3.4 PB process-related factors

#### 3.4.1 General elements and stages of a PB process

The process-related factors are partly influenced by the two dimensions mentioned above. The financial situation and a different structure of the citizen groups largely determine the activities and the process design. The regulations and laws to which a community is bound, can also affect the process design. In general, there should be publications about the PB in order to create transparency about the rules, facts, time frame, costs, role of actors involved and the PB procedure.<sup>27</sup>

The first factor to be considered should be expectations, wishes and demands of the citizens. If citizens actively make suggestions for the design of a PB or express their lack of agreement in a proposed PB concept when answering a questionnaire/survey, citizens may enter into a dialog among each other, with politicians and the administrative staff. Thus, more and more citizens and actors get involved. This raises awareness for the PB, its regulations and restrictions as well as educate the citizens about what can be expected.<sup>28</sup>

To address transparency and traceability, information about the process itself, the proposals and the voting should be published. This also includes statements by the administration, comments on the feasibility of proposals or reasons for the rejection of proposals. In any case, the interim and final results should be published and explained. The reporting on the implementation progress and achievements in proposal and voting phase are interesting information for the citizens and include hints on administration work and accounting practices in the public sector to educate and inform. E.g. possible decisions through PB about taxes or

---

<sup>25</sup> Holtkamp/Bogumil (2007), p. 242f.

<sup>26</sup> Holtkamp (2008), p. 230.

<sup>27</sup> Sintomer/Herzgerb/Röcke (2010), p. 10.

<sup>28</sup> Lorson/Haustein (2020), pp. 66-69.

income opportunities for the municipality can be linked to the financial aspects and therefore provide a new perspective on regular reporting.<sup>29</sup>

The process can consist of several stages, steps or phases. Their number and design depend on individual contingency factors and plans. At least, four PB phases are needed: information, proposal, voting and feedback phase. Thus, one PB phase is the proposal phase. Neglecting possible combinations, the responsibility for gathering proposals can be alternatively organised as follows: it is only with

- the citizens,
- the government (e.g. city council),
- the administration.

To raise citizens' engagement, it is recommended to assign the responsibility for making proposals to citizens. However, it is not for sure that citizens will refuse to vote on proposals by the city council or the administration or that those proposals will be rejected a priori by citizens.

Neglecting possible combinations, the same set of alternative responsibilities applies to the voting phase on the proposals: Decision-making is only with

- the citizens: top-voted feasible proposals are accepted,
- the local government: feasible proposals are selected.

Again, a more direct democratic way is suggested. But there are successful PB projects, such as the one in Stuttgart/Germany (with a relatively high citizen participation rates for a large city of around 8%): Citizens do not have the final decision right, but the politicians decide on any of the top-voted proposals, which passed the feasibility check by the administration.<sup>30</sup> In any case, the perception should not be created that the administration responsible for the feasibility assessment makes a pre-selection or ultimately implicitly determines the selection of proposals to be implemented.

Specific elements of the PB process may concern the administration structure, the proposal and voting phases.

---

<sup>29</sup> Lorson/Haustein (2020), p. 60f.

<sup>30</sup> Information is available in German only: [www.buergerhaushalt-stuttgart.de](http://www.buergerhaushalt-stuttgart.de)

### 3.4.2 Specifics for the administration

A possible structure element is a special project unit or team, that only works on setting up and implementing PB. This procedure may prevent from administrative staff being inter alia responsible for PB. The latter case means that PB represents an additional workload, which can have a negative impact on the process due to limited knowledge and motivation of the administrative staff concerning the PB.

It can be helpful to explore existing PB processes of other/comparable municipalities to evaluate their organisational structure (e.g. the role of the administration) in terms of responsibilities and sharing of tasks. Of course, also the financial resources of the municipality play a role.

A major task of the administration is to decide whether a proposal is feasible or not. The workload of such a feasibility check depends on the number of proposals and the timeframe. Therefore, an outsourcing of this task to an external service provider might be considered. This requires the availability of external experts in this field but also acceptance by citizens and financial resources.

Alternatively, the feasibility check can take place before or after the voting phase with the following consequences:

- Either only feasible proposals are put to discussion/voting, which inter alia implies a high workload for the administration,
- or some of the top-voted proposals will be excluded from the PB implementation phase (like in Stuttgart's PB), which inter alia can lead to frustration of citizens who voted for an excluded proposal.

### 3.4.3 Specifics of the proposal phase

The proposal phase can take various forms. The first element to be considered is the gathering method. There are different methods to collect the proposals:

- Paper and pencil: no requirements, but more effort than online, maybe preferred by some citizens, because more intuitive to older citizens,
- Online: comfortable to do, but internet access and IT equipment needed (maybe a problem in some cases and for some citizen groups),

- In person (telephone): high workload, maybe a hotline is required, on the one hand an overload is possible, but on the other hand check backs and questions are possible.

Another element is the scope of the proposals. By calling for proposals, restrictions can be formulated. These restrictions may give citizens additional advice. Possible restrictions are:<sup>31</sup>

- Estimating follow-up costs,
- Short timetable to implement,
- Specific topic areas for proposals (e.g. infrastructure, savings etc.),
- Maximum amount of budget per proposal,
- Limited to specific districts and areas of the city.

### 3.4.4 Specifics of the voting phase

If the level of trust in citizens is high enough, discussions on the proposals can also be allowed. One possible way could be an online comment function, like in Stuttgart, which however needs to be monitored and possibly moderated.<sup>32</sup>

To push the participation, many municipalities integrated the PB voting phase into a festival or an event that's in the same period like the date of foundation of the city, or a general city festival.<sup>33</sup>

### 3.4.5 Specifics for the mobilisation (intermediation)

In the Civic Voluntarism proposed by Verba/Schlozman/Brady (1995) two main factors have been identified: resources and motivation. But there is also the factor of recruitment. Brady/Verba/Schlozman (1995), excluded the individual addressing of citizens by political bodies. They just focused on the association and church work.<sup>34</sup> Thus, this factor might be underestimated in the theoretical model. The recruitment is a focal point of the initiation of a PB. Without participants (and multipliers) PB will not be considered as successful.<sup>35</sup> The recruitment needs to address the motivation of the citizens and increase the participation rate. The targeted addressing of citizens directly by the government or intermediates, as

---

<sup>31</sup> Interviews with several municipalities completed by University of Rostock.

<sup>32</sup> Check the website and proposals to see the common function: <https://www.buergerhaushalt-stuttgart.de/>.

<sup>33</sup> Interviews with several municipalities completed by University of Rostock.

<sup>34</sup> Brady/Verba/Schlozman (1995), p. 272-273.

<sup>35</sup> Participation rate is the most mentioned and asked indicator of PBs.

associations, NGOs or the church community is likely to become a success factor when designing PB.<sup>36</sup>

On the one hand, these possible multipliers are a chance for the PB process and may help for raising citizens' attention. On the other hand, there is a risk that the associations and NGOs may use their role to exercise an influence on the proposals to be submitted or citizens in the voting phase. At least that is the fear of some communities.<sup>37</sup>

---

<sup>36</sup> Justice/Dülger (2009), p. 256.

<sup>37</sup> Interviews with several municipalities completed by University of Rostock.

## 4. Decision guidance for PB-design

This Chapter should provide a decision-guidance on different PB-design elements. Any input or suggestions that are based on the data of the citizen survey is highlighted with a star\*.

### 4.1 Municipality-related factors

| <b>Financial situation</b>   |  |
|--|--|
| Bad (forced to save money)   | Good   |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Low number per proposal</li> <li>● Realise less proposals</li> <li>● Seek volunteers for a working group/ project team</li> <li>● Use low-cost activities, like guerrilla marketing activities                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Chalk spray</li> <li>○ Mobile advertising pillar</li> </ul> </li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● High number per proposal</li> <li>● Realise more proposals</li> <li>● Separate project team with “professionals”</li> <li>● Focus on suitable activities and range</li> </ul> |

Table 2: Guidance of financial factors

| <b>Region/Density</b>   |   |
|---|---|
| Below average: “Rural”  | Above average: “City”   |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Consider region-specific topics</li> <li>● Possible topics:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Employment rate</li> <li>○ High dispersion of population making direct contact more difficult</li> <li>○ Availability of services (e.g. broadband internet in rural regions, public transportation, childcare facilities)</li> <li>○ Industry sectors (e.g. agri-food sector in rural regions)</li> </ul> </li> </ul> |   |
| <p>Potential topics for PB*:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Infrastructure</li> <li>● Youth affairs</li> </ul> <p>Potential topics in general* (promotion):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Environmental pollution</li> <li>● Cleanness</li> <li>● Housing market</li> </ul>  | <p>Potential topics for PB*:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Education</li> <li>● Culture</li> </ul> |

Table 3: Guidance of regional factors

| <b>Legal framework</b>  |  |
|---|--|
| Restricting factors   |  |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Influence of citizens is limited or even excluded by the law and regulations (e.g. no direct voting possible without a proper PB statute)</li> <li>● Check for possibilities of special statutes and regulations</li> <li>● Exemplary topic:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Citizens make proposals (“co-planning power”)</li> <li>○ Citizens vote → power to decide (“co-planning power”)</li> <li>○ Engagement of citizens in the implementation (“co-designing power”)</li> <li>○ Engagement of citizens in the PB design (“co-designing power”)</li> <li>○ Level of the available budget (e.g. fixed percentage of the total municipal budget)</li> <li>○ Type of available budget (fixed or flexible/scalable)</li> </ul> </li> </ul> |  |
| Restricted  | Not restricted   |
| <p>If restrictions are made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Change design to be in line with legal restrictions (e.g. statutes for decision-making)</li> <li>● Try to contact the legal authorities (gain support for the process, often there are no rules what unsettles the decision-makers in those bodies)</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Free design of the PB process</li> <li>● Long-term aim for “co-designing” is recommended (consider all factors, e.g. suitability for citizens)</li> </ul> |

Table 4: Guidance for legal framework restrictions

## 4.2 Citizen-related factors

| Stage of life of citizen groups   |   |   |  |                            |
|---|---|---|--|----------------------------|
| Independence  | Coupling or Marriage  | Parenting: babies through adolescents   | Launching adult children   | Retirement or senior years |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Specific topics, such as:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Apartments</li> <li>○ Cultural program</li> </ul> </li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Specific topics, such as:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Apartments, small houses</li> </ul> </li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Specific topics, such as:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Houses</li> <li>○ Child care</li> <li>○ Education* (Kindergarten, schools)</li> <li>○ Playing fields, Leisure activities</li> <li>○ Labour market*</li> </ul> </li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Specific topics, such as:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Medical care*</li> <li>○ Senior citizens' facilities</li> <li>○ Public transportation</li> </ul> </li> </ul> |                            |
| online  |   | → offline   |  |                            |

Table 5: Guidance for citizens' stage of life

| Net income  |         |   |
|---|---------|---|
| Low (below national average)  | Average | High (above national average)   |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Less resources</li> <li>● Less likely to participate</li> <li>● Try to activate by focussing on topics that are "in their backyard"</li> </ul> |         | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● More resources</li> <li>● More likely to participate</li> <li>● Try to activate by focussing on "social responsibility"</li> </ul> |

Table 6: Guidance for citizens' net income

| Educational level   |                  |  |
|---|------------------|--|
| Primary level   | Vocational level | University level   |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Less resources</li> <li>● Less likely to participate</li> </ul>    |                  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● More resources</li> <li>● More likely to participate</li> </ul>   |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Focus on service availability for advertising purposes*</li> </ul> |                  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Focus on cultural activities for advertising purposes*</li> </ul> |

Table 7: Guidance for the education level

| <b>Knowledge about PB</b>   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>“Never heard of”</b>   | <b>“Idea of PB”</b>   |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Increase knowledge</li> <li>● Possible mechanisms:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Awareness events</li> <li>○ School visits</li> <li>○ Practical seminars</li> <li>○ Simulations of general process</li> </ul> </li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Increase motivation</li> <li>● Possible mechanisms:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Simulations of detailed process</li> <li>○ Scenarios</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Debate/comment function</li> <li>● Integrate citizens in development of the PB process</li> </ul> |

Table 8: Guidance for different PB knowledge

| <b>Duration of residence in the municipality</b>  |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Old-established</b>  | <b>New inhabitants</b>  |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Try to discuss and get ideas for existing problems</li> <li>● Could be more likely to participate, try to activate this group</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Inform about situation, raise awareness</li> </ul> |

Table 9: Guidance for duration of residence

| <b>Political engagement</b>   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Low</b>  | <b>High</b>   |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Think about prolonged informal process length</li> <li>● Try to raise political interest by addressing “Not in my backyard”-problems</li> <li>● Try to engage NGOs with high member numbers in the process (mobilization)</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Seek for volunteers from inhabitants for project teams and supporting tasks</li> <li>● Integrate citizens in the PB process</li> </ul> |

Table 10: Guidance for political engagement

### 4.3 PB-process-related factors

| <b>Proposals by:</b>  |   |
|---|---|
| Citizens  | Politics/administration   |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Activate citizens to submit proposals</li> <li>● Guidance for proposal submission</li> <li>● Possible incentives to submit:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Awards for winning proposals (branding)</li> <li>○ Awards for submission</li> </ul> </li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Watch the communication of proposals</li> <li>● Take up references from public events (committee meetings)</li> <li>● Pay attention to transparency</li> </ul> |
| Possibly discussion forum (debate function)   |   |

Table 11: Guidance for proposers

| <b>Voting by:</b>   |   |
|---|---|
| Citizens  | Politics/administration   |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Incentives to vote:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Voting in special location or on special events</li> <li>○ Rewards (social acknowledgements)</li> </ul> </li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Pay attention to transparency</li> <li>● Release decision parameters                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Possibly discussion forum/workshops</li> </ul> </li> </ul> |

Table 12: Guidance for voters

| <b>Restrictions on proposals</b>   |   |
|--|---|
| Yes (possible restrictions)  | No (pay attention)  |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Budget amount</li> <li>● Subject areas</li> <li>● Follow-up costs</li> <li>● Time for implementation</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Quality of proposals</li> <li>● Maybe need for check back function of missing information</li> </ul> |

Table 13: Guidance for proposal restriction

| <b>Be aware of citizens for desires about these factors:</b>  |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● General needs, interests, topics, problems, cultural aspects etc.</li> <li>● Integration in PB process design</li> <li>● Integration in PB process steps (responsibility)</li> </ul> |
| <b>Recommendation to request (e.g. by questionnaire)<sup>38</sup></b>   |

Table 14: Guidance for citizen desires

<sup>38</sup> [https://empaci.eu/photo/Files/EmPaci%20GoA%202.2%20Output%201%20Citizen%20survey\\_final.pdf](https://empaci.eu/photo/Files/EmPaci%20GoA%202.2%20Output%201%20Citizen%20survey_final.pdf).

| <b>Project team</b>  |   |
|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Use a mixed team of administration/politics and citizens/representatives of NGOs</li> <li>● Maybe seek volunteers (watch financial situation and suitability of citizens)</li> <li>● Assigning clear tasks to the team</li> <li>● Possible tasks:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Prepare and maintain a homepage</li> <li>○ Set up promotion</li> <li>○ Guide seminars</li> <li>○ Moderate/lead discussion forums</li> <li>○ Conduct communication</li> </ul> </li> </ul> |   |
| Done among other activities<br>(part-time team members)  | Create own department<br>(full time team members) |

Table 15: Guidance for a project team

| <b>Feasibility check</b>  |  |
|---|--|
| Check possibility to outsource this process to an external service provider   |  |
| Before the vote   | After the vote   |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Massive workload, but less workload after the vote</li> <li>● Could speed up implementation of (voted and feasible) proposals</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Preselection effects</li> <li>● Risk of an appearance of censorship</li> <li>● Massive workload after the voting and risk that favourite proposals of the citizens are not feasible and therefore not implemented at all</li> </ul> |

Table 16: Guidance for a feasibility check

## 5. Overview about PB design possibilities

Taking the same approach as Sintomer et al. and not “getting lost in a thousand and one examples”<sup>39</sup>, based on the tables of decision guidance before, the following table presents a tool box to find helpful information for every phase of a potential PB process. The table is structured by PB phases in the pre-column and by municipality-related as well as citizen-related factors in the header. This “construction kit” prevents an overload of type groups and still provides useful tips for practitioners.

Any input or suggestions that are based on the data of the citizen survey is highlighted with a star\*.

<sup>39</sup> Sintomer et al. (2012), p. 5.

# Overview about PB design possibilities

| PB type group construction kit  | Municipality-related   |   |   |                                       |  | Citizen-related  |   |   |                                      |   |  |   |   |               |   |
|---|--|---|---|---------------------------------------|--|--|---|---|--------------------------------------|---|--|---|---|---------------|---|
|   | Legal framework  | Financial situation   |   | Region                                |  | Stage of life / Age  | Education   | Knowledge of PB   |                                      | Political engagement  |  | Duration residence  | Net income  |               |   |
|   |  | Bad   | Good  | Rural                                 | City   |  |   | High  | low                                  | high  | low  |   | Above average   | Below average |   |
| Planning phase  | Determine desires and goals for the municipality, check capacities   |   |   |                                       |  | Recommended: Explore desires of citizens and try to consider them            |   |   |                                      |   |  |   |   |               |   |
| Organisation structure  | Check whether the project team is allowed to make decisions or to act in an advisory capacity<br><br>Project team<br>Consider capacity of employees, (part-time team / full time team) | If project team is formed: Seek volunteers  | If project team is formed: Think about external professionals | -                                     | Recommended: Seek for volunteers from different stages of life (diversity)   | Recommended: Seek for volunteers from different education levels (diversity) | Seek for volunteers from inhabitants  | -   | Seek for volunteers from inhabitants | -   | -  | Recommended: Seek for volunteers from different income situations (diversity) |   |               |   |
| Proposal phase  |  |   |   |                                       |  |  |   |   |                                      |   |  |   |   |               | Level of the available budget is a fixed amount or percentage of the total municipal budget |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Period length: 2-4 weeks</li> <li>• Consider timeline, which can be shortened after first run(s)</li> <li>• Proposals by citizens are recommended when possible</li> <li>• If not used, watch transparency of the process (proposals by council))</li> </ul> |  | Budget size examples:<br>1-5 % of investment budget<br>1-5 EUR per inhabitant   |   |                                       |  |  |   |   |                                      |   |  |   |   |               |   |
| Addition informal process (topics for events, mechanisms, length)<br><br>Period length: 4-6 weeks   | -  | Use low-cost activities, like <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Guerrilla marketing activities</li> <li>• Chalk spray</li> <li>• Mobile advertising pillar</li> </ul> Maybe think about donations/ funds from NGOs/private companies | Focus on suitable activities and range                        | Use regional topics to catch citizens | <b>Independent:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cultural program</li> <li>• Apartments</li> </ul> <b>Coupling or Marriage:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Apartments</li> </ul> <b>Parenting babies/ Launching adult children:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Houses</li> <li>• Wages</li> <li>• Child care</li> <li>• Kindergarten, schools</li> <li>• Playing fields, Leisure activities</li> <li>• Labour market</li> </ul> <b>Retirement:</b> | Think about <b>prolonged</b> informal <b>process length</b>                  | Focus on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Motivation of citizens</li> <li>• Debate function</li> <li>• Possible mechanisms :               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Simulation of detailed process</li> <li>○ Scenarios</li> <li>○ Integrate citizens in the PB process</li> </ul> </li> </ul> | Think about <b>prolonged</b> informal <b>process length</b> | Seek for volunteers from inhabitants | Think about <b>prolonged</b> informal <b>process length</b> | <b>For long duration:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Motivate to participate by discussion and focus on long existing problems</li> </ul> <b>For short duration:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ask for their view</li> <li>Raise awareness for</li> </ul> | Focus on social responsibility  | Focus on activation by addressing problems in the low income population |               |   |

## Overview about PB design possibilities

| PB type group construction kit   | Municipality-related  |  |                                      |  | Citizen-related  |   |  |   |   |   |                                   |  |  |
|--|---|--|--------------------------------------|--|--|---|--|---|---|---|-----------------------------------|--|--|
|  |   |  |                                      |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Medical care</li> <li>Senior citizens' facilities</li> <li>Public transportation</li> </ul>   |   |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Awareness events</li> <li>School visits</li> <li>Practical seminars</li> </ul>                   | Simulations of process in general           | membership in the process   | the situation of the municipality |  |  |
| <p>Proposal creation/quality (proposals should be able to be implemented in one year or less, follow-up costs should be considered)</p>  | <p>Think about restrictions like topics, areas, implementation time, budget</p>               | <p>Check for different online tools, freeware or special software providers</p>  |                                      |  |  | <p>Think about guided seminars for proposal creation</p>  |  | <p>Think about guided seminars for proposal creation</p>  | <p>Integrate citizens in the PB process</p> | <p>Think about guided seminars for proposal creation</p>  |                                   |  |  |
| <p>Feedback on proposal processing</p>   | <p>Watch data privacy for check backs</p>   | <p>Check capacity and contact options (Mail, E-Mail, personal)</p>   |                                      | <p>Watch availability of broadband internet, attendance of city hall for information notices</p> | <p>Think about a feedback for proposals, possible mechanisms: online/ publicly visible or individual contact by Mail, E-Mail or personally</p>   |   |  |   |   |   |                                   |  |  |
| <p>Incentives</p>  |   | <p>Think about social rewards (naming)</p>   | <p>Think about financial rewards</p> |  | <p>Think about awards for winning proposals (branding) or rewards for submission</p> <p>To increase visibility and raise interest, discussions should be held on the proposals (online/offline)*</p> |   |  |   |   |   |                                   |  |  |
| <p><b>Check phase?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Period length: ca. 10 weeks</li> </ul> <p>Check before voting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Massive workload, but less workload after the vote</li> <li>Could speed up implementation of (voted and feasible) proposals</li> <li>Leads maybe to enhanced time gap between proposal and voting phase</li> </ul> |   | <p>Think about an external service provider, criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cheaper than internal solution</li> <li>Internal solution capacity and budget for jobs are limited</li> <li>Higher quality than internal solution / no know-how inside the internal staff</li> </ul> |                                      |  |  |   |  |   |   |   |                                   |  |  |
| <p><b>Voting phase</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Period length: 2- 6 weeks</li> <li>If there is no voting by the citizens, watch transparency by explaining the decision: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Release decision parameters</li> <li>Possibly discussion forum/workshops</li> </ul> </li> </ul>  | <p>Voting by citizens is recommended when possible</p> <p>If not used, watch transparency</p> |  |                                      |  | <p>Use online tools to reach younger participants (independent – Parenting babies)*</p>  | <p>If education/ political engagement/ knowledge of PB are low, think about letting the citizens vote on a proposals by the council</p> |  | <p>If education/ political engagement/ knowledge of PB are low, think about letting the citizens vote on a proposals by the council</p> |   | <p>If education/ political engagement/ knowledge of PB are low, think about letting the citizens vote on a proposals by the council</p> |                                   |  |  |

## Overview about PB design possibilities

| PB type group construction kit  | Municipality-related  |  |   |  | Citizen-related  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|---|---|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Incentives  |   | Think about social rewards (naming)  | Think about financial rewards   |  |  | Think about voting on special location and events and use of rewards (social acknowledgements)           |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| <b>Check phase?</b><br>Check after voting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Period length: 10 weeks</li> <li>• Preselection effects</li> <li>• Risk of an appearance of censorship → transparency</li> <li>• Massive workload after the voting and risk that favourite proposals of the citizens are not feasible and therefore not implemented at all</li> <li>• Leads maybe to enhanced time gap between proposal and implementation phase</li> </ul> | Inform citizens transparently about the criteria that have been used to distinguish feasible and infeasible projects<br><br>Communicate from two perspectives: Local council and municipal administration                                     | Think about an external service provider, criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• cheaper than internal solution</li> <li>• Internal solution capacity and budget for jobs are limited</li> </ul> Higher quality than internal solution |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| <b>Implementation phase</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Period length: under 1 year</li> </ul>   | Implementation by citizens is possible (co-design power))<br><br>Watch timetable to build certain proposals (permits, requests)   | Citizens may take a role in implementing the projects  |   |  |  |  |  | Citizens may take a role in realizing the projects |  | Citizens may take a role in realizing the projects |  |  |  |
| <b>Feedback (internal/external)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Period length: 1-2 weeks</li> <li>• Date suggestions:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Internal: after the implementation starts</li> <li>○ External: after voting or after implementation starts</li> </ul> </li> </ul>   | If there are many restrictions: Seek for network of other/comparable municipalities to jointly contact the ministry or government in charge of changing these restrictions, inform about the restrictions and make suggestions for amendments | Use online resources only to disseminate accountability report of a completed PB cycle<br><br>Ask for feedback via online questionnaire  | Develop and provide a printed leaflet to provide accountability information about completed PB cycle<br><br>Use different sources to obtain feedback (online/ offline questionnaires, discussion events etc.) |  | Consider an evening event to present the accountability report of a completed PB cycle and seek for feedback | Think about evaluation by asking citizens, possible topics: activation, motivation, phases, transparency |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 17: PB type group construction kit

An example for the categorization of a PB design: Stuttgart

## 6. An example for the categorization of a PB design: Stuttgart

Using the toolbox to analyse the participatory budget of Stuttgart.

| PB Construction kit  | Municipality-related   |  |      |        |   | Citizen-related   |           |   |                                      |   |     |                    |               |               |
|--|--|--|------|--------|---|---|-----------|---|--------------------------------------|---|-----|--------------------|---------------|---------------|
|  | Legal framework  | Financial situation  |      | Region |   | Stage of life / Age   | Education | Knowledge of PB   |                                      | Political engagement  |     | Duration residence | Net income    |               |
|  |  | Bad  | Good | Rural  | City  |   |           | High  | low                                  | high  | low |                    | Above average | Below average |
| Planning phase   | Determine desires and goals for the municipality, check capacities |  |      |        |   | Recommended: Explore desires of citizens and try to consider them   |           |   |                                      |   |     |                    |               |               |
| Organisation structure<br>(part-time team / full time team)  |  | project team is formed with volunteers<br>"Arbeitskreis Stuttgarter Bürgerhaushalt"                    |      |        |   |   |           | -   | Seek for volunteers from inhabitants | -   | -   |                    |               |               |
| Proposal phase<br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Period length: 6 weeks</li> <li>• Proposal by citizens</li> <li>• After 2 weeks summary of similar proposals</li> <li>• Comments are possible</li> <li>• Online format</li> </ul> | No fixed budget, depend on proposals                               | Initial costs for the online platform:<br>About 130 000 EUR<br><br>Annually costs:<br>About 55 000 EUR | -    |        | Use online tools to reach younger participants<br><br>Participation of young people increased from 3% to 20%  | If education/ political engagement/ knowledge of PB are low, think about starting with a consultative process (no voting) |           | If education/ political engagement/ knowledge of PB are low, think about starting with a consultative process (no voting) |                                      | If education/ political engagement/ knowledge of PB are low, think about starting with a consultative process (no voting)   |     | -                  |               |               |
| Addition informal process<br>Period length: 3 weeks<br><br>18 workshops in different districts<br><br>Project team contacts multipliers: events in schools, associations etc.  | -  | Promotion video  |      |        |   |   |           |   |                                      |   |     |                    |               |               |
| Feedback on proposal processing  |  | Online tool/survey invitation by e-Mail (needed for registration/newsletter))                          |      |        | Citizens expressed (survey) on the one hand the wish for:<br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More information about the budget as a whole</li> <li>• Practical seminars to develop proposals in meetings</li> <li>• More information about the process</li> <li>• Discussions</li> </ul> |   |           |   |                                      | But on the other hand some citizens said:<br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Information meetings are redundant</li> <li>• A focus on problems on district level, not the whole city</li> <li>• A real participation should be provided</li> </ul> |     |                    |               |               |

An example for the categorization of a PB design: Stuttgart

| PB Construction kit   | Municipality-related   |   |  |  |  | Citizen-related  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|---|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| <b>Voting phase</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Period length: 3 months (integrated in normal budget decision)</li> <li>• there is no voting by the citizens,</li> <li>• Possibly discussion forum/workshops</li> </ul>  | No legal framework to let the citizens vote, the city council decides on the proposals   |   |  |  |  | Voting to prioritize proposals by citizens, final decision by city council after feasibility check       |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| <b>Check phase?</b><br>Check after voting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Period length: 10 weeks</li> <li>• Preselection effects</li> <li>• Risk of an appearance of censorship → transparency</li> <li>• Massive workload handled by grouping and dividing tasks</li> <li>• Leads maybe to enhanced time gap between proposal and implementation phase</li> </ul> | Transparency about the administration check are available for the top 130 proposals<br><br>If feasible, the proposals are discussed by the city council  |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| <b>Implementation phase</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Period length: less than one year</li> </ul>   |  |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| <b>Feedback (internal/external)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Period length: 2-3 weeks</li> <li>• External Feedback of citizens with the proposal phase of the next year</li> </ul>  | If there are many restrictions: Seek for network of other/ comparable municipalities to jointly contact the ministry or government in charge of changing these restrictions, inform about the restrictions and make suggestions for amendments | Use online resources only to disseminate accountability report of a completed PB cycle<br><br>Ask for feedback via online questionnaire |  |  |  | Think about evaluation by asking citizens, possible topics: activation, motivation, phases, transparency |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 18: PB design example of Stuttgart

## References

Bednarska-Olejniczak/Olejniczak/Svobodova (2020): "How a Participatory Budget Can Support Sustainable Rural Development—Lessons From Poland", *Sustainability* 12 (7), p. 2620, <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12072620>.

Brady/Verba/Schlozman (1995): A Resource Model of Political Participation, *The American Political Science Review* 89 (2), pp. 271-294.

Cabannes (2004): "Participatory budgeting: a significant contribution to participatory democracy", *Environment & Urbanization* Vol 16 (1), 27-46.

Dahl (1998): „On Democracy“, Yale University Press.

Ebdon/Franklin. (2006): „Citizen Participation in Budgeting Theory“, *Public Administration Review*, 66 (3), pp. 437-447, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2006.00600.x>.

Geißel et. al (2015): „Dialogorientierte Beteiligungsverfahren: Wirkungsvolle oder sinnlose Innovationen? Das Beispiel Bürgerhaushalt“, *Zeitschrift für Parlamentsfragen*, 46 (1), pp. 151-165.

Günther (2007): „Der Bürgerhaushalt“, Beck Verlag.

Holtkamp (2008): „Bürgerhaushalt“, in: Norbert Kersting (Ed.), „Politische Beteiligung“, Wiesbaden: VS, pp. 222-235.

Holtkamp/Bogumil (2007): „Bürgerkommune und Local Governance“, in: Lilian Schwalb/Heike Walk (Ed.), „Local Governance – mehr Transparenz und Bürgernähe?“, Wiesbaden: VS, pp. 231-250.

Justice/Dülger (2009): "Fiscal transparency and authentic citizen participation in public budgeting: the role of third-party intermediation", *Journal of Public Budgeting, Accounting & Financial Management*, 21 (2), pp. 254-288.

Koehler/Koontz (2008): "Citizen Participation in Collaborative Watershed Partnerships.", *Environmental Management*, 41(2), pp. 143-154.

Krenjova/Raudla (2013): "Participatory Budgeting at the Local Level: Challenges and Opportunities for New Democracies.", *Halduskultuur – Administrative Culture* 14 (1), pp. 18-46.

## References

---

Lorson/Haustein (2020): Public Sector Reporting: Lessons Learnt from Participatory Budgeting, in: Manes-Rossi, F./Levy Orelli, R. (Eds.): New Trends in Public Sector Reporting: Integrated Reporting and Beyond, Cham 2020, pp. 57-79.

Schlozman/Verba/Brady (1999): Civic Participation and the Equality Problem, in: Skocpol (Ed.): Civic Engagement in American Democracy, 427-459.

Schneider (2018): "Bürgerhaushalte in Deutschland", Springer Verlag.

Schneider/Busse (2019): „Participatory Budgeting in Germany. A Review of Empirical Findings“, International Journal of Public Administration, 42(3), pp. 259-273, <https://doi.org/10.1080/01900692.2018.1426601>.

Sintomer/Herzberg/Allegretti/Röcke (2012): „Participatory Budgeting Worldwide“ URL: [https://www.buergerhaushalt.org/sites/default/files/downloads/LearningfromtheSouth-ParticipatoryBudgetingWorldwide-Study\\_0.pdf](https://www.buergerhaushalt.org/sites/default/files/downloads/LearningfromtheSouth-ParticipatoryBudgetingWorldwide-Study_0.pdf)

Sintomer/Herzberg/Röcke (2010): "Porto Alegre nach Europa?", in: Sintomer, Y./Herzberg, C./Röcke, A. (Eds.): Der Bürgerhaushalt in Europa – eine realistische Utopie?, Wiesbaden 2010, pp. 31-53.

Verba/Schlozman/Brady (1995): "Voice and Equality: Civic Voluntarism in American Politics", Harvard University Press.

Wampler (2007): "A Guide to Participatory Budgeting.", in: Shah, A. (Ed.) Participatory Budgeting, The World Bank, doi:10.1596/978-0-8213-6923-4, pp. 21-54.