To build on the important, global momentum of participatory budgeting (PB) over the past few decades, we now have a critical opportunity to support implementers—the civil servants and other actors who make PB happen around the world—strengthen the impact of their PB initiatives. This opportunity is the motivation behind Participatory Budgeting Exchange.

Through co-design, workshop participants will develop new resources for these implementers, along with new mechanisms for global coordination. This workshop is action-oriented, and the Hewlett Foundation has allocated seed funding of USD 500,000 to support follow-on activities; among other next steps, participants will be invited to help select the most high-potential ideas that are surfaced during the workshop, for follow-on collaborations and funding.

Participatory Budgeting Exchange is built on the principles of co-design—a method for developing solutions that are feasible and effective, thanks to the true collaboration of all crucial stakeholders, which includes the end-users of the new solutions. Five key challenge and opportunity scenarios, surfaced by PB implementers around the world, will serve as our initial co-design prompts:

1. **Unclear if PB is Right.** Some decision-makers may lack guidance to evaluate pros and cons of PB against other participatory processes.

2. **Top-Down Mandates.** Some PB processes initiated through legislation struggle to adapt to local political and institutional dynamics.

3. **Limited Relevant Guidance.** Implementers lack access to practical, context-specific technical guidance.

4. **High Stakeholder Coordination Needs.** Implementers often lack resourcing to facilitate productive collaboration.

5. **Slow or stalled implementation.** Complexities of project implementation are often overlooked.

As we will have an action-packed two days, this Design Brief will help you prepare for the conversations and activities at PB Exchange. In addition to a description of the five scenarios that will serve as a jumping-off point for the workshop, this brief includes portraits of PB models, “the people of PB,” and other tools for the design process, as well as an overview of the agenda. As you read this short document, we welcome your comments and feedback on these foundational tools.

Contact us at pb@reboot.org with feedback, questions, or ideas, or visit our website at www.pbexchange.org
PB today is expanding globally and evolving rapidly, in very distinct contexts—and with widely varied results. This expansion has been driven, in part, by significant investment to equip political and civil society leaders to champion PB. Fewer resources, however, have been explicitly focused on supporting the operational actors of PB: the civil servant who inherits a less-than-optimal process; the technical specialist who is responsible for implementing an infeasible project; the resident delegate trying to drive community participation but is hindered by rigid rules. These and other “implementers” are critical to the success of any PB initiative.

And as everyone at this workshop knows well, many of these implementers are in need of new types of support to overcome challenges, which are similar across many countries but play out differently in individual contexts. These common challenges are the core motivation for Participatory Budgeting Exchange.

WORKSHOP GOAL/OBJECTIVES

Recognizing an important opportunity to support PB implementations around the world, and to use peer exchange to strengthen the PB movement at large, the Participatory Budgeting Exchange aims to:

- Share approaches and co-design new resources to address common PB challenges
- Define how these resources can be best coordinated and distributed to support PB implementers and strengthen initiatives around the world

Follow-on activities

To ensure Participatory Budgeting Exchange remains action-oriented, the Hewlett Foundation has allocated an initial USD 500,000 in seed funding for 2019 to support resources and ideas that emerge from the workshop. As part of this ongoing work, participants will:

- Receive summaries of key insights and ideas from the workshop;
- Be invited to help select the most high-potential ideas that surfaced during the workshop, for follow-on collaborations and potential funding;
- Be able to apply for support to develop ideas into practical resources, with criteria for selection to be co-established by participants during the workshop.
Co-Design Process
This workshop builds on months of research and co-design activities, soliciting input from experts and implementers across different PB networks, countries, and initiatives. Co-design is a method by which new solutions are defined and developed with their intended users and other crucial stakeholders, in order to ensure that resulting initiatives meet real needs and are feasible to implement. This captures the full process:

- **MEXICO CITY**
- **MADRID**
- **ANTANANARIVO**
- **SEOUL**

Supporting Research
In June and August 2018, research teams (comprised of Reboot staff, expert advisors on PB, and local researchers) conducted design research on district and municipal PB initiatives in four countries: Madagascar, Mexico, South Korea, and Spain. Key observations were synthesized into a range of tools—shared in this document—that we will use during the workshop as design considerations, to help keep in mind the wide-ranging contexts and actors that we are designing for.

**MAY**
Interviews with leading PB experts, researchers, and funders to learn about existing efforts

**JULY–SEPTEMBER**
Field research in four diverse local contexts to surface the perspectives, needs, and experiences of local implementers, and ensure they are represented in the co-design process. Opportunities surfaced by this broad cross-section of perspectives serve as a launching-off point for the Participatory Budgeting Exchange.

**OCTOBER**
International public survey to elicit wider ideas and get input about the themes and opportunities emerging from field research.

**NOVEMBER**
International experts and Participatory Budgeting implementers identity and co-design strategies to grow our individual and collective impact.

**DECEMBER**
Sharing of workshop highlights, outcomes, and next steps with participants.
WORKSHOP AGENDA

DAY 1

Morning: Welcome Presentations, Research Insights, and Deep Dive Conversations

After registration, coffee, and networking, Reboot and the Hewlett Foundation will host a Welcome Session. We’ll share workshop objectives and discuss what types of follow-on work has been envisioned. We will also map the community gathered to understand the experiences and expertise in the room.

Reboot will then offer an overview of Research Insights, sharing key findings from 4 research case studies and the global implementer survey, inviting implementers and experts to comment and add their experiences. We’ll finish the morning in break-out groups for deeper discussions on Key Opportunity Areas surfaced through research and by the group.

Afternoon: Product in a Box Design Session

After lunch, participants will bring insights from their morning discussions back to the larger group, as the basis for a plenary discussion on our co-design challenge.

Participants will then choose a small group to work in a Design Session; each group will be asked to generate at least one concrete concept to address the challenges or opportunities surfaced. We’ll close the day by sharing our early designs for initial group discussion and feedback.

The day will end with a lively gathering, where everybody will get to network and chat informally over dinner and drinks.

DAY 2

Morning: Open Spaces, Product Listening Tours, and “What’s Missing?”

During the morning’s Open Spaces, participants will be able to propose, lead, or attend sessions on topics of interest that are not addressed in other parts of the workshop. After this, we will begin a Design Listening Tour to discuss ideas developed on Day 1, based on potential for impact, feasibility, and other considerations.

As part of this, we will consider what structures or mechanisms may be necessary or helpful to facilitate the delivery and maintenance of ideas that have surfaced. We’ll close the morning by assessing our progress thus far and asking What’s Missing? to surface support or coordination needs that haven’t yet been discussed, to consider in the final sessions.

Afternoon: Global Sharing & Coordination, and Forward Planning

Based on outcomes of the morning conversations, we will begin outlining possibilities for Global Sharing & Coordination, designing and assessing different approaches to getting implementers more of the support they seek, and to coordinating around common interests. We’ll close with a Forward Planning session to discuss concrete next steps for this work, and how different actors will be able to contribute and participate.
We’ve prepared tools that we will use during the workshop as design prompts to help keep in mind the wide-ranging contexts and actors that we are designing for. We ask you to review these in advance of Participatory Budgeting Exchange, and take the opportunity to reflect on similarities and differences that you see within your own PB initiatives.
Archetypes of PB Models

Below is a representation of different models of PB initiatives observed during Reboot’s field research. These “archetypes” (assembled based on primary and secondary research) are not intended as comprehensive models; rather, we will use them during the workshop to ground discussions around how to support implementers operating in different contexts and implementing different models of PB.

Who’s Who

The ecosystem around every PB implementation looks different, and different people may use different terms to describe actors that are playing similar roles. For this workshop, these are the terms we are using:

- **Authorizing & Oversight Government Bodies (aka “Local Government”):** Elected and appointed political officials (district or municipal mayors, and their respective councils).
- **PB Team:** A group of civil servants who run a PB process. They may be assigned to or have volunteered for the job. They may work on PB activities full-time, part-time, or outside work hours in addition to their primary responsibilities.
- **Implementing Departments or Agencies:** The sectoral government offices responsible for delivering different public services.
- **Technical Specialist:** Technical staff within those departments responsible for overseeing the execution of individual projects.
- **Resident PB Committee:** A group of residents that are either elected or appointed to oversee different aspects of the PB process (e.g., reviewing and shortlisting proposals, or conducting community outreach).
- **Residents or Citizens:** Used interchangeably to refer to those living within the territorial district of a PB initiative.

### Antananarivo

**POLITICAL STRUCTURE:** New democracy

**STATE CAPACITY:** Weak

**TERRITORIAL LEVEL OF PB INITIATIVE(S):** Municipal (commune)

**DECISION-MAKING (WITHIN PB INITIATIVE):** Consultative

**GOVERNMENT-ALLOCATED RESOURCES (FOR PB INITIATIVE):** Varied across municipalities

- A: No project or operational resources
- B: Partial project resources
- C: Partial project and operational resources

- Local government publicly announces PB participation & posts annual municipal budget
- 2–3 residents from each village are selected or appointed as Resident PB Committee members
- Resident PB Committee members are trained on PB by local government or NGO counterpart
- Resident PB Committee members collect project ideas from residents in their village through public town hall meetings & discussions,Discussions with village elders,CSO proposals,Door-to-door consultations with residents
- Resident PB Committee members from all villages gather to discuss, shortlist & rank ideas
- Resident PB Committee members present shortlisted ideas to local government
- Local government selects 1 or more ideas for implementation & incorporates into annual budget
- Resident PB Committee members update residents on selected project(s)

If municipality has sufficient funds for implementation

Implementing Departments or Agencies implement projects

If municipality has insufficient funds

Local government presents project to multiple donors & seeks support, and/or local government asks residents & businesses to contribute needed resources (money, materials, & labor) for implementation
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Archetypes of PB Models

### Madrid
**SPAIN**

**ANNUAL PLANNING & MANAGEMENT**
- PB Team organizes public event to collect resident feedback on previous PB cycle

**OUTREACH & CIVIC ENGAGEMENT**
- PB Team launches public communications campaign to announce new PB cycle

**PROJECT DEVELOPMENT & REVIEW**
- ParticipaLab runs pilot experiments with residents to increase engagement
- Residents submit proposals to Online PB platform, or at City Hall

**PROJECT SELECTION**
- PB Team prioritizes & shares projects with technical specialists
- Technical specialists review projects for feasibility

**PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION**
- Residents can argue against winning projects during appeals project
- Implementing Departments or Agencies implement winning projects

### Mexico City
**MEXICO**

**ANNUAL PLANNING & MANAGEMENT**
- Electoral Institute (IECM) evaluates previous PB cycle & recommends process changes

**OUTREACH & CIVIC ENGAGEMENT**
- District officials, neighborhood committees, & others recruit Residents to participate through local networks & word of mouth

**PROJECT DEVELOPMENT & REVIEW**
- Residents develop & submit PB proposals to local Electoral Institute offices
- Technical specialists assess project feasibility

**PROJECT SELECTION**
- Residents vote for projects by ballot at local Electoral Institute offices
- Electoral Institute announces winning projects

**PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION**
- Residents can argue against winning projects during appeals project
- City Comptroller, neighborhood committees, Electoral Institute, and trained volunteers monitor project implementation

**POLITICAL STRUCTURE:**
- Consolidated democracy

**STATE CAPACITY:**
- Strong

**TERRITORIAL LEVEL OF PB INITIATIVE(S):**
- Municipal

**DECISION-MAKING (WITHIN PB INITIATIVE):**
- Direct-voting (on/offline)

**GOVERNMENT-ALLOCATED RESOURCES (FOR PB INITIATIVE):**
- Project and operational resources
Archetypes of PB Models

Seoul
SOUTH KOREA

01 ANNUAL PLANNING & MANAGEMENT
- PB Team reviews and revises PB ordinance
- Residents apply to attend local Budget School
- Some Budget School graduates are elected or assigned to Resident PB Committee(s)
- PB cycle is publicly announced through traditional and new media, & local networks

02 OUTREACH & CIVIC ENGAGEMENT
- Residents submit proposals to government PB team and PB committees
- Online or at district offices

03 PROJECT DEVELOPMENT & REVIEW
- Implementing Departments or Agencies assess feasibility of proposed projects
- Resident PB Committees present selected projects to local government for final approval & budget incorporation

04 PROJECT SELECTION
- Residents vote for projects: online, or offline (ballot boxes)
- Local government incorporates winning projects into municipal/district budget

05 PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION
- Implementing Departments or Agencies implement projects (within 1 year), according to existing department rules and processes
- Local governments contracts private companies to implement larger projects
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Porto Alegre
BRAZIL

01 ANNUAL PLANNING & MANAGEMENT
- PB Team works with “PB Council” (elected participants) to modify rules and procedures
- City is decentralized into 16 districts to facilitate local decision-making

02 OUTREACH & CIVIC ENGAGEMENT
- PB Team holds thematic meetings (transportation, environment) to expand breadth of PB’s impact
- Local government holds informational workshops to educate citizens on rules, budgets, and previous implementation

03 PROJECT DEVELOPMENT & REVIEW
- Local government allocates resources to each district based on population size and community need
- Citizens attend larger regional meetings to gather basic-fiscal and budget information

04 PROJECT SELECTION
- Government departments provide cost estimates of proposed projects
- Citizens deliberate in public meetings

05 PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION
- Local government includes winning PB in annual budget
- Municipal legislature must approve
- Local government will implement smaller projects with internal civil servants
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POLITICAL STRUCTURE:
Consolidated democracy
STATE CAPACITY:
Strong
TERRITORIAL LEVEL OF PB INITIATIVE(S):
Municipal; District
DECISION-MAKING (WITHIN PB INITIATIVE):
Direct voting (on/offline) (municipal)
Consultative, representative decision-making (varied across district processes)

GOVERNMENT-ALLOCATED RESOURCES (FOR PB INITIATIVE):
Project and operational resources

Varied across districts:
A. Project and operational resources
B. Project resources only

POLITICAL STRUCTURE:
New Democracy
STATE CAPACITY:
Medium to Strong
TERRITORIAL LEVEL OF PB INITIATIVE(S):
Municipal
DECISION-MAKING (WITHIN PB INITIATIVE):
Binding decision-making; Initially district-only, but then expanded to include thematic areas.

GOVERNMENT-ALLOCATED RESOURCES (FOR PB INITIATIVE):
Initially 100% of new investment spending; Decentralization generated new resources for municipal government. Level of funding decreases in post-2005 period

LOCAL GOVERNMENT IN THE IMPLEMENTATION PHASE

Resident PB Committees monitor progress and report back to residents, report back to residents, and/or problem-solve during implementation, as needed

Evaluation of PB process is conducted by PB Team or external institution
The People of PB

The following personas represent archetypes of key actors who play a critical role in PB implementation. As with the models, it is important to note that personas represent aggregate profiles and characteristics compiled across multiple respondents in multiple contexts; they do not represent any one person. They are useful tools to make sure we have common understandings of implementers’ needs, challenges, and working patterns which can ground our design conversations. During the workshop, we will have a chance to discuss these personas, and to update them or to create new ones.
Jose came to the city’s Department of Planning after 8 years of working across various city agencies; he was known for his youthful energy, interest in public sector innovation, and strong project management capabilities.

Based on this reputation, Jose was chosen by the newly-elected mayor to design and implement a new PB process, which was one of the mayor’s central campaign promises. Prior to this assignment, he had never heard of PB, and rapidly began researching what his new mandate entailed and how he should implement it in the city. Jose and his team found many case studies that were useful for explaining why to do PB and the general steps of the process, but they were sparse on details of how to navigate existing municipal regulations and processes to execute different PB activities.

While excited by this high-profile career opportunity, Jose has some concerns about delivering a process that meets the different objectives and demands for all stakeholders—while fulfilling the mayor’s ambitious targets for rates of citizen participation. An early roundtable he organized with different government departments was unexpectedly difficult to manage, as everyone had a different goal for the PB process. The meeting produced more conflict than consensus.
Rose

Age: 48
Role: Implementer of City PB Process

Rose has worked in the city’s Administrative Services Bureau for 15 years, and takes pride in her encyclopedic knowledge of city rules and procedures. When the district council issued a request for bureau staff to support the district’s new PB process, she quickly volunteered, even though she knew the district lacked funds to pay staff to run the process. Despite this, she saw it as an opportunity to demonstrate her value (amidst recent layoffs and budget cuts across all city agencies), while also learning new skills.

Entering her second year in this role, Rose has realized that she vastly underestimated the time and effort required. It is up to her to coordinate with local civil society groups that have volunteered to organize different PB community outreach activities, and to make sure they have the correct information they need to share with residents. She is also responsible for communicating both requests and actions of the Resident PB Committees to the district mayor and council members, as well as council decisions (e.g. on required modifications to shortlisted proposals) back to Committee members.

Rose wants to do this job well, but she often feels under attack as the only government representative attending the monthly Committee meetings, when proposals are discussed, revised, and ranked. Some Committee members insist that the district needs to allocate more money for PB projects, and don’t seem to understand that this is not her decision to make. Rose is also facing new tensions at the office when distributing PB projects to implementing departments, as some colleagues resent the “extra work” required to review and implement PB projects. While she likes the idea of PB as a way for government and residents to work together, she’s exhausted by the extra work it requires.

Role in process:
Leads administration of PB activities, including:
- Arranging logistics for resident outreach activities
- Distributing shortlisted projects to implementing government departments for feasibility reviews
- Attending Resident PB Committee meetings
- Allocating projects across departments

Pain points & needs:
- Managing PB workload on top of existing responsibilities
- Navigating new tensions with implementing departments on the “extra work” caused by PB
An engineer within the city’s Department for Housing and Urban Development, Ibrahim takes pride in ensuring that all regulations are closely followed for the projects he works on. This, he knows, leads to safe, efficient, and cost-effective housing and infrastructure.

Ibrahim first learned of PB last year, when his team was assigned to implement one of the winning projects: to install security cameras in a public housing complex. Although the department received funding for the installation, the money allocated only accounted for the cost of basic consumer-level supplies and not for the time and cost of doing the project in line with city protocols, or for the salaries of security staff needed to regularly review and act upon the information captured by the cameras. As such, Ibrahim’s team had to locate additional funds from their already-stretched annual budget. Adding to his frustration was a resident complaint that implementation was taking too long—the scale of the project required him to go through a specific procurement process that took time, and he was not motivated to think about creative alternatives, given he thought that the project was useful but relatively low-priority given everything else he was managing.

As the city gears up for another PB cycle, Ibrahim is glad the updated process now includes a Feasibility Review that he and other colleagues within the department had advocated for. He thinks that government departments can benefit from “crowdsourcing” ideas, yet firmly believes that projects are best planned by technical experts.
Alina

**Age:** 19  
**Role:** Leader of a District Resident Committee

Alina is a first-year university student and a long-time volunteer at her neighborhood youth drop-in center. She is strongly committed to improving her community, a lower income neighborhood in the outskirts of the city. She comes from an immigrant household, just like one-third of the residents in her district. Alina has been excited about PB since it came to her district three years ago—she sees it as a real way to "get money out of the hands of corrupt government officials and into our communities".

This year, Alina was narrowly elected as Team Leader of her Resident PB Committee—unseating the incumbent, a prominent business owner. She isn’t sure exactly how their PB process was designed, but remembers learning about Porto Alegre, although she suspects some changes have been made to make PB work in her district. She knows that her position comes with a lot of responsibility, and takes it very seriously. Unlike some of the other districts in her city, her Resident PB Committee has the power to select the final three projects that are opened up for public vote.

Alina has been surprised at what she sees as political maneuvering by some Committee members, trying to solicit personal favors by voting for projects that are known to have the support of prominent business persons or district officials. Alina has introduced secret ballot voting as a way to prevent this, but she still suspects some members’ votes are being unfairly influenced.

### Role in process:
- Organizes outreach activities to encourage residents to participate
- Leads Resident PB Committee to review and shortlist proposals, including conducting site visits and discussions with residents to better understand their submissions
- Oversees the internal Resident PB Committee vote to select the final projects that are opened to a public vote

### Pain points & needs:
- Facing pressure from influential residents and district officials to direct the Resident PB Committee to prioritize specific PB projects
- Navigating community hierarchies to ensure that all proposals are given equal consideration, not just those preferred by elder members of the Committee
CHALLENGES & OPPORTUNITIES

Drawing from research and interviews in different countries and contexts worldwide, and from a global implementer survey, we have compiled some common challenges that many PB implementers face. During the workshop, these will serve as “design prompts,” or jumping-off points both for discussion and for the co-design of new resources and support mechanisms for PB implementers.

We are keen to hear your feedback on these. Please share any ideas, including additional challenges you’d like to see included, by November 20.

Scenario 1: UNCLEAR IF PB IS RIGHT

Challenge
PB is an important part of broader discourses and experiments to advance participatory democracy, and is one approach among many being used all over the world today. Injecting a PB process into an ecosystem with existing civic participation mechanisms can create redundancy (and cause citizen confusion or participation fatigue); in other cases, decision-makers may choose PB when a different approach may be more suitable for their goals or resources.

Illustration
A county government creates a PB program as part of a broader political platform grounded in enabling civic participation in governance. The new PB process is just one of 11 different civic participation mechanisms also available to residents, including neighborhood improvement funds, town hall meetings for policy input, and local district council fora. Participation is stretched thinly between these avenues, citizens are confused as to what mechanisms to use for which needs, and participation fatigue soon sets in—fewer and fewer people participate in each forum. For PB, citizens submit few feasible and innovative proposals to the PB process, and PB voter turnout is low.

Opportunity
How might we help decision-makers take a strategic, ecosystem-level view of local participation? How might we help governments select between different civic participation or deliberative democracy approaches, and understand the pros and cons of PB against other options.
Scenario 2: TOP-DOWN MANDATES

Challenge
In its global expansion, PB is now often initiated or scaled through a legislative mandate or political promise. While well-intended, these top-down beginnings often come with parameters that hinder implementers’ work on the ground, creating restrictions that are not responsive to the local context, and that limit PB success.

Illustration
Civil society organizations champion PB in their country, and a political party sees its value to increase civic participation and adds PB to its campaign platform. The party wins control in a major city and introduces PB through new legislation which requires all districts to launch their own PB processes. In practice, many districts struggle to comply with this new mandate—one wants to use theme-based committees for proposal selection, in a way similar to other programs in their district, but can’t because of the law’s requirements. Another consistently struggles to find the staff time and funding needed to run even the minimum number of PB activities required; without local associations to rely on to lead outreach efforts, she sees PB as a district burden rather than a means of problem-solving. While another district official sees PB as decreasing his already limited budget, and stalls on launching the process. As districts differently struggle merely to interpret and comply with the mandated guidelines, political will and outreach efforts are often limited, resulting in low public participation and few adaptations made to address the results.

Opportunity
How might we help aspiring or elected public officials develop mandates that both serve their political interests and leave space for PB implementers to design models that account for their unique contexts and communities?
Scenario 3: LIMITED RELEVANT GUIDANCE

Challenge
The canon of PB knowledge has developed at the global level; available reference materials largely focus on arguments for adopting PB, and feature case studies illustrating models that may not be appropriate in other contexts. Further, consultants and experts often interface with high levels of leadership. As a result, implementers on the ground often lack access to relevant support, especially as they navigate challenges mid-stream.

Illustration
An implementer bases the design of PB processes largely on a model from another country, for which she found detailed case studies and reports online. Once launched, the pilot runs into a challenge when the number of proposals submitted from wealthier districts far outnumber those coming from under-resourced communities. One of the objectives of the PB process, though, was to better allocate resources to the city’s most underserved communities. She now realizes that some rules are needed to allocate PB funding more equitably across districts, but isn’t sure how to go about this. She ends up working hard to try to convince neighborhood associations to carry out last-minute outreach efforts, some specific civil society groups to submit proposals, and committee members to adapt a ranking system that favors critical infrastructure projects. Despite her efforts, winning projects are largely concentrated in wealthier neighborhoods; she fears participation in next year’s PB cycle will be even lower, with residents viewing PB as just another way for “the rich to get what they want.” (Six months later, another PB designer in a different country faces the exact same challenge, but has no way to access the first implementer’s hard-earned wisdom).

Opportunity
How might we provide guidance on the different PB approaches, the challenges they can address, and how each affects outcomes, so that designers can make effective decisions?
Scenario 4: HIGH STAKEHOLDER COORDINATION NEEDS

Challenge
PB is a inherently multi-stakeholder process, requiring ongoing and intensive collaboration. But many models do not account for the demands of facilitation and coordination, and often there are too few resources dedicated to stakeholder coordination. Often, the workload falls to a single actor, which creates a steep burden and frequently results in frustration and conflict between stakeholders.

Illustration
A civil servant in a district office is assigned the role of implementing a mandated PB process. She spends a year managing citizen committees, supporting CSOs, and coordinating with government agencies; the vast majority of her time is spent addressing concerns and mediating conflicts, including a critical government stakeholder who blocks the process—repeatedly delaying implementation of one of the winning projects with claims that it violates existing regulations. The first PB cycle completes with moderate success (evaluated through number of voters and proposals submitted) but the civil servant is burnt out and resigns.

Opportunity
How might we support implementers in planning and managing stakeholder coordination, including allocating sufficient resources for the efforts, determining when and how different actors should be involved, and mediating tensions and conflicts that arise?
Scenario 5:  
SLOW OR STALLED IMPLEMENTATION

Challenge
Implementation of winning PB projects is essential to the success of any PB initiative. Residents see tangible benefits of their participation when the projects they proposed, developed, and organized around are delivered according to the agreed-upon designs and timelines. Yet the pathways for translating winning proposals into concrete projects and services are often filled with challenges. Slow or stalled implementations see both government PB teams and implementing agencies struggling to deliver on their respective commitments, which ultimately undermine the potential impact of PB.

Illustration
A PB Team has invested significant energy to design a PB process that includes a wide range of actors—civil society groups, neighborhood associations, and residents—in different activities across the cycle. They are thrilled to have a high turnout to select the final projects, and winning projects are distributed to different government departments for implementation. But when the PB Team checks in on progress a few months later, they find that not a single project has been initiated. One technical expert explains that the projects his department was assigned don’t align with their existing workplan, and wonders why they weren’t included in the PB process earlier or given additional capacity to help with the additional workload. Another explains that one of the winning ideas (to develop a youth-drop in centre in a high-crime neighborhood) first requires exploring many issues overlooked in proposal development (e.g. zoning laws, safety regulations, security measures for the center). In the meantime, two of the district Resident PB Committees have lodged formal complaints to the PB team, claiming they have not seen any results from the time-intensive PB process.

Opportunity
How might we help PB Teams better enable smooth implementation of winning PB projects? How might we help government agencies more effectively plan for and implement winning PB projects?