****

**SURVEY ON EXPERIENCES THAT INVOLVE CITIZENS IN DEBATING REVENUES**

We would like to ask you if in the country(ies) where you work, there are relevant (or shy) experiments in the direction of involving citizens in discussing also the revenues side of budgets or contribute to co-fund citizens proposals. In fact, we would like to stimulate experiences to grow in this direction for the future, providing useful example in a comparative perspective, and organising grids of different typologies for conducting such a model of participatory processes. **Here below, you can find some questions that can help you to contribute on building a first panoramic overviews, and making existing experiences more visible than they have been until now.**

YOU CAN CHOOSE CASES THAT are SUCCESSFUL EXPERIENCES, FAILED EXPERIENCES or also INTERESTING PROPOSALS that, finally, were not implemented (please, in the last case, expose the circumstances why they did not take place). If you have more experiences to quote in each typology of actions, please duplicate the classification items, and fill them for each experiment you would like to quote.

1. **Do you know any experience were citizens were involved in discussing revenues for the budget coming from international cooperation or bank loans, using meetings and voting procedures similar to those used by PB?** *(For example: in Porto Alegre, Brazil, in 1994-96 several meetings were held to decide if accepting loans of International Banks and their heavy requirements).*

**1.1 Country** Click or tap here to enter text.

**1.2 City** Click or tap here to enter text.

**1.3 Name and type of organisation that did it** Click or tap here to enter text.

**1.4 Year(s) in which the citizens engagement happened** Click or tap here to enter text.

**1.5 Was the experience formally part of PB?**

Yes

No, because that place has not a PB

No, it was a parallel/separate process, even if this place had an ongoing PB

**1.6 Notes or weblink** Click or tap here to enter text.

**2) Do you know any experience were citizens were involved in discussing taxes, using meetings and voting procedures similar to those used by PB?** *(For example: in Santa Cristina de Aro, Spain, in 2005-2006 the municipality added to PB a discussion on rates of local taxes on property)*

**1.1 Country** Click or tap here to enter text.

**1.2 City** Click or tap here to enter text.

**1.3 Name and type of organisation that did it** Click or tap here to enter text.

**1.4 Year(s) in which the citizens engagement happened** Click or tap here to enter text.

**1.5 Was the experience formally part of PB?**

Yes

No, because that place has not a PB

No, it was a parallel/separate process, even if this place had an ongoing PB

**1.6 Notes or weblink** Click or tap here to enter text.

**3) Do you know any experience were citizens were involved in discussing taxes, using formal tools of direct democracy?** *(For example: in Milton Keynes, UK, in 1999 a participatory process discussed which questions could be formulated in a referendum, for proposing different level of increase for local property taxes, on which citizens were lately invited to vote).*

**1.1 Country** Click or tap here to enter text.

**1.2 City** Click or tap here to enter text.

**1.3 Name and type of organisation that did it** Click or tap here to enter text.

**1.4 Year(s) in which the citizens engagement happened** Click or tap here to enter text.

**1.5 Was the experience formally part of PB?**

Yes

No, because that place has not a PB

No, it was a parallel/separate process, even if this place had an ongoing PB

**1.6 Notes or weblink** Click or tap here to enter text.

**4) Do you know any experience were citizens were involved in discussing other extra-budgetary sources for increasing the common resources of a city or an institution?** *(For example: in 2002 in Grottammare, Italy, public meetings were held to discuss which types of public compensations the municipality had to ask to a local developer, in exchange for conceding him the permission to transform the landuse of a former industrial area and build a residential estate: parking lots, schools, and apartments with cheap rentals were suggested by citizens as a planning compensation to be negotiated)*

**1.1 Country** Click or tap here to enter text.

**1.2 City** Click or tap here to enter text.

**1.3 Name and type of organisation that did it** Click or tap here to enter text.

**1.4 Year(s) in which the citizens engagement happened** Click or tap here to enter text.

**1.5 Was the experience formally part of PB?**

Yes

No, because that place has not a PB

No, it was a parallel/separate process, even if this place had an ongoing PB

**1.6 Notes or weblink** Click or tap here to enter text.

**5) Do you know any experience were citizens were involved in discussing on how to contribute (with co-funding, crowdfunding or any agreement for shared-maintenance with public authorities) to the value of projects to be co-decided through PB?** *(For example: in some school PBs in Germany in 2012-2013, students needed to cover around 30% of the proposals’ value for which they asked funding to PB).*

**1.1 Country** Click or tap here to enter text.

**1.2 City** Click or tap here to enter text.

**1.3 Name and type of organisation that did it** Click or tap here to enter text.

**1.4 Year(s) in which the citizens engagement happened** Click or tap here to enter text.

**1.5 Was the experience formally part of PB?**

Yes

No, because that place has not a PB

No, it was a parallel/separate process, even if this place had an ongoing PB

**1.6 Notes or weblink** Click or tap here to enter text.

****

**“CASE STUDY”**

**EMPTY FORM**

**For experiences which happened in the last 5 years: 2015-2019**

**1. Name of the country where the experience is/was located**

Click or tap here to enter text.

**2.1. Name of the City**

Click or tap here to enter text.

**2.2.** **Name of the Region**

Click or tap here to enter text.

**3. Name of the organization that promoted the experience**

Click or tap here to enter text.

**4. Typology of the organization that promoted the** **experience**

Regional government

Municipal government

Other government level

School

University

Other institution/organization

**5. Name of the process**

Click or tap here to enter text.

**6.Dates or year(s) in which the citizens engagement happened**

Click or tap here to enter text.

**7. Was the experience formally part of PB?**

Yes

No, because that place has not a PB

No, it was a parallel/separate process, even if this place had an ongoing PB

**8. Short description of the methodology of the experience**

Click or tap here to enter text.

**9. Short description of the results of the experience**

Click or tap here to enter text.

**10. Some data on participants**

Click or tap here to enter text.

**11. Weblink or other sources**

Click or tap here to enter text.

**12. name and address of the person who answered the questions**

Click or tap here to enter text.

**AN EXAMPLE OF A “CASE-STUDY”**

**FORM THAT YOU COULD SIGN ON THE EXPERIMENTS YOU FOUND**

**1. Name of the country where the experience is/was located**

United Kingdom

**2.1. Name of the City**

Milton Keynes

**2.2.** **Name of the Region**

County of Buckinghamshire

**3. Name of the organization that promoted the experience**

Town Hall of Milton Keynes

**4. Typology of the organization that promoted the** **experience**

Regional government

Municipal government

Other government level

School

University

Other institution/organization

**5. Name of the process**

Referendum on different options por an increase of local taxes

**6.Dates or year(s) in which the citizens engagement happened**

Between September 1998 and February 1999

**7. Was the experience formally part of PB?**

Yes

No, because that place has not a PB

No, it was a parallel/separate process, even if this place had an ongoing PB

**8. Short description of the methodology of the experience**

Between September 1998 and February 1999, the Mayor proposed a series of discussions about the risks to have to cut several services for the difficult situation of the local treasure. The solution imagined was to increase local taxes, but for the municipality governing majority, this could result in the risk of loosing next elections. But the participant to the meetings organized by the Town Hall suggested how to formulate a multiple option referendum, committing the council to imagine a special fund where to deposit the new resources coming to the eventually approved increase of tax collection, so that it could be controlled in a transparent way. At the end of the process, a municipal propositional referendum was held. The ballot was organised for the council by the Electoral Reform Society.

**9. Short description of the results of the experience**

Voters were given three options to choose from: a 5% rise, a 9.8% rise and a 15% rise of local council tax. Over 46% backed the 9.8% rise while nearly 24% plumped for a 15% rise in their taxes.

**10. Some data on participants**

The city has 184,000 inhabitants, and around 149,200. Over 45% of the voters took part in the ballot - a figure 20% higher than that for the last council elections

**11. Weblink or other sources**

a) http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk\_news/politics/284733.stm; b) Pratchett L. (2000) Renewing Local Democracy? The Modernisation Agenda in British Local Government. London: Routledge

**12. name and address of the person who answered the questions**

Giovanni Allegretti (University of Coimbra, Portugal), giovanni.allegretti@ces.uc.pt