



we grow the leaders who build great companies

# Review of Participatory Budgeting 2018 Process

*Author:* Danette Fenton-Menzies

**Magical Learning Pty Ltd**

ABN: 37 104 320 550

1 Wambidgee Road GUNDAGAI NSW 2722

**t:** +61 2 6944 8200

**w:** [www.magicallearning.com](http://www.magicallearning.com)

# Table of Contents

<b>1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>4</b>
Background .....	4
Findings .....	5
<b>2. INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>7</b>
Background to the PB Process .....	7
TCCS Approach .....	7
Purpose of the Review .....	8
Approach to the Review .....	9
<b>3. FINDINGS.....</b>	<b>10</b>
Insights and Challenges .....	10
Pre-Forum Information .....	10
Day 1 – Play Spaces Forum .....	10
Day 2 – Play Spaces Forum .....	12
Panel Meetings .....	12
Process Overall .....	13
Opportunities for Improvement .....	14
<b>4. DRAFT PRINCIPLES/CRITERIA FOR THE TRAIL OF CITIZENS’ JURIES IN THE ACT (ACTCOSS and CAPAD).....</b>	<b>16</b>
Draft Principles .....	16
Findings in Relation to these Principles.....	17
<b>5. ESTIMATED COSTS OF PB EXERCISE .....</b>	<b>19</b>
Experiences from other Australian PB.....	20
<b>6. REVIEW OF TCCS DOCUMENTS .....</b>	<b>21</b>
<i>Better Suburbs Play Spaces Forum – Member Information Pack (TCCS, August 2018)</i> .....	21
Recommendations: .....	22
<i>Better Suburbs Play Spaces Forum: Community Report – Transport Canberra and City Services,     August 2018.....</i>	22
Recommendations: .....	23
<i>Better Suburbs Play Spaces Forum Day 2: Community Report, Transport Canberra and City     Services, October 2018.....</i>	23
Recommendations: .....	23
<i>Play Spaces Forum 2018: Summary of Decisions.....</i>	24

Recommendations .....	24
<b>7. DESKTOP REVIEW OF OTHER AUSTRALIAN EXAMPLES OF PB .....</b>	<b>25</b>
Other Australian Examples .....	25
Lessons from Overseas – Limitations of PB Worldwide.....	27
Compare and Contrast Australian Experiences with TCCS Experience .....	28
PB Process Recommendations from Participants .....	30
<b>8. ASSEMBLY MOTION .....</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>9. RECOMMENDATIONS MOVING FORWARD .....</b>	<b>34</b>
Components of the Budget and Budget Process that Would Benefit from Greater Community Input .....	34
Possible Models for Future PB Processes in the ACT.....	34
Report Recommendations.....	35
<b>APPENDIX 1 – REVIEW OF AUSTRALIAN EXPERIENCES IN PB .....</b>	<b>37</b>
The City of Canada Bay Council, NSW .....	37
Melville Council WA 2012.....	38
The City of Greater Geraldton, WA 2013 – 10 Year Capital Works.....	39
The City of Greater Geraldton, WA 2014 – Services and Operations.....	42
Darebin (VIC) 2014 .....	43
City of Melbourne 2015.....	44
South Gippsland Shire Council (VIC) 2016 .....	45
Fund My Neighbourhood (SA) 2017-18 .....	46
Bayswater Council (VIC) 2018-19 .....	46
<b>REFERENCES .....</b>	<b>47</b>
<b>GLOSSARY OF TERMS.....</b>	<b>51</b>

## **CONTACT DETAILS**

Danette Fenton-Menzies  
Director of Learning  
Magical Learning Pty Ltd  
1 Wambidgee Road, Gundagai NSW 2722  
P: +61 2 6944 8200  
M: +61 409 602 085  
E: danette@magicallearning.com

## **Acknowledgement**

We would like to acknowledge and thank all the participants who provided feedback for this review including participants and facilitators in the Play Spaces Forum and TCCS staff.

## **Disclaimer**

This document has been produced with information supplied to Magical Learning Pty Ltd by TCCS, including reports and other information related to the participatory budgeting process for the Play Spaces Forum, as well as information collected from participants, including TCCS staff specifically for this review. While we make every effort to ensure the accuracy of the information contained in this report, any judgements as to the suitability of the information for the client's purposes are the client's responsibility. Magical Learning Pty Ltd extends no warranties and assumes no responsibility as to the suitability of this information or for the consequences of its use.

## 1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

### Background

On 4 May 2017 the Economic Development Sub-Committee of Cabinet supported a proposed approach to deliver a Better Suburbs Program to deliver two initiatives:

- the development of a Better Suburbs Statement, that would outline a vision; and
- a reform program to deliver the defined priorities.

The Better Suburbs Play Spaces forum was part of the Better Suburbs program. Forum participants were community members, including a randomly selected group of Better Suburbs forum members (45 members) and 9 additional community members that responded to a promotion by the ACT Playgroups Association and Parents and Citizens Council.

The forum met on six occasions, with various forum members participating at each. They:

1. Developed a priorities framework for play spaces.
2. Allocated \$1.9 million in expenditure on play spaces from the Better Infrastructure Fund for 2018-19 through a trial of Participatory Budgeting (PB).
3. Made recommendations on how the community and the ACT Government can work together in future decision making about play spaces.

Input for the Play Spaces PB pilot was delivered through traditional community engagement (surveys; analysis of citizen feedback and petition activity) and deliberative democratic processes were used to determine the outcomes. The forum activities were

- Two full day forums conducted to:
  - Develop and confirm draft decision-making frameworks to inform future work prioritisation.
  - Define and gain agreement to the overall allocation of funds into work categories (i.e. development of nature play spaces; undertake whole-of-suburb reviews; play space upgrades; play space refreshes and miscellaneous).
  - Define the panel compositions for the next phase of decision-making.
- 4 panels were then organised to determine the allocation of funding to specific projects within each funding category.
- The decisions were announced by the Minister in November 2018 and TCCS has commenced work to deliver the desired works.

This review has been conducted to examine how the PB (PB) pilot responded to criteria in a 2017 Assembly motion (No 27 – 23 August 2017). This Assembly motion states that the ACT Government will 'commission and make public an independent post-implementation analysis of the pilot, identifying which components of the Budget and budget process would benefit from greater community input and possible models for future PB processes in the ACT'.

## Findings

The overall findings from this review were:

1. That TCCS was a good choice for the first PB in the ACT. It is a directorate that has high visibility and high citizen engagement due to the nature of the services offered by the directorate.
2. That the following recommendations be adopted in relation to PB moving forward:
  - I recommend that the ACT Government continue to undertake PB as it is an effective tool for citizen engagement – particularly in terms of helping citizens understand the complexity and difficulty of making decisions regarding allocation of limited resources.
  - Based on other Australian experiences of PB and participant feedback, there are many other areas that PB could be applied to in the ACT. I recommend that PB be extended to other directorates, to cover both discretionary grants and discretionary capital funding.
  - In relation to discretionary grants, I recommend using an online budget allocation tool to allow the Canberra community to vote for where grants are to be allocated. To make this process robust, workshops, public meetings and online forums could be used to support discussions on grant allocation and to engage those who are otherwise unlikely to engage with the government.
  - In relation to discretionary capital funding, I recommend that a deliberative community panel be used. Capital projects can be complicated and this process would allow for more informed deliberation of these projects. Where participants are to be involved in face-to-face forums, sufficient time should be allowed to plan and recruit participants, to ensure that the panel is representative of the entire community. Sending personalised invitations that provide information on what PB is and how the participants can help is one way to encourage participation. Articulating (in the invitation) the government's commitment to utilise their findings can also influence people to participate in the process.
  - Where a deliberative community panel is utilised, I recommend that the PB process be run as a stand-alone process, with a reduced time frame, to allow for the same participants to participate in the whole process.
  - I recommend using the same independent facilitator throughout the PB process.
  - I recommend additional funding, including for staff, other resources and systems changes, be made available to directorates to ensure that, wherever PB is to be undertaken, the directorate's systems – including the finance/budgeting system/s – can support the PB process from a management and reporting perspective.
  - I recommend directorates consider ways to engage staff throughout the PB process, to help them with the change process and to improve engagement and knowledge of government services (see Canada Bay and City of Greater Geraldton experiences in Appendix A).

- I recommend that directorates look for opportunities to engage positive media and social media around the PB process, to promote PB and the outcomes to the broader ACT Community to encourage greater community engagement (see Appendix A for examples).
- I recommend the government prioritise seeking bi-partisan support for the PB process. PB needs bi-partisan support for it to work well and to enhance its ongoing viability. Without this, PB is unlikely to continue longer-term, which will likely cause the community to lose trust in the PB process.

## 2. INTRODUCTION

### Background to the PB Process

PB began in Porto Alegre, Brazil in 1989. According to Anwar Shah in *PB*, PB represents a direct-democracy approach to budgeting. It offers citizens at large an opportunity to learn about government operations and to deliberate, debate, and influence the allocation of public resources. (Shah, 2007)

Australia started on the PB process relatively late, with Canada Bay, NSW, being the first local government to trial this process in 2012. Since then time several other local government councils have used various approaches to PB to engage with their citizens in relation to government spending. More information on the Australian experiences are detailed in Section 7 and Appendix A of this report.

Some of the councils have focused PB on their operating budgets, while others have allocated their capital budgets, or both. In terms of time frames for the moneys allocated through the PB processes, it ranged from one through to ten years.

In terms of dollars involved, the range was from \$100,000 (Melville, WA) for one-year community grants, to \$70m (Geraldton, WA) for one year for its total services and operating budgeting.

The Bayswater Council (WA) is currently undertaking PB for its 2019-20 total operating budget with an amount of \$84.37m.

### TCCS Approach

The ACT is unique in Australia as it combines both state and local government service delivery functions. It has existing budget consultation processes in place, including submissions from peak bodies and community stakeholders.

On 23 August 2017 a motion was agreed in the Legislative Assembly regarding PB.

On 23 May 2018, the then Minister for Transport and City Services, Meegan Fitzharris MLA, announced in a press release that they would 'ask the Better Suburbs Citizen's Forum to directly allocate \$1.9 million set aside in this year's Budget for local community upgrades, \$1 million of which must be spent on playgrounds.'

It was decided to use the Play Spaces forum as the vehicle for the allocation of the \$1.9 million, as this would allow the funding to be allocated and spent within the 2018-19 financial year.

The following summarises the process in relation to the Better Suburbs Citizens Forum and the Play Spaces forum.

'Invitations were sent to 6,000 households across the ACT seeking nominations to be part of the Citizen's Forum. The representative group of 46 community members worked with up to 25 senior representatives from government, industry and non-government organisations, to plan for the right mix of city services for Canberra into the future.' (ACT Government, 2019c)



The outcome of this process was the 'Better Suburbs Statement 2030', which:

- set the vision for Canberra in 2030,
- identified why better suburbs are important,
- suggested ideas for future community engagement, and
- made recommendations for each of the 14 Business Areas of Transport Canberra and City Services and core service focus areas (Citizen's Forum, 2018).

Business Area No. 11 of the 'Better Suburbs Statement 2030' covered Play Spaces.

As part of the Better Suburbs Forum, the fifth day (19<sup>th</sup> August 2018) was allocated as Day 1 of the Play Spaces forum. This was the start of the PB process.

Day 1 was facilitated by democracyCo. It involved 45 participants, including members of the Better Suburbs forum and nine additional forum members who had a personal perspective on play space. The day included knowledge building where the participants analysed and deliberated on 16 community submissions. Presenters on the day included: four community petitioners, play spaces expert Greg Mews and Stephen Alegria, and Owen Earl from TCCS management. (ACT Government, 2019d)

Day 2 of the Play Spaces Forum (22 September 2018) was facilitated by Jacinta Cubis as democracyCo were unavailable. On Day 2 the Priority Framework was agreed and the broad allocation of \$1.9m into categories was finalized.

In September and October, four smaller panel meetings were held to decide the allocation of funding to specific projects including locations within each funding category.

### Purpose of the Review

The purpose of this review is to:

- Conduct a full review of the play spaces PB pilot. In particular, this review should examine how the pilot responds to criteria in a 2017 Assembly motion about a PB pilot. This consultation should include interviews of key TCCS staff and Better Suburbs Play Spaces forum and panel members.
- Prepare 2 reports on the play spaces PB pilot. The main report should detail the approach taken in the review and include an executive summary, findings and issues, opportunities for improvement and capture the learnt lessons identified by participants and offer a range of recommendations. This report may be tabled in the ACT Legislative Assembly. A second report should be delivered in a simple presentation, suitable for use in briefing the TCCS Executive board and participants in the process.
- Make strategic recommendations on the suitability of PB as a citizen engagement activity, and the maturity of budgeting practices within TCCS to accommodate further activity.
- Make recommendations on any suitable future PB models and the most suitable budget types (recurrent or capital) that would benefit from PB activities.

## Approach to the Review

As part of this review, we interviewed 10 participants (government and community members) who were involved in the PB process, to identify their insights and challenges. These interviews were undertaken during December 2018, either face-to-face or over the phone.

We also reviewed documents available about the TCCS process and outcomes.

Finally, we undertook desktop research about PB processes undertaken across Australia. We also considered overseas experiences, particularly in relation to limitations of PB, to provide guidance about best practice activities.

### 3. FINDINGS

In December 2018, we interviewed 10 participants (government and community members) who were involved in the PB process, to identify their insights and challenges. The following is a summary of our findings.

#### Insights and Challenges

In terms of insights and challenges the following were provided by participants:

#### Pre-Forum Information

Forum members were sent an Information Pack as background reading, prior to participating in the Play Spaces Forum process.

- From discussions with participants it was noted that not everyone read the information provided pre-forum, with several participants admitting that they ‘didn’t allocate enough time’ to go through the pre-forum information. One participant commented that ‘it seemed like laxness was expected.’
- According to one participant some links provided did not appear to work.
- Participants also suggested some ways to improve this process including:
  - having a buddy system to help people digest and understand the information might help
  - pre-meet ups to allow participants to talk about the material before the process started
  - considering different communication preferences such as one participant who suggested that they would have preferred someone to talk them through the information on the phone and then send the email with the booklet/links.

**Note:** A review of the contents of the Information Pack is provided in Section 6 of this report under the heading: *Better Suburbs Play Spaces Forum – Member Information Pack* (TCCS, August 2018).

#### Day 1 – Play Spaces Forum

- From discussions with participants the following were seen as positives in relation to Day 1 of the Play Spaces Forum:
  - One participant commented that it was ‘great that the Minister attended the Forum and they found them engaged and approachable.’ The same comment was made regarding senior public service representatives who attended.
  - Several participants commented that Day 1 of Play Spaces Forum was facilitated well.
  - One participant considered that the facilitators were ‘experienced and extremely responsive to concerns, which allowed them to modify the process on the fly really

well'. They also considered that they created a 'safe space' which allowed people to contribute value.

- One participant considered that the facilitators did a good job of reminding participants that this process was for 'Canberra as a whole, not personal interests.'
- Several participants commented that 'the presentations were very informative', especially the Play Spaces expert and ACT Government explanations.
- One participant commented that the breaks 'allowed for further discussions to help people understand each other more'.
- One participant commented that fifty was considered a good number as it was regarded by one participant as 'an excellent representation of Canberra community.' Much more than that was considered by that participant as 'too much.'
- One participant commented that they had a 'good sense of closure' at the end of Day 1 – Play Spaces Forum.
- In terms of challenges and areas for improvement:
  - Several participants commented that including this as part of the Better Suburbs forum caused some participants to be confused as to the purpose. They suggested it would be better to separate the two process to ensure that there was no confusion.
  - One participant commented that 'because this (PB) was a sub-topic in Play Spaces that some people were annoyed because their pet project didn't get up'.
  - One participant commented that there was 'a lot packed in' on the day, while another commented that they 'ran out of time. There were lots of decisions to make and a lot of people and voices, which can be confusing.'
  - One participant commented that they would have liked 'clarity upfront about ACT Government decisions versus what TCCS wanted the Forum members to decide.'
  - One participant considered that there were 'set ideas from ACT government – didn't seem negotiable re: buckets.'
  - Several participants considered that the amount of \$1.9m was not a lot of money given the resources/effort involved. They were also concerned that there wasn't enough money to bring Play Spaces up to the standards of other cities.
  - One participant would have liked to have seen more younger generation representation.
  - One participant commented that 'community groups with active volunteers were more driven and active, while other groups without this may have been disadvantaged' in terms of presenting their viewpoint to the forum.
  - Some found the venue size a bit small.

## Day 2 – Play Spaces Forum

- From discussions with participants the following were seen as positives by the participants:
  - One participant commented that the facilitator ‘got the room to useful, meaningful consensus’.
  - One participant commented that it was a ‘welcoming, friendly and positive environment, where you knew time was valued.’ Another commented that the day ‘moved on well.’ However, another participant felt that the tension was ‘high’ with ‘strong personalities.’
  - Great venue, catering, government officials and facilitator.
  - At least one participant commented that it was a ‘lot better than Day 1’
  - Having an independent note-taker allowed the facilitator to focus on their role while information was still being captured.
- In terms of challenges and areas for improvement:
  - One participant found the venue ‘too squashed, with the tables too close’.
  - One participant suggested that decision making methods could be refined.

## Panel Meetings

- From discussions with participants that participated in the panel meetings the following were seen as positives by the participants:
  - Those who attended the panel meetings found that the group size was right (4-10 people) and there was enough time to allow for meaningful consensus.
  - The facilitator ran the sessions well.
  - Having the subject matter experts (SME) on hand was helpful as participants could ask questions and this helped with decision-making. One participant suggested that the process should leverage the experts more.
  - One participant remarked that there was ‘a good job on the information’ including on disadvantaged voices which was helpful to making decisions.
  - One participant commented that what worked well for them was that the process ‘integrated people well’.
  - Proactive in terms of dietary needs.
- In terms of challenges and areas for improvement:
  - Timing – consider that if participants are to include working people then perhaps weekends would be better.
  - One participant suggested that they could have used the approach from Day 1 – Play Spaces, e.g. presentations and wall information as the process felt ‘too rushed’.

- One participant who hadn't attended Day 2 – Play Spaces Forum would have like more information regarding the outcomes of Day 2.

## Process Overall

- Due to the timeframe involved other options for PB approach were not really considered. With more planning other options could be trialed that would have engaged more of the population.
- Overall, the process helped improve participants' knowledge of PB and there was a greater appreciation of the budget process and complexities of allocating funding following participation in this process.
- The amount of information provided was considered appropriate.
- All participants interviewed considered having access to experts, TCCS staff and information helped them during the process. There was great collaboration between the policy and finance teams which helped ensure a great process for the Forum participants.
- People found the 'buckets' of funding helpful when making decisions.
- One participant commented that 'don't fear to engage, this is great for government.' They found the process 'fantastic.'
- TCCS was a great first choice for this process as the services touch people's daily lives.
- It is important to ensure that risk is managed throughout the process including resourcing, reputational risk and managing community expectations.
- It was suggested that it may help to provide funding for childcare for those who needed it so they could attend the forum. One participant suggested this would be a better use of the *per diem* funds.
- Consider transport to the events to help people attend.
- Consider undertaking bus trips to the opposite side of Canberra from where participants were located so they could understand both perspectives (North and Southside).
- Some people were not as confident speaking up in groups and there were some strong personalities. The facilitators handled this well, however it could be worth considering training people who aren't confident public speakers to ensure they are able to contribute equally.
- As the PB process involves people giving up their time it is important to ensure people's time isn't wasted. Ensuring that the process be run close together with the same group of participants would assist with having less need for refreshers in terms of the information and decisions required of the groups. Undertaking the panel meetings on the weekend may also assist with getting more representation from those working.
- This process didn't really go out to the broader community once the Forum was underway. It was suggested that using social media to share what was happening with the Forum would be a possible way to help improve community engagement.

## Opportunities for Improvement

Suggestions for improvement from participants included:

- On the approach used:
  - One participant commented that there was ‘no explanation that it was a participatory process in the emails.’ They suggested being more open about how it was going to be done.
  - One participant suggested that the information provided as pre-reading should be more succinct.
  - Separate the PB process completely from the Better Suburbs Forum to ensure clarity of purpose.
  - Use the same cohort throughout the process, rather than bringing in new participants part way through the process.
  - Shorten the timeframe for the whole process to reduce the number of refreshers that needed to be held so people remember what had already been discussed. Suggestion to make the gaps between forums no more than one week.
  - Using a buddy system so that all participants could share about what they were learning and also that participants who didn’t attend all parts of the process could be briefed by their buddies.
- Some other suggestions on ways to get more people involved and skilled up:
  - Use a public gallery approach to skill people up in budgeting approach.
  - Consider live streaming so others can observe and learn.
  - Use technology more – for example, to capture knowledge of TCCS director and staff. This allows knowledge to be captured and saved. Also, could be used for voting during the PB process or by the public, if PB went that way. One participant also suggested using new technology such as Blockchain to assist in the PB process.
  - Involve people outside the process more through social media channels as not ‘enough people knew about it’.
  - Consider recording the live events as this would be ‘ultimate transparency’.
  - Consider different channels to engage the different demographics in becoming part of the PB process. For example, mail and mail drop for elderly, email and use social media for younger generation. Also consider putting information about the process in MLA mailouts and encourage people to register their interests.
- In terms of representation:
  - Young people were underrepresented. The Youth Council weren’t in the room although they did put up a representation. Look for ways to improve representation of young people. Another participant considered that given the process was about playgrounds that involving children would have also been good.

- One participant commented that other people who were underrepresented included transgender, ethnic minorities and people with disabilities (although the participant acknowledged that there were advocates for people with disabilities).
- One participant suggested that there was a need for more local voices and suggested local input from all suburbs.
- One participant suggested that information on health and play spaces overlapped and they would have liked to have heard more from the health sector on their opinions in relation to this topic.
- In terms of making the experience better for participants:
  - Consider accessibility and phobias more when developing activities for the workshops. For example, some of the activities such as one involving chairs and throwing a microphone were made with able-body assumptions and also did not consider phobias such as sharing and germs.
  - Not all participants will be familiar and comfortable with numbers. Providing too much financial information 'made it difficult to decipher' for some. The Excel printouts were challenging for some to decipher.
  - Sometimes resources such as big enough screens and technology were not available which made reading information on screens difficult.
  - Consider offering public speaking course to less confident participants to skill them to have their voice heard.
  - It was also suggested that consider providing tokens for talking to allow all participants to have a relatively equal say.
- Other suggestions for improvement include:
  - One participant remarked that after the PB process 'politicians appeared to be taking credit.' They wanted the politicians to acknowledge the contribution from the forum group more.
  - One participant suggested that decisions and logic be documented for sharing more widely which they also acknowledged would create longer reports.
  - Consider how to create legitimacy around community perception.
  - Consider having an indicator on people's name badges that indicates their locality – North or South.
  - One participant suggested that it would be good to share the 'evolution' of this process more widely with the public.
  - In terms of moving forward it was suggested that they keep providing follow-up information to keep people engaged.



## 4. DRAFT PRINCIPLES/CRITERIA FOR THE TRIAL OF CITIZENS' JURIES IN THE ACT (ACTCOSS and CAPAD)

### Draft Principles

The ACT Council of Social Service (ACTCOSS) and the Canberra Alliance for Participatory Democracy (CAPaD) provided a draft set of principles/criteria for the Trial of Citizens' Juries in the ACT as part of a joint media release on 12 August 2017. These principles were to ensure that deliberative mechanisms were trialed in a robust, respectful and informed way.

The principles ask for fairness, accountability, neutrality and an evidence-based approach with clear markers of success. The draft principles were included as Attachment A of the press release. They are as follows:

1. **The drivers, process, output/recommendations and response processes must be transparent and enable accountability.** *Indicator: Sponsors provide a public description of the purpose and process (including how the public will be kept informed and how recommendations will be considered and responded to), before the jury is convened so everyone knows what is proposed.*
2. **Commitment is made to build broad community confidence in the process.** *Indicator: The public is regularly updated on progress and receives prompt responses to questions about the process.*
3. **Sponsors/decision makers have not already made up their minds – they are open to advice and consider it seriously.** *Indicator: There are no fixed positions on the outcome on the public record from sponsors and decision makers. The public is kept informed, the jury is given access to available points of contesting advice and government includes the advice in their considerations and responds publicly.*
4. **Sponsors and decision makers back the process and commit to responding.** *Indicator: Sponsors provide a public description of the purpose and process (including how the public will be kept informed and how recommendations will be considered and responded to), before the jury is convened so everyone knows what is proposed.*
5. **Recruitment and facilitation are conducted by neutral actors with a transparent process.** *Indicator: Community feedback trusts the process.*
6. **A fair spread of evidence/information is provided and drawn upon, and sufficient time allowed for deliberation.** *Indicator: Juror and community feedback confirms that a fair spread of information was provided, and sufficient time was allowed.*
7. **It is clear how the deep deliberative process relates to broader engagement.** *Indicator: Sponsors provide a public description of the purpose and process (including how the public will be kept informed and how recommendations will be considered and responded to), before the jury is convened so everyone knows what is proposed.*
8. **Evaluation, learning and feedback is demonstrated to the community to be used to continuously improve the process.** *Indicator: A public and transparent evaluation process is used to gather and share information about the success and failures of the trial.*

## Findings in Relation to these Principles

The following are our findings in relation to the draft principles:

- 1. The drivers, process, output/recommendations and response processes must be transparent and enable accountability.** TCCS met this principle based on the recommended indicator: TCCS produced the *Better Suburbs Play Spaces Forum: Member Information Pack* (August 2018) which clearly sets out the purpose, outcomes and process prior to the jury being convened. Based on the indicator for this principle the information pack could be strengthened by including information on how the public will be kept informed regarding the progress of this process.
- 2. Commitment is made to build broad community confidence in the process.** TCCS met this principle based on the recommended indicator: The public were regularly updated on the progress via the YourSay website where information including a timeline regarding the PB process has been published in a timely manner. Questions about the process are sent to TCCS's Better Suburbs Program Team via email or mail.
- 3. Sponsors/decision makers have not already made up their minds – they are open to advice and consider it seriously.** TCCS met this principle based on the recommended indicator: TCCS produced the *Better Suburbs Play Spaces Forum: Member Information Pack* (August 2018) which provided a list of outcomes that they were looking for the Forum to make including four categories 'buckets' that the funding could be allocated to. These four categories were changed during the Forum process to five categories recommended by the Forum members and accepted by Government.
- 4. Sponsors and decision makers back the process and commit to responding.** TCCS met this principle based on the recommended indicator: TCCS produced the *Better Suburbs Play Spaces Forum: Member Information Pack* (August 2018) which publicly described the purpose and process prior to the jury being convened so that everyone knew what was proposed. Based on the indicator for this principle the information pack could be strengthened by including information on how the public will be kept informed regarding the progress of this process.
- 5. Recruitment and facilitation are conducted by neutral actors with a transparent process.** TCCS mostly met this principle based on the recommended indicator: The facilitators of the two days of Play Spaces Forum were democracyCo (Day 1) and Jacinta Cubis (Day 2) both who are external, neutral actors with a transparent process. The four Panel meetings were run by TCCS which possibly may be regarded as not meeting the 'neutral actor' requirement. During this review I did not find any evidence that the facilitator was in any way not neutral, however, it is likely because they are TCCS staff that community perceptions may be otherwise. Participants who were interviewed considered that the facilitator ran the sessions well and that the outcomes were achieved. I recommend that in future external facilitators are used in order to meet this principle.
- 6. A fair spread of evidence/information is provided and drawn upon, and sufficient time allowed for deliberation.** TCCS met this principle based on the recommended indicator: TCCS provided access to experts and provided information requested by the Forum panelists and overall allowed sufficient time for deliberation. With different participants involved in different parts of the Forum process some would have like a bit more time for

their deliberations. However overall participants agreed that they reached the right outcomes. I recommend that in future that the same group of participants are utilized throughout the process in order to ensure that sufficient time is allowed for the deliberation as everyone has had access to the information at the same time.

7. **It is clear how the deep deliberative process relates to broader engagement.** TCCS met this principle based on the recommended indicator: TCCS produced the *Better Suburbs Play Spaces Forum: Member Information Pack* (August 2018) which is available on YourSay website and clearly sets out the purpose, outcomes and process prior to the jury being convened. Based on the indicator for this principle the information pack could be strengthened by including information on how the public will be kept informed regarding the progress of this process.
8. **Evaluation, learning and feedback is demonstrated to the community to be used to continuously improve the process.** TCCS met this principle based on the recommended indicator: TCCS has engaged Magical Learning to undertake an evaluation of the trial PB process with a view to evaluating, learning and seeking feedback in order to continuously improve the process.

## 5. ESTIMATED COSTS OF PB EXERCISE

The following estimated costs have been provided by TCCS Finance in relation to the PB Exercise:

### Participatory Budget Pilot Costing - Play Spaces Forum

	Forum and Panel Attendances	Preparations	Venue hire & Catering	Consultants	Total Costs
Total Hours	224	777			
Costs	\$14,751	\$50,756	\$8,395	\$28,914	\$102,816

#### Notes:

Forum and panel attendances calculated based on the register attendances for play spaces forum.

Preparations calculated based on:

- Admin and Management team (610 hours),
- Program Coordinator (151 hours), and
- Finance team (16 hours).

Venue hire, catering and Consultants based on invoices.

This amounts to approximately 5% of the total cost of the capital allocation. It does not calculate the time value of the participants involved in this process.

Costs that were not included in the above figures include the cost of getting participants up to speed on what is PB and how they will go about making their decisions. During this pilot these expenses were allocated to the Better Suburbs Citizens Forum costs, not the Play Spaces Forum (PB) costs. If the PB were to be held as a separate process, as per the recommendations of this report, then these additional costs would also need to be added to the budget. These costs could result in a potential doubling of the current costs.

Several participants noted that the PB process involved a lot of resources, including participants' time for a relatively small amount of money (\$1.9m).

It is also important to consider the benefits of this type of approach including increased community and ministerial engagement.

By using the lessons learned from this trial PB approach and adopting suggestions for improvement from participants as well as from other Australian PB experiences it is likely that additional benefits, in terms of increased community and ministerial engagement, and increased savings, in terms of time and \$ could be made in future.

## Experiences from other Australian PB

Based on information reviewed in other Australian PB experiences, the following information was found in relation to financial information:

- City of Greater Geraldton paid participants \$100 per-diem (\$400 each in total).
- City of Melbourne had a budget of \$150,000 for the PB process with each panelist being paid \$500 for their contribution to the panel.
- South Gippsland Shire Council had a budget of \$16,000 to facilitate the Community Budgeting process.

Moving forward with PB would require that the ACT Government to provide additional funding and resources including staff, budget \$ and funding for systems changes/upgrades including a proper Activity Based Costing tool to ensure that PB can be managed and reported on correctly.

## 6. REVIEW OF TCCS DOCUMENTS

### *Better Suburbs Play Spaces Forum – Member Information Pack (TCCS, August 2018)*

This document was supplied to all participants who took part in the Better Suburbs Play Spaces Forum. This document was produced to help members prepare for their role in the Forum. This document highlighted that additional information would be made available to them on the day of the Forum.

The document was clear and set out what was required of members during this process.

The document suggested four proposed categories for spending (page 7). Several participants suggested that they felt that this meant TCCS had already decided the categories and wasn't really open to negotiating them. However, based on the results of the Forum, including changes to TCCS suggestions and the addition of a new bucket, TCCS was open to negotiation. The document clearly noted that these were 'proposed' categories, so perhaps being aware that when discussing the categories with the group for the first time that TCCS emphasize that these are merely 'proposed' and therefore are up to the group to finalise.

This document clearly explained the differences between play space and playground and the various groups that the spaces can cater for. It also described what a natural play space is and the benefits of these types of spaces.

The document highlighted that the ACT has a higher than average provision of playgrounds (6.7 playgrounds per 1000 children under 15 versus 5.2 playgrounds per 1000 children under 15, 2017 national benchmark) (p. 11). In total, the ACT has 512 play spaces, with 505 of these in urban areas (p. 11). Due to this and the tight budgetary constraints, Forum participants were asked to 'consider that decisions should result in no net increase in the number of playgrounds' and instead it was suggested that it was useful for them to 'look at the quality of play provided and even opportunities for consolidation of playgrounds within local areas in return for increased diversity of play experiences (p. 13).'

The document highlighted that there was lower than average play opportunities for teenagers in the ACT compared to the median for Australia (1.1 youth facility per 1000 children (ACT) versus 1.9 (median for Australia) (Yardstick Benchmark report 2017) (p. 13).

The document provided guidance around the differences between local, central (including CRIP) and District play spaces to assist Forum members when considering decisions around the different play spaces classifications (pp. 14-15). In addition, photos were provided of the different categories to give Forum members some visual examples of the different play spaces categories (pp. 17-19).

This document provided information on the different ACT Government directorates that collaborate in relation to play spaces (p. 20).

The document provided a snapshot of ACT's changing population (1976-2016) as an infographic.

Forum members were also provided with summaries of the results of two studies/surveys – *Play: Canberra Destination Playgrounds Study* and *Feedback on Play Spaces from The Better Suburbs Survey* (pp. 22-27).

The majority of the remainder of the document covered the six key outcomes that the Forum group would be working towards on the day. These were followed with ideas that Forum members could consider prior to (and during) the Forum.

Finally, the report provided additional links to research and consultations on page 40 should forum members wish to read additional publications.

Overall, at 41 pages, this document was very comprehensive. (Transport Canberra and City Services, 2018)

A number of participants who were interviewed suggested that they had not read the complete document, due to the size. Most of the reasons related to participants not allocating enough time to read the document. One participant suggested that they would have preferred someone to talk them through the major parts of it and then they could have read it with a bit more context. This comment was based on their learning preferences.

#### Recommendations:

Overall the information in this document was very comprehensive.

It is worth considering alternative ways of providing some of this information to shorten the amount of time and also the way the information is provided. Some of the information could be presented as video and/or audio to help those with different learning preferences as well as those who may be visually impaired or have reading issues.

#### *Better Suburbs Play Spaces Forum: Community Report – Transport Canberra and City Services, August 2018*

This report was a summary of the outcomes of Day 1 of the Play Spaces Forum written by democracyCo. It included a background on how the Play Spaces forum came about and what the tasks were that they were to consider. The document then explained how they came to understand what the community wanted and needed and why this topic matters to the community.

They then set some strategic objectives to guide TCCS in relation to allocating funding and resources for play spaces. There were four categories that TCCS suggested in terms of allocation for investment in play spaces that forum participants were willing to work with and another additional three categories that were suggested for exploration in the future. The forum then defined the first four categories and worked on the decision criteria for each of the four categories. These were then expanded for the four categories.

Forum members were asked to consider the best way to engage the community around each of the categories and ideas around this are included in this document.

Finally, the forum, while unable to make a decision about the allocation of money for each category, did provide 'some insight into what they felt about the TCCS suggestions in relation to the allocation.' (democracyCo, 2018)

Overall the information in this document provided a good overview of the outcomes of the discussions of Day 1.

#### Recommendations:

None.

#### *Better Suburbs Play Spaces Forum Day 2: Community Report, Transport Canberra and City Services, October 2018*

This report was written by the facilitator, Jacinta Cubis, as a summary of Day 2 of the Play Spaces Forum. The report summaries how the forum members made their final decisions and their rationale behind those decisions.

The report included a background, what the forum remit was, a reminder about inclusive practices and a self-assessment on their ability to do the job.

The report provides an overview of the decisions of forum including the principles and strategies, bucket tour and review, and the deliberation on funding including the outcomes of each table's discussions. The funding decisions including rationales are also provided.

The final sections of the report included how the panel members could be involved in the next phase of funding allocation, member and facilitator feedback. (Cubis, 2018)

Overall the information in this document provided a good overview of the outcome of the discussions of Day 2 and what was the next steps and some suggestions for improvement.

#### Recommendations:

None.



## *Play Spaces Forum 2018: Summary of Decisions*

This document provides a summary of the decisions made as a result of the Play Spaces Forum 2018. The original *Better Suburbs Play Spaces Forum – Member Information Pack* (TCCS, August 2018) set out three overarching outcomes that the group were working towards:

- Outcome 1 – Criteria development – identify criteria to guide decisions made by the Forum and future ACT Government decisions
- Outcome 2 – Recommendations on Future Engagement – recommendations on how the ACT Government should work with the community in making decisions about play spaces into the future’ (p. 28)
- Outcome 3 – PB – allocating up to \$1.9m by the Forum.

The document sets out agreed Play Spaces Priorities Framework including the principles and strategies which was agreed to on 22 September 2018 in the Play Spaces Forum. The Framework is used to guide immediate and also future decisions.

The document provided an overview of the broad funding allocations including a visual of the five different buckets and the financial allocation of the \$1.9 million into those five buckets.

The document provided more detailed information about the individual buckets and the dates of the decisions including an overview on the information that was considered prior to making decisions on how each buckets funding would be allocated. The specific funding allocations also included ‘reserve’ sites/suburbs and any additional panel recommendations. (ACT Government, 2018b)

Overall this document provides a good summary of how and why decisions were made in relation to the individual amounts of funding allocated to each bucket.

## *Recommendations*

None.

## 7. DESKTOP REVIEW OF OTHER AUSTRALIAN EXAMPLES OF PB

### Other Australian Examples

PB commenced in Porto Alegre, Brazil in 1989 and has since spread to many parts of the world including South America, North America, Europe and Australia. It has also been used in developing countries via international lenders, such as the United Nations Development Program and the World Bank making PB a ‘condition of their loans as a means of promoting good governance.’ The first Australian experience of PB was in 2012 in Canada Bay, NSW. Since then several councils in different states have undertaken PB.

The following table from the article, “Participatory Budgeting: The Next ‘Big Thing’ in Australian Local Government” by Helen Christensen and Bligh Grant (2 Feb. 2017) provides a summary of the different PB approaches undertaken in Australia up to and including 2015.

**Table 2**

Year and City	Budget area and outlook	Proportion of budget available for PB	Key methods used
2012 Canada Bay, NSW	All services and operating – 4-year period	Dollar amount not stipulated (2013/2014 budget of \$72 million)	Deliberative community panel
2012 Melville, WA	Community grants budget – 1-year	\$100,000 (of total operating budget of \$87.3 million in 2012/2013)	Workshops, Online budget allocator tool to vote
2013 Geraldton, WA	All capital works – 10-year period	\$68 million (Total capital works budget)	Deliberative community panel
2014 Geraldton, WA	Services and operating – 1-year period	\$70 million (Total services/operating budget)	Deliberative community panel
2014 Darebin, VIC	New community infrastructure capital budget – 2-years	\$2 million (\$1 million per year) (Total capital works budget of \$40.3 million in 2014/2015)	Public submissions Deliberative citizen’s jury
2015 Melbourne, VIC	All services and operating – 10-year period	\$5.9 million (Total budget)	Deliberative community panel

Following publication of Table 2 in the Christensen, H. and Grant, Bligh., 2017 article, we also identified additional PB examples undertaken in Australia.

**Table 3: Additional PB Examples in Australia since 2016**

Year and City	Budget area and outlook	Proportion of budget available for PB	Key methods used
2016 South Gippsland Shire Council, VIC	Capital works budget – 1-year period	\$1.6m Capital Works budget	Citizen Juries, Online Forums, Public Meetings
2017 South Australia: Fund My Neighbourhood, SA Government	Grant funding – 1-year period	\$20m Grant Funding budget	Online voting
2018 TCCS Directorate ACT	Capital works budget – 1-year period	2017-18 \$1.9m capital budget (Play Spaces)	Deliberative community panel
2018-19 Bayswater Council, WA ‡	Operating budget – 1-year period	2019-20 total operating budget of \$84.37m	Online Budget allocator tool for community voting, deliberative community panel

‡ Note: this initiative is currently being undertaken.

In terms of making this an ongoing engagement tool, the Melville (WA) council has continued to use PB every second year since its original implementation. While the money allocated has not been large, between \$50,000 to \$100,000 each time, it has involved the community, including their Youth Advisory Council - and has utilised technology well. Additional information on this process is provided in Appendix A.

The South Gippsland Shire Council appears to have experienced the most difficulties with this process (as discussed in Appendix A) with the Council deferring the project in December 2015 until the 2017/18 budget. The council noted, 'due to the tight timelines involved in getting panels convened and recommendations back to Council for the 2016/17 budget there wasn't the chance to build a groundswell of support in the community.' There was also some community feedback in terms of the money allocated to the process (\$16,000), which some members of the community thought could be spent better elsewhere.

## Lessons from Overseas – Limitations of PB Worldwide

In addition to reviewing PB experiences in Australia, we also examined some of the lessons learned in terms of limitations of PB worldwide.

In particular, in Shah 2007, Chapter 1: 'A Guide to PB' by Brian Wampler, highlighted the following limitations of PB:

- Many participants are interested in obtaining funding for small infrastructure projects, rather than for the good of the whole community. This can lead to people leaving the process once they have got what they want.
- To achieve a good result requires strong commitment to PB by government leaders as they underpin the whole process: from organizing meetings, providing information, meeting with the participants and ensuring policies are implemented.
- Much of the focus for PB participants is on securing short- to medium-term public works projects. There has been limited results around stimulating discussions and developing long-term plans.
- The emphasis on local issues and public policies reduces the amount of time dedicated to regional, national, or global problems.
- There is a danger that PB programs may be manipulated due to the central role played by the mayor's office. In particular, trying to use the PB program to advance their own agendas. Some of the ways this could occur may include: non-disclosure of key information, lack of implementation of selected public policies, or the weakening of citizen oversight committees.

Also, in Bhatnagar et al., 2003, some other challenges associated with PB include:

- involving the very poor and young people in the PB process.
- dealing with frustrations experienced by the participating public arising from the slow progress of public works.

According to Williams et al., 2015, evidence suggests that the representative and participatory potential of PB hinges on four factors. These are:

- The process needs to result in tangible outcomes to prove that people's engagement has had an impact.
- The process needs to be ongoing, in order to build support and increase engagement over a long period.
- There needs to be effective marketing of the PB process to ensure everyone is aware of what is happening, how they can get involved and the impact that can be made.
- Additional resources are often required to target those who are hardest to reach to ensure broad participation.

## Compare and Contrast Australian Experiences with TCCS Experience

Based on the information gathered in the previous section from Tables 2 and 3 and also from information in Appendix A it can be seen that a variety of PB methods have been used across Australia.

The following table provides an overview of the types of funding and what key PB methods have been used in TCCS and the other Australian experiences. This information has been used to provide recommendations of PB and types of funding in relation to applicability for TCCS and other ACT Directorates.

**Table 4: Types of Funding and PB Methods used in Australia**

Type of Funding	Year and City	Key methods used	Applicability for TCCS and other ACT Directorates
Services and operating	2012 Canada Bay, NSW (4 years) 2014 Geraldton, WA (1 year) 2015 Melbourne, VIC (10 years)	Deliberative community panel	Given the complexity of TCCS operations and services and the experience from the trial PB process, undertaking PB using deliberative community panel/s, would require substantial additional resources including staff, funding and changes to systems. PB is not recommended for this funding type at this stage.
Community grants	2012 Melville, WA (1 year) 2017 South Australia: Fund My Neighbourhood, SA Government	Workshops Online budget allocator tool	PB, particularly use of online budget allocator tools, has been used for discretionary community grants. This approach is helpful for greater community engagement and understanding around government funding and allocation of those funds. PB is recommended for discretionary grant funding in other directorates.

Type of Funding	Year and City	Key methods used	Applicability for TCCS and other ACT Directorates
Capital works	2013 Geraldton, WA (10 years) 2014 Darebin, VIC (2 years) 2016 South Gippsland Shire Council, VIC (1 year) 2017 TCCS Directorate, ACT (1 year)	Deliberative community panel Public submissions Deliberative citizen's jury Online Forums Public meetings	Given this has already been tried within TCCS this would be the easiest to implement. However, for TCCS to successfully manage and report on the outcomes, additional resources (people, funding and changes to systems) would be required. PB could also be used in other directorates for discretionary capital funding.

## PB Process Recommendations from Participants

Many of the participants noted that PB was an excellent approach, a 'step in the right direction'.

Several of the participants interviewed considered that it was important to use the public service experts to decide the final funding allocation. They believed that participants could decide the general direction/ areas of allocations and then leave it up to the public service experts to decide the amounts allocated to specific projects.

In order to support the PB process, the finance/budgeting systems within the directorate/s need to be flexible enough to support the PB process. This will likely require additional funding to have the systems adapted to meet these requirements.

Participants suggested that areas which could be considered by the ACT Government for inclusion in future PB processes included capital and grant funding for different directorates, such as :

- whole of ACT Government
- affordable housing
- City Renewal Authority
- health
- education
- libraries
- shopping centre upgrades
- road safety
- not anything emotive or dangerous (e.g. safety) or planning related
- any area that decreases social isolation, increases community engagement and increases social enterprise.

Other suggestions from individual participants included:

- Direct proportional representation to improve community input into budget decision-making in future years.
- That the PB process should also include long-term decisions that go over election cycles in order to 'maintain legitimacy' which would allow for greater stability and legitimacy.
- 'Explore how it (PB) would work in each stage or change the budget process to get the best outcomes.'
- Consultation and online (for all community comments).
- Some of the ways to engage community members in this process could include: having community meetings for the different regions in the ACT, Council meetings (which already exist in ACT), through schools or other local groups and through the libraries.

One participant suggested looking for additional funding for Play Spaces through sources such as:

- new building developments – developers
- neighbourhood philanthropic – local businesses, developers
- philanthropic – e.g. physical space such as Hospital Play Space
- increase funding with creativity around better spaces for local communities.



## 8. ASSEMBLY MOTION

The ACT Assembly's motion of 27 August 2017, noted 'that the Government will

(4)(a) as part of its Budget Review to 'improve community input' conduct a participatory budgeting pilot no later than the 2019-20 Budget cycle, which:

(i) asks citizens to consider and make clear recommendations on how a discretionary portion of the City Services budget could be allocated to best reflect community priorities;

(ii) is designed by an advisory group with relevant expertise in deliberative democracy processes, including practitioners, academics and the community sector, to be convened by the Government;

(iii) is informed by the set of principles developed by ACTCOSS and CAPAD to ensure that deliberative mechanisms are trialed in a robust, respectful and informed way; and

(iv) uses a randomly selected citizen panel as a representative cross-section of the Canberra community and provides the panel with all relevant information;

(b) commit to transparently considering and publicly responding to the pilot panel's recommendations; and

(c) commission and make public an independent post-implementation analysis of the pilot, identifying which components of the Budget and budget process would benefit from greater community input and possible models for future participatory budgeting processes in the ACT.'

In terms of addressing the ACT Assembly's motion TCCS addressed the requirements of the motion as follows:

(4)(a) a participatory budget pilot was undertaken during the 2018-19 Budget cycle, a year ahead of that required in the ACT Assembly's motion – Requirement met ahead of time

(i) the citizens were asked, via the citizen panel, to consider and make clear recommendations on how a discretionary portion of the City Services budget (\$1.9m for Play Spaces) could be allocated to best reflect community priorities – Requirement met

(ii) is designed by an advisory group with relevant expertise in deliberative democracy processes, including practitioners, academics and the community sector, to be convened by the Government – Requirement met

(iii) is informed by the set of principles developed by ACTCOSS and CAPAD to ensure that deliberative mechanism is trialed in a robust, respectful and informed way – Requirement mostly met – refer to Section 4 of this report

(iv) uses a randomly selected citizen panel as a representative cross-section of the Canberra community and provides the panel with all relevant information – Requirement met

(b) commit to transparently considering and publicly responding to the pilot panel's recommendations – Requirement met

(c) commission and make public an independent post-implementation analysis of the pilot, identifying which components of the Budget and budget process would benefit from greater community input and possible models for future participatory budgeting processes in the ACT – Requirement met – refer to Section 9 of this report.

## 9. RECOMMENDATIONS MOVING FORWARD

### Components of the Budget and Budget Process that Would Benefit from Greater Community Input

There have been a variety of components of the budget that have been used across Australia in PB experiences (see Section 7 and Appendix A of this report for more detail) varying from small community grants (Melville, WA) through to the entire budget (The City of Greater Geraldton).

Initially I recommend that the Government apply PB only to discretionary grant and discretionary capital funding components of the budget. My recommendation is based on my review of the various Australian PB experiences and participants recommendations. In particular, this would allow the Canberra community to have input into areas that directly affect them. For example, community grant funding can lead to high community engagement for relatively small \$ ongoing funding (e.g. see Melville, WA experience in Appendix A). This approach would also allow directorates time to upgrade their systems to be able to manage and report on the impact of PB

In terms of the parts of the budget process that would benefit from greater community input, in all but one example of PB examples in Australia, the Council had the final say based on the recommendations from the PB process. In the City of Darebin's 2014 experience, the Citizen's Jury specified that the Council were required to accept the recommendations on an 'all or nothing' basis to help ensure that there was no 'cherry picking' of only ideas that they liked.

As per participants suggestions I recommend that PB be used to select projects ('buckets') to be funded including recommending overall budget amounts for each 'bucket' and then the specific details to be decided by directorate experts to ensure the best value for money.

Moving forward I recommend that the Government undertake another review of the PB process after two complete financial years to determine whether other components of the budget and budget process would benefit from greater community input and therefore be included in the PB process. This review would allow time for the community to better understand and become involved in the process and also for directorates to update their systems to be able to support PB management and reporting.

Government will also need to provide additional resources to ensure that directorates have sufficient staff, money and updated systems to be able to support PB efforts within their directorates.

### Possible Models for Future PB Processes in the ACT

Based on the findings of this review there are a number of possible models that the ACT could use for future PB processes. These could include:

- Deliberative community panels

- Workshops
- Online budget allocator tools
- Deliberative citizen's jury
- Public submissions
- Public meetings
- Online forums.

Suggestions for which to use are provided in the recommendations below.

## Report Recommendations

TCCS was a good choice for the first PB in the ACT. It is a directorate that has high visibility and high citizen engagement due to the nature of the services offered by the directorate.

With this and based on information gathered and reviewed for this report, the following are my recommendations to improve the PB process moving forward. They include:

- I recommend that the ACT Government continue to undertake PB as it is an effective tool for citizen engagement – particularly in terms of helping citizens understand the complexity and difficulty of making decisions regarding allocation of limited resources.
- Based on other Australian experiences of PB and participant feedback, there are many other areas that PB could be applied to in the ACT. I recommend that PB be extended to other directorates, to cover both discretionary grants and discretionary capital funding.
- In relation to discretionary grants, I recommend using an online budget allocation tool to allow the Canberra community to vote for where grants are to be allocated. To make this process robust, workshops, public meetings and online forums could be used to support discussions on grant allocation and to engage those who are otherwise unlikely to engage with the government.
- In relation to discretionary capital funding, I recommend that a deliberative community panel be used. Capital projects can be complicated and this process would allow for more informed deliberation of these projects. Where participants are to be involved in face-to-face forums, sufficient time should be allowed to plan and recruit participants, to ensure that the panel is representative of the entire community. Sending personalised invitations that provide information on what PB is and how the participants can help is one way to encourage participation. Articulating (in the invitation) the government's commitment to utilise their findings can also influence people to participate in the process.
- Where a deliberative community panel is utilised, I recommend that the PB process be run as a stand-alone process, with a reduced time frame, to allow for the same participants to participate in the whole process.
- I recommend using the same independent facilitator throughout the PB process.

- I recommend additional funding, including for staff, other resources and systems changes, be made available to directorates to ensure that, wherever PB is to be undertaken, the directorate's systems – including the finance/budgeting system/s – can support the PB process from a management and reporting perspective.
- I recommend directorates consider ways to engage staff throughout the PB process, to help them with the change process and to improve engagement and knowledge of government services (see Canada Bay and City of Greater Geraldton experiences in Appendix A).
- I recommend that directorates look for opportunities to engage positive media and social media around the PB process, to promote PB and the outcomes to the broader ACT Community to encourage greater community engagement (see Appendix A for examples).
- I recommend the government prioritise seeking bi-partisan support for the PB process. PB needs bi-partisan support for it to work well and to enhance its ongoing viability. Without this, PB is unlikely to continue longer-term, which will likely cause the community to lose trust in the PB process.

## APPENDIX 1 – REVIEW OF AUSTRALIAN EXPERIENCES IN PB

### The City of Canada Bay Council, NSW

The City of Canada Bay Council was the first Australian local government council to undertake PB in Australia. The process took place in 2012 with the council opening up the PB to all services and funding for a four-year planning period.

This process involved three different components:

- The use of randomly selected citizens
- A non-partisan intermediary organisation (the new Democracy Foundation)
- A parallel process for staff engagement during the process.

Based on information from Thompson, 2012, some lessons learned include:

- Personal invitations worked much better at generating interest than public invitations
- The majority of panelists had not previously attended a Council event nor contacted the Council about a local concern. After the process the panelists had indicated they were 'likely or very likely' to contact the Council about an issue in the future
- Panelists indicated that one of the main reasons they volunteered is because the invitation indicated that 'the Citizen's Panel (CP) would be able to influence Council's decision-making on a significant matter' and they wanted to be part of that process
- The use of facilitators reminding the group to think of themselves as a 'mini-public representing the wider community' helped participants to 'leave their baggage at the door'
- Using the new Democracy Foundation enhanced the process overall through – not only through 'initiating and setting the broad design, recruiting panelists, participating on the oversight committee, attending all sessions of the CP and handling panelists questions outside the formal sessions.' They also, through their networks were able to engage the media in positive media coverage about the process.
- 'All parties valued the independence and impartiality' that the new Democracy Foundation brought to the process
- A staff panel (SP), comprising 23 randomly selected Council staff members from across the Council, was engaged in a parallel process internally created by the Council to engage Council staff. The idea behind this was to address a concern about staff members might react to being required to implement changes arising out of the PB process if they were not engaged themselves. The SP resulted in staff learning more about council services, their views aligning with the community's views, they provided input into the CP and it was a 'good experience' for staff
- Final recommendations of the CP were developed through dialogue and deliberation rather than aggregating preferences through a vote

- The Council has since released its 'Community Engagement Strategy' (26 September 2017) which includes CP as part of its future options for engagement.
- This was a significant move for this Council whose previous approaches to consulting their communities sat predominately in the first two levels of the IAP2 spectrum: 'inform' and 'consult'. The most recent major consultation process undertaken by the Council, prior to the CP, was in 2008 to develop the *FuturesPlan20*, which moved into the level of 'involve'. The CP sits squarely at the 'collaborate' level.

### Melville Council WA 2012

In the 2012-13 budget year, the City of Melville Council provided \$100,000 for community grants from a total operating budget of \$87.3 million. This initiative was labelled 'Robin Hood' and involved small grants of between \$1,000 to \$20,000 'for projects presented by community groups, not-for-profit organisations, businesses and individuals.' (Hartill, 2016) Rather than using a traditional approach, the approval of the grants was conducted by the community through an online (and offline) voting process. All applications were open to the public for voting on which projects they wanted implemented in their community.

- The project was facilitated the City of Melville's Youth Advisory Council (YAC) involving a core group of 15-25 year olds.
- The project was designed to match the City's existing plans and values
- Applications for funding were filtered to ensure they were safe, legal and would satisfy the community spirit of the project (p. 8 of Project Robin Hood book). Once they met this requirement they were listed on the online 'budget allocator' tool where voters could allocate their 'virtual budget' of \$100,000 in any way they saw fit (with no project being allowed more than \$20,000 in the vote)
- This process 'attracted over 1,379 individual votes' (p. 9 of Robin Hood book)
- The Council has run the process again in 2014/15 (\$50,000) and 2016/17 (\$100,000)
- Robin Hood IV is currently being run in 2018-19 (\$100,000).
- Where a project was unsuccessful, additional support was provided including 'advice on other funding opportunities, technical assistance and moral encouragement being the most common' (p. 9 of Robin Hood book)
- The Council even wrote a book about the experience (City of Melville, 2012)
- The project uses a website 'Melville Talks' ([www.melvilletalks.com.au](http://www.melvilletalks.com.au)) to bring the City of Melville community and allow residents to connect online, including through 'Suburb Talks', 'Topic Talks' using forums to encourage discussions. The website states that they 'wish to increase levels of participation, knowledge of local government issues and processes, and online citizenship' through using the following tools:
  - 'Polls and surveys, providing the City with valuable community feedback.'

- Regular project updates.
- Community forums and messaging boards.
- Photo and video-enriched content.
- In order to participate, we encourage you to become a member of Melville Talks today’.
- Additional information is available on Project Robin Hood at <https://www.melvillecity.com.au/our-community/grants-scholarships-and-sponsorship/project-robin-hood>.

### The City of Greater Geraldton, WA 2013 – 10 Year Capital Works

In 2013 the City of Greater Geraldton commissioned two PB panels as part of this process. The main basis was to ‘improve the public’s feelings of trust and legitimacy in difficult budgetary decisions’ (Involve, 2015). The #changeCGG program was an internal and external change management program that was created to improve engagement, productivity, efficiency and align corporate outcomes with community expectations. The #changesCGGcommunity program was established to make decision making regarding the City’s budget ‘more equitable, transparent and inclusive’ by involving the community in this process. The two PB panels are part of the #changesCGG process. (#changesCGG Community, 2019)

- The first panel (of 25 people) covered the 10 Year Capital Works PB – they were asked to ‘determine a priority list of projects for inclusion in the City’s ten-year capital works plan’ as well as create a set of criteria to assess future capital works to be used by the City Council (Involve, 2015)
- The approach used for the first panel included:
  - Prior to the first workshop background information pack was provided to panelists including:
    - The Strategic Community Plan 2013-2023
    - Frequently asked questions about the City strategy  
#changesCGGcommunity project
    - Descriptions of the Community Panel and social media to be used
    - Copies of media coverage to date
    - A Community Panel Agreement and other required forms.
  - 4 full days of deliberative workshops held on Saturdays from 9<sup>th</sup>-30<sup>th</sup> November 2013 and one additional sub group meeting
  - At the beginning of each workshop agendas were handed out outlining the day’s purpose in terms of deliberation and how it would be achieved. Each day had a specific purpose and Agenda, See Appendices in PB Community Panel, 2013 for copies of the Agendas.



- At the first meeting Panelists received an additional information pack which included:
  - Descriptions of the recruitment methodology
  - More about the Community Panel facilitation
  - A code for working together
  - A glossary of terms
  - The role of the Independent Review Committee (IRC); and
  - The City's Long-Term Financial Plan.
- Panelists were provided with:
  - Access to Council staff with expertise in and/or knowledge of the City capital works projects
  - Ongoing access to the Mayor, CEO and several City Directors
  - A support team of cross functional City staff, who facilitated at the small table deliberations, scribed where needed, provided logistics support, as well as the overall daily organisation.
- A variety of public deliberation techniques were used during the deliberations including:
  - 21<sup>st</sup> Century Dialogue
  - Multi Criteria Analysis (MCA) Conference; and
  - Software platform called CivicEvolution
- Various social media platforms were used to include the broader community which resulted in ongoing contributions from local people, as well as state, national and international comments (Appendix 5) (PB Community Panel, 2013)
- At the end of each workshop a participant's evaluation survey was completed, with results being discussed the following week. Also, two members of an Independent Review Committee met with the participants at the end of each day's deliberation to determine the extent to which the process was fair, unbiased, representative, well informed and deliberative. (Participative Budgeting Community Panel, 2013)
- The Independent Review Committee (IRC) was created as a 'watch dog' and was made up of business and community leaders, in a panel of between 5 to 7 panelists, including the Mayor and Deputy Mayor. Their job was to observe and to ensure the process was free from bias, the interactions were transparent and that the council was accountable. At the end of each panel meeting all staff and consultants were removed from the room and the Independent Review Committee had a discussion with panelists about whether bias was shown, did they feel they were being railroaded, was there a sense that council or staff trying

to push them down a particular path and how satisfied were they with the way the process was undertaken. The IRC also reported back weekly to the Executive of the Council with a summary of their findings from the previous meeting.

- The council also surveyed the panelists at the end of each day to see how they found the day whether the information they were provided was adequate and their interaction with staff has been of quality.
- In addition to the #changesCGGcommunity, which was externally focused on the community, the council also created #changesCGGstaff, which was an internally focused program. It was designed to help improve effectiveness and productivity of the organisation through involving staff in the process. Some of the focuses designed to do this included focusing on culture and behaviours, business processes and strategic intent. Outcomes from this program were that staff not only felt part of the process, they also embraced the process.
- To cover out-of-pockets expenses, those participants who took part in all 4 sessions, received \$100 per-diem payment (\$400 in total).
- The first part of the panel process was for panelists to identify their values and align them with the known values of the community through the strategic community plan. This helped to focus on the greater good of the community.
- Panel members were recruited by a local, independent demographer, 'through a stratified random sample with age, gender, indigenous and multi-cultural background and location used as criteria'
- The outcomes of the first panel (10 Year Capital Works plan) included a list of priorities which included City and Community initiated projects. The Panel also created a set of criteria to assess future proposed projects for the Council to use. They recommended that projects be subject to two rankings – 'City rank' and 'Community rank' to encourage debate in decision-making. The Panel also recommended a plan for future community participation through the Panel's continued involvement in the 10 Year Capital Works budgetary allocation, as well as future 2-4 yearly random sample Community Panels. (PB Community Panel, 2013)
- This report was endorsed by the Council with the results from the Capital Works PB resulted in prioritisation would be implemented and the council would use the Panel's suggested rating system for future works.
- Both PB processes led to participants having significant shifts in their feelings of trust towards the City council. Most interviewees also said they now have a great understanding of the 'complexity and size' of the issues that the council has to deal with.
- Another outcome of the panels was the importance of having decision-makers involved from the beginning.

## The City of Greater Geraldton, WA 2014 – Services and Operations

In 2013 the City of Greater Geraldton commissioned two PB panels. The main basis was to ‘improve the public’s feelings of trust and legitimacy in difficult budgetary decisions’ (Involve, 2015).

- The second panel (35 people) – the Range and Level of Services PB – were tasked with ‘recommending the community desired range, level, and priority of services to achieve minimal rate increases, or reductions, within the budget limitations set by the Council’s adopted Long-Term Financial Plan.’ (Involve, 2015) The services considered by this panel were the non-mandatory services only.
- The approach used for this panel included:
  - 8 days of deliberation held on Saturdays in February and March
  - The panel chose to use the values-based assessment criteria developed by the first panel in 2013 with some minor modifications to suit services (versus capital works projects) to ensure continuity of fundamental principles
- Panel members were recruited by a local, independent demographer, ‘through a stratified random sample with age, gender, indigenous and multi-cultural background and location used as criteria’
- This report was endorsed by the Council with the result of the Range and Level of Services PB recommendations were used to form the 2014/15 budget. This was passed by an absolute majority by council members.
- Both PB processes led to participants having significant shifts in their feelings of trust towards the City council. Most interviewees also said they now have a great understanding of the ‘complexity and size’ of the issues that the council has to deal with.
- Another outcome of the panels was the importance of having decision-makers involved from the beginning
- Additional resources in terms of the Council’s experience are available at Diehm, 2015 and City of Greater Geraldton, 2014.

## Darebin (VIC) 2014

The Darebin City Council created an infrastructure fund of \$2m (\$1m for 2014-15 and \$1m for 2015-16) and used a Citizen's jury (comprising 44 people) process to get advice on how these funds should be spent.

- The 44 jurors were drawn from a random sample of 3,000 Darebin residents. They were then selected to ensure a representative group from the local community.
- The jurors were provided with a participant pack which covered areas such as:
  - Information on the jury's key focus
  - PB, how the jury will be run, your role, and who else will be there
  - Frequently asked questions including their terms of reference
  - Details of the 2014/15 proposed capital works budget
  - Information on the Local Solutions to Local Issues feedback received in Feb. 2014. (City of Darebin, 2014)
- The jury met four times over four months in 2014 to decide from 54 possible projects. They received submissions from the public, stakeholder groups and community organisations with proposed projects. They were also supported by external experts, senior managers and staff.
- The council were required to accept the recommendations on an 'all or nothing' basis to help ensure they didn't cherry pick only the ideas they liked.
- The council unanimously supported the jury's eight recommendations.
- This experience demonstrated mutuality and respect between the citizens and councilors around complex issues such as finite budgets, equity and long-term planning. PB was developed to ensure transparency in places experiencing budgetary constraints. This process allows the community to work productively with council to enhance the work of the council. Above all it generates qualities rare in contemporary politics, respect between the parties involved, and the effort to listen (Bolitho, 2015a)
- The council also decided to run the jury process approximately every two years.
- Key learnings from this process include:
  - Greater efforts around recruiting in particular locations and students
  - Provide a road map for jurors of the whole process
  - Community submissions – early and only 1 process
  - Juror submissions early
  - Provide jurors with all community submissions prior to their first meeting
  - Invite the community to present their submissions to the jury
  - Greater encouragement of other voices of the jury. (Bolitho, 2015b)

## City of Melbourne 2015

The City of Melbourne Council undertook a PB approach in 2015 to inform the long-term spending priorities for the development of the city's 10-year financial plan (2015-2025).

- The community was engaged in two ways: broad community engagement and via the People's Panel
  - The broad engagement of the community through different outreach and traditional engagement methods including an online Budget Simulator, conversations at community events, workshops and pop-ups. Over 600 people actively contributed to the broader community engagement including CALD communities, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders, senior residents, workers, businesses, children and young people and students. (Clear Horizon Consulting, 2015)
  - The People's Panel comprised of 43 randomly selected citizens that were stratified for gender, age, location and ratepayer status. The selection process was overseen by the New Democracy Foundation.
  - Reports from the broader engagement were provided to the People's Panel... to inform their decision-making process with the panel meeting 6 times during the three-month period of August to November 2014. The panels were facilitated by MosaicLab. They were also given access to experts and information to support their decision making. The Panel made 11 recommendations to the Council. Ten of the 11 recommendations from the Panel are being implemented by the Council (MosaicLab, 2015)
  - The recommendation that wasn't implemented related to an increase in rates by CPI plus up to 2.5% for the next 10 years due to the Victorian State Government's plans to introduce a rate capping policy for all Victorian councils. (City of Melbourne, 2015)
  - The budget for the PB process was \$150,000 with each panelist was paid \$500 for their contributions to the Panel.
- The 10 Year Financial Plan provided for approximately \$4B worth of expenditure.
- The community engagement for the 10-Year Financial Plan was regarded as both highly effective and appropriate in terms of the IAP2 Core Values and other good-practice community engagement criteria.

## South Gippsland Shire Council (VIC) 2016

In November 2015 the South Gippsland Shire Council voted unanimously to allocate \$1.6m of capital works funds to four communities in the shire: Foster, Venus Bay, Korumburra and Mirboo North. Each community was allocated \$400,000 to be spent on capital works. They called their process 'Community Budgeting.'

- The Council chose the four communities because they were large and provided a reasonable sample on 'which Council and residents can form a judgement on the value of the process.' (Giddy, 2015)
- The Council allocated \$16,000 in their budget to facilitate the Community Budgeting process
- In December 2015 the Council decided to defer the project until the 2017/18 budget, 'due to the tight timelines involved in getting panels convened and recommendations back to Council for the 2016/17 budget there wasn't the chance to build a groundswell of support in the community.' This led to a small number of nominees which 'would have made the process unrepresentative.' (Press Release PR1766 17/12/15)
- In June 2016, the Council 'voted to re-shape and re-name the Community Budgeting project to the Community Capital Works Allocation project.' The new approach was 'formed with feedback received from the Community Budgeting nominees when the project was deferred due to an inadequate number of nominees to form representative panels.' (Source: Press Release PR1869 23/6/16)
- In September 2016 individuals were invited by Council to 'participate in an online forum where they can vote on projects identified from their community plan and the Long-Term Capital Works Program or provide their own ideas.' Following the voting process, 'community workshops will be facilitated with these communities in late October/ early November to discuss forum results and form a recommendation for Council to consider in December 2016.' (Press Release PR1893 1/9/16)
- In December 2016 the Council finalized the Community Capital Works Allocation Project and 'allocated the \$400,000 for each town (\$1.6M total).' The projects were recommended by the community following an extensive engagement campaign that included online forums and community workshops.' Works were expected to begin in the 2017/18 financial year for some of the projects while others required 'further planning and consulting with relevant committees.' (Source: Press Release PR1948 15/12/16)

## Fund My Neighbourhood (SA) 2017-18

In 2017-18 the South Australian government allocated \$20m to SA local communities where communities pitched and voted for their favourite ideas in their local areas.

- In the first round, over 112,000 votes were cast, with more than 200 neighbourhood improvement projects being funded
- Projects covered a variety of areas including: playgrounds, walking paths, pedestrian lights, dog parks, upgrades to skate parks and sporting facilities (O’Rielly, 2018)
- A change in government resulted in the program being cancelled for the 2018-19 year.
- Due to the website being no longer available, it was difficult to obtain further information regarding this process.

## Bayswater Council (VIC) 2018-19

The City of Bayswater Council has invited ‘the community to help inform the City’s annual operating budget for the 2019/20 financial year.’ The focus of the PB process was on the Council’s 2019-20 total operating budget of \$84.37m. The process they are undertaking includes the following:

- A number of Community drop-in sessions to learn more about the City’s operating budget
- Online fact sheets to learn more about the City’s operating budget
- An online Budget Allocator Tool where community members could vote on how they would spend the City’s annual operating budget
- A representative, randomly-selected Community Panel whose role will be to look at the budget in more detail and provide recommendations for Council to consider during budget deliberations. Community members were invited when they completed the Budget Allocator Tool online to let the Council know if they were interested in being part of the Community Panel. The panel will use community feedback from Budget Allocator and recent Community Survey along with other strategic documents.’ (City of Bayswater, 2019)
- Council will then consider the Community Panel’s recommendations along with other draft budget documents to compile the draft 2019/20 Budget.

## REFERENCES

ACT Council of Social Services Inc (ACTCOSS) and Canberra Alliance for Participatory Democracy (CAPaD) (2017) **Media Release: Citizens' Juries – Let's Get It Right**. Retrieved from <https://www.actcoss.org.au/citizens-juries>.

ACT Government (2019a) **How We Communicate and Engage**. Retrieved from <https://www.act.gov.au/yoursay/our-conversations/how-we-communicate-and-engage>

ACT Government (2019b) **Play Spaces Forum 2018: Summary of Decisions**. Retrieved from [https://s3.ap-southeast-2.amazonaws.com/hdp.au.prod.app.act-yoursay.files/3515/4294/9584/Play\\_Spaces\\_Decisions\\_Summary\\_Report.pdf](https://s3.ap-southeast-2.amazonaws.com/hdp.au.prod.app.act-yoursay.files/3515/4294/9584/Play_Spaces_Decisions_Summary_Report.pdf)

ACT Government (2019c) **Your Say**, Citizen's Forum page. Retrieved from <https://www.yoursay.act.gov.au/BetterSuburbs/citizens-forum>

ACT Government (2019d) **Your Say**, City Services and a Better Suburbs Statement for Canberra. Retrieved from <https://www.yoursay.act.gov.au/BetterSuburbs>

Bhatnagar, D. Rathore, A. Moreno Torres, M and Kanungo, P. (2003) **PB in Brazil**, Washington DC: Indian Institutes of Management: World Bank. Retrieved from [http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTEMPowerment/Resources/14657\\_Participatory-Budgeting-Brazil-web.pdf](http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTEMPowerment/Resources/14657_Participatory-Budgeting-Brazil-web.pdf).

Bolitho, A. (2015a) **Fresh Conversations, New Stances: Deliberative Democracy and PB**. Retrieved from <https://apo.org.au/node/54348>

Bolitho, A. (2015b) **PB Process City of Darebin, May- August 2014**. Retrieved from [https://www.mav.asn.au/\\_data/assets/pdf\\_file/0008/4895/Asset-2015-Participatory-budget-process-at-Darebin-Council-Annie-Bolitho.pdf](https://www.mav.asn.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0008/4895/Asset-2015-Participatory-budget-process-at-Darebin-Council-Annie-Bolitho.pdf)

democracyCo (2018) **Better Suburbs Play Spaces Forum Community Report: Transport Canberra and City Services**, August. Retrieved from [https://s3.ap-southeast-2.amazonaws.com/hdp.au.prod.app.act-yoursay.files/9515/3679/7180/Play\\_spaces\\_FINAL\\_REPORT\\_Aug18.pdf](https://s3.ap-southeast-2.amazonaws.com/hdp.au.prod.app.act-yoursay.files/9515/3679/7180/Play_spaces_FINAL_REPORT_Aug18.pdf)



Christensen, H and Grant, B. (2017) **PB: The Next 'Big Thing' in Australian Local Government?** Retrieved from <https://www.austaxpolicy.com/participatory-budgeting-next-big-thing-australian-local-government/>

Citizen's Forum members (2018) **Better Suburbs Forum**. Retrieved from [https://s3.ap-southeast-2.amazonaws.com/hdp.au.prod.app.act-yoursay.files/4215/3722/6646/Better\\_Suburbs\\_Statement\\_accessible\\_SEPTEMBER\\_2018.pdf](https://s3.ap-southeast-2.amazonaws.com/hdp.au.prod.app.act-yoursay.files/4215/3722/6646/Better_Suburbs_Statement_accessible_SEPTEMBER_2018.pdf)

City of Bayswater (2019) **PB 2019/20**. Retrieved from <https://engage.bayswater.wa.gov.au/budget>

City of Darebin (2014) **Darebin PB Process: May – August 2014 – Participant Pack**. Retrieved from <https://www.darebin.vic.gov.au/~media/cityofdarebin/Files/YourCouncil/HowCouncilWorks/CouncilInitiatives/Citizens-Jury/Darebin-Participatory-Budgeting-Participant-Pack-A2476299.ashx?la=en>

City of Greater Geraldton (2014) **#changesCGGcommunity – PB Project Interview 2014**. Retrieved from [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ooCs-fL\\_Yk](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ooCs-fL_Yk)

City of Greater Geraldton PB (2015) **Community Summit Report: Outcomes and Recommendations**. Retrieved from [https://www.cgg.wa.gov.au/Profiles/cgg/Assets/ClientData/Community\\_Summit\\_Final\\_Report\\_-\\_23\\_March\\_2015.pdf](https://www.cgg.wa.gov.au/Profiles/cgg/Assets/ClientData/Community_Summit_Final_Report_-_23_March_2015.pdf)

City of Melville (2012) **Project Robin Hood**. Retrieved from [https://s3-ap-southeast-2.amazonaws.com/ehq-production-australia/ca317758e15eb5ba3e950f06aa3d9a9ed11e7218/documents/attachments/000/012/437/original/Project\\_Robin\\_Hood\\_Booklet.pdf?1398918096](https://s3-ap-southeast-2.amazonaws.com/ehq-production-australia/ca317758e15eb5ba3e950f06aa3d9a9ed11e7218/documents/attachments/000/012/437/original/Project_Robin_Hood_Booklet.pdf?1398918096)

City of Melbourne (2015) **10-Year Financial Plan Released**. Retrieved from <https://participate.melbourne.vic.gov.au/10yearplan/10-year-financial-plan-released>

Clear Horizon Consulting (2015) **Evaluation of the Community Engagement Process for the 10 Year Financial Plan: Prepared for Melbourne City Council**. Retrieved from [https://s3.ap-southeast-2.amazonaws.com/hdp.au.prod.app.com-participate.files/3514/4477/8217/Evaluation\\_of\\_community\\_engagement\\_for\\_the\\_10\\_Year\\_Financial\\_Plan.pdf](https://s3.ap-southeast-2.amazonaws.com/hdp.au.prod.app.com-participate.files/3514/4477/8217/Evaluation_of_community_engagement_for_the_10_Year_Financial_Plan.pdf)

Cubis, J. (2018) **Better Suburbs Play Spaces Forum Day 2 Community Report, Transport and City Services**, October. Retrieved from [https://s3.ap-southeast-2.amazonaws.com/hdp.au.prod.app.act-yoursay.files/2615/4294/4865/Jacinta\\_Cubis\\_-\\_Play\\_Spaces\\_Community\\_Report\\_FINAL.pdf](https://s3.ap-southeast-2.amazonaws.com/hdp.au.prod.app.act-yoursay.files/2615/4294/4865/Jacinta_Cubis_-_Play_Spaces_Community_Report_FINAL.pdf)

Diehm, K. (2015) **City of Geraldton's Participatory Budget Journey**. Retrieved from

Giddy, L. (2015) **Communities to Have a Say in Council Infrastructure Spend**. Retrieved from <https://foster.vic.au/communities-to-have-a-say-in-council-infrastructure-spend/>

Gordon, M. (2018) **A Snap Insight on PB**. Retrieved from <https://home.oursay.org/2018/10/15/a-snap-insight-on-participatory-budgeting/>

Hartill, L. (2016) **City of Melville Project Robin Hood**. Retrieved from <https://www.lgprofessionalswa.org.au/Documents/Better%20Practice/July%202016/Presentations/Leanne%20Hartill.pdf>

IAP2 International Federation (2014) **IAP2's Public Participation Spectrum**. Retrieved from [https://www.iap2.org.au/Tenant/C0000004/00000001/files/IAP2\\_Public\\_Participation\\_Spectrum.pdf](https://www.iap2.org.au/Tenant/C0000004/00000001/files/IAP2_Public_Participation_Spectrum.pdf)

Involve (2014) **Geraldton Council PB**. Retrieved from <https://www.involve.org.uk/resources/case-studies/geraldton-council-participatory-budgeting>

Involve (2015) **Melbourne People's Panel**. Retrieved from <https://www.involve.org.uk/resources/case-studies/melbourne-peoples-panel>

Leinghninger, M and Rinehart, C. (2016) **Power to the people! (and settings for using it wisely?)**. Public Agenda, Brooklyn NY.

MosaicLab (2015) **Case Study: Melbourne People's Panel**. Retrieved from <https://www.mosaiclab.com.au/news-all-posts/2016/8/2/peoples-panel>

O'Rielly, M. (2018) **Fundy My Neighbourhood Program Ceases**. Retrieved at <https://www.barossa Herald.com.au/story/5446147/community-miss-out-on-annual-funds/>

PB Community Panel (2013) **10 Year Capital Works Plan: Recommendations and Report to the City of Greater Geraldton**. Retrieved from

[https://www.cgg.wa.gov.au/Profiles/cgg/Assets/ClientData/Participatory\\_Budgeting\\_-\\_10\\_Year\\_Capital\\_Works\\_Plan\\_Report\\_and\\_Recommendations\\_-\\_Final\\_-\\_Rated.pdf](https://www.cgg.wa.gov.au/Profiles/cgg/Assets/ClientData/Participatory_Budgeting_-_10_Year_Capital_Works_Plan_Report_and_Recommendations_-_Final_-_Rated.pdf)

Shah, A. (ed.) (2007) **PB**, Public Sector Governance and Accountability Series, The World Bank.

Retrieved from <https://siteresources.worldbank.org/PSGLP/Resources/ParticipatoryBudgeting.pdf>.

Transport Canberra and City Services (2018) **Better Suburbs Play Spaces Forum: Member Information Pack**, August. Retrieved from [https://s3.ap-southeast-](https://s3.ap-southeast-2.amazonaws.com/hdp.au.prod.app.act-yoursay.files/4215/3679/7160/Play_Spaces_Forum_Information_Pack.pdf)

[2.amazonaws.com/hdp.au.prod.app.act-yoursay.files/4215/3679/7160/Play\\_Spaces\\_Forum\\_Information\\_Pack.pdf](https://s3.ap-southeast-2.amazonaws.com/hdp.au.prod.app.act-yoursay.files/4215/3679/7160/Play_Spaces_Forum_Information_Pack.pdf)

Thompson, N. K. (2012) **PB - the Australian way**. Journal of Public Deliberation: Volume 8 : Issue 2 , Article 5. Retrieved from <https://www.publicdeliberation.net/jpd/vol8/iss2/art5/>

Williams, E, St. Denny, E. and Bristow, D. (2017) **PB: An Evidence** Review. Retrieved from

<https://www.oidp.net/docs/repo/doc215.pdf>

#changesCGG Community (2019) **#changesCGG Community**. Retrieved from

<https://www.cgg.wa.gov.au/your-council/having-your-say/changescgg-community.aspx>

## GLOSSARY OF TERMS

Unless specifically references these terms come from ACT Government, 2019a:

**Aggregative Approach** – participants vote for their preferred outcome (William et al., 2017)

**Citizens' Juries** – sometimes also referred to as 'Deliberative Citizens' Jury', a particular type of minipublic process, which generally involves a particular question or 'charge' and seek to arrive at a consensus position or recommendation.

**Community panel** – a diverse panel of stakeholders which represents the main interested and affected groups associated with an issue.

**Citizens panel** – a panel of randomly selected citizens filtered to reflect population diversity with respect to either demographics or views.

**Deliberation** – a process by which diverse people exchange perspectives and arguments in a spirit of openness and mutual respect, together seeking to understand and resolve particular problems or questions.

**Deliberative democracy** – a systematic approach that is concerned with improving collective decision making (by making it more deliberative and inclusive).

**Deliberative Engagement** – engagement activities involving knowledge sharing, reflection and consideration of reasons, and considered input to decisions and plans.

**Minipublic** – a deliberative forum involving a randomly selected group of citizens filtered to reflect a wider population and brought together to deliberate about a particular forum.

**PB (PB)** – has been used to describe a diverse range of activities, but there is a general consensus that it broadly refers to the process of involving citizens in decision making regarding the distribution of public funds. (William et al., 2017)