

## READINGS ON PARTICIPATORY BUDGET REVIEW AND ANALYSIS: AVAILABLE ONLINE

*(The following annotated readings are available online. The list is not comprehensive but only a sampling of what can be found in the web.)*

Throughout the readings, the following icons identify the different types of resources used:



Background Information explaining ideas, processes and terms used at each steps



Tools and Resources which provide a framework for applying the concepts



Real-life Examples in the form of case studies and comments from practitioners



Suggested Methodologies for undertaking the steps and guidance in applying participatory budget review and analysis tools



Templates that help capture the outputs of the different steps in participatory budget review and analysis. The templates can be merely suggestions that may be adapted according to the needs by adding or modifying individual element, or by simplifying them.



Shah, A. (2007). [Participatory Budgeting](http://siteresources.worldbank.org/PSGLP/Resources/ParticipatoryBudgeting.pdf) (Public Sector Governance). District of Columbia: The World Bank. Retrieved February 24, 2010, from The World Bank <http://siteresources.worldbank.org/PSGLP/Resources/ParticipatoryBudgeting.pdf>

This book presents an authoritative guide to the principles and practices of participatory budgeting (PB). PB represents a direct democracy approach to budgeting. The PB offers citizens at large an opportunity to learn about government operations and deliberate, debate and influence the allocation of public resources. It is a tool for citizens education, engagement and empowerment and strengthening demand for good governance. Enhanced transparency and accountability brought about by this tool can help reduce government inefficiency, waste and curb clientele-ism, patronage and corruption. PB also strengthens inclusive governance by giving the marginalized and excluded groups of the society to have their voices heard and influence public decision making vital to their interests. PB is noteworthy because if done right, it has the potential to make governments more responsive to citizens needs and preferences and accountable to them for performance in resource allocation and service delivery. In doing so, it can improve government performance and enhance the quality of democratic participation. This book provides a careful analysis of potentials and perils of participatory budgeting as observed from practices around the globe. The book is divided into three parts. Part I presents the nuts and bolts of participatory budgeting. This is followed in Part II by

regional surveys of experiences. Finally, Part III presents a review of PB practices in seven countries.



Weare, C. , Elliot, M. , Sithole, M. and Musso, J. , 2007-04-12 "[Implementing Participatory Budgeting: The Case of Neighborhood Councils in Los Angeles](#)" Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, Palmer House Hotel, Chicago, IL Online <PDF>. 2010-01-24 from [http://www.allacademic.com/meta/p198824\\_index.html](http://www.allacademic.com/meta/p198824_index.html)

This paper provides a process evaluation of the implementation of a participatory budgeting process for the neighborhood council system in Los Angeles. The paper reviews the literature on budgetary participation to consider the normative grounds for neighborhood council involvement in budgeting, and to identify design principles for such involvement. It then evaluates the extent to which the emergent process in Los Angeles appears to achieve the requisites of a representative, deliberative, and informed process. We find that the City's implementation of participatory budgeting has been largely tokenistic, and has been hampered by several implementation obstacles, most notably, poorly articulated goals, a hostile fiscal environment, and mayoral politics and organizational culture that have not supported participation in the budget process.



Leubolt, A. N. (2005, October). [Participatory Budgeting in Porto Alegre: Social Innovation and the Dialectical Relationship of State and Civil Society](#). Retrieved February 24, 2010, from Chinese Democratization.com: <http://www.chinesedemocratization.com/budget/ParBdginPortoAlegre.pdf>

The [lesson of Porto Alegre can be gleaned from the] significant transformation—from 'I' to 'we'—brought about by participating in discussions on the direct material needs of the participants within democratic decision making committees (Baiocchi, 2003). Overcoming a purely individualistic approach and assuming a community-based perspective form the core of civic consciousness. As popular education goes hand-in-hand with popular movements (Freire, 2003), Benevides (2001, p. 24) deems the participatory budget a "school of democracy".

The main difference between participatory democracy in Porto Alegre and participation as an increasingly used policy tool lies in the fact that in the latter all crucial policy issues remain out of reach for those invited to participate (Cooke and Kothari, 2001). . . The model of Porto Alegre differs from most of its counterparts in its political conception. In Europe, the main objective for implementation is the desire to increase economic efficiency, not to change political priorities and the correlation of power.

The experiment [in public sphere] proved successful in Porto Alegre, because these public spaces came alive within a network of organizations and social movements (Fedozzi, 2000a; Moll and Fischer, 2000; Solidariedade, 2003). Public spheres are simultaneously local

governmental spheres, for deliberative democracy does not develop beyond the state, but rather comes from within it. The resulting more universal citizenship (Dagnino, 2002) indicates the importance of republican values (Winckler, 2000). In the public sphere, personal interests confront the individual interests of others. Sometimes this results in a political exchange, while at other times it results in a collective learning process within which the dialogue of multiple personal interests and opinions crystallises into a common interest.

From a republican perspective, [participatory budgeting in Porto Alegre proved] . . . successful: it fostered a public space for deliberation and achieved advances in the diffusion of true citizenship and the delivery of social and political rights to all. From a Gramscian point of view, it seemed to have failed because it was not sufficiently radical: democratisation of the state was not systematically used as a step towards deepening social change. Therefore, dominant groups, historically hostile to popular participation and equal access for all, could challenge and finally defeat the counter-hegemonic strategy. The promising lesson from Brazil, however, is that attempts at social innovation, collective learning and empowerment have been regularly absorbed and defeated, but never silenced for long. New courageous actors will pick up the challenge.



Weiser, R. A. (2006). [Fostering Public Participation in Budget-making](http://www.adb.org/Documents/Books/Fostering-Public-Participation/default.asp). Retrieved February 24, 2010, from Asian Development Bank: <http://www.adb.org/Documents/Books/Fostering-Public-Participation/default.asp>

The experiences of the three countries in this pilot project highlight that the challenges to opening budget processes to public oversight are primarily political, not technical. In general, the willingness of the head of government to enable and consider public input into the budget process sets the tone for how successful activities will be. Resistance at the lower levels of the bureaucracy will only give way in the face of an overarching environment supportive of these efforts. Reform-minded individuals should be supported with technical assistance for their staff and should be engaged in disseminating their activities to other local governments. The active participation of heads of government in this pilot project demonstrates that there are counterparts who are eager to institute more consultative practices. Donors are encouraged to focus programming on these sites to develop viable models for consultation that can be used to persuade other local governments of the benefits of opening the budget process to the public.



Wampler, B. (2007, November). [Participatory Budgeting in Brazil: Contestation, Cooperation, and Accountability](#). Retrieved February 24, 2010, from Amazon.com: Hard-cover price: \$ 23.54

<http://www.amazon.com/Participatory-Budgeting-Brazil-Contestation-Accountability/dp/0271032529>

As Brazil and other countries in Latin America turned away from their authoritarian past and began the transition to democracy in the 1980s and 1990s, interest in developing new institutions to bring the benefits of democracy to the citizens in the lower socioeconomic strata intensified, and a number of experiments were undertaken. Perhaps the one receiving the most attention has been Participatory Budgeting (PB), first launched in the southern Brazilian city of Porto Alegre in 1989 by a coalition of civil society activists and Workers' Party officials. PB quickly spread to more than 250 other municipalities in the country, and it has since been adopted in more than twenty countries worldwide. Most of the scholarly literature has focused on the successful case of Porto Alegre and has neglected to analyze how it fared elsewhere.

In this first rigorous comparative study of the phenomenon, Brian Wampler draws evidence from eight municipalities in Brazil to show the varying degrees of success and failure PB has experienced. He identifies why some PB programs have done better than others in achieving the twin goals of ensuring governmental accountability and empowering citizenship rights for the poor residents of these cities in the quest for greater social justice and a well-functioning democracy. Conducting extensive interviews, applying a survey to 650 PB delegates, doing detailed analysis of budgets, and engaging in participant observation, Wampler finds that the three most important factors explaining the variation are the incentives for mayoral administrations to delegate authority, the way civil society organizations and citizens respond to the new institutions, and the particular rule structure that is used to delegate authority to citizens.



Fahey, R. (2009, August 23). [Talkin' bout a revolution](#). Retrieved February 24, 2010, from Rfahey.org: <http://www.rfahey.org/2009/08/23/increasing-engagement-through-e-participatory-budgeting/>

This blog is a comparison of three PB processes that use differing amounts of online engagement, in Toronto, Berlin, and Belo Horizonte. Interestingly, he suggests that a greater percentage of participants had low incomes in the face-to-face processes than in the e-PB process. One of the reasons PB has been so popular is because it tends to at least partly reverse the standard political bias towards the more affluent. Does e-PB take the social justice out of PB, or does the online participation just need to be designed better?



Unit, P. B. (2010, January 26). [What is participatory budgeting?](http://www.participatorybudgeting.org.uk/documents/What%20is%20PB%20leaflet%20website%20version%20FINAL.pdf) Retrieved February 24, 2010, from Participatorybudgeting.Org.UK:  
<http://www.participatorybudgeting.org.uk/documents/What%20is%20PB%20leaflet%20website%20version%20FINAL.pdf>

The short leaflet draws people into the world of PB and gives them a flavour of what it's about.

The leaflet covers: (a) A definition of PB; (b) Where it originated; (c) How it's developed in the UK; (d) The benefits of PB; (e) The different models of PB in the UK; (f) Three case studies; (g) Where to find out more information.



Unit, T. P. (2009, December). [Unpacking the Values, Principles and Standards](http://www.participatorybudgeting.org.uk/documents/PB%20document%20two%20colour_lores%20website%20version.pdf). Retrieved February 24, 2010, from Participatorybudgeting.Org.UK:  
[http://www.participatorybudgeting.org.uk/documents/PB%20document%20two%20colour\\_lores%20website%20version.pdf](http://www.participatorybudgeting.org.uk/documents/PB%20document%20two%20colour_lores%20website%20version.pdf)

The purpose of this document is to provide participatory budget (PB) projects with a way of identifying which values, principles and standards they have adopted in their process, and to what extent. It's not a requirement that PB processes adopt all values to their fullest extent. However, they are designed to help ensure projects get maximum benefit from a PB process. The values, principles and standards demonstrate good practice. The matrices in this document were developed to help projects identify direction of travel, but not to provide an overly prescriptive model.

We have provided a case study of a project which demonstrates good practice for each value, to provide a tangible example of how the values can be incorporated into a process.

The adoption of the values, principles and standards set PB within the community development and empowerment arena, helping to guard against people paying 'lip service' to PB to 'tick a box' without any real intention of empowering communities.



Baiocchi, G. (2006, March/April). [The Citizens of Porto Alegre](http://www.bostonreview.net/BR31.2/baiocchi.php). Retrieved February 24, 2010, from Boston Review: <http://www.bostonreview.net/BR31.2/baiocchi.php>

Given its accomplishments, it came as some surprise that the Workers' Party, after 16 years of uninterrupted rule, lost the municipal election in October of 2004 to a competing left-of-center party. Opposition politicians cheered that Porto Alegre "does not belong to one party." The reasons for the defeat were not straightforward. The opposition candidate ran a well-planned campaign that capitalized on anti-incumbent sentiments, calling on Porto Alegrenses to vote for "democratic alternation" (the tradition of parties alternating in power) and an end to "one-party rule." There were also lingering negative sentiments from the one term of state-level Workers' Party rule, not to mention the dissatisfaction with President Lula's national

administration. The opposition ran a campaign of “keeping what is good, improving the rest” that proved particularly effective with middle-class voters who were ideologically opposed to the Workers’ Party but who recognized its effective style of governance. Campaign materials promised “change in a safe way, the way we want. He [mayoral candidate José Fogaça] knows that some changes are necessary, but without destroying the good things the city has achieved in the last few years, such as the participatory budget, and the World Social Forum.”

Experience suggests that it would be difficult to entirely dismantle a successful participatory scheme even after the defeat of its sponsoring party. Parallel cases, as in Recife in the late 1980s, have ended in the eventual re-adoption of the scheme—if not the re-election of the party that promoted it—in response to the organized pressure of former participants. Had participatory budgeting been a different kind of institution, one without the democratic openness that makes it so vibrant, another party might never have been able to claim to be for the participatory budget and against the Workers’ Party.

In the end, whatever the future of participatory budgeting in Porto Alegre, its model of effective governance and vibrant civic life offers a striking contrast to newspaper headlines about corruption and civic disaffection. But if these two images seem at odds, it is only because of how we look at democracy. It is not simply that Brazilian democracy is in shambles and Porto Alegre is an island of civic-mindedness in a sea of apathy. Looking at citizen attitudes and behaviors in isolation from the state institutions and the politics behind them reveals little about democratic possibilities. The story of participatory budgeting is useful beyond the template it offers for other cities in Brazil and throughout the world. It also raises questions about the way we discuss declining civic engagement in the United States. Perhaps we should be asking not only about television-watching habits and other social behaviors but about the nature of our national and local governments. We should be asking how transparent, responsive, and accessible they are to the citizen.



Oliviera, N. (2008, December). [The Pedagogical Role of Participatory Budgeting: Lessons from Santo Andre, Brazil](http://www.mdpafrica.org.zw/journals/vol2-2/The%20Pedagogical%20Role%20of%20Participatory%20Budgeting.pdf). Retrieved February 24, 2010, from Municipal Development Partnership for Eastern & Southern Africa: <http://www.mdpafrica.org.zw/journals/vol2-2/The%20Pedagogical%20Role%20of%20Participatory%20Budgeting.pdf>

Santo Andre, a municipality in Brazil offers a clear lesson on how to participatory budgeting to all those who may wish to take the route of participatory budgeting. The author likens the process to a pedagogical step-by-step approach of doing participatory budgeting with clear mandates to achieve and clear paths and time bound to satisfy all to the benefit of the citizenry.



A, R. (n.d.). *Effective Participation: Community Engagements in Participatory Budgeting in Bangladesh*. Retrieved February 24, 2010, from Engaging Communities 2005.Org: <http://www.engagingcommunities2005.org/abstracts/Rahman-Atiur-final.pdf>

Bangladesh is a social laboratory where all kinds of developmental experimentation are going on mostly by the civil society and non-governmental organisations. In general, the scope of people's participation in local budgeting is indeed very narrow in Bangladesh. Participatory budgeting exercise in Bangladesh is still emerging mainly centering around a few Union Parishad (UP) and village levels. A few experimentations are going on both the government (e.g. Sirajganj Project, SDF's village-level planning), and non-government levels (e.g. the Hunger Project's open budget session, Agragati Sangstha's open budget hearing and multi-year planning for UPs, CARE Bangladesh's Capacity Build project). Effective participation does not just happen, it needs to be initiated. Both government and non-government organisations successfully initiated community participation in the UP budgeting in Bangladesh. From participatory planning to participatory monitoring of implementation this engagement has already demonstrated effectiveness and promising results in ensuring effective participation through community engagement in the local level budgeting. Quality of public expenditure and service delivery and women's empowerment both have been enhanced by dint of participatory budgeting exercises. These innovative exercises deserve to be studied more in depth to transform it into more matured models for subsequent replication. This is all the more needed if Bangladesh really wants to make a dent in its fight against poverty, particularly in the light of the roadmap set under PRSP.



Shapiro, R. C. (2000, October). *A Taste of Success*. Retrieved February 24, 2010, from The International Budget Project: <http://www.internationalbudget.org/resources/success.pdf>

This report is a compilation of examples of the budget work undertaken by nongovernmental organizations from around the world. Although many of these organizations are new to budget analysis, they have clearly tasted success with their work. The breadth and depth of such work is growing rapidly, and new and existing groups are anxious to learn about each others' activities.

Accordingly, the International Budget Project solicited these examples from various organizations, then tried to place them in a wider context. To give them some cohesion, the examples are divided into two general categories: organizational development and training, and analyzing and affecting budget policies. Most of these stories or mini-case studies are two to three pages in length, but there also are three more in-depth case studies.



Yves Sintomer, C. H. (2005). [From Porto Alegre to Europe: Potentials and Limitations of Participatory Budgeting](http://www.dpwg-lgd.org/cms/upload/pdf/participatory_budgeting.pdf). Retrieved February 24, 2010, from The Informal Development Partners Working Group on Local Governance and Decentralisation Portal - DPWG-LGD: [http://www.dpwg-lgd.org/cms/upload/pdf/participatory\\_budgeting.pdf](http://www.dpwg-lgd.org/cms/upload/pdf/participatory_budgeting.pdf)

In this article, we have demonstrated that the importation of Porto Alegre in Europe has been a highly differentiated process. In this continent, participatory budgeting does not rely on one procedure but rather on a multitude of devices. In a comparative research, it is therefore necessary to give a clear methodological definition of participatory budgeting and to construct ideal-types in order to present a global panorama of the variety of concrete experiments. The six models we proposed (Porto Alegre adapted in Europe, the representation of organized interests, community funds on the local and city level, the public/private negotiation table, the consultation on public finances and the proximity participation) show striking differences. At the same time, they probably delimitate a new space for politics and public policies, a space where participation becomes a new frame for action, but in which the question what this frame concretely means is highly debated. Participatory budgeting is only one participatory device among others, but it probably can be seen as one of the most innovative ones. Furthermore, it represents a good prism in order to better understand the different dynamics of democratic participation at the beginning of the new century.



Schneider, B. G. (2006). [Competitive Institution Building: The PT and Participatory Budgeting in Rio Grande Do Sul](http://www.jstor.org/stable/4490476?seq=1). Retrieved February 24, 2010, from JSTOR: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4490476?seq=1>

This article has argued that participatory budgeting is part of the Partido Trabalhadores' (PT's) strategy of institution building in a competitive partisan arena. In Porto Alegre, the creation of PB was partly a response to a social movement demands, but its design show clear traces of the partisan goals of weakening the legislature and winning new constituencies. In Rio Grande do Sul, the competitive nature of PB became more evident, stimulating direct confrontation between the PT executive and the opposition-dominated legislature. The absence of PB under the national PT government also suggests that partisan competition plays an important role. If PB were only about deepening democracy, energizing civil society, or expanding accountability, Brazil's new PT government would have implemented it by now. After all, a majority of PT governments at the municipal and state levels have tried it. Yet Lula's administration has managed to construct a tenuous majority in the national congress, and might see working with the congress as a better option that going around the legislature antagonizing it with PB. Whether this route or relying on traditional representative institutions actually results in the successful application of the PT's historically progressive policies remains to be seen.





Peixoto, T. (2008, September 25). [e-Participatory Budgeting: e-Democracy from Theory to Success?](http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1273554) Retrieved February 24, 2010, from Social Science Research Network:  
[http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\\_id=1273554](http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1273554)

This paper concerns the use of Information and Communication Technologies (ICTs) as a strategy for reinforcing democratic processes - broadly defined as "electronic democracy" practices - and focuses on the use of ICTs in participatory democracy initiatives. By considering the experience of the e-Participatory Budgeting in the city of Belo Horizonte (Brazil), the aim is to understand some of the possible prospects and limitations offered by ICTs in participatory processes at the local level.

Considering the fact that the e-Participatory Budgeting took place in a city with 1.7 million electors and attained a level of participation of nearly 10%, the e-Participatory Budgeting of Belo Horizonte is, by any standards, one of the most significant initiatives in the world in the domain of e-democracy to have been implemented so far.

Among other findings, this paper argues that even though the use of ICTs was essential to the success of the initiative, other factors were also crucial in accomplishing such a level of participation, notably: i) the scope of the public works at stake; ii) the salience of the initiative and iii) citizens' perception of their actual impact in the decision-making process.

It is expected that the outcomes of this incipient research will contribute to the literature on electronic and participatory democracy, as well as providing a policy evaluation of the use of ICTs at the local level in a large-scale participatory initiative.



Empowerment, C. f. (n.d.). [Participatory budgeting from Brazil to Britain: What can you learn from your local authority?](http://www.cfe.org.uk/uploaded/files/Participatory%20Budgeting.pdf) Retrieved February 24, 2010, from CfE:  
<http://www.cfe.org.uk/uploaded/files/Participatory%20Budgeting.pdf>

A very reader-friendly brochure on participatory budgeting and how it might be applied to Britain. It answers the following: (a) What is participatory budgeting; (b) Key features of the Porto Alegre model; (c) The UK experience; (d) Why implement participatory budgeting? And; (e) The challenges of implementing participatory budgeting.



USAID Local Governance Support Program, Indonesia. (2007, April 18). [Musrenbang Policy Brief](http://know.brr.go.id/dc/press_news_releases/20070418_Musrenbang_Key_Driver_Effective_Participatory_Budgeting.pdf). Retrieved February 25, 2010, from The BRR Knowledge Centre (KNOW): [http://know.brr.go.id/dc/press\\_news\\_releases/20070418\\_Musrenbang\\_Key\\_Driver\\_Effective\\_Participatory\\_Budgeting.pdf](http://know.brr.go.id/dc/press_news_releases/20070418_Musrenbang_Key_Driver_Effective_Participatory_Budgeting.pdf)

The principal instrument introduced by the Government of Indonesia for public consultation is the Musrenbang (Musyawarah Rencana Pembangunan) or Multi Stakeholder Consultation Forum for Development Planning. Despite the renewed commitment by central and regional governments since 1999, there is still insufficient clarity about the fundamental principles of public participation and the role, functions and powers of civil society organizations (community groups, non-governmental organizations and professional associations) in local planning and budgeting. In addition, few laws and regulations specify adequately the need for community participation in budgeting and public policy implementation. These ambiguities limit the effectiveness and influence of the Musrenbang and community involvement in planning. In practice, this means limited regional government transparency and accountability, as well as limited involvement of civil society organizations and DPRD's in policy research, formulation, debate and oversight. Analyses of policy impacts on the poor and women are also scarce, and civil society organizations often participate in an evaluation of budgets after only they are spent. Members of these groups still frequently have a limited understanding of the complex steps regional governments take to decide and allocate regional budgets.

Among the issues haunting public participation in planning and budgeting are the following:

- Uneven commitment from regional leadership.
- Limited legislative oversight of budget preparation and disbursement.
- Little real influence of Musrenbang process on resource allocations.
- Limited capacity of civil society organizations (CSOs) to understand the planning process and to push for greater transparency, change. And
- Magnitude and complexity of issues in local planning and budgeting.



Leduka, M. (2009, March). [Participatory Budgeting in the South African Local Government Context: The Case of Mantsopa Municipality, Free State Province](http://etd.sun.ac.za/bitstream/10019/2550/2/Leduka,%20M.pdf). Retrieved February 25, 2010, from Stellenbosch University: <http://etd.sun.ac.za/bitstream/10019/2550/2/Leduka,%20M.pdf>

This thesis made a comparison of participatory budgeting in Porto Alegre vis-à-vis Mantsopa Municipality of South Africa. The author found out that it is not sufficient to enshrine public participation in the Constitution. There need also be a complementary capacity building of citizens for them to participate effectively. In addition, participation should lead to learning and appreciation of the whole process of deliberation. Participation should not be done because of participation, it should serve a larger whole.



Stewart, J. (2009, March). *Dilemmas of Engagement: The Role of Consultation in Governance*. Retrieved February 25, 2010, from Electronic Press - Australia National University: [http://epress.anu.edu.au/anzsog/dilemmas/mobile\\_devices/index.html](http://epress.anu.edu.au/anzsog/dilemmas/mobile_devices/index.html)

This research monograph seeks to establish a case for proactive engagement (by public managers) of those ‘outside’ normal policy communities in Australian policy making. I argue that there are theoretical and practical reasons for a more adventurous approach. It is true that there are many potential pitfalls, for both consulters and the consulted, in extending public policy in this way. The research reported here discusses these and also suggests ways of avoiding them.

The discussion is developed along theoretical and practical lines. I have sought to bring out key themes from the large and sprawling academic literature that has grappled with the task of building conceptual tools to understand engagement. In addition, I convened a project of practical research—the ‘dilemmas project’—in order to add to the stock of relevant case studies.

This is, perhaps, the fundamental dilemma of engagement: that those seeking its benefits must be prepared to share some of their power with those outside the system. Deciding when, how or indeed whether to do this can be a tough call.

This monograph is not an engagement ‘manual’. It will not tell the manager what to do when. Rather, its objective is to provide ways of *thinking through engagement in practical contexts*. The first half of the monograph sets out what is known, in broad terms, about engagement. Rather than simply ‘rehearse’ the extant literature, I have presented it in relation to the ‘sticking points’, the dilemmas of engagement.

The discussion then moves on to theoretical questions. It is important to discuss the normative arguments about engagement—that is, should public managers do all they can to encourage engagement because it widens and deepens our democracy? I then consider practical arguments for and against engagement, before moving on to an overview of general trends in Australia and elsewhere. The empirical heart of the book examines engagement in many different sites and settings, drawing out the importance of context and highlighting (from a number of perspectives) the problematic aspects of the process. Finally, these problems are further analysed to bring out the fundamental dilemmas of engagement: dilemmas of risk, control and values.



Robinson, M. (2006, September). [Budget Analysis and Policy Advocacy: The Role of Nongovernmental Public Action](#). Retrieved February 25, 2010, from Institute of Development Studies:  
<http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu%2Fviewdoc%2Fdownload%3Fdoi%3D10.1.1.128.558%26rep%3Drep1%26type%3Dpdf>

This paper examines the impact and significance of independent budget analysis and advocacy initiatives that are designed to improve budget transparency and the poverty focus of government expenditure priorities. It draws on case study research of six budget groups in Brazil, Croatia, India, Mexico, South Africa, and Uganda, which include non-governmental organisations, research institutions and social movements. The findings demonstrate that civil society budget initiatives contribute to improvements in the transparency of budgetary decisions and the budget process, increased budget awareness and literacy, and deeper engagement in the budget process on the part of legislators, the media and civil society organisations. While the structure of the budget process makes substantial changes in expenditure priorities difficult to achieve, budget groups directly contribute to positive impacts on budget allocations and improved implementation, thereby increasing the accountability of decision-makers. Tracking of budgetary expenditures and impacts was also found to be effective in ensuring effective utilisation of education and health expenditures. Increased budget allocations and improved utilisation of public funds that benefit poor and disadvantaged groups can ensure greater equity in budget priorities and further social justice objectives. The activities of budget groups strengthen democracy by fostering accountability, enhancing transparency and deepening participation and voice.



Partnership, N. C. (n.d.). [Participatory Budgeting - A Toolkit for Norfolk](#). Retrieved February 25, 2010, from Norfolk Ambition.Gov.UK:  
<http://www.norfolkambition.gov.uk/consumption/groups/public/documents/article/ncc068887.pdf>

A step-by-step guide on how to do participatory budgeting for Norfolk, UK. The guide has been simplified from its original to suit the needs of Norfolk.



Leon, F. I. (2009, March). *Action Aid (AA) Guatemala and Participatory Budgeting: An Empowering Practice*. Retrieved February 25, 2010, from Action Aid:  
[http://www.actionaid.org/exchanges/issue\\_4/account\\_partnership.html](http://www.actionaid.org/exchanges/issue_4/account_partnership.html)

One of the challenges that AA Guatemala and partners have faced, every time Child Sponsorship has been introduced in the Development Areas (DA), is that communities see Child Sponsorship (CS) as a fundraising mechanism, but they feel that they cannot help to decide how the CS funds should be used. Individual families in the communities that are part of the DAs, particularly at the beginning of the work in a DA, always tell the partner how they want the funds to be used. However, experience has shown that, even in a DA that is fully operating, if there is no community participation in the budgeting, this will create suspicion about how the funds will be used in the project by the partners and AA. Although partners make sure that communities understand the CS steps, procedures and principles, and all AA partners in Guatemala ensure that there is time for discussion and consultation, AA Guatemala wanted to do more than discuss the content of project work. They introduced the idea of openly discussing the amount of funds provided by CS for a specific project in the community, and openly discussing the allocation of funds to the various activities that a project entails.