COM'ON EUROPE

WHITE PAPER on PARTICIPATORY BUDGETING FOR YOUTH IN EUROPE

COM'ON EUROPE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

A. CONTEXT 4
WHAT IS THIS WHITE PAPER? 5
WHAT IS COM'ON EUROPE? 5
THE CONTEXT OF THE NETWORK OF EUROPEAN YOUTH CAPITALS. 6
Vision, philosophy. 6
Mission. 7
Objectives. 7

B. RATIONALE. 8
WHY IS THIS WHITE PAPER TAKING BIRTH? 9
The role of youth in urban development 9
The context of urban level thematic youth programmes: the case of the European Youth Capital title 9
The context of youth friendly cities in Europe 10
WHAT IS PARTICIPATORY BUDGETING? 11
General definition 11
History of participatory budgeting 12
WHAT ARE THE MAIN DIFFERENCES IN PARTICIPATORY BUDGETING (PB) IN GENERAL AND PARTICIPATORY BUDGETING FOR YOUTH (PBY)? 12

C. VISION AND VALUE PROPOSITION FOR EUROPE. 14
WHAT IS THE VALUE PROPOSITION OFFERED TO EUROPEAN CITIES? 15
WHAT IS THE VALUE PROPOSITION OFFERED TO THE EUROPEAN UNION AND EUROPE IN GENERAL? 15
WHAT IS THE VALUE PROPOSITION OFFERED TO MEMBER STATES OF THE EUROPEAN UNION, EEA AND PARTNER COUNTRIES?. 15
WHAT IS THE VALUE PROPOSITION OFFERED TO THE WORLD? 16

D. THE PRACTICE OF CREATING AND DEVELOPING PARTICIPATORY BUDGETING FOR YOUTH MECHANISMS 17
WHY ESPECIALLY LOCAL? 18
SYNCHRONISING PARTICIPATORY BUDGETING FOR YOUTH WITH EXISTING STRATEGIC FRAMEWORKS AND OTHER URBAN PROCESSES 18
WHEN SHOULD A PARTICIPATORY BUDGETING FOR YOUTH BE LAUNCHED? 19

WHO ARE THE LOCAL ACTORS OF A PARTICIPATORY BUDGETING PROCESS FOR YOUTH? WHAT ARE OTHER CORE ELEMENTS? . . 19
Three key actors: financial supporters, initiators and decision makers. . . . 19
Fourth key core element: the mechanism of the PBY itself 20
Financial sources of a participatory budgeting process for young people . . 20
Initiators and initiatives becoming part of a PBY process 20
The process' decision makers 21
Geographic area 22
Governing body 22
The Municipality 22
The youth NGO sector 23
Facilitators (or mentors) 23
Media and social media 23
Other catalysts in a PBY process 24
THE PROJECT CYCLE MANAGEMENT OF A PARTICIPATORY BUDGETING IN GENEGAL AND OF A PARTICIPATORY BUDGETING FOR YOUTH. 24
Preparatory measures: creating the framework 24
Implementing the PBY process: selecting initiatives 25
Monitoring the implementation of initiatives 26
Principle of equal access 26
Communication 27
Critical success factors of a PBY 27
HOW MUCH DOES A PARTICIPATORY BUDGETING FOR YOUTH COST? 29
Who can fund a participatory budgeting process for youth? 29
What is the ideal size of a PBY process? 29
What other financial management aspects should be considered? 29
Direct or indirect funding for initiatives? 30

E. WHAT IMPACT CAN PARTICIPATORY BUDGETING FOR YOUTH BRING FOR EUROPE? 31
IMPACT AT LOCAL LEVEL 32
IMPACT ON REGIONAL/NATIONAL LEVEL 34
IMPACT ON EUROPEAN LEVEL 35
IMPACT ON GLOBAL LEVEL 35

F. YOUR PLAN OF PARTICIPATORY BUDGETING FOR YOUTH IN YOUR CITY 37

COM'ON EUROPE

A. CONTEXT

WHAT IS THIS WHITE PAPER?

A white paper is an authoritative report or guide that informs readers concisely about a complex issue and presents the issuing body's philosophy on the matter. It is meant to help readers understand an issue, solve a problem, or make a decision.

The White Paper on Participatory Budgeting for Youth in Europe is a framework document created in the context of the initiative and strategic effort called COM'ON Europe – European Platform of Participatory Budgeting for Youth.

WHAT IS COM'ON EUROPE?

The **GOAL** of COM'ON Europe is to create an open source framework for European cities in implementing participatory budgeting processes, which target young people not just as creators and initiators but also as decision makers themselves. It also aims to create a platform for cooperation between cities which applied or are willing to apply similar processes in the near future. The project aims to reach these goals until June 2019.

The **GENERAL OBJECTIVE** of COM'ON Europe is to contribute to the improvement of civic participation of young people in local life through local level participatory budgeting mechanisms. The project will contribute to the increase of young people's spirit of creativity, associativity, entrepreneurship, and community development by providing a safe environment for planning and coming forward as informal groups with small-scale initiatives, while providing funding on behalf of the municipalities or other donors and sources of funding, and delegating decisions towards the local community about initiatives which should to be supported through this process.

Specific objectives are:

- 01: to create a clear general policy framework in order to increase civic participation of young people through dedicated participatory budgeting processes for youth in urban communities based on theory and practice which connects European policies with local level practical implementation, while also bringing up local experience to the European playfield (LOCAL-EUROPEAN),
- 02: to provide participatory urban environments for young people and for public authorities based on trust, assistance and easy access and with the active contribution of the civil society (DECISION, VOTE), and to reach out to young people and to enable their creativity in the service of the urban quality of life of cities (IDEA, INITIATIVE),
- 03: to enable other cities in adopting similar participatory processes and consolidating the cooperation of European cities (and especially cities involved in the Network of European Youth Capitals) regarding youth participation through the creation of the European Platform of Participatory Budgeting for Youth (consisting first of the European

Centre for Youth Participation, the European Youth Participatory Registry and an open source methodology and toolkit (NETWORK, FRAMEWORK).

COM'ON Europe connects two specific aspects: youth participation and participatory budgeting, and this way it becomes original, unique. The reason for this is that it keeps the principle of participatory budgeting (deciding on public money's faith) but it provides a double-sided platform through the engagement with organised and also unorganised young people willing to organise themselves but not through legally established organisations. This enables untapped energies of young people brought to surface in shaping community life in cities.

All partners are representing European Youth Capital title-bearer cities like Torino 2010, Braga 2012, Maribor 2013, Thessaloniki 2014, Cluj-Napoca 2015, Varna 2017 and Cascais 2018. These are all currently active cities in the Network of European Youth Capitals, all of them coming from member states of the European Union.

COM'ON Europe will create a general theory framework enhanced by practical examples of seven European cities regarding participatory budgeting for youth, comprising of the following:

- **Methodology:** White Paper on Participatory Budgeting for Youth;
- **Toolkit** for youth participation and public decision making in participatory budgeting processes for youth;
- **Pool of Facilitators,** with specific competences and skills in engaging young people at grassroots level;
- **Local Action Plans** for youth participatory budgeting processes in partner cities during 2019;
- **European Platform of Participatory Budgeting for Youth,** through the framework for the creation of the European Centre for Youth Participation, and the European Youth Participatory Registry.

THE CONTEXT OF THE NETWORK OF EUROPEAN YOUTH CAPITALS

VISION, PHILOSOPHY

The Network of European Youth Capitals' vision is one Europe with cities and metropolitan areas committed to youth and actively involving youth policies in local and regional development, participatory processes and decision making,

The Network's vision considers youth participation, equal opportunities for youth and sustainability of youth structures as driving forces of medium and long term urban development, with a key contribution to the quality of life of all inhabitants of cities and the surrounding regions.

The Network's vision takes into consideration youth policies and strategies of the European Union, the Council of Europe and the United Nations, and aims implementing them effectively at local level.

MISSION

The mission of the Network of European Youth Capitals is to develop a cooperative and sustainable network of European cities which were designated as European Youth Capitals by the European Youth Forum, building solidarity among members and partners and encouraging European cities to align to the vision of this network.

OBJECTIVES

Objectives of the Network are:

- to enable project based interaction with a special emphasis on youth and develop platforms between member cities and partners based on solidarity in the cooperation process;
- to set sustainable and demonstrative standards, frameworks and good practices in policies regarding local level youth participation and active citizenship;
- to empower European cities and their surrounding regions in considering youth participation, equal opportunities for youth and sustainable development of youth structures as strategic priorities for their medium and long-term development in the process of achieving better quality of life;
- to contribute to the European and global level recognition of the European Youth Capital title as a tool for local level implementation of European policies, for strengthening interactions between European institutions and local bodies and as a role model for the further development of youth policies in other European municipalities.

COM'ON EUROPE

B. RATIONALE

WHY IS THIS WHITE PAPER TAKING BIRTH?

The White Paper on Participatory Budgeting for Youth in Europe takes birth in the context of several factors which underline its relevance in our current times, such as the role of youth in urban development, the context of urban level thematic youth programmes and the concept of youth friendly cities in Europe.

THE ROLE OF YOUTH IN URBAN DEVELOPMENT

European cities face constant challenges regarding their future and the dynamics witnessed among their citizens. Recently, compared to economic development, citizens value more the quality of life in cities which includes more factors then just material well-being. Topics such as smart cities, green cities, pollution, feeling of security, regional and global outreach complete the general sense of having a high quality of life for a city's inhabitants. Being a special age category, youth act differently, engage with the city differently, and their needs are shaping in a constantly differentiated way than of other age or social categories.

Furthermore, this age category is the fastest adopter of new technologies. Hence, youth and digitalisation become more and more connected, and most of the technology innovations are validated by this generation first. Not the least, if we add the aspect of social innovation, we can conclude that any improvement in these kind of processes, technological or not can bring a broad impact at the level of a whole urban social ecosystem.

All of this generates impact on all aspects of urban life and development. Youth's needs and proposed solutions shall be not reflected only in dedicated youth strategies or chapters on youth in general plans. Rather, they should be an overarching horizontal aspect of any future development. Furthermore, forming and shaping a city's long-term vision about herself can be addressed only in the wake of the future generations as they will be the nucleus of this vision taking shape in practice in the following 20-30 years. Else, it will not be a realistic vision.

THE CONTEXT OF URBAN LEVEL THEMATIC YOUTH PROGRAMMES: THE CASE OF THE EUROPEAN YOUTH CAPITAL TITLE

While living their renaissance, the different kind of European capital titles provide cities with a basic need: the certification of efforts in one specific area

of activity with a general impact on urban level. Besides the most recognised title of the European Capital of Culture, other titles such as the European Capital of Sport, the European City of Sport, the European Green Capital or other titles addressing innovation, SMEs etc. emerged especially in the 21st century in order to stimulate cities to have a special focus with European added value on a certain area.

This is also the case with the European Youth Capital title. Emerged in 2009, just 10 years before the birth of this white paper, this title provided a wide range of annual thematic youth programmes in various parts of Europe addressing a wide range of topics but which are all connected to youth in a way. While focusing in general on some recurring aspects such as youth participation, co-management involving the public and youth sectors likewise, or providing an international brand for cities, these programmes were also very specific for each of the cities which earned this title. This variety also emerged because of the different and sometimes very particular challenges cities of Europe are facing depending of a large variety of factors.

Cities which are part of the project called COM'ON Europe - European Platform of Participatory Budgeting for Youth are all European Youth Capital title holders and decided that, although being in different situations, some aspects of their effort shall be standardized and enhanced through a joint framework, methodology and a set of tools for implementation.

THE CONTEXT OF YOUTH FRIENDLY CITIES IN EUROPE

Not the least, there is a specific aspect of the European Youth Capital title that creates a notable differentiation compared to other titles as it is the only title which addresses a generation rather than a specific domain. Hence, this title and cities developing annual thematic programmes under this framework maybe also address a more abstract question: the long-term vision of the hosting cities. It starts from the premises that today's youth will be a city's future leaders, decision makers, investors, business managers, NGO activists and youth workers. In general, today's youth will provide for societies of the future.

Putting this into perspective, the question is not just about the recognition of cities as being youthful for one year, but also the long run effort to transform urban environments into one being capable to provide for young people especially when they are deciding to settle for a longer term. Hence, this is also about how a city is becoming youth friendly and what the conditions are for this to happen. A strategic effort launched by Fundação Bracara Augusta from Braga, 2012's European Youth Capital city in which 6 other European cities were also partners, resulted in the creation of the quality label called 100% Youth City. This is one of a possible set of complementary tools for cities to invest in and work on creating youth friendly environments.

However, interaction and participatory processes also need to be put in place in order to achieve a high-level sense of ownership of the city and its neighbourhoods by its citizens. Also, from this point of view, young people act and socialize differently as older generations do. Hence, solutions for creating this sense of ownership also need to vary.

On this matter, participatory budgeting processes for youth in a city can become another useful tool. The reason for initiating COM'ON Europe and creating this white paper is exactly the aim to extend the range of tools and methods through which a city can connect to young people and can involve them in co-creating one city's future.

WHAT IS PARTICIPATORY BUDGETING?

GENERAL DEFINITION

Participatory budgeting (PB) is a process of democratic deliberation and decision-making, and a type of participatory democracy, in which ordinary people decide how to allocate part of a municipal or public budget. Participatory budgeting allows citizens to identify, discuss, and prioritize public spending projects, and gives them the power to make real decisions about how money is spent.

PB processes are typically designed to involve those left out of traditional methods of public engagement, such as low-income residents, non-citizens, and youth. A comprehensive case study of eight municipalities in Brazil analysing the successes and failures of participatory budgeting has suggested that it often results in more equitable public spending, greater government transparency and accountability, increased levels of public participation (especially by marginalized or poorer residents), and democratic and citizenship learning.

Participatory budgeting (PB) generally involves several basic steps:

- community leaders identify investing and spending priorities and select budget delegates (initiators, forms of initiatives and decision makers);
- budget delegates develop specific spending proposals (initiatives), with help from experts;
- community members vote on which proposals to support and fund;
- the city, another governing body of initiators themselves implement voted proposals;
- the city or another donor institutions supports implementation in practice.

COM'ON EUROPE

HISTORY OF PARTICIPATORY BUDGETING

"From its inception in Brazil in the late 1980s, Participatory Budgeting has now been instituted in over 1500 cities worldwide. We rely on science studies for a fundamental insight: it is not enough to simply speak of "diffusion" while forgetting the way that the circulation and translation of an idea fundamentally transform it (Latour 1987). In this case, the travel itself has made PB into an attractive and politically malleable device by reducing and simplifying it to a set of procedures for the democratization of demand-making. The relationship of those procedures to the administrative machinery is ambiguous, but fundamentally important for the eventual impact of Participatory Budgeting in any one context".[1]

WHAT ARE THE MAIN DIFFERENCES IN PARTICIPATORY BUDGETING (PB) IN GENERAL AND PARTICIPATORY BUDGETING FOR YOUTH (PBY)?

It is probably the most pertinent question. Possible main differences between a general participatory budgeting process (PB) and a participatory budgeting process for young people (PBY) can be summarised as follows:

- In a PBY, initiatives are implemented by the ones who proposed them. No matter if initiatives are proposed by an individual, an informal or formal group of young people or a youth organisation, if voted and selected or funding, the initiative will be implemented by the same person or group of individuals, while the PBY mechanism itself might provide assistance in implementation and promotion.
- In a PBY, initiatives are proposed by a special category of young people (like young people defined by age, or by another specific component such as attending a certain type of school or being part or another specific social category except being young.
- A PBY process has usually a much smaller allocation and does not concern investments in public infrastructure, especially because the value of a single initiative out of the pool of initiatives presented,

1 Ganuza, Ernesto and Baiocchi, Gianpaolo (2012) „The Power of Ambiguity: How Participatory Budgeting Travels the Globe," Journal of Public Deliberation: Vol. 8 : Iss. 2 , Article 8. Available at: https://www.publicdeliberation.net/jpd/vol8/iss2/art8

selected and voted is small at the level of only hundreds or thousands of euro (or a comparable amount in a local currency).
- Decision makers themselves can optionally come from only a special age category, such as young people, or a special category among young people. This depends on the architecture.

However, it is important to remark that not necessarily all these aspects are present as differentiation in a city where there is a general PB and a PBY process, too. It is up to the designed governing bodies of both processes to make inhabitants aware about the concept, architecture and the process of a PBY.

Especially because of the lower amount of financial allocation and the lower level of public visibility of results, a PBY process gets most probably less public attention than a general PB process, however, its impact on grassroots level might provide additional and stronger short and especially long-term changes in the local urban society.

COM'ON EUROPE

C. VISION AND VALUE PROPOSITION FOR EUROPE

WHAT IS THE VALUE PROPOSITION OFFERED TO EUROPEAN CITIES?

The value proposition offered to European cities is a policy framework enhanced by guidelines and tools, a platform of support, a pool of facilitators, a pool of implemented and enhanced practical examples and a resource centre accessible in the effort of creating democratic processes aiming the active participation of young people in every aspect of urban life.

The value proposition offered to European cities is a way to be constantly connected to young generations while being aware of their needs and wants and their contribution to improving their own and their co-citizens' quality of life.

The value proposition offered to European cities is a framework for social innovation through which the mindset of organisations, public institutions and companies leans towards creating an ecosystem which enables and encourages, assists and guides young people to fulfil and realise themselves and while letting them figure out their own path by themselves.

WHAT IS THE VALUE PROPOSITION OFFERED TO THE EUROPEAN UNION AND EUROPE IN GENERAL?

The value proposition offered to the European Union is a framework supporting the active participation of young people on grassroots level in improving the quality of life in cities and metropolitan areas, which also stands at the basis of a realistic vision on the future of Europe and its cities with young people acting as a constituting part and a proactive agent while having a high-level sense of ownership of the process.

WHAT IS THE VALUE PROPOSITION OFFERED TO MEMBER STATES OF THE EUROPEAN UNION, EEA AND PARTNER COUNTRIES?

The value proposition offered to the European Union's and European Economic Area's member states and Partner Countries of the EU is a practical example which can put at the basis of national level policies and programmes

encouraging participatory democracy and empowerment of young people on grassroots-level.

The value proposition offered to EU, EEA and Partner Countries is a way to engage with young citizens within their urban environments in a proactive, empowering way, making them more responsible, entrepreneurial and active citizens with a high-level interest also towards issues concerning their country of provenience and/or residence.

The value proposition for EU, EEA and Partner Countries is a reliable and real-time tool to be aware of the needs and wants of young people which can form the basis for any policy decision, strategy or action plan that impacts young people directly.

WHAT IS THE VALUE PROPOSITION OFFERED TO THE WORLD?

The value proposition to the world is a leading continental effort in addressing and changing the mindset and the attitude towards young people in trusting them as a generation being able to be a constituting part in forming a sustainable vision of the future for their environment and for the world.

The value proposition to the world is an enhanced and consolidated but still bottom-up approach starting from grassroots level in urban environments which brings social innovation regarding the mindset of urban youth communities on globally challenging issues such as sustainability and responsibility in humanity's attitude, behavior and action, today and in the future.

COM'ON EUROPE

D. THE PRACTICE OF CREATING AND DEVELOPING PARTICIPATORY BUDGETING FOR YOUTH MECHANISMS

Either in the case of an already existing participatory budgeting for youth (PBY) process in a city or a local community where PBY is just about to be established, there are a set of aspects which shall be considered before the planning process of the creation and/or development. Actors, aspects of the project cycle management and the timing of this participatory process shall be all considered.

WHY ESPECIALLY LOCAL?

Although Portugal is the first country in the world which developed a participatory budgeting process on national level starting from 2017, one can say that PB in general takes birth and develops as a process at local and mostly urban level. Based on the principle of subsidiarity (an organizing principle that matters ought to be handled by the smallest, lowest or least centralized competent authority), decisions about local public funds shall be made by the most relevant actors of this decision. While for most of local public funds decisions are taken by the elected local governing body (the decision-making branch of a municipality), whose legitimacy stems from the decision of inhabitants expressed during local elections, for a part of funds decision might be delegated directly to the source of legitimacy, or citizens themselves.

SYNCHRONISING PARTICIPATORY BUDGETING FOR YOUTH WITH EXISTING STRATEGIC FRAMEWORKS AND OTHER URBAN PROCESSES

A participatory budgeting process should not exist without being put into a broader context. Urban level general or youth-specific strategies provide a good framework for the priorities that a PBY process should also follow. This is true not just for certain investments in infrastructure, but also for broader societal objectives and priorities. Regional, national and European priorities and strategic documents should also be taken into consideration but without being the defining aspect. Complementary with local priorities should rather be envisaged.

A special relation and interaction of a PBY with a general PB process should always be considered, where both exist. As explained before, a PBY process has certain significant differences compared to a general PB. The existence of both in the same urban environment can provide a high-level additionality in the interaction of decision makers with the public. Furthermore, a PBY process is able to produce results when more general, traditional ways of interaction, like public consultations, structured dialogue processes do not work. If conceived properly, a PBY has the capacity to

bring to surface human potential lying within young people while in the same time other tools do not.

There are situations where a general PB process wasn't able to create the level of involvement among young people as the level witnessed with other age categories. In situations like this, a complementary PBY process can stimulate young people's participation on matters concerning them directly, but it can also raise their interest towards other urban problems addressed through a general PB.

WHEN SHOULD A PARTICIPATORY BUDGETING FOR YOUTH BE LAUNCHED?

A broader analysis regarding the opportunity for a process to be launched shall precede any decision on having a PBY. This analysis shall consider aspects like the geographical area and specific categories of young people one should consider. If this analysis provides answers regarding the possibility to increase youth empowerment and participation and there is need and willingness for young people to be involved in community actions, then one shall consider launching a PBY initiative. Launching a PBY should not depend on a city's current state of development or decline. A PBY can produce positive impact anytime given that it can tackle current challenges of the urban environment while also taking into account regional, national, European or even global factors.

WHO ARE THE LOCAL ACTORS OF A PARTICIPATORY BUDGETING PROCESS FOR YOUTH? WHAT ARE OTHER CORE ELEMENTS?

A participatory budgeting process for youth involves a wide range of actors with a relevant contribution. Some of the actors are critical for the very existence of the process, while other actors bring complementarity and further added value for its results and impact.

THREE KEY ACTORS: FINANCIAL SUPPORTERS, INITIATORS AND DECISION MAKERS

For a participatory budgeting process to happen, there is a need for three key aspects to exist and deliver for such a process.

First, as we are addressing the topic of budgeting, there is a need for a financial supporter providing this budget. Second, there is a need of a pool of initiators,

which can consist of individuals, groups or organisations who come forward with ideas and plans in a given format and context. Third, there is a need for a decision-making body which provide a wide access to all the people of the city or to some special categories, as defined by the PBY's rules of procedure. The non-existence of any of these three components makes impossible for a participatory budgeting process to happen.

FOURTH KEY CORE ELEMENT: THE MECHANISM OF THE PBY ITSELF

All three basic components need to be connected through the mechanism of a dedicated participatory budgeting process for young people. This mechanism takes the form of a basic rules of procedure completed by other documents, guidelines, technical platforms, a management and communication process and a pool of human resources accessible in assisting individuals and groups of people in taking part in the process. This mechanism considers public decisions regarding the creation and development of PB, widely accepted principles regarding PB in Europe and in the world and other local policies and strategies which have an impact on youth affairs at local level. This mechanism shall be also the result of a wider consultation with relevant stakeholders to be accepted and promoted as such.

FINANCIAL SOURCES OF A PARTICIPATORY BUDGETING PROCESS FOR YOUNG PEOPLE

Participatory budgeting does not always mean that public funds provide financial support for it. It is also possible for a group of private donors or a wider range of individual donors to provide funding for such a process. Not the least, there is also a possibility for a combined effort of public, private and community donors. In majority of cases, funding for a PB or PBY process is provided by a municipality from local public funds based on a legally based local decision, an annual budget or a special financial allocation for a governing body which is different than the municipality itself.

INITIATORS AND INITIATIVES BECOMING PART OF A PBY PROCESS

Defining potential initiators and initiatives is paramount for any PBY process. Defining these two aspects will have the most important impact on urban activization in the full process.

When deciding on this aspect, a governing body of a PBY shall consider what kind of problem and impact shall the process achieve. If the aim is to enhance individual youth participation and entrepreneurship, then the initiator shall be a private person. However, if a PBY considers improving associativity or passive socializing being transformed into an active participation, then the most suitable form of an initiator can be a group of young people, formal or informal. Furthermore, a PBY can also help increasing associativity through connecting young individuals with ideas

with other individuals who would like to join in, creating informal groups thanks to the process itself. There is also the option to involve existing groups, like school classes or officially constituted youth NGOs. Any option taken, it is vital that the definition if the initiator is very clear in the rules of procedure of the PBY in order to avoid any doubt and any eligibility misunderstandings in the process.

Defining the type of the initiative is also paramount. Some key aspects shall be considered by any governing body charged with the implementation of the PBY. Types of initiatives define how the governing body or the donors imagine the impact of initiatives supported by the process on the targeted community. The geographical area for implementation is another aspect to be considered. Not the least, the financial allocation for one certain initiative will also define the complexity or simplicity of initiatives which will be supported during the process. For example, if a process defines the upper limit of resources allocated to a project at 1,000 euro, one will receive small scale initiatives, while if the financial ceiling is 10,000 euro, more complex initiatives will emerge. Furthermore, the same ceiling will also define the need for a capacity of an individual or group initiator to implement its own proposal.

THE PROCESS' DECISION MAKERS

With all PB processes, the key questions which emerge are about who exactly is taking the decision about the proposed ideas or initiatives. That is also the case with a PBY process. There are several options to be considered. There are models where decisions are only taken by young people in the city, as defined by a specific age category, their current activity (attending school or university), or a geographic area of a city. Another PBY model also considers decision-making on behalf of all citizens.

Participation below the age of 18 is also to be considered. First, there are several countries where voting at the age of 16 is already a fact. The European Youth Forum is also promoting voting from the age of 16. However, an even younger level participation might be also considered in a PBY process, if one takes in account that social media networks allow young people to register and be active online starting from the age of 13. Whatever the decision, this should be considered in the context of the objectives and priorities pursued by each specific PBY.

Another aspect to be decided is how decision makers express their decisions. Traditional way of balloting is also an option, but one should consider especially in the case of young voters that their social interaction is also happening online, with a quickly growing impact. Hence, any kind of online solution might produce higher-percentage participation than traditional methods. Of course, if the initiatives and the voters come from a very specific age group, social situation (like for example a PBY done in schools), then voting might be considered in the framework of school activities.

GEOGRAPHIC AREA

Not the least, for any PBY to happen there is a specific need for a geographic demarcation zone in which the process happens. The most common area is one defined by a city's boundaries. However, a metropolitan area or a specific neighbourhood of a city can also be considered, depending on city priorities and specific needs in certain areas of a city. When defining the geographic area, one should take into consideration the principle of subsidiarity, or the lowest level on which a decision should be taken.

GOVERNING BODY

Any PBY shall have a nominated governing body. However, there is a variety of options for who this body should be. The first and obvious option is for the donor itself to be also the governing body for the process. However, there are situations where the donor(s) consider(s) that they are not the most suitable organisation to implement such a process either because a lack of time or because a lack of know-how in participatory budgeting. In other cases, the initiative to establish a PBY process comes from an organisation or institution which doesn't have the necessary financial resources to be the donor by itself. Hence, it reaches out to donors (like for example a municipality) to support this mechanism and provide funding for this.

Whatever the situation, a governing body enhanced by an executive team should be nominated for the full project cycle of a PBY. This body will have the role to create the full framework of the PBY, starting from the rules of procedure and then continued by the full technical management, communication, awareness raising and subcontracting of any special service or product needed for implementation, including cooperation agreements with initiators which are selected through public voting to implement their initiatives. The governing body is responsible for implementation and will report to various stakeholders about the result of the process. The governing body can be formed by a single organisation or by a council, board formed by representatives of several organisations. However, one legal entity should provide the executive work for the process.

THE MUNICIPALITY

The municipality of the city can fulfil a wide range of roles in a PBY. However, it is a fact that it is one of the most important stakeholder in such a process. The municipality can be the sole donor as it is proven by already existing good practices in Europe (including in several cities participating in the COM'ON Europe strategic project). Furthermore, in several cases, the municipality is the governing body for the process providing the role of the regulator and the technical manager for the full project cycle. But even in the case of external funding and management, a municipality's involvement is vital for providing awareness at urban level. Finally, for any PBY, the municipality is one of the key indirect beneficiaries, as the process provides a wide range of positive impact in the city, which can be scaled and multiplied in the whole urban environment.

THE YOUTH NGO SECTOR

No matter of its format regarding its details, a PBY shall cooperate actively with the local youth sector as it is one of the most important catalysts towards young people. Furthermore, a PBY can enforce youth organisations in the effort to attract and involve young people in their activities. Youth organisations shall be involved in all stages of the project cycle of such a process, their role in a governing body can be also of a high added value.

However, it is important to be aware that youth organisations are not the only tool for reaching young people. European cities already face the fact that young people do not engage in social interaction through usual, traditional channels. Other catalysts need to be embraced.

FACILITATORS (OR MENTORS)

Every social interaction is a person-to-person relation after all. As one of the key factors of success with a PBY is trust, a pool of facilitators can bring significant improvement for this participatory process. But what is a pool of facilitators (or mentors)? It is basically a group of people (preferably young people and youth workers) who already have or learn abilities for direct interaction with individuals or groups of young people. Their role in the process is to provide easy-to-understand information about PBY, about the possibility for young people to have access to this process. A facilitator will also have a vital role in assisting and helping initiators to work on an initial idea and transform it into a specific proposal for an initiative according to the requirements in the rules of procedure. A facilitator can also help and teach young people about how to use various communication channels to promote their own ideas, including social media. Not the least, a facilitator's role is important in assisting an initiator in the implementation of the proposed and accepted initiative. The facilitator is like a mentor, he/she is holding the hand of any initiator who needs and asks for help. The pool of facilitators (or mentors) provides one of the critical tools for attracting and engaging young people in the PBY.

MEDIA AND SOCIAL MEDIA

Statistics underline the fact that young people barely consume traditional media. However, the role of mass-media at local level shouldn't be undervalued. Local media actors have a vital role in providing awareness for the PBY among all age and social categories of the city. Especially in the case of a format where all citizens vote for the initiative, traditional media promotion provides the premises in providing legitimacy through the wide participation of all social categories in decision-making. A side-effect of active media involvement is also an increased awareness among journalists about the positive impact of participatory democracy for a city.

Social media should be considered in this perspective from the point of view of key people and trendsetters who have a massive number of followers. Popular social media groups shall also be considered.

COM'ON EUROPE

OTHER CATALYSTS IN A PBY PROCESS

Although not mentioned directly until now, a city's ecosystem hosts a range of other actors which can also have a role in a PBY. Schools and universities, private companies and networks of such entities, local public institutions with attributions impacting young people, cultural spaces and centres, and senior NGOs with relevant work in the field of youth can all add to a successful PBY. It is up to a governing body to identify the best partners for a specific PBY depending on the various characteristics presented in this white paper.

THE PROJECT CYCLE MANAGEMENT OF A PARTICIPATORY BUDGETING IN GENEGAL AND OF A PARTICIPATORY BUDGETING FOR YOUTH

PREPARATORY MEASURES: CREATING THE FRAMEWORK

The rules of procedure for any participatory budgeting is the most essential document laying down the whole framework of the mechanism from the very first moment of its announcement and until the final moments of implementation and reporting. The rules describe all the steps in implementing the whole process, and gets into details on several technical aspects during the whole project cycle,

The rules of procedure shall not be the only official document for the creation and implementation of the PBY. Whoever the source of funding for the process, there shall be an official decision establishing the PBY in a city. In the case of a municipality, a decision regarding a financial allocation or a decision on the intent to organise a PBY process shall be put in place before the process itself is launched in the public.

The rules of procedure define the process, but there shall be a wide range of tools supporting implementation, which are created in the planning phase. Different forms and guidelines, explanatory materials, a unique brand and visual identity all serve the purpose of an easily identifiable and accessible participatory budgeting process. Not the least, if an online format is pursued in any of the phases of a PBY, the technical platform supporting these stages should be created and tested in due time.

The creation of a rules of procedure shall be preceded by a more detailed analysis about the opportunity of implementing this process in the right moment and in the right time. This analysis will also provide relevant arguments for a rationale which explains why the PBY is taking birth or is continued and developed based on past experiences and results.

IMPLEMENTING THE PBY PROCESS: SELECTING INITIATIVES

Empowering initiators, generating initiatives and enabling the community to decide on the available budget in a participatory way provide together the most important aspect of any participatory budgeting. The most important steps of implementation are the following:

- **INFORMING TARGET GROUPS:** the first stage of the PBY process is about letting target groups know about the idea of this participatory process, about its stages and any other aspects of concern for envisaged young people. Informing shall be conducted on a broad scale using every possible communication channel. It is important to underline however that mass-media and social media tools shall be enhanced by peer-to-peer informing efforts, too. Presence in schools, direct interaction with young people in their usual environments is paramount in raising awareness about the process. A concentrated effort of all stakeholders involved in the planning stage is also of a high added value in transforming key aspects into viral messages.
- **CONSULTING TARGET GROUPS:** as a consequence of information efforts towards target groups, a consultation period provides the possibility for direct interaction about needs and about how these needs can be answered by young people directly through various initiatives, events, services or urban space reconfiguration. This stage is also vital for creating a proper mindset for the later stages in the process where these theoretical proposals can be transformed into an active engagement of young people. Consultation can be put in practice using a variety of tools, techniques, offline and online formats. The role of facilitators (or mentors) becomes increasingly more important during this stage.
- **INVOLVING INITIATORS:** this stage takes efforts further by enabling initiators (as defined by the rules of procedure) to become active and to propose initiatives. It is a kind of official registration of the initiators, offline or online. This stage is also about transforming a passive interest towards the PBY into an active involvement where discussions and theory debates can be transformed into specific proposals. This stage also means a kind of transformation of an engagement into a responsibility, as young people in their quality of initiators also assume that they are willing to implement whatever they propose, if the public will consider their initiatives as good opportunities for the envisaged geographical area (city, neighbourhood, school, etc.).
- **COLLABORATING IN PROVIDING THE BEST INITIATIVES:** this step focuses on creating additionality and a general open approach towards all initiatives. The process can facilitate the connection between various initiatives and groups of initiators in finding common ground and providing better solutions to the identified needs of the young people or the whole community. This stage can provide even better embedded initiatives in society which will also lead to a wider acknowledgment by the public. Connected initiatives

also increase their chances for being voted by the public in the empowerment stage.

- **EMPOWERING PEOPLE:** this final stage is about putting the final decision in the hands of the public. It is the stage where the preference of the public as a decision-maker (as defined by the rules of procedure) is expressed towards the initiatives proposed by young people. No matter of the adopted format, the public shall have a broad access to information regarding the ways they can express their vote and the initiatives they can decide on. Usually with participatory budgeting, the decision-making process takes place during a longer period of even two-three weeks or a month.

These steps are not necessarily following each-other in a sequential order. However, it is important to have a clear calendar on all the steps of the process as part of a broad information campaign. Also, a governing body can design this process allocating different time periods and putting differentiated focus on each of the stages. Some of the PBY processes do not necessarily take target groups through all the steps. Not the least, regarding communication, target groups do not have to be aware about all these stages, these steps being more like an internal conceptualisation of the process.

MONITORING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF INITIATIVES

Although officially a PBY process ends with the fifth, empowerment stage when people decide on initiatives directly, from a project management point of view implementation doesn't stop. A governing body shall invest further resources in monitoring and assisting initiatives which were selected for implementation by voters. This stage is also a good tool for non-formal learning by young people involved in the implementation of their initiatives. A proper monitoring and assistance raises the quality of initiatives, it provides a practical experience regarding the management and communication of an initiative, event and it builds the self-confidence of young people and their recognition in society. The roles of facilitators (mentors) is also vital in this stage as they provide any necessary senior support for initiators. One positive side-effect of this process is also that every condition is provided for a governing body to do a proper reporting towards donors and the wider public. Furthermore, this aspect provides very good chances for a long-term sustainability of a PBY from the point of view of legitimacy and high-level acceptance also in the context of the final results and impact produced by initiatives.

PRINCIPLE OF EQUAL ACCESS

Past experiences show that one of the main problems of participatory budgeting for youth is the lack of equal access to the process. At a first glance, it might seem that participatory democracy is about widened accessibility for people, but if one takes a closer look, one will realise that those who have access anyway will also be more tempted to participate in this kind of

process, while disadvantaged young people will witness more disadvantage. Hence, when creating the architecture of a PBY, the governing body shall consider exceptional measures enabling the participation for disadvantaged young individuals or groups. Specific measures can be proposed in all stages. However, the most important aspect of access is for disadvantaged young people as initiators. This means a special focus during the first stages of a PBY, such as informing, consulting and involving these categories. Special measures in the voting stage can be also put in place, like a separate financial allocation for initiatives coming from disadvantaged groups of young people. This way one can guarantee that no matter of the outcome of a voting, initiatives coming from these special groups will also have the chance to be funded and implemented.

COMMUNICATION

A PBY process shall be considered as a full-scale programme with multiple layers of activity packages and with a easily identifiable visual identity or brand. Importance in the communication process shall be given for the process as whole, but also for individual activities and stages. A special focus shall be put on an easy-to-understand language as communication targets especially young people as initiators in a specific geographic area and a public engaged in decision-making. Although the rules of procedure provide the main regulatory document of a PBY, this needs to be translated into campaigns delivering simple messages and explanatory guidelines on how one can have access to its different stages. A high-quality, preferably youthful visual identity helps creating a positive attitude of young people, but also of other generations and categories towards young people. Additional corporate PR and communication can be enabled and enforced especially through institutional networks providing more detailed information about the different, more complex layers of the process.

CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTORS OF A PBY

There are some critical aspects without which a participatory budgeting process for young people will not succeed in the city, such as:

- **BUILDING TRUST:** a PBY is mostly about building trust towards an innovative process which aims to introduce additional participatory forms of interaction between members of a community. Higher trust of society towards its institutions and individuals provides more good faith towards new initiatives and proposals for improvements in all sectors. Ultimately, this trust enables a proper atmosphere towards social innovation coming from the bottom towards the top, but also stemming from the top to the bottom. However, without trust, a PBY will fail and might segregate the community further, and will mean more distrust especially towards young people's ability to generate a positive change in society.
- **CREATING OWNERSHIP:** there is no successful PBY without the sense of ownership on multiple levels. A PBY becomes an active and

accepted process when young people feel that whatever they created and implemented is also their own, while also being of an added value for the micro-community they targeted and the urban ecosystem itself. Young people will get further motivation if they are allowed and helped in fulfilling their ideas and plans. Furthermore, a sense of ownership is also created at the level of the public if they witness their choice and decision being respected and considered through this kind of participatory process.

- **ENGAGING DIFFERENT ACTORS FROM SOCIETY:** it is very important to underline that a PBY is not just about young people, although it addresses their needs and wants. A PBY is much more, it connects different generations, it is interdisciplinary, it is cross-sectorial, it connects people who usually do not interact actively. PBY is a kind of form to increase the flow of blood within the city, a way to increase participation and a way to add to the entrepreneurial, active attitude of the whole urban society through its individuals and organisations. However, not being able to involve different sectors will mean that the PBY does not have the expected impact and outreach towards the whole community of the envisaged geographic area.
- **BUILDING LEGITIMACY THROUGH MASS PRESENCE OF THE PUBLIC:** any decision-making process becomes accepted by a community if it stems from a legitimacy which is also accepted. In the case of a PBY, legitimacy can be provided by the high number of voters, of people who get involved in different stages. This number proves that the decision represents the will of a high proportion of the target group, as defined by the rules of procedure, and that, especially in the case of a municipality, the donor is complying with the decision, it is in fact accepting the will of the people. Lack of legitimacy will lead however to a general distrust in participatory processes which can also result in a disconnection of citizens from topics of common interest for a whole or a part of an urban area.
- **MONITORING AND COMMUNICATION OF RESULTS AFTER INITIATIVES SUPPORTED THROUGH THE PROCESS GO TRHOUGH IMPLEMENTATION:** while the most important part of a PBY is the decision-making about financial allocations, it is important to highlight how this decision is put in practice. In this case, it is paramount to inform people involved in the final decision about how their choice materialised through the implemented initiatives. This effort of a governing body will provide long-term acceptance for a PBY in the case it is repeated several times or it is extended on several social or age categories, neighbourhoods, or from a city to a metropolitan area. A proper dissemination provides additional positive effects, like the broad acceptance of the PBY by donors, or other key actors. It also creates the premises for a larger involvement of young people, public and private partners in future editions of the process. A lack of accessible results created by supported initiatives might create the sense of usefulness regarding a participatory budgeting process.

HOW MUCH DOES A PARTICIPATORY BUDGETING FOR YOUTH COST?

WHO CAN FUND A PARTICIPATORY BUDGETING PROCESS FOR YOUTH?

It is a misperception that a participatory budgeting process can only provide a decision-making process regarding public, and especially local funds. As its name suggests, the essence of participatory budgeting is that a there is a certain kind of budgeting done in a participatory way. Any public institution (local, regional, national, European) and private company of group of private companies can decide to empower a certain public to decide on a financial allocation in a participatory form. Furthermore, there is also the possibility for a community of individuals to create a pool of financial resources on whose faith they themselves do not decide, instead involving a wider group of individuals in decision-making. The only important aspect is that whoever funds a PBY, it does not take the decision itself on what is supported from that fund and what is not.

WHAT IS THE IDEAL SIZE OF A PBY PROCESS?

There is no ideal size. A governing body should always consider the following questions: how many initiatives should get support? How large initiatives should one consider? The final question can be best answered by an upper ceiling for an initiative's estimated budget.

Another approach is of course feasible from the perspective of an already allocated budget. In this case, one needs to consider the total budget compared to a minimal number of supported initiatives but also the extra costs for managing the whole process (see below). All these aspects will also define the upper financial ceiling for an initiative.

With PBY processes done for several years repeatedly, a governing body may already know the exact dynamics of the process at local level, and it can provide adjustments compared to past editions based its own past experiences.

WHAT OTHER FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT ASPECTS SHOULD BE CONSIDERED?

The total budget of a PBY process is always more than the amount of funding reaching initiatives proposed by young people directly. To achieve the critical success factors of a participatory budgeting, its governing body needs to assure a proper management, monitoring and awareness through communication regarding the process among all key actors. Hence, when planning the management of such a process, one shall consider aspects of technical and human resources needed for implementing a full project cycle.

Without assuming to present a complete list of the occurring type of costs, the following aspects should be considered when providing the budget for a PBY:

- general HR costs with managing the process of a PBY, including reporting towards donors (public, private donors or community of support);
- general HR costs with information, awareness raising, and the facilitation of individuals or groups of young people in proposing ideas;
- general HR and technical costs with monitoring the selected initiatives and assisting individuals and groups of young people during implementation;
- general costs with the communication and dissemination of a full PBY project cycle;
- technical costs for the coordination of the process (providing information and optionally managing the whole proposing and decision-making process online);
- technical costs for managing the support in the implementation process of supported initiatives.

DIRECT OR INDIRECT FUNDING FOR INITIATIVES?

This topic can also be addressed through different approaches. The core question is to decide if there is any direct financial transaction for implementing the initiatives, or there isn't one.

If there is, one needs to consider the legal background of how an initiator (individual or group) can receive funding from the funding source of the PBY. Again, there are two options. First, if a legal body (NGO, school) takes responsibility of providing the legal background for an initiative, funding can be received by this entity directly. However, if an informal group shall be the beneficiary of a funding, a representative of the group (in fact one of the members of the group) shall take responsibility for receiving the funds, under certain conditions which can be defined in a funding or awarding contract.

There is of course the second option, when there is no direct financial transaction between a governing body and a beneficiary or initiator. In this case, it is very important to define how an initiator can define and present the needs for implementing a proposed initiative and how the exact needs for resources are quantified and budgeted. If this option is pursued, a centralised acquisition of goods and services can be provided by the governing body or by the donor, while initiators receive the purchased goods and services in-kind.

In any case, it is important that a governing body of a PBY presents the exact form and method of support at the very beginning of the process (when launching a call for initiatives).

COM'ON EUROPE

E. WHAT IMPACT CAN PARTICIPATORY BUDGETING FOR YOUTH BRING FOR EUROPE?

Putting into the context of value propositions expressed by this white paper, participatory budgeting for youth is capable to create impact not just on local, but on regional, national, European and global level, too.

IMPACT AT LOCAL LEVEL

There is a wide range of arguments for creating and implementing PB processes. But there is also a strong case for dedicated PB processes for young people, or PBYs. There is a wide range of possible impacts within a city, such as:

- **Happier, stronger communities:** as underlined in aspects regarding the context of the creation of this white paper, the role of youth in urban development is to be measured not just through economic aspects but in a more general sense, through the quality of life of its inhabitants. A PBY process can contribute to the general positive perception about the city and its community by the fact that ideas and proposals of young people are heard and furthermore, the best ideas in the opinion of the public as the main decision maker of the process, are to be implemented by young people themselves.
- **More empowered & self-reliant youth communities:** this effect can lead not just to a stronger youth NGO sector, but also to a higher number of young people being active in their community and a higher level of involvement of the young individual. Associativity can also increase by providing an easy-to-access mechanism through which groups of young people can fulfil their will of doing something in their own micro-communities. Not the least, PBY can also have an impact on the entrepreneurial attitude of young people which can impact their openness towards self-employment and positive attitude towards creating an own business.
- **Increased mutual trust & appreciation between young citizens & local government:** as already proved by several examples within European Youth Capital programmes or complementary initiatives, any kind of successful participatory project provides a significant improvement in the interaction and cooperation of young people and their organisations and public authorities. It builds trust which has a positive impact on future initiatives proposed by young people but also on collaborative approaches in setting visions, strategies and action plans with impact on young people.
- **Increased mutual trust & appreciation between young citizens & other citizens:** an essential result can be felt on how other generations consider the contribution of young people to society. As young people are the most dynamic gamechangers in a city, an approval of their impact is vital for keeping an urban society united. As in most of the cases these relations are about conservation against progress, keeping things the same against innovating, a PBY process helps finding the proper balance in defining the best suitable approach which is acceptable for all generations of the urban community. This

leads to mutual trust and cooperation in improving the quality of life of citizens.

- **Shared vision & shared responsibility:** also, as a consequence of mutual trust built through this process, better conditions also come on surface in creating common understanding about how different generations and social categories see the future of their city and what are the common points on which all of them can agree on. These common aspects can be laid down and included in future strategies and action plans by the municipality.
- **Increased social cohesion & inclusiveness among young people:** a PBY mechanism provides real solutions for young people in socializing not just with the "usual suspects" from their environment, like the close circle of friends, classmates or acquaintances on social media, but also with other groups of young people with whom they usually do not intersect and interact. This can provide a less atomised youth society in a city.
- **Developed skills & knowledge for active citizenship and an entrepreneurial attitude:** taking part in a participatory budgeting process for young people as an initiator provides a lasting experience regarding how to think on solutions for one's social environment and how to transform an idea into a plan. This also enables young people think on why is the idea good and who is the idea good for, while during the idea's implementation, if selected young people access a relevant experience in how to put ideas into practice, including management and communication skills, a critical thinking regarding the success (or failure) of the idea. Being part of this kind of process creates the conditions for a more active civic engagement but also for an enhanced entrepreneurial behaviour, by having the initiative, doing things of an added value in economy and society and thinking actively on how to improve the economic and social environment.
- **Sense of pride & accomplishment:** being part of a participatory budgeting as an initiator, being voted and approved by society and then being able to implement one's proposed initiative contributes to the inner sense of accomplishment enhanced by the feeling of pride.
- **Participatory governance, participatory democracy:** a PBY extends and consolidates the role of participatory democracy as a complementary tool to representative democracy at urban level. Participatory democracy provides a tool of real-time and fast engagement with citizens and extends the spectrum of citizen involvement in decision making. As a result, representative democracy is also empowered from the point of view of the fact that citizens realise that not all decisions about the city can be taken through participatory methods, but it is important for them to be involved in decision making while electing local representatives. On the other hand, participatory democracy makes political parties and elected representatives more responsible regarding their decision-making and makes them more accountable by the public.

- **More accountable & transparent decision-making:** a PBY process itself provides an increased attention of citizens towards other decisions made by local decision makers. However, this also benefits decision makers themselves who have the possibility to reach the public also outside of election campaigns and in the case of a PBY to engage with young people especially.
- **More deliberative culture and sense of partnership and ownership among young people:** a proper solution for the active involvement of young people in discussing and taking common decisions is through a high-level sense of ownership. A PBY process enables this sense, as what young people propose is their own and they can feel that, while being their own, also adds to the life of the community. This way, "mine" becomes "ours" without losing any of these two components. Furthermore, through the connection between groups of young people in merging some of their initiatives, the culture of cooperation and partnership and a stronger sense of providing common solutions is also provided. Through deliberation, a stronger community ownership becomes a reality.
- **Sustainable decisions & policies, better awareness and approval of public policy decisions among young people:** successfully implemented PBY processes create the premises for a higher-level interest of young people towards other decisions and public policies concerning themselves or even other relevant topics for the city. It enables a wider interest towards public policies and topics while it also empowers young people to take part in other decision-making processes, like general PB and local, regional, national and European elections.
- **Collaborative community development:** while not having this effect immediately, the representative community development can be enhanced by a collaborative component, through which parts of public decisions concerning the city are delegated towards the public, towards citizens. If young people feel that they are part of this process, they will have a further incentive to stay and to contribute to the development of their own city while feeling they can stay home and that the city is also taking care of them.

IMPACT ON REGIONAL/NATIONAL LEVEL

Participatory budgeting for youth implemented locally can produce impact also on regional and national level. On regional level, it generates more cohesion in planning and deploying regional development strategies, especially concerning the field of urban regeneration and the quality of life of citizens. Furthermore, PBYs can address specific metropolitan area issues also where the cooperation of the main city and its neighbourhood settlements can address specific aspects such as the mobility of young people and their access to public services. A PBY provides a very good map of needs which might be solved more efficiently at a metropolitan or regional level.

A PBY's impact on national level can be established especially through its influence on national policies. As youth is a national competence in the European Union, most relevant policies can be drawn at this level. Impact between the local and the national can be based on reciprocity, the local experience providing insight and raw data about the active participation of young people, while the national policy level providing frameworks, guidelines and tools for creating, developing and consolidating such processes in even more urban settlements.

IMPACT ON EUROPEAN LEVEL

A multitude of participatory budgeting processes for young people in European cities will help enforcing participatory democracy as a complementary tool in engaging young people actively at continental level, in convincing them that they can have a real voice regarding the future of Europe and that they can do this in an active way. But PBY might produce something more, especially in the mindset of others than young people. Trust in young people's capability to form, innovate and change society will be enhanced significantly. Ultimately, this can lead to a change of approach regarding the fear that the future generation is not able to take matters on their own hands, and that older generations need to take care of this.

Within the European Union, a wide range of participatory budgeting processes for young people will provide extensive data and feedback about young people's current perception about their environment their needs and commitments towards improving the quality of life in European cities. As a compact unit, the European Union can be a global leader in reacting, adapting, improving and innovating policies based on these needs and wants, not just in the youth field, but in all areas as they all constitute the future of the continent.

IMPACT ON GLOBAL LEVEL

Participatory budgeting for youth implemented in all parts of the world will contribute to a more organic co-existence of young people and their cities. PBY creates channels through which there is a real-time access to the constantly changing needs of young people. A PBY identifies two vital aspects regarding young people: their needs and their wants. The first aspect has a very positive impact on defining strategies and action plans not just on local, but also on global level as one can observe specific but also general aspects of these needs on a comparative basis. However, the second aspect provides a realistic insight on how young generations can be an active part in social innovation processes worldwide. It is about how the global society views young people and how young people views society as a whole.

Not the least, the global impact of extended PBY processes will have a positive impact on forming the vision for our common future. There are two options:

either the older generations will try to define this vision for future generations (but they will miss the ones, young people, who will be the main beneficiaries of this vision), or they change their attitude by involving young generations from the very beginning. The first option might be easier, but less sustainable. The second could contribute for a more organic vision of the future based on commonly agreed principles. The global PBY story can be about how the global society puts emphasis on trying to think with the young person's mind and heart and on serving the young person. And there is one more aspect which adds value to this process: it identifies needs and wants at grassroots level, it connects them, at correlates them first at regional and then at national, continental level leading to a global view starting from the very local approach.

COM'ON EUROPE

F. YOUR PLAN OF PARTICIPATORY BUDGETING FOR YOUTH IN YOUR CITY

COM'ON EUROPE

FURTHER NOTES

FURTHER NOTES

COM'ON EUROPE

FURTHER NOTES

FURTHER NOTES

COM'ON EUROPE

FURTHER NOTES

FURTHER NOTES

COM'ON EUROPE

FURTHER NOTES

FURTHER NOTES

COM'ON EUROPE

FURTHER NOTES

Created in the framework of the project entitled COM'ON Europe, European Platform of Participatory Budgeting for Youth with the support of the Erasmus+ Programme, Key Action 2, Strategic Partnerships for Youth.

Created in the framework of the Network of European Youth Capitals.

Consortium leader:
Grupul PONT (PONT Group), Cluj-Napoca, Romania

Partners:
Citta di Torino, Italy
Fundação Bracara Augusta, Braga, Portugal
Mladinski kulturni center, Maribor, Slovenia
UNESCO Youth Club Thessaloniki, Thessaloniki, Greece
Association "Varna European Youth Capital", Varna, Bulgaria
Camara Municipal de Cascais, Cascais, Portugal

Contributors:
András Farkas, Andrei Popescu, André Dantas, Babis Papaioannou, Carlos Santos, Claudia Fernando, Mauro Capella, Miguel Narciso, Mircho Hristov, Nina Roškar, Oana Almășan, Örs Szokolay, Réka Kisgyörgy, Sergey Petrov and Željko Milovanovič

Co-funded by the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union

The European Commission support for the production of this publication does not constitute an endorsement of the contents which reflects the views only of the authors, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.