|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| *What?* | method/tool | participatory budgeting (PB) |
| *Where?* | name + administrative level (population) | City of Gdańsk (470,000) |
| *When?* | time/duration (cycle) | from November 2013- (annual cycle) |
| *Why?* | reasons/rationales for implementing (bottom-up or top-down initiative) | lobbying of local urban activists + the mayor’s openness for urban experimentation (top-down but inspired bottom-up after a pioneer edition in the neighbouring city of Sopot in 2011 and a pilot edition organised independently by one of the Gdańsk district councils in 2012; obligatory since 2018) |
| *What for?* | main objectives/tasks/ problems to be solved | local urban activists: increasing citizen control of budget spending at the city level; city authorities: manifestation of openness for citizen empowerment, city marketing |
| *Who?* | actors: organisers/ participants/observers etc. | o: City of Gdańsk  p: inhabitants of Gdańsk |
| *Key strengths?* | e.g., empowerment of marginalised groups, etc. | relatively high turnout (32,000-51,000 participants); community-building potential; effective means of social production of urban space; launched the Right to the City debate |
| *Key weaknesses?* | e.g., low participation, high exclusion, etc. | overrepresentation of participants with high social capital; individualisation of project proposals (private interests > community interests); insufficient public debate prior to voting; top-down design |
| *How it changed over time?* | direction of evolution/ institutional change | overall: from bottom-up local activism to full control of local authorities + partial capturing by the state (legislative regulation - see “Other comments”); small changes introduced yearly following top-down evaluations of each edition (with only elements of public participation) |
| *How successful?* | general assessment, scale: 1 (not successful) to 5 (highly successful) | 3  (the weaknesses offset the strengths) |
| *How relevant in relation to our project?* | general assessment, scale: 1 (not relevant) to 5 (highly relevant) | 5  (conclusions drawn from the critical assessment of this case study’s strengths and weaknesses may be highly informative for WP4 and WP5) |
| *Which step of the ladder?* | location within Arnstein’s model (see page 3) | 4-6 (changed over time) |
| *Other comments/ observations?* | anything really which you think may be of importance… | since 2011 PB has become a popular participatory tool in Poland, practiced in many variants and forms but not reaching above the 7th rung of Arnstein’s ladder; in 2018 some legislative changes were introduced at the state level defining PB as “a special form of social communication" and making it obligatory in larger cities; a bottom-up civic assembly was organised after the 1st PB in Gdańsk to evaluate it and provide recommendations for upcoming editions (no follow-up) |