

A Report on
PLANNING IN THE LOCAL LEVEL OF NEPAL

Submitted by:

G. P. Aryal

TU MPA 2nd year Exam Roll No. (Private)

TU Registration No.....

E-mail ID :@gmail.com

Phone No.....

Rural Development (LGD-641)

Submitted to:

Tribhuvan University

Faculty of Management

Central Department of Public Administration

Balkhu, Kathmandu

**THIS REPORT IS SUBMITTED FOR PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF MASTER OF
PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION DEGREE**

5 March, 2020

Table of Contents

	Page No.
Acknowledgements	I
CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION	
1.1 Background	3
1.2 Problem of the Study	3
1.3 Objectives	4
1.4 Significance of the Study	4
1.5 Structure of the Report	5
1.6 Limitation of the Study	6
CHAPTER II: LITERATURE REVIEW	
2.1 Concept of the Participatory Planning	7
2.2 Design Variables	8
CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY	
3.1 Research Design	11
3.2 Sources of Data	11
3.3 Sample Size	12
3.4 Data Collection Procedure	12
3.5 Data Presentation and Analysis	13
CHAPTER IV: DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS	
4.1 Degree of the Impact of Different Variables	15
4.2 Preferences to the Participatory Planning Models	18
CHAPTER V: CONCLUSION	
5.1 Conclusion	19
ANNEXES	
BIBLIOGRAPHY	

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

Public participation in local level planning is a process of ensuring citizens' participation in local level planning process – the allocation of financial resources – is sometimes called a democratic innovation stemming from the South. It had been introduced in Brazil's local authorities in 1989 and has now spread all over the world (Sintomeret *al.* 2010a). Presumably, it has become obvious that representative democracy does not fully satisfy citizens despite its worldwide success. It could be the reason behind the worldwide spread of the participatory local level planning. Political dissatisfaction, political distrust, citizens' apathy are the few phrases that could explain today's political characteristic of the democracy. In spite of these deficiencies, public participation in the decision making has become one of the important topics in the political sphere. In the witness of this, open government partnership (Open government Partnership 2015) has affirmed civic participation in public affairs to be one of the building blocks of its program. Participation, however, has its critics as well. Someone can find skepticism focusing on the lack of citizens' awareness in public affairs, lack of the public knowledge about decision making on critical socio-economic and political decisions.

1.2 Problem of the Study

Although there is a variety of literatures' describing the application of the participatory planning at local level and its different variations, there is a clear lack of systematic approach to describing the applicability of different models of participatory

planning at local level in different contexts. Hence, this paper attempts to fill this gap by answering the question what are the responsible factors for a particular model of participatory planning to be applicable in a given context. This paper will attempt to answer following questions:

- (a) What are the factors that determine the applicability of a particular model of participatory planning at local level?

1.3 Objectives of the Study

Main purpose of the research can be outline in following way:

- (a) To find out the variables which determine applicability of a particular model of participatory planning at local level?

1.4 Significance of the Study

For the reason that Nepal has faced many political changes in the recent decades, absence of representativeness at local authorities has become a major problem for more than 15 years. Civil officials are acting as the representatives of the citizens. Due to the limitation of given authorities, civil officials can't make any decisions beyond the legal circumstances. In other word, civil service can't make a large change with their chain of authorities and bureaucratic culture. If there is absence of any representative, the system should ensure the representation of the public demands or expectation within the budget and planning. But, Nepal has very limited experience of participatory planning mechanism. To enrich such managerial and political experiences, it is clear that Nepal

has to introduce such participatory mechanisms or system within the local bodies in order to ensure public participation in budgeting and planning.

This paper will attempt to give list of variables which are mainly responsible to determine the applicability of a particular model or scheme of public participation in public affair. It will find out the linkage between the variables and effective implementation of the participatory planning at local level.

1.5 Structure of the Study

This report is divided into five chapters as follows:

Chapter first: introduction deals with background, statement of the problem, objectives of the study, significance of the study, limitation of the study and the organization of the study.

Chapter second: review of literature deals with concept of the participatory budgeting, identifying process design variables and identifying environmental variables.

Chapter third: methodology deals with research design, sources of data, sample size, data collection procedures and data presentation and analysis.

Chapter four: data presentation and analysis deals with the design variables, and preferences and applicability of the participatory budgeting models.

Chapter five: conclusion presents a brief conclusion of the study based on the findings of the study.

1.6 Limitations of the Study

This research is conducted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Masters of Public Administration. In that sense, this research will be completed under some limitations. Because of the time factors and financial limitation, this study will take some secondary data from published documents and official records. Only one local government unit of Nepal will be selected for case study in order to test the relevance of local-level variables on the preference of participatory planning. While selecting the local government, this research will use non-random, purposeful sampling which is supposed to enable researcher to select information-rich case. In other word, the research combines maximum variation sampling with criterion and theory-based sampling i.e. stratified purposeful sampling. In order to test public preferences, a survey among 10 participants will be conducted.

CHAPTER II

LITERATUREREVIEW

2.1 Concept of the Participatory Planning

Participatory planning at local level is about to participate the ordinary citizens in making decisions about making development plan and budget allocations. The point of reference is Porto Alegre that has become “the symbol of a possible alternative way to govern a place” (Allegretti, Herzberg 2004, 6). The number of participatory planning models in Europe has reached the landmark of 200 by 2009 and the corresponding number of worldwide initiatives has exceeded 1000 cases (Sintomeret *al.* 2010a). Furthermore, the number of cities planning to adopt participatory instruments has been increasing. There is no universal definition of participatory local level planning as its models and practices vary all over the world and depend on local contexts and conditions (Matovu 2007). The differences in participatory local level planning practices range from the form of citizen participation in the budget allocation procedure to the control once the project has been approved (Sintomeret *al.* 2005; Cabannes 2004, 28). Sintomeret *al.* give a broad definition of Participatory budgeting (here, the term ‘participatory budgeting’ is taken as an interchangeable term for ‘participatory planning’): “participatory budgeting allows the participation of non-elected citizens in the conception and/or allocation of public finances” (Sintomeret *al.* 2005). Additionally, they propose five criteria for successful implementation of participatory local level planning: (1) the financial dimension has to be discussed, (2) the city level has to be involved, (3) the process has to

be repeated, (4) there has to be some form of public deliberation, and (5) some accountability is required.

Someone can raise a question how participatory planning at local level mechanism differs from traditional government-citizens interactions. The participatory planning is ascribed to the reforms in the budgeting mechanism so that is called “empowered deliberative democracy” or EDD. These reforms are fundamentally democratic in their “reliance on the participation [...] of ordinary people”, deliberative because they promote “reason-based” decision-making and empowered as they try to “tie action to discussion” (Fung, Wright 2003, 7). While discussing on participatory democracy and governance there is very much similar opinion in the statement that participatory planning could be found helpful for fighting against such problems like political apathy, distrust, dissatisfaction, etc. Furthermore, in terms of modernization of public service, the participatory planning could be a capable mechanism for enhancing transparency and accountability. It charges citizens with new responsibilities of “co-producers” of public services and in general “co-deciders” in political/administrative decisions which in turn fits with the “post-post-NPM” rhetoric called New-Weberian-State (Pollitt, Bouckaert 2004; Herzberg 2011).

2.2. Design Variables

As Max Weber argued in his famous work “Economy and Society” in order to give meaning to any phenomenon it is necessary to “formulate pure ideal types of the corresponding forms of action” (Weber 1978, 19-20). Sintomer, Herzberg, Röcke and Allegretti (2005, 2010a, 2010b) have been attempted this. The scholars have distinguished the participatory planning models between 6 models of European

participatory planning experiences. However, this study analyzes about only five variables that are common in all participatory local level planning models. Therefore, the sample of 5 variables fully covers the variety of participatory local level planning experiences. To show the linkage of the variables, the paper at hand discusses the following models: Porto Alegre adapted for Europe, proximity participation, consultation on public finance, community participatory planning at local level and multi-stakeholder participation. The description of the models will be based on the literature by Sintomer *et al.* (2005, 2010a, 2010b) but adjusted to the framework of process design variables. The other reason for such a compressed presentation is a purely practical one – the limited space of this paper. Porto Alegre adapted for Europe model can be considered the “genuine” type of participatory planning as it has preserved the basic features of the Brazilian case, where this participatory process has its roots. The other models are grouped on the basis of two features: proximity participation and consultation on public finance are purely of **consultative** nature (rather than implying binding constraints on the elected representatives), while multi-stakeholder and community PARTICIPATORY PLANNING are oriented towards **organized** citizens only (rather than individual citizens). Here all models of participatory planning are presented only for analyzing the variation of public choices in our context.

This type of participation can be considered as participatory local level planning only in case the larger part of financial resources comes from the local VDC.

Table 1: Participatory Budgeting Models

Variables	Adaptation of Porto Alegre	Proximity Participation	Consultation on Public Finance	Community Participatory Planning	Multi-Stakeholder Participatory Planning
	Council	Local	Local	A committee	A committee

Decision making body	composed of elected delegates	administration	administration	composed of representative of LG, NGOs, state organizations	composed of representative of LG, NGOs, state organizations and private sectors
Participation	Participants selection methods				
	Self selection	Self selection	Random selection	Targeted selection	Target selection
	Scope of Participation				
	Single active citizens	Single active citizens	“ordinary” citizens	Organized citizens	Organized citizens together with private enterprises
	Participation mechanisms				
	Open meetings at settlement level, delegates at VDC level	Open meeting at settlement and VDC level	Open meeting or citizens’ forum at VDC level	Different types of meetings at settlement level and delegates at VDC level	Closed meeting at VDC level
Deliberation	Focus of decision				
	Public investment	Micro-local public investment or board guidelines of VDC’s policy	Overall budget or offer of services	Concrete community projects	Concrete projects financed public-private partnership
	Methods of communication				
	Develop preferences	Listen as spectators, express preferences	Listen as spectators, express preferences	Express, develop preferences	Express, develop preferences
	Formality of the process				
	Projects ranked according to criteria of distributive justice, formalized rules	No ranking of investment or actions, informal rules	No ranking of services, possible ranking of priorities, rather informal rules	Projects ranked, formal rules	Projects ranked, formal rules
Empowerment	Decision-making power	Consultation	Consultation	Co-governing partnership	Co-governing partnership
Control and monitoring	Council composed of citizens’ elected delegates	Local administration	Local administration	Local administration and donors	Local administration and donors

Source :Sintomer et al. (2010b);Modified on the basis of Cabannes (2004),Fung (2010), Franklin (2006).

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research Design

This research combines both quantitative and qualitative methods in order to examine the implications of national- level and local level variables in to the model of participatory budgeting. The research entails three different methods i.e. theory-building, case study and a survey. It was proceed in two phases - firstly, discussion of the conceptual framework and its variables and secondly, an empirical test of public opinion about the impact of different variables of participatory budgeting through examination of existing statistical data and empirical findings regarding the preferences of the citizens. For this purpose, a local government unit (VDC) of Nepal was selected for the case study in order to test the relevance of the variables. Local body was selected by non-random purposeful sampling. Such sampling enables to select information-rich case for illumination of issues of central importance.

3.2 Sources of Data

This research relies on the different sources of data. The preferred sources are broadly categorized as below:

- (a) **Primary Sources:** Primary data were collected through semi-structured interview with the responsible officials or the chief of the local body of the government or responsible person of the local body. Furthermore, a survey was conducted among 10 persons in order to know citizens' view about the participatory planning at local

government. Other information was collected during the case study of the selected local government unit of Nepal.

(b) *Secondary Sources:* Secondary data was collected from different government reports related to participation and local governance. Websites of the Ministry of Federal Affairs and Local development was taken as the sources of secondary data. Some data were taken from published reports and the websites of international organizations.

3.3 Sample Size

For the purpose of testing relevance of local level variables on the on the preference of participatory planning at local level, one local government unit: Turmakhand VDC, Achham was selected. While selecting the unit, the study used non-random, purposeful sampling. Furthermore, a survey was carried out among 10 participants selected randomly from the people who have experience of the local administration or local planning in order to test their preference on participatory planning at local level.

3.4 Data Collection Procedure

The research entails two different methods i.e. theory-building and empirical study like case study, a survey, etc.

The case Study: The case study was preceded in two stages. First, it covers country-level variables on a choice of participatory planning through examination of existing statistical data and empirical findings regarding financial autonomy and political culture in Nepal. Secondly, a local government unit of Nepal

wasselected for the case study. The Turmakhand VDC was selected for comparative case study.

Turmakhand VDCwas selected non-randomly since, for the researcher, it ismore convenient VDC for visit during the study. Its office was visited and some semi-structured interviews were taken with the secretary of the office. Some official data were collected by the researcher during that visit. Some information and data about its plan and progress were taken from its yearly progress report and its portfolio book.

- **Sampling:** While selecting a local government unit, non-random, purposeful sampling, was used. Such sampling is supposed to enable researcher to select information-rich cases.
- **Interview:** For a part of the case study, individual and group semi-structured interviews with the officialsand with the secretary ofthe VDC were taken. These interviews were conducted during field visit of the office.
- **Survey:** As a part of the study, a survey among 10 persons was conducted in order to test the preference of the local people regarding the participatory budgeting system. A questionnaire was sent to the respondent via e-mail and hard copy by hand. Ninety percent of the targeted persons filled up the questionnaire and sent it to the researcher.

3.5 Data Presentation and Analysis

This paper has used tabulation or quantitative analysis and qualitative discussion methods while presenting and analyzing the data. It tests different variables using

different statistical tools like averages, standard deviation, comparing tools, etc. It uses different parameters like percentage, mean, median and standard deviation to test the implications of the given variables on a particular model of participatory planning. While analyzing the public opinion, this paper has used qualitative discussions although the quantitative data are used for the justification of the given arguments.

CHAPTER IV

DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS

We have discussed about different variables in the context of different models of participatory local level planning, this section will examine the public preference about the participatory planning at local level. The facts collected from the case study of Turmakhand VDC and the preferences of people expressed in the survey will be analyzed in this section.

4.1 Degree of the Impact of Different Variables

A survey among the ten persons who are directly or indirectly experienced in the field of local governance was conducted during this study. Questionnaire for the survey (see: Annex-1) consists of six sections which cover the system design variables: decision making body, participation, deliberation, empowerment, control and monitoring and personal information of the respondents, in order to examine their preferences for the components of given models of Participatory Planning. The result of survey is summarized in the following table-2.

Table 2: Preferences for the Participatory Planning Models.

Components	Adaption of Porto-Algerie		Proximity Participation		Consultation on Public finance		Community Participatory budgeting		Multi-stakeholder participatory		Overall Weight given by People (Average of all Percentage)	
	Over all score (%)	Rating scale (agree/disagree)	Over all score (%)	Rating scale (agree/disagree)	Over all score (%)	Rating scale (agree/disagree)	Over all score (%)	Rating scale (agree/disagree)	Over all score (%)	Rating scale (agree/disagree)		
Decision making body	83.57	Somewhat agree	40.00	Mostly disagree	75.71	Somewhat agree	87.14	Mostly agree	94.29	Mostly agree	78.141	
Participation	Participant selection methods	83.21	Somewhat agree	33.57	Mostly disagree	93.21	Mostly agree	92.50	Mostly agree	91.07	Mostly agree	80.713
	Scope of participation	74.29	Somewhat agree	72.86	Somewhat agree	68.93	Neutral	84.29	Mostly agree	79.29	Somewhat agree	72.931
	Participation mechanism	92.50	Mostly agree	72.50	Somewhat agree	42.14	Somewhat disagree	87.50	Mostly agree	28.21	Mostly disagree	66.57
Deliberation	Focus of decision	75.00	Somewhat agree	74.29	Somewhat agree	86.79	Mostly agree	83.21	Somewhat agree	94.64	Mostly agree	84.786
	Methods of communication	72.86	Somewhat agree	31.76	Mostly disagree	84.29	Mostly agree	86.07	Mostly agree	87.86	Mostly agree	74.564
	Formality of the process	72.86	Somewhat agree	34.29	Mostly disagree	68.93	Somewhat agree	85.71	Mostly agree	89.64	Mostly agree	72.283
Empowerment	30.71	Mostly disagree	90.36	Mostly agree	91.07	Mostly agree	93.21	Mostly agree	97.14	Mostly agree	82.497	
control and monitoring	85.71	Mostly agree	80.00	Somewhat agree	87.86	Mostly agree	87.50	Mostly agree	86.07	Mostly agree	87.425	

Source: Field Survey, 2015

Above rating by participants of the survey shows that there is no one-size-fits-all model of participatory budgeting. Since the local variables differ from one LG to another, the preferences for the Participatory planning models and their applicability vary from one LG to another LG. Above result suggests that the control and monitoring is the most prominent variables of the plan decision making. Even though the empowerment provides much more opportunities for enhancing the significance and implacability of the projects,

controlling and monitoring mechanism in participatory planning is rated as the most influencing factor of participatory planning. This shows that control of people over the governance system or meeting agendas of local peoples is the most important factors to ensure the implacability of a particular model of public participation. In other word, people want more participation and representation in monitoring and controlling the public purse.

If we see the weight given to each variable which are responsible to determine the applicability of a particular model of participatory planning at local level, we can see the following result.

Table 3: Rank of variables by their weight given

Variables	Rank	Given Weight (Out of 100)	Interpretations of variables
Controlling and monitoring	1	87.425	Who controls the implementation of the budget?
Focus on decision	2	84.786	What is being deliberated? (Investments or service deliver, projects or general areas)
Empowerment	3	82.497	What role does the civil society play?
Participation selection	4	80.713	How are participants being selected?
Decision making body	5	78.141	Who sets up “the rules of the game”?
Scope of Participation	6	77.931	How do citizens participate? (direct or indirect)
Methods of communication	7	74.564	How do participants communicate and make decisions?
Formality of the procedures	8	72.283	How much formal / legal procedures are to be followed?
Participation mechanism	9	66.57	How are the meetings organized? (territorial or thematic logic, city, district or neighborhood level)

If we see the above table people think that the controlling and monitoring factor is most important and vital although other variables are also given high weights.

4.2 Preferences to the Participatory Planning Models

If we see(at table-2) what component of which model is rated high by the participant, there is no single model whose all components are mostly liked or there is no model whose all components are mostly disliked. If we collect the mostly agree ratings we should collect the components from all models. However, comparing above ratings of participants, we can see that the community participatory budgeting model is ranked in the first and multi-stakeholder participatory model is ranked in the second. This shows that the co-governing partnership in development work is highly accepted by the people.

Applicability of a particular model depends upon how the environmental variables interact with the design variables of the participatory planning model. These variables obviously do not constitute a comprehensive list of factors that influence the applicability of a particular participatory planning as well as the choice of the suitable model. Neither can they be investigated in detail due to the limited scope of this paper.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

5.1 Conclusion

From the analysis, the variable which indicates the power of local level participation is much more preferable in the context of Nepal since most of the LGs have either lower or average level of public awareness. Controlling and monitoring is mostly preferred while the better practices from other model could be taken in the process. On the basis of this analysis, it can be concluded that if we adopt any model of participatory planning, the power of the decision making should be given to the public in order to ensure that the model is a more applicable and suitable mechanism which will be fit in the local context.

Furthermore, one can conclude that there is no one-size-fits-all participatory planning model for LGs in Nepal. Overall, the relevance of the national-level as well as the local-level variables generated in the theory-building part of the paper has been at least partially confirmed. Curiously, the only local-level factor that was not considered important by the LG representatives was ethnic diversity. Political will and the size of LG unit seem to be the primary factors influencing the suitability of participatory planning models in Nepal.

Future research could focus on the analysis of environmental variables in other countries as well as investigate if there are other variables that might influence the feasibility of participatory local level planning and the choice of the model.

As for Nepal, in spite of the complexity of factors for and against participatory planning implementation, there is still hope that this mechanism could serve as a vehicle for developing the civil society as well as could enhance budgetary leeway of Nepalese LGs.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Allegratti, G., Herzberg C. (2004). Participatory budgets in Europe: Between efficiency and growing local democracy. Amsterdam: TNI briefing series No 2004/5, 3-23.
- Almond, G., Sidney, V. (1966). An approach to political culture. The civic culture: political attitudes and democracy in five nations, 1-44
- Bird, R., Vaillancourt, F. (1998). Fiscal Decentralization in Developing Countries. UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Cabbannes, Y. (2004). Participatory budgeting: a significant contribution to participatory democracy. *Environment & Urbanization*, Vol. 16, No. 1, 27-46, UK: SAGE Publication.
- Coleman, St., Gøtze, J. (2005). *Bowling Together: Online Public Engagement in Policy Deliberation*. London: Hansard Society.
- Davey, K. (2003). Fiscal Decentralization. UNPAN. Retrieved on February 17, 2016 from : <http://unpan1.un.org/intradoc/groups/public/documents/untc/unpan017650.pdf> 15.04.2012
- DeNardis, L. (2011). Democratizing the Municipal Budget in Latin America: citizen Participation in Brazil and Mexico. *International Review of Social Sciences and Humanities*, Vol. 2, No. 1, 91-102. USA: Sacred Heart University Press.
- Ebdon, C., Franklin, A. L. (2006). Citizen Participation in Budgeting Theory. *Public Administration Review*, Vol 66, No 3, 437-447. USA: American Society for Public Administration.
- Elazar, D. J. (1972). *American federalism: a view from the states*, 2nd Ed. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell.

-
- Fung A., (2003). *Countervailing Power in Empowered Participatory Governance. Deepening Democracy, Institutional Innovations in Empowered Participatory Governance*. London: Verso
- Fung, A. (2006). *Varieties of Participation in Complex Governance*. *Public Administration Review*, Special Issue, 66-75. USA: American Society for Public Administration.
- Fung, A., Wright E. O. (2001). *Deepening Democracy: Innovations in Empowered Participatory Governance*. *POLITICS & SOCIETY*, Vol. 29, No. 1, 5-41. UK: SAGE Publications.
- Herzberg, C. (2011). *Democratic innovation or symbolic participation? A case study of participatory budgeting in Germany*. Paper written for 6th ECPR General Conference, Panel 25 – Democratic Innovations in Europe – A comparative perspective. 25th – 27th Aug. 2011. Reykjavik: Iceland.
- Hinsberg, H., Kübar, U. (2009). *Kaasamise käsiraamat ametnikele ja vabaihendustele*. Retrieved on February 18, 2016 from:
https://valitsus.ee/UserFiles/valitsus/et/riigikantselei/strateegia/Kaasamise_k%C3%A4siraamat.pdf 18.02.2012
- Ishiyama, J. T., (2012). *Political Culture and Ethnopolitics. Comparative politics. Principles of democracy and democratization*. UK: Blackwell Publishing, 89-118.
- Johnson, G. (2002). *Data Collection: Surveys and Focus Groups. Research Methods for Public Administrators*. Westport, Connecticut, London: Quorum Books, 87-104.
- Lee, R. D., Johnson, R. W., Joyce, P. G. (2008). *Introduction. Public Budgeting Systems*, 8th edition, 1-29. Boston: Jones and Bartlett Publishers.

Lijphart, A. (1991). Self-determination versus pre-determination of ethnic minorities in power sharing systems. New York. Thinking about democracy : power sharing and majority rule in theory and practice. NY: Routledge, 42-66.

Matovu, G. (2007). The Challenges and Constraints of Introducing Participatory Budgeting as a Toll for Resource Mobilization and Allocation and Realizing Good Governance in Africa. Paper presented for the 7th Editions of the Africa Local Government Action Forum (ALGAF) on February 2nd 2007, 1-21.

Open Government Partnership. 2015. Retrieving on February 15, 2016 from: <http://www.opengovpartnership.org/>

Pollitt, C. (2003). Partnerships, networks, joined-up governance, the information age (and all that). In The Essential Public Manager. Maidehead: Open University Press. 52-82

Rubin, I. (2010). Chapter 1: The Politics of Public Budgets. The Politics of Public Budgeting: Getting and Spending, Borrowing and Balancing. Chatham. N.J.: Chatham House, 1-33.

Sintomer, Y., Herzberg, C., Röcke, A. (2010a). Der Bürgerhaushald in Europa - ein realistische Utopie? Zwischen partizipativer Demokratie. Verwaltungsmodernisierung und sozialer Gerechtigkeit. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften, GWV Fachverlage GmbH

Sintomer, Y., Herzberg, C., Allegretti, G., Röcke, A. (2010b). Learning from the South: Participatory Budgeting Worldwide – an Invitation to Global Cooperation. Bonn: InWEntg GmbH – Capacity Building International, Germany. No. 25 English version in the Dialog Global series published by the Service Agency Project management: Christian Wilhelm, 1-83. Retrieved on February 12, 2016 from

:<http://www.buergerhaushalt.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/02/LearningfromtheSouth-ParticipatoryBudgetingWorldwide-Study.pdf> 08.04.2012

Sintomer, Y., Herzberg, C., Röcke, A. (2005). Participatory Budgeting in Europe: Potentials and Challenges. International Journal of Urban and Regional Studies. Vol. 32, No. 1, 164-78. Available at: http://www.dpwg-lgd.org/cms/upload/pdf/participatory_budgeting.pdf 08.04.2012

Talpin. (2007). Who Governs in Participatory Democracy Institutions? A comparative study of the decision-making processes in Three European cases of participatory budgeting. Paper prepared for the CINEFOGO Conference “Citizen Participation in Decision-Making”, February 14-15.

Wampler, Brian (2007). A Guide to Participatory Budgeting Participatory Budgeting. Anwar Shah (ed.). Washington: The World Bank, 1-55. Accessible at: <http://siteresources.worldbank.org/PSGLP/Resources/ParticipatoryBudgeting.pdf> 10.03.2012

Wildavsky, A. (2001). Toward a Comparative Theory of Budgetary Processes. Budgeting and Governing. New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers, 179-197.

The End.