

Participatory budgeting: Lessons for Indonesia

Ruth Silvia ^{a*}, Achmad Lutfi ^b

Universitas Indonesia. Jl. Margonda Raya, Kota Depok, Jawa Barat 16424, Indonesia

^aruth.silvia@ui.ac.id; ^bachmad.lutfi@ui.ac.id

* Corresponding Author

Abstract: Some countries have enjoyed the adoption of Participatory Budgeting (PB) with real impact. In Brazil, Participatory Budgeting increases local revenues; in New York, there is a change in budget allocation based on demand; whilst in the Czech Republic, Participatory Budgeting has succeeded in increasing the number of general election participants. Participatory Budgeting has created opportunities for citizens to be involved, educated and empowered. It helps increase transparency and has the potential to reduce government inefficiency and corruption. However, participatory budgeting in Indonesia encounters problems regarding the low participation rate amongst people with low incomes, making it only a formality. This study was conducted in order to see how Indonesia may take lessons from the experiences of other countries in the world that have implemented Participatory Budgeting. It can be concluded that the level of public participation in the Participatory Budgeting process is a key factor in learning from the implementation of Participatory Budgeting in countries across America, Europe, Asia and Africa. By increasing the role of Non-Government Organizations (NGOs), we may find that community political awareness and involvement in Participatory Budgeting are encouraged.

Keywords: Participation; Musrenbang; Democracy; Inclusive

How to Cite: Silvia, R., & Lutfi, A. (2022). Participatory budgeting: Lessons for Indonesia. *Integritas: Jurnal Antikorupsi*, 8(1), 113-122. <https://doi.org/10.32697/integritas.v8i1.902>



Introduction

Community involvement is a vital aspect of democracy. According to Surbakti (2005), the assumption that underlies democracy (and participation) is that the people who know best about what is good for themselves *are* the people themselves. Community involvement is key because the community itself will feel the impact of public policies formulated by the government. The more these policies have an impact on the community, the more they encourage the community to be involved in decisions that affect them. According to Halvorsen (2003), community involvement plays a role in underlying the legitimacy of certain decisions, increasing participants' trust in the organisation, creating tolerance for views and expectations of public decisions, generating citizen confidence in the agency's performance and building public support. This leads to decisions becoming more acceptable and an improvement in the relationship between citizens and government.

The concept of community involvement shows that there has been a paradigm shift in public administration, from old public management to new public service (NPS). In their book on New Public Service, Denhardt and Denhardt (2015) state that in today's world and in the future, many people do and will wish to participate in decisions that will influence them. The more public decisions, the more affected people will insist on being heard (Denhardt & Denhardt, 2015). Therefore, public finance governance must rely on the public interest. According to Krishno Hadi (2006) and Salahudin (2012), the budget is the most important instrument in economic policy as it reflects policy priorities, deciding where monies should be spent and where they should be collected. Financial governance should consider both ensuring that a large portion of budget allocation is in the public interest but also how much community participation is involved planning, implementation and supervision processes in local finance.

Community participation in budgeting is important because the public contributes money from taxes which are then used by government. Much of funds that the Government collects are intended to be returned to the community in the form of public services, infrastructure development and

social welfare. When using the budget to reflect community aspirations, the global term used is 'Participatory Budgeting'. It describes when the community is involved in making decisions regarding the use of the budget in their regions.

According to Madej (2019), Participatory Budgeting is a widely studied concept of community involvement in local or sub-local government with regards to the financial decision-making process. According to Wampler (2020), Participatory Budgeting is defined as a decision-making process regarding the distribution of public resources that is deliberated and negotiated by citizens. According to Cabannes (2004), there are four key dimensions in Participatory Budgeting. These include: (1) participation, (2) finance, fiscal and budgetary, (3) legal normative, and (4) territories. In order for Participatory Budgeting to properly function, it must also implement active citizen participation (votes), increasing citizen authority (voting), reallocation of resources (social justice), and increasing transparency (supervision) (Wampler, 2020). Wampler (2020) explains that Participatory Budgeting is performed under the instruction of governments, citizens, non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and civil society organizations (CSOs), which allows citizens to play a direct role in deciding how and where resources should be used.

Participatory Budgeting has grown considerably in the last 20 years. It was initially pioneered in Brazil. Participatory Budgeting in the cities of Porto Alegre and Belo Horizonte was considered quite successful, as indicated by an increase in local revenue due to trust in the local government. Local taxes were raised so that local government revenues increased and were then redistributed to the community through a participatory budgeting scheme (Souza, 2001). Participatory Budgeting in Brazil opened the eyes of the world and has had a positive impact on improving people's welfare.

Shah (2007) states that Participatory Budgeting has created opportunities for citizens to be involved, educated and empowered, encouraging civil society to be more enthusiastic. According to Ibrahim (2012), there are six major benefits of Participatory Budgeting (1) Democracy-ordinary people can speak up, (2) Transparency-when members of the public decide the form of spending through a public vote, this minimizes opportunities for corruption, waste and high costs, (3) Education-where every member of the community, staff and officials learn by hands-on practice. People gain a deeper understanding of complex political issues and community needs, (4) Efficiency-budget decisions become better when they utilise the knowledge and oversight of local people (5) Social justice-every citizen has equal access to decision making at every level of society, (6) Communities-through regular meetings, people can get to know their neighbors and feel more connected to each other in their city. Local organisations spend less time lobbying and more time deciding policy.

Fiscal transparency is an important component of minimising corruption and building a fair and equal democratic system in public finance governance (Rahmawati & Supriatono, 2019). Zakariya (2020) found that a village's high vulnerability to corruption indicates a lack of accountability and community involvement in financial management. By involving the community in the budgeting process, it is hoped that corruption by misuse of the budget can be prevented and budget accountability can be encouraged.

Some countries that adopt Participatory Budgeting feel the positive impact. In New York, there was a change in the budget allocation based on the demand of the people, whilst in the Czech Republic, Participatory Budgeting has succeeded in increasing the number of general election participants in the country. It has created opportunities for citizens to be involved, educated and empowered, making civil society more enthusiastic.

In Indonesia, the concept of Participatory Budgeting can be defined as development planning deliberation (*musrenbang*). Through this concept, the community is given space to involve themselves in stages of development planning. Musrenbang has been formally regulated. According to Sukardi (2009), *Musrenbang* is defined as development stakeholders agreeing on the draft of Government Work Plan (RKP) and the draft of Local Government Work Plan (RKPD) with a focus on synchronising activity plans between ministries/agencies/local working units and between Central Government, Local Government and the community, resulting in local and national development.

At the *Musrenbang* stage, the Indonesian people have an intervention role. In preparing the Local Government Work Plan (RKPD) as an annual planning document, the regions need to hold a *musrenbang* forum, commencing from village to subdistrict to district level, wherever the community may have opinions and wish to provide input on development planning. However, even though the community has been involved in the budget planning stage, their involvement in budget preparation in Indonesia is limited to a superficial level, meaning it is not a vital element in democratic policy making (Pheni, 2005). According to Salahudin (2012), Participatory Budgeting in Indonesia only follows the times, not the political will of the stakeholder, while Hagelskamp et al. (2020) states that Participatory Budgeting in Indonesia falls into problems regarding low participation levels amongst low-income people.

Sukardi (2009) observed that groups representing various social organisations found that participatory policies, such as the *musrenbang*, that were used as a “magnetic field” for community involvement in development planning and budgeting were simply ceremonial. This is likely due to the fact that many proposals from the community are defeated by many other interests and forces considered far more important. Proposals from the community are considered unrealistic, uneconomical and not within the budget line; out of sync with local and central development programs. Sukardi (2009) argues that the problem of community participation in Indonesia does not lie in the absence of national commitment or legal legitimacy but instead the consistency of implementer with which these commitments are implemented.

Participatory Budgeting is a rich and challenging field of study because no two experiences are exactly the same (Cabannes, 2004). Participatory Budgeting has been adopted by many countries around the world, by developed and developing nations alike. It is unclear to which it is best applied. The question is, how can Indonesia take lessons from the experiences of countries in the world that have implemented Participatory Budgeting to influence the community involvement? From the research literature, researches can find out the important factors that influence community involvement so that participatory budgeting can be implemented properly in a country.

There are still few articles that review the implementation of Participatory Budgeting in various parts of the world at once. Most of the reviews on Participatory Budgeting are conducted in only one or two countries. This paper aims to review the implementation of Participatory Budgeting in seven countries, representing the continents of America, Europe, Asia and Africa to see how lessons learned from these countries may be applied by Indonesia.

Methods

This research was conducted through a literature review from various sources, including books, international journals and other relevant information. Based on the existing research literature, the implementation of Participatory Budgeting in some countries will be reviewed. From the results of the study, it can be seen that Participatory Budgeting has been implemented by countries in four continents; the Americas, represented by the United States (New York) and Brazil (Porto Alegre and Belo Horizonte), Europe, represented by Poland and the Czech Republic, on the Asian continent, represented by China (Wenling and Wuxy) and India (New Delhi) and the African continent, represented by Egypt. Based on International Monetary Fund (IMF) data reviewed by Pristiandaru (2022), these countries can be grouped into developed countries and developing countries (Table 1). Countries that are categorised as developed countries based on IMF criteria are selected on the basis of gross domestic product (GDP) and diversified exports, and are integrated into the global financial system.

Table 1. Grouping of Countries that implement Participatory Budgeting (Pristiandaru, 2022)

Continent	Developed Countries	Developing Countries
America	United States of America	Brazil
Europe	Czech Republic	Poland
Africa	-	Egypt
Asia	-	China/India

Results and Discussion

Participatory Budgeting in Brazil

In 2001, Celina Souza, Professor of Public Administration from Brazil, conducted a study on Participatory Budgeting in Porto Alegre and Belo Horizonte, to review how it was implemented in these two cities. The implementation of Participatory Budgeting in Porto Alegre began with local government officials and the planning department explaining the income and expenditure situation and the amount required for Participatory Budgeting. The next meeting discussed the agreed priorities, brought together the desires of each subdistrict and selected representative delegates for the district Participatory Budgeting forum. After the district delegates were elected, priorities were organised and representatives were selected to prioritise issues at the district meeting.

The aim was to provide an overview of the problems of each district and thus to observe a wider view of the problems of other districts. Another goal was to prevent the tendency of delegates from subdistricts to choose issues which were too specific. The forum in this district was the deliberative phase of Participatory Budgeting, where a priority list was made. The forum also oversaw the selection of committee members who would follow up and supervise the project when it was implemented. The last phase was the city forum, where the Participatory Budgeting venue was inaugurated.

One of the success factors in implementing Participatory Budgeting in Brazil was that residents in Porto Alegre had a high level of association, were involved in national activities and had high political awareness and communal trust when compared to other residents in most Brazilian cities. In Belo Horizonte, the priorities were registered by participants in a questionnaire form. In Porto Alegre, criteria were made to determine priorities if technically it cannot be implemented, the proposal is rejected, budget preference is given to the project in progress. Each priority was scored and ranked. Not all budgets were affected by the decisions of Participatory Budgeting participants. Priority projects for Participatory Budgeting in Porto Alegre at that time were roads, sewerage, housing and community equipment. In Belo Horizonte, priorities were housing, sewerage, road paving, urbanisation, health and education.

Surbakti (2005) explains that there are two factors why an individual participates or does not participate in the political process. The first factor is political awareness and the second is trust in the government (political system). Political awareness means awareness of rights and obligations as citizens. Surbakti (2005) explains that this awareness concerns one's knowledge of the social and political environment and one's interest and concern for the social and political environment in which he/she lives, while trust in the government is an individual's assessment of whether the government can be trusted and if it can be influenced.

Knobloch et al. (2020), explains that the greatest changes in political attitudes will occur in those who are most aware of the process and its outcomes. Therefore, citizens' awareness of the results/impacts of policy can bring about a change in one's political attitude. With regards to Participatory Budgeting, if the results have an impact on the community then that can change people's political awareness. Participatory Budgeting has shown that what is frequently considered important by public officials is not necessarily in accordance with the desires of the community. The presence of Participatory Budgeting can also be a tool to prevent the implementation of political promises as a lure by public officials hoping to be elected by the people. Participatory Budgeting makes public funds more transparent and accountable so that they have an impact on the development of a region.

Participatory Budgeting in the United States

In Participatory Budgeting, ordinary citizens who are not elected public officials may be involved in deciding the budget allocation in their regions. Citizens can decide where public money will be spent. Participatory Budgeting has highlighted that it is not uncommon that what is decided by the public is different from what is prioritised by public officials. Priorities shift when citizens are directly involved in the budgeting process. The results of research by Hagelskamp et al. (2020) showed that there was a budget shift when a region implemented Participatory Budgeting. The study showed that in eight years (2011-2018) in New York there were differences in the allocation

of public budgets from those originally budgeted by public officials. Money originally budgeted for parks and recreation, housing preservation and development projects shifted to schools, roads and traffic, and housing improvements.

The first phase of Participatory Budgeting in New York began with residents considering community needs. The second phase involved representatives from the community developing project ideas and budgeting priorities into project proposals. In making these proposals, representatives often collaborated with government representatives. The third phase was the voting phase, where the public vote decided the priorities of the Budget. Citizens could choose between proportional allocations to policy areas or concrete projects that arose in project development. In the implementation phase, the government implemented priorities and projects based on people's chosen options.

Participatory Budgeting in New York is performed annually by continuing the last phase of the previous year's discussion. Hagelskamp et al. (2020) show that Participatory Budgeting in New York has succeeded in involving marginalised communities. Marginalized communities are involved not only in voting but also during brainstorming and project development. In addition, Participatory Budgeting in New York has involved communities who have lost access to their civil rights.

Participatory Budgeting in the People's Republic of China

Budget decision making will determine which government programs can be funded and what policies can be put into practice, then will determine the distribution of public resources and finally reveal the political goals of a state government (Wu & Wang, 2012). The practice of public budgeting is closely related to the legitimacy of state government. Participatory Budgeting was introduced in China in 2005 by the China Development Research Foundation (CDRF). The first cities which adopted Participatory Budgeting were Wenling in Zhejiang province, Wuxi in Jiangsu province, Haerbin in Longjiang Province and Shanghai. Participatory Budgeting was first introduced as a pilot project in several districts, cities, or counties- for example, Xinhe City and Zeguo City in Wenling. In 2010, more cities started Participatory Budgeting, including Jiaozuo in Henan.

Wu and Wang (2012) conducted research on the successful implementation of Participatory Budgeting in China, namely in the cities of Wuxi and Wenling. The research of Wu and Wang (2012) revealed the success of Participatory Budgeting in these two cities using different approaches. It was implemented in Wenling as a reform to strengthen the involvement of the legislative branch in fiscal decision making and stimulate citizen involvement in congressional deliberations. In Wuxi, Participatory Budgeting focused more on empowering citizens, not the People's Congress, to make budgeting decisions on capital projects. It was adopted in Wuxi to reallocate investment in areas such as environmental protection and rehabilitation, cultural development, medical care, security, education, and home-based care for the elderly, benefiting 800,000 residents. In Wenling, the implementation of Participatory Budgeting was effective in encouraging the increased legitimacy of public budgeting in local governments. In Wenling, the acceptance of Participatory Budgeting amongst citizens was greater because citizens were granted the right to design participation procedures. Both cities promoted a Participatory Budgeting process to gain the consent of citizens and government officials on budget priorities.

The survey results in Wu's research showed that more than 90 percent of sample respondents agreed that public funds in Participatory Budgeting handling were allocated to the most pressing local problems, meaning that communities have benefited from these projects. The survey results in Wuxi showed that more than 80 percent of respondents were satisfied with the public infrastructure projects selected through Participatory Budgeting. The implementation of Participatory Budgeting improved fiscal transparency and communication between the government and the general public, ensuring that public funds were allocated in accordance with the view of public needs.

Participatory Budgeting in the Czech Republic

Participatory Budgeting appeared in the Czech Republic in 2014. It was created as an instrument to empower citizens, but according to research conducted by Kukučková and Bakoš (2019),

Participatory Budgeting was called an ornament, not an instrument. The implementation of Participatory Budgeting created the illusion of participation rather than actually improving the quality of local governance (Minárik, 2020). In the electoral process in the Czech Republic, the low level of public participation pushed the Government to use Participatory Budgeting to trigger community involvement in elections. The presence of Participatory Budgeting was expected to be a solution to increase public participation or “democratic crisis”, especially in local elections. Participatory budgeting is focused on local issues and more likely to change voters’ attitudes towards local politics. Quantitative data shows that Participatory Budgeting in the Czech Republic was very limited, both in terms of financial allocation in the city budget and citizen participation. According to the researcher, this might have been caused by the fact that Participatory Budgeting in the country was still relatively new.

Based on a study conducted by Kukučková and Bakoš (2019), the implementation of Participatory Budgeting in the Czech Republic increased voter participation in municipal elections by three points and by about 1.2 points at the level of parliamentary elections. It could be concluded that the use of Participatory Budgeting had a positive effect on voters; that it could increase voter participation in the local elections. However, there were other factors to be considered for deeper analysis. Kukučková explained that solving the “democratic crisis” using Participatory Budgeting alone was not possible and that local politicians should be more careful and not consider Participatory Budgeting as an ideal instrument to encourage civic participation in all circumstances.

Minárik (2020) detailed the Participatory Budgeting budgeting process in the Czech Republic, starting with the city assembly allocating funds in the city budget for Participatory Budgeting, followed by residents being asked to submit investment project proposals. Proposals were discussed in public forums between citizens and city government officials to ensure that the project could be implemented from a technical and legal perspective. In the end, residents would choose which project should be implemented by the city government. Voting procedures varied between municipalities. Some only allowed local authorised residents to vote. Others were more inclusive. A total of 29 Czech cities had implemented participatory budgeting by 2019, but two of the three major Czech cities had not implemented it at the city level. However, there were exceptions to the general pattern, as Participatory Budgeting had been applied in many small towns (with populations under 5000 residents). In the Czech Republic, very few projects were submitted for Participatory Budgeting, however almost all projects submitted were accepted for financing. Dozens of cities had implemented Participatory Budgeting, although its implementation was very limited in terms of financial allocation, scope and public involvement, and it was unclear how participatory budgeting was introduced.

Participatory Budgeting in Poland

Participatory Budgeting in Poland was not very attractive to its citizens. In Malgorzata Madej's research (2019), the implementation of Participatory Budgeting showed little community involvement, even though the local government had made efforts to encourage community activity. Local authorities made efforts to organize voting in the most citizen-friendly manner. The eighteen cities analysed provided the possibility for their citizens to vote online. 14 of these cities distributed ballots to ensure that residents who did not wish to participate via the internet could take part in project elections in their cities, whilst the other four made advertisements, consultation facilities and help desks for residents who had difficulty using a virtual form. In two cases, residents were also allowed to vote in person at a special meeting in Gorzow Wielkopolski, or by coming to the city government office.

According to Madej (2019), the analysis showed that voter participation in the voting did not show a significant result between the voter and the city's population. This applied equally in big cities-overall, the participating population was still quite low. Although the method of calculating the number of participant each city is not uniform (for example residents who are not officially registered are not counted, although some cities allow all residents to vote in participatory budgeting regardless of their formal status), the number of residents who participated remained quite low.

The low level of community participation was caused by the disappointment of the community as they were not involved in the process prior to the publicity election. Madej (2019) underlines the need for a bottom-up process by inviting sub-local activists to address problems at the lowest levels of city government. Municipal offices should only provide a framework for and support certain initiatives and projects proposed by residents. Another issue is that the allocation of funds for Participatory Budgeting is quite small as a percentage of total expenditure. Madej (2019) stated that none of the 18 cities analysed allocated more than 1% of their total expenditure for Participatory Budgeting, despite the concept being attractive to residents. Low levels of funding may obstruct participation in the long term.

According to Shybalkina-Bifulco in the journal Madej (2019), participatory budgeting is designed to increase social inclusion and support groups who are marginalised or at risk of being marginalised, although the impact of such initiatives on re-distributiveness have not been clearly proven and require further analysis. (Hong-Shine, 2018). Among other goals, Participatory Budgeting is intended to eliminate inequalities within cities and tensions between the city center and the suburbs, leading to more sustainable development. Thus, it needs to support marginalised people and groups affected by lack of investment by revitalising development. Residents of the periphery should have the authority as an important players in budgeting. Unfortunately, based on Madej's analysis, Participatory Budgeting is not used for revitalisation projects in big cities. This does not mean that city authorities do not care about revitalisation, instead that they do not use Participatory Budgeting to encourage revitalisation.

The lack of community involvement in Participatory Budgeting is also conveyed by Bednarska-Olejniczak and Olejniczak (2017). In research on the Solecky Fund (which was claimed to be a form of Participatory Budgeting in Poland), Bednarska-Olejniczak and Olejniczak (2017) showed that the level of citizen involvement in the participation process was quite low. The study found that some of the causes were inadequate community knowledge about Solecky Fund procedures, complexity of procedures, and frequency of decision making in one meeting where projects were presented, discussed, and selected. According to Dorota et al., the solution to this problem was that the community needed to be educated about the Solecky Fund procedure. It was also necessary to simplify the mandatory procedures, introduce stages of project selection procedure in the Solecky Fund and provide more time for discussion and voting before project submission.

Participatory Budgeting in Egypt

Ibrahim (2012) said that in Egypt, there were many projects that encouraged citizen participation, especially in projects funded by international organisations such as GIZ (GTZ), Agha Khan in the Darb Al Ahmar project and projects of other NGO's. However, the main problem was that the ongoing projects did not guarantee representation of all population groups. The discussed budget was not part of the national budget but was an external fund. As for monitoring the implementation of the approved budget and project, it had to be performed according to each city's mechanisms, including the Participatory Budgeting board.

Private sector participation in Participatory Budgeting in Egypt was formally restricted. Despite this, in some cities the private sector sometimes had a vote in the decision-making process. The industrial, commercial and service sectors were part of the Municipal Congress in Belem, with three out of 50 representatives. Ibrahim (2012) concluded that participation in developing countries, especially in Egypt, was still inadequate because they tended not to represent the broad population and were unable to engage in dialogue that could influence the public to make decisions. According to Ibrahim (2012), civil society and NGOs could play an important role in increasing citizen participation.

Chowdhury et al. (2020) explains how empowering NGO's could lead to increased public political awareness. Chowdhury et al. (2020) took a case study involving the Bangladesh Rural Advancement Committee (BRAC), which was a leading NGO in Bangladesh, and found that with NGO programs and projects across the country in Bangladesh it had an impact on (i) creating social and political awareness among underprivileged groups and the socially vulnerable, (ii) assessing the needs and demands of such people, and (iii) training and encouraging them with activities oriented towards social, political, and economic development. A large number of

multifaceted NGO programs, including micro-finance, education, health care, human rights law, women's empowerment, agriculture and socially responsible business contributed to social change and positive development in Bangladesh.

Back to Egypt, according to Ibrahim (2012), Participation was considered a vital factor in the Participatory Budgeting Process. Many considerations had to be fulfilled, including involving community representation in all categories in society without excluding one particular group. Participation for all these groups, it was found, should not be limited to the final decision making and budget allocation stages, but should be extended to the implementation, follow-up, and monitoring stages. Therefore, it is important for government to create a flexible administrative framework to ensure the sustainability of Participatory Budgeting. In addition, the study found that integrating the private sector in the Participatory Budgeting process could ensure that their investment was directed to the right projects, ones which had earned support from the community, so that in the end it could maximise benefits for all stakeholders.

Participatory Budgeting in India

Participatory Budgeting in India has been adopted in many places at their own initiative. Kerala, a state in India, implemented Participatory Budgeting in all government units, from villages and urban villages to districts. After more than two decades, Participatory Budgeting has been safely institutionalised, withstanding many changes to the ruling party at the state level (Blair, 2020). Participatory Budgeting in Kerala has helped improve infrastructure in rural areas and has contributed to reducing poverty.

The Participatory Budgeting Program received assistance from the Kerala Sastra Sahitya Parishad (KSSP), which is the largest CSO in Kerala by providing training to key persons as facilitators and technical advisors in Participatory Budgeting. In Blair (2020) research, Participatory Budgeting in Kerala begins with open meeting in stages, and supported from key trained personnel. In the ward level, priorities are set and delegates decided on the higher level, in which they meet with the elected nearby authorities officeholders and bureaucrats in a chain of improvement seminars to forge a unified budget and then task forces and sectoral working groups are formed to plan and implement projects. Once the projects approved, the projects are implemented and monitored by the elected delegates throughout the cycle and then report the result of monitoring on the next cycle.

The key of Participatory Budgeting success in Kerala because of the overall quality of governance is very good compared to other parts in India, competitive politics in which parties trying to reachout for support from all levels of population and ethnic, Kerala had strong leadership at the top favoring Participatory Budgeting and a strong CSO presence. On the other hand, the implementation of participatory budgeting is not very good in other Indian Cities even though several big cities in India have tried participatory budgeting. For example in Pune. The implementation of Participatory Budgeting in Pune began with an advertisement in the newspaper asking citizens suggestion for public investment. Citizens provide their suggestions through a form and it is collected and those who had submitted form were invited. Unfortunately, City officials kept publicity of participatory budgeting low. Beside that the role of citizens is only limited to providing suggestions and there is no follow-up on these suggestions. The effort to incorporate slum neighborhoods was also dropped. The allocation of funds provided in Participatory Budgeting is also limited, residents are not involved in determining the priorities for the budget to be used and are not involved in monitoring the implementation of the use of their funds. There is no accountability from the bureaucrats to their citizens. In addition, there is no political support from the Mayor.

Conclusion

Based on the above review, it is clear that the level of public participation in the Participatory Budgeting process is a key factor. The residents in Porto Alegre, for example, have a high level of association, are involved in national activities and have high political awareness and communal trust when compared to residents in other Brazilian cities. However, not all people want to be

involved in Participatory Budgeting. Some of the reasons for the low community participation include: disillusionment amongst the community as they are not involved in the process before the publicity election (Poland), the low amount of funds for Participatory Budgeting allocated by the government (Poland, Pune- India), the regulator restricting the use of Participatory Budgeting funds for projects that the community has expressed a desire for (Poland, Pune - India), inadequate public knowledge about Participatory Budgeting procedures (Poland, Pune- India), procedures being too complex (Poland), community participation not being representative of all population groups (Egypt), lack of a cohesive public dialogue (Poland, Egypt), mistrust due to a political motive from the government (Czech Republic),

In a country where the level of public participation in Participatory Budgeting are quite high, the factors that encourage community involvement include: very high public political awareness at all levels (Brazil), involving all levels of society, including minorities and marginalised groups (Brazil, New York), the government's commitment to implementing projects based on people's options (New York, China, Kerala), citizens being granted the right to design participation procedures (China), and high levels of communication between citizens and the government (China). It was also found that NGOs can play an important role in increasing civic participation (Kerala-India), The projects are implemented and monitored by the elected delegates (Kerala _India)

The results of this study need to be further tested considering that the conditions and problems of each country are not the same. In addition, this research was conducted based only on literature from previous research, so the information obtained was limited to the results of the experts/ academics' research. The year in which each country adopted Participatory Budgeting differs. The results of reviews from various countries that perform Participatory Budgeting need to be adjusted contextually between each country. This is because the economic background, culture, regulations and political conditions are different in each country.

Some suggestions that the Indonesian government can make to improve the implementation of Participatory Budgeting are; (1) Increase public political awareness by increasing the role of non-governmental organisations (NGOs), improving social networks and empowering academics. In addition to the formulated policies, they must have a real impact according to the needs of the community itself; (2) Involve all levels of society including minorities and marginalised communities; (3) Increasing the government's commitment to delivering projects based on community options; (4) Give citizens the right to design participation procedures; (5) Improve communication between citizens and the government; (6) Involve the community from the beginning of Participatory Budgeting implementation; (7) Provide adequate budget allocation for Participatory Budgeting in the community; (8) The use of budget of Participatory Budgeting to things which are needed by the community; (9) Encourage participation not only through voting but through dialogue and community communication with the government; (10) Develop clear Standard Operating Procedures (SOP) and dedicated and trained staff; and (11) The projects are implemented and monitored by the elected delegates

References

- Bednarska-Olejniczak, D., & Olejniczak, J. (2017). Participatory budgeting in Poland—finance and marketing selected issues. *Hradec Economic Days, January*, 55–67. <https://mpr.ub.uni-muenchen.de/87659/>
- Blair, H. (2020). Accountability through participatory budgeting in India: Only in Kerala? In S. Cheema (Ed.), *Advances in 21st Century Human Settlements* (pp. 57–76). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-15-2973-3_3
- Cabannes, Y. (2004). *Participatory budgeting: conceptual framework and analysis of its contribution to urban governance and the millenium development goals*. Un-Habitat.
- Chowdhury, T. A., Das, A. B., Chakraborty, L., & Barai, M. K. (2020). NGOs for development: experience of Bangladesh. In M. K. Barai (Ed.), *Bangladesh's Economic and Social Progress* (pp. 351–380). Springer Singapore. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-15-1683-2_12
- Denhardt, J. V., & Denhardt, R. B. (2015). *The new public service*. Routledge.

- <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315709765>
- Hagelskamp, C., Silliman, R., B. Godfrey, E., & Schleifer, D. (2020). Shifting priorities: participatory budgeting in New York City is associated with increased investments in schools, street and traffic improvements, and public housing. *New Political Science*, 42(2), 171–196. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07393148.2020.1773689>
- Halvorsen, K. E. (2003). Assessing the effects of public participation. *Public Administration Review*, 63(5), 535–543. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1540-6210.00317>
- Ibrahim, A. A. A. M. (2012). Guidelines for applying budgeting as a tool for participatory democracy in Egypt. In M. Pacetti & G. Passerini (Eds.), *Sustainable City 2022* (pp. 255–266). <https://doi.org/10.2495/SC120221>
- Knobloch, K. R., Barthel, M. L., & Gastil, J. (2020). Emanating effects: The impact of the Oregon citizens' initiative review on voters' political efficacy. *Political Studies*, 68(2), 426–445. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0032321719852254>
- Kukučková, S., & Bakoš, E. (2019). Does participatory budgeting bolster voter turnout in elections? The case of the Czech Republic. *NISPAcee Journal of Public Administration and Policy*, 12(2), 109–129. <https://doi.org/10.2478/nispa-2019-0016>
- Madej, M. (2019). Participatory budgeting in the major cities in Poland – Case study of 2018 editions. *Politics in Central Europe*, 15(2), 257–277. <https://doi.org/10.2478/pce-2019-0017>
- Minárik, P. (2020). Participatory budgeting and traditional participation in Czech municipalities. *Slovak Journal of Political Sciences*. <https://doi.org/10.34135/sjps.200102>
- Pheni, C. (2005). *Keuangan daerah, investasi, dan desentralisasi*. Kemitraan Partnership.
- Pristiandaru, D. L. (2022). *Daftar negara maju dan negara berkembang di dunia*. Kompas.Com. <https://internasional.kompas.com/read/2022/02/05/143000070/daftar-negara-maju-dan-negara-berkembang-di-dunia>
- Rahmawati, S. M., & Supriatono, B. (2019). Implementasi penganggaran partisipatif di Indonesia. *Jurnal SIKAP (Sistem Informasi, Keuangan, Auditing Dan Perpajakan)*, 4(1), 12. <https://doi.org/10.32897/jsikap.v4i1.150>
- Salahudin, S. (2012). *Korupsi, demokrasi dan pembangunan daerah*. LAPINDA BIDOS NTB.
- Shah, A. (2007). *Participatory budgeting. Public sector governance and accountability*. World Bank.
- Souza, C. (2001). Participatory budgeting in Brazilian cities: limits and possibilities in building democratic institutions. *Environment and Urbanization*, 13(1), 159–184. <https://doi.org/10.1177/095624780101300112>
- Sukardi, A. (2009). *Participatory governance dalam pengelolaan keuangan daerah*. LaksBang.
- Surbakti, R. (2005). *Memahami ilmu politik*. Grasindo.
- Wampler, B. (2020). Participatory budgeting: Core principles and key impacts. *Journal of Deliberative Democracy*, 8(2). <https://doi.org/10.16997/jdd.138>
- Wu, Y., & Wang, W. (2012). Does participatory budgeting improve the legitimacy of the local government?: A comparative case study of two cities in China. *Australian Journal of Public Administration*, 71(2), 122–135. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8500.2012.00771.x>
- Zakariya, R. (2020). Partisipasi masyarakat dalam pencegahan korupsi dana desa: Mengenali modus operandi. *Integritas : Jurnal Antikorupsi*, 6(2), 263–282. <https://doi.org/10.32697/integritas.v6i2.670>