PART 1: BASIC DATA

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Title of the experience**: | | | | |
| **Name of the city/region**: | | | | |
| **Country**: | | | | |
| **Institution presenting the candidacy**: | | | | |
| **Contact person**: | | | | |
| **Position of the contact person**: | | | | |
| **Contact phone number**: | | | | |
| **E-mail**: | | | | |
| **Start date of the experience**: | | | | |
| **End date of the experience**: | | | | |
| **Type of candidacy** | New experience | | |  |
| Innovation on an existing experience | | |  |
| **Type of experience** (*you may choose more than one*) | Participatory budgeting | | |  |
| Urban planning | | |  |
| Council | | |  |
| Workshop/meeting for diagnosis, monitoring, etc. | | |  |
| Audience/forum | | |  |
| Poll/referendum | | |  |
| Citizen jury | | |  |
| E-government/open government | | |  |
| Citizen initiative | | |  |
| Other (specify): | | |  |
| **Objective of the experience** (*you may choose more than one*) | To achieve higher levels of equality in terms of participation and to incorporate diversity as a criterion for inclusion | | |  |
| Community empowerment | | |  |
| To empower non-organised citizens | | |  |
| To increase citizen’s rights in terms of political participation | | |  |
| To connect different tools of participation within a participatory democracy “ecosystem” | | |  |
| To improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the mechanisms of participatory democracy | | |  |
| To improve the quality of public decision-making through the mechanisms of participatory democracy | | |  |
| To improve the evaluation and accountability of the mechanisms of participatory democracy | | |  |
| **Territorial area** | All the territory | | |  |
| District | | |  |
| Neighbourhood | | |  |
| **Thematic area** | Governance | | |  |
| Education | | |  |
| Transport | | |  |
| Urban management | | |  |
| Health | | |  |
| Security | | |  |
| Environment and/or urban agriculture | | |  |
| New social movements and associationism | | |  |
| Culture | | |  |
| Housing | | |  |
| Job creation | | |  |
| Decentralization | | |  |
| Local development | | |  |
| Training/learning | | |  |
| Economy and/or finances | | |  |
| Legal regulations | | |  |
| Social inclusion | | |  |
| All | | |  |
| Other | | |  |

PART 2: DESCRIPTION OF THE EXPERIENCE

Objectives

|  |
| --- |
| **Main objective of the innovative experience:**  *Choose the one you consider the most important out of the objectives mentioned in part 1*  (100 words maximum) |
| **How have you achieved this objective?**  (200 words maximum) |
| **To what extent has this objective been achieved?**  (200 words maximum) |

Dimensions of the experience

|  |
| --- |
| **Which is the most innovative aspect of the experience?**  *Explain what you think is the most innovative aspect of the practice. It is not necessary to repeat what you have already presented in the original candidacy through the ParticipateOIDP platform (the jury will have direct access to that proposal). Explaining that it is the first time this kind of practice is implemented in your city, village or region does not suffice. However, it will be considered innovative if this involves a significant adaptation of this kind of practice to the particular context.*  (250 words maximum) |
| **To what extent is the procedure transferable?**  *Explain to what extent the experience has the capacity to allow the repetition of the essential elements which constitutes it in a different context to that of its creation with a great chance of success. Which elements do you think are replicable? How can other institutions access these elements?*  (100 words maximum) |
| **Why do you consider that the experience is feasible?**  *Explain how the economical, technical, organizational and socio-political context was taken into account when designing the experience and how this improved the chances of success of the experience. Which measures were taken when considering the context?*  (200 words maximum) |
| **How has the experience been coordinated with other actors and processes?**  *Explain how the experience has been coordinated with simultaneous or pre-existing actors and processes. Explain the success rate of this coordination.*  (200 words maximum) |
| **What has been the level of co-responsibility?**  *Explain the type of implication of other political or technical actors and citizens (organised and unorganised). Which roles did these participants undertake?*  (200 words maximum) |
| **Which evaluation and accountability mechanisms were used?**  *Explain the types of evaluation and accountability which were part of the planning, and how these have worked in practice. You may mention some results to exemplify it. How has the information been disseminated among the citizens? How was the feedback process done once the procedure had finished? Which have been the conclusions of the evaluation? (if they currently exist and, if not: when are they planned to be disclosed?)*  (250 words maximum) |
| **Summary of the experience**  (500 words maximum) |