



PARTICIPATORY BUDGETING IN CHISINAU

(ANATOMY OF A FAILURE)

Moldova

1. LITHUANIA
2. LUXEMBOURG
3. LIECHTENSTEIN
4. CZECH REPUBLIC
5. BOSNIA & HERZEGOVINA
6. SERBIA & MONTENEGRO



Short history

- It came out as an idea in the activist circles and was later “adopted” by one of the political parties in 2015.
- The draft of the Law on participatory budgeting (PB) was written by activists.
- It was adopted by the city council in 2017.
- It is organized in two rounds: the formal approval and the voting and has two types of projects: small (up to 2000 Euro) and big (up to 5000 euro).
- In 2017 - 53 projects, in 2018 - 73 projects.



Prima / Bugetul civil Chișinău

Bugetul civil Chișinău

- + Formular
- + Ghidul Aplicantului
- + Decizia nr. 1/3 din 07.02.2018 "Cu privire la aprobarea Regulamentului privind bugetul civil în municipiul Chișinău"
- + Contacte
- + Depunerea proiectelor
- + Lista proiectelor depuse în bugetarea civilă 2017
- + Prezentare rezultate bugetare civilă 2017
- + Desemnarea reprezentanților societății civile în Comisia de evaluare a proiectelor depuse spre finanțare prin mecanismul bugetării participative
- + Lista proiectelor depuse în bugetarea civilă 2018
- + Rezultate aplicații bugetare civilă 2018



PRIMĂRIA MUNICIPIULUI CHIȘINĂU

Prima / Bugetul civil Chișinău

Bugetul civil Chișinău

– Formular

[Formular](#) 

[Lista proiecte mici](#) 

[Lista proiecte mari](#) 

characteristics

- No budget for promoting the PB process
- No budget for a website tailored to the needs of the PB process
- No license, for the existing website of the PB, to process personal data
- No clear institutional protocol on implementing the projects
- No national legislation on PB
- Citizens and activists have no control on the PB process.
- The local rule on PB was modified in 2018 with activists not being able to influence the process (ex. the rule of co-financing).

Conclusions

- In contexts where local authorities (mayors, city councils) are not open to genuine participatory practices, PB becomes just a tool to improve the work of the local government (i.e. to increase its transparency, efficiency), and not a tool for expanding democracy.
- In Chisinau, the city council presents the PB as its success story, without mentioning the contribution of activists (in this way the story of PB loses its potential to inspire and ignite other groups and practices).
- The city administration being “opened” to PB but being hostile to other participatory practices: public-civic partnerships, local councils on participation etc.
- Activist communities to have the role not only “to know” but also “to live” participatory practices.



