

**12TH "BEST PRACTICE IN  
CITIZENS' PARTICIPATION" Award**  
AWARD APPLICATION FORM



**1ST PART: BASIC DATA**

Title of the experience: <b>'Our Money, Our Say!' - Budgeting by Inclusion</b>		
Name of the city/region: <b>Seberang Perai, Penang</b>		
Country: <b>Malaysia</b>		
Institution presenting the candidacy: <b>Penang Women's Development Corporation (PWDC)</b>		
Start date of the experience: 2015		
End date of the experience: 2018		
Type of candidacy	New experience	
	Innovation on an existing experience	X
Type of experience	Participatory budgeting	
	Urban planning	
	Council	
	Workshop/meeting for diagnose, monitoring, etc.	
	Audience/forum	
	Poll/referendum	
	Citizen jury	
	E-government/open government	
	Citizen initiative	X
Others (say which one):		
Objective of the experience	To achieve higher levels of equality in terms of participation and to incorporate diversity as a criteria for inclusion	X
	Community empowerment	X
	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	

**12TH "BEST PRACTICE IN  
CITIZENS' PARTICIPATION" Award**  
AWARD APPLICATION FORM



	To improve the quality of public decision making through the mechanisms of participatory democracy	X
	To improve the evaluation and accountability of the mechanisms of participatory democracy	
Territorial area	All the territory	
	District	
	Neighbourhood	X
Thematic area	Governance	X
	Education	
	Transport	
	Urban management	
	Health	
	Security	
	Environment and/or urban agriculture	
	New social movements and associationism	
	Culture	
	Housing	X
	Job creation	
	Decentralization	X
	Local development	X
	Training/learning	
	Economy and/or finances	
	Legal regulations	
Social inclusion	X	
All		
Others		

**2ND PART: DESCRIPTION OF THE EXPERIENCE (4 pages maximum)**

**Objectives**

**Main objective of the innovative experience:**

*Choose one of the objectives mentioned in part 1, the one that you think is the most important*

To achieve higher levels of equality in terms of participation and to incorporate diversity as a criteria for inclusion.

**12TH "BEST PRACTICE IN  
CITIZENS' PARTICIPATION" Award**  
AWARD APPLICATION FORM



**How have you achieved this objective?**

The objective was achieved through the pilot project called '*DUIT KITA, HAK KITA!*' (Our Money, Our Say!). This project is a smart-partnership between PWDC with the State Assemblyman of *Machang Bubuk*, Members of Parliament of *Bukit Mertajam*, Municipal Councils of Seberang Perai including the 17 members of the council of citizen in the constituency (MPKK).

Both of the state assemblyman and the member of parliament give RM50,000 as a grant for the project. The 17 MPKK were to compete to win the RM100,000 by proposing a project from the community engagement using the GRPB approach/process in their own neighbourhood.

A working group was set-up as the accountability mechanism to make sure the 17 MPKK comply to the process in the public consultation.



**To what extent has this objective been achieved?**

Achieving higher levels of equality in participation and diversity for greater inclusion lies in implementation of GRPB at community level by the MBKK members. The community engagement involves 4 steps and they are:

- Step 1 – survey on demography background and issues in community
- Step 2 – focus group discussion (according to sex and age group, including abilities and ethnicity);  
In the focus group discussion, the community were encouraged to express their issues and also proposed the solution on how to overcome them;
- Step 3 – voting for the priorities of community needs; and
- Step 4 – planning and implementation and evaluation

The 17 MBKK members groups were expected to implement all the steps to their own neighbourhood. The process will be monitored by the working group. A series of capacity building were organised before every steps implemented, example: on how to do survey, focus groups discussion facilitation and taking notes.

The processes:

Step 1 was participated by all the 17 groups of MBKK. Only 8 out of 17 abled to do they survey. Others feel challenged to do it.

Step 2 was focus group discussion. 3 out of 8 be able to organise it. The group choose 1 project to carry on to the Step 3 voting. The projects were:

1. MPKK *Alma*: Infrastructure project – upgrading of community hall and build gazebos
2. MBKK *Taman Selamat*: Futsal building
3. MBKK Permatang Tinggi: Village development – Arch signage, CCTV and beautifying the village.

**Step 3: Voting of needs**

The group that has the highest voting was MBKK Permatang Tinggi on Village development project: to build the arch signage for the village, CCTV and beautifying the village.



## Dimensions of the experience

### **Which is the most innovative aspect of the experience?**

*Explain what you think that is the most innovative aspect of the practice. It is not necessary for you to repeat what you have already presented in the initial candidacy through the PARTICIPATE OIDP platform (the jury will have direct access to that proposal). It is not enough to explain that it is the first time which this kind of practice is implemented in your city, village or region. However, it will be considered innovative if this involves a significant adaptation of this kind of practice to the particular context.*

This model approach is to be proposed as the mechanism on getting the community to participate in the budget making of the local and State government. The findings of these community engagement will be presented at the local government budget dialogue and/or send to the respective State departments/agencies for annual budget planning.

### **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 that are replicable? How can other institutions access to these elements?*

The model has potential to be replicated and implemented in the different context of urban or rural area. The step can be shortened, therefore, can pick and chose the most suitable method to use in community engagement and data collection. For example: can either choose Step 1:survey or Step 2: focus group discussion to get community inputs about their needs, then, followed by voting of needs.

Capacity building is important in training the community on the methods of data collection.

### **Why do you consider that the experience is feasible?**

*Explain how the economical, technical, organizational and socio-political context were 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?*

The success of this project relies on the smart-partnership of different key players at different levels: State, local government, community and NGOs. PWDC as an ngo that provides content matters expertise; state and local government commit

to the project through money allocation, and community leaders as implementers and to mobilise the community.

**12TH "BEST PRACTICE IN  
CITIZENS' PARTICIPATION" Award**  
AWARD APPLICATION FORM



**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.*

As mentioned earlier, the project was coordinated and monitored by the working group that consists of different key players at every levels.

**Which has been the level of co-responsibility?**

*Explain the kind of implication of other political or technical actors and citizens (organised and nonorganised). Which roles did these participants undertake?*

This already explained in the column above.

**Which evaluation and accountability mechanisms were used?**

*Explain the kind of evaluation and accountability which part of the planning of the experience are and how they have worked in practice. You can mention some results for exemplify it. How has the information been disseminated to the citizens? How was the feedback 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?)?*

The key people in this project were the two political leaders: the state assemblyman and member of parliament of the constituency and Municipal Council of Seberang Perai (MPSP). This concept of participatory budgeting is new in Malaysia, and Penang is the first state that implemented it through a programme calls GRPB that was initiated by PWDC.

The two political leaders including members of MPKK groups work hard to promoted the program to community by going to the coffee shops, morning markets, night market etc. During each steps: survey, focus group discussion and voting – banners and flyers were given to the MBKK members to distribute to their neighbourhoods.

A dialog session was held after the step 3 to all the 17 MPKK groups to get their feedback on the process and identified challenges. Among others, the suggestions are: community need more capacity building on the methods skills especially to the implementer of the steps; the process can be simplified and less complicated by skipping the unnecessary step. For example, can choose between Step 1 and 2. To come up with list of funders so that the projects that didn't get the highest votes still can be implemented at their neighbourhood.

The whole steps and process follows the 'dialogical action' whereby for each plan of action will be followed by the reflections dialogue at the working committee.