





December 2022

ECOD APPLICATION BRUSSELS

Supporting Documents



- **ECoD Compliance Guidelines**
- **ECoD Confidentiality Agreement**
- ECoD Data Processing Agreement
- > ECoD Data Security Guidelines
- > Council resolution for participation

Content



Mission Statement

Teaser	
Summary	5
Democratic Ambitions	6
Achieved Successes	
Future Challenges	9

Projects

Project 1 – Redeveloping « Nouveau Marché aux Grains »1
Project 2 – Governance system for the climate plan 14
Project 3 – Participatory budgeting
Project 4 – Neighborhood councils
Project 5 – GoodMove
Project 6 – A new tramway line

Project Ideas

Project Idea 1 – Waiting spaces	. 43
Project Idea 2 – Youth participation	.46

ECOD APPLICATION BRUSSELS

Mission Statement





A commitment by the City of Brussels to rethink its local democracy

Teaser

The city of Brussels wants to reinvent its local democracy by giving citizens the means to become more involved in decisions that affect their lives, their city, their neighborhood. In order to do so, the City wants to increase the visibility and undertanding of local issues, but also wants to ensure that their needs and aspirations are better taken into account, leading to more transparent and relevant decisions. Reaching a diversity of citizens to dialogue with is key for us to restore trust.

Summary

Citizens must no longer be satisfied with an expression in the ballot box every 5 or 6 years. Faced with the challenges of our time, everywhere in our neighborhoods, citizens are coming together, acting on their own scale. They want to find answers and they want to be part of the answer. Alongside the civic commitment of some, another less optimistic observation must also be made: the rise of populism and the ever-increasing number of abstentionists at electoral events. It is difficult not to see this as a sign of disinterest, or even mistrust, in our democratic system, its functioning and its credibility. Faced with the widening gap between those who ,decide' and those who increasingly have the impression that they have nothing to do but to obey, the City of Brussels wants to reinvent its local democracy. Indeed, following the example of many cities around the world, Brussels wants the voice of its citizens to be better heard. Therefore, the City of Brussels aims at the reappropriation by the citizens of their political institutions through a structural, organized and real participation in the sense that the dialogue is renewed and the results of it are effectively taken into account by the public authorities. This does not, of course, detract from the democratic legitimacy of the College in defining the major impulses and orientations of this city project. By applying a structural approach on citizen participation, the City of Brussels wants to increase the visibility, understanding and quality of the policies implemented. It is also about giving citizens the means to get involved and contribute to urban development. The City aims to include the widest possible range of citizens in these processes, so that everyone can have an influence on the decisions that concern them. As a consequence, citizen participation takes on different forms: Sometimes they are collective processes of information, listening and dialogue that accompany the implementation of public projects (citizens' meetings, surveys, publications, etc.). In this case, the methods deployed depend on the degree of influence that the city wishes to give to citizens, taking into account the objective of the project, the demand for citizen participation, the time and budget constraints, the history of the file, etc.

Summary

Sometimes they are deliberation tools (neighborhood council, participatory budget) which are based on the needs expressed directly by the citizens and agree on the responses to be provided. As such, citizen engagement can vary from attending a public meeting or voting for a project (low intensity), over attending a series of meetings or filling in a survey (middle intensity), to becoming a panel member (high intensity). The city of Brussels has an experience in citizen participation in various policy areas: mobility, sports, public space, green space (redevelopment of parks), climate (drawing up a new climate plan). So each citizen can engage in the topic of its choice.

Democratic Ambitions

Within Belgium, the city of Brussels is not the only one looking for a solution to the wave of anger and distrust sweeping Western democracies. An experiment in European democracy took place in a small region in eastern Belgium: in September 2019, the parliament representing the German-speaking region of Belgium handed over some of its powers to a citizens' assembly drafted by lot. It was the first time in Belgium a political institution created a permanent structure to involve citizens in political decision making. In order to do so, the MPs from all six parties moved past ideological differences to endorse the bill. This "Ostbelgien model" was designed by a group of 14 international experts brought together by G1000, Belgium's leading platform for democratic innovation. The "Bürgerrat" (Citizens' Council), consisted of 24 members who each served 18 months and set the agenda. Its members defined the questions, but didn't give the answers. Instead they organized regular "Bürgerversammlungen" (citizens' assemblies) made up of at most 50 people who met for three weekends over three months. These panels allowed to invite experts to help them learn about the topic and draft independent policy proposals. Parliament were bound to organizing two hearings with the assembly's participants and then to respond to their recommendations. For the city of Brussels, and other Belgian cities and regions, it was seen as a courageous move, a sign to other politicians — who tend to see their voters as a threat rather than a ressource — that citizens should be trusted, not feared, or "spun." In the same vein, the Brussels Parliament launched deliberative commissions in 2020: for the first time in the Brussels Region, citizens chosen by lot were involved in parliamentary work, to deal with a very specific theme that can be proposed by the people of Brussels (citizen suggestion) or by the parliamentarians. After several meetings of the deliberative committee, parliamentarians and citizens together proposed recommendations that will be dealt with in the Parliament. In the end, the recommendations guided political decisions. With the installation of the new political majority at the City of Brussels in 2018, the City wants to rethink its local democracy, in order to become a city which envisages a re-appropriation by the citizens of their political institutions through the co-construction of the city project and a structural, organized and real participation.

Democratic Ambitions The idea of a co-City is being realized through neighborhood councils, participatory budgeting, an online platform for citizen participation, a tool box to stimulate an internal culture of citizen participation, but also by supporting existing citizen initiatives. The city of Brussels is convinced that citizen participation is needed in order to stimulate public authorities to make transparent information available, without which effective citizen participation is not even possible. Participation also implies the involvement of everyone in common affairs, including those who are furthest away from public life, by increasing the possibilities for citizens to deliberate and co-decide, to get involved in order to influence their living environment. We are convinced this will improve public policies. Furthermore, the involvement in social and political life will guarantee a greater social cohesion. Co-constructed projects will also be more respected and thus more efficient and sustainable. Encouraging active citizenship therefore implies that the City diversifies the opportunities for involvement and taking responsibility. By geographical area: from the neighborhood to the city as a whole. By method of participation: neighborhood councils, thematic councils, drawing lots, participatory budget, citizens' initiatives. By level of participation: information, consultation, co-decision, co-development and evaluation. By the diversity of the publics reached and involved in the processes.

Achieved Successes

The first success of the City of Brussels concerns the application of stratified lottery within the framework of the neighborhood councils. Indeed, drawing lots has made it possible to reach a diversity of sociological profiles of citizens. Whereas for open neighborhood meetings we tendto reach the usual suspects (citizens who are more likely to be male, older, with a university degree, Belgian, home owner, already active in civil society), we see that by drawing lots it is also possible to reach younger, female, less educated citizens with a different background or from a lower socio-economic class. This search for a diversity of citizens who can participate in the reflection on local policy is also realized by means of other activation methods. For example, the City of Brussels has used a mobile meeting table, installed on a cargo bike, to go to the inhabitants and ask their opinion in the streets or on the squares, not in dark meeting rooms. This tool was named "de Babbeleir" (Brussels dialect for "the talkative one"). The Babbeleir has been used in many projects to inform and consult citizens: the climate plan, the new circulation plan, the redevelopment of squares, parks or school streets. Always with the same aim: to hear a diversity of opinions and to question the needs of citizens where they are. In order to make full use of this tool, two neighborhood facilitators were also hired. The task of these neighborhood facilitators is to go to the people, put them at their ease and explain why we are asking for their opinion. The neighborhood facilitators are the people who drive the Babbeleir, but also have the skills to facilitate discussions with project leaders or intervene in case of tension.

Achieved Successes Thanks to their knowledge of the neighborhood, the main actors in the neighborhood and the bond they build with the citizens, the neighborhood facilitators are also able to contact new target groups and spread information about certain projects more widely locally. Another way to reach a wider audience, is through the communication focus group. This group, composed of various profiles, has the task of evaluating the City's communication. In a first test phase, this group assessed the communication of Good-Move, the City's new circulation plan. The focus group assessed the attractiveness and clarity, the language level and the dissemination channels. The recommendations were immediately integrated into posters that were placed on totem structures in the squares. This ensured very accessible communication to the local residents. Another success of the City of Brussels concerns the citizens' budget. For the first time in the city's history, a substantial budget of 1 Million euros was released for one neighborhood, whereby citizens have a say in future investments. Later, another Million euros were released for two smaller neighborhoods. Thanks to the citizens' budget, anyone who wants to can submit an idea. This can range from the renovation of a playground to the renovation of a neighborhood kitchen or the installation of fitness equipment to the creation of a tiny forest. The projects are supported by a group of citizens, but the City can also take care of the implementation. It is important that the investments benefit the community. The way in which they are realized also promotes social cohesion in the neighborhood.

Future Challenges

Despite the technique of drawing lots and the activation methods used in the neighborhoods (Babbeleir, site facilitators), it is not easy to involve young people in local policy. In the future, we want to strengthen youth participation, first of all in the context of the City's climate plan. Secondly, in the launch of the next citizens' budget. In doing so, we will establish a partnership with the Bureau International Jeunesse, which, together with other organizations, has designed the Democracy Reloaded tool, with the support of the European Commission. This tool will ensure that various officials of the City are trained to strengthen youth participation and that they have access to an online database of international good practices. Because after all, youth participation is not about age limits but about investing the necessary means into accompanying youth in that way that city policy speaks to them. We also want to work on the internal culture for participation, by working on a formal internal toolbox for participation. The purpose of this toolbox is to share examples of good practice, to clarify the choice for a certain level of participation and the type of stakeholders that were involved. As we developed different kind of tools to support other city services, our aim is to capture all this experience in a formal toolbox and for the participation service to become a 360° support service for participation that is also able to provide training for other city services. In this way, we hope that the city will grow further in adopting a citizen-oriented service and that the various city projects will be even better coordinated. Furthermore, we want

Future Challenges to deepen our neighborhood-oriented approach, by applying temporary use. After all, our experience in urban innovation has shown the power of a transformation approach that focuses on a specific place. We believe that the many tasks the City is facing today can best be tackled at neighborhood level. The neighborhood level brings people together and ensures that the impact of investments is increased by focusing on linkage opportunities and a local platform. We already see concrete examples of this with the Positive Energy Districts within our Climate Plan, local mobility meshes, or in the redesign of public spaces. We also see innovative local ideas emerging from citizens: repair cafes, solidarity refrigerators, play streets, shared mobility. By focusing on a "waiting spaces" approach, with room for experimentation, we want to stimulate cooperation across policy domains and also promote cooperation between urban policy, organised civil society and local businesses. In this way, we want to address urban challenges, such as the climate crisis, growing inequality, social stratification, from the perspective of democracy and democratic values. By investing in inclusive governance, transparency and participatory and socially conscious urban management, we focus on dialogue and action to help bridge the growing geographical, generational, social, economic and political divides that can undermine democratic societies.

ECOD APPLICATION BRUSSELS





Brief

description

Brussels – Project 1



BEST PRACTICE | ONE-OFF | 08.11.2021-01.10.2025 | URL: HTTPS://FAIREBRUXELLESSAMEN.BE/PROCESSES/NIEUWEGRAANMARKT

Redeveloping the square « Nouveau Marché aux Grains » together with pupils

As part of the planned redevelopment of the square "Nouveau Marché aux Grains", the City of Brussels is embarking a participatory process to draw the outlines of the new square. This trajectory was tailored to the different users of the square: the residents, the traders, the young people who often use the square, but also the young people from nearby schools. The aim is to give them all a voice in the future of the square. In collaboration with the MAD Brussels, an incubator for creators, the City organized a series of workshops with the surrounding schools. In a setting with reference images of squares in Belgium and abroad, we wanted to encourage young people to put together their ideal square. We did this by using Lego blocks and a maquette, to stimulate the imagination. By organizing site actions on the square itself, in collaboration with various organizations, we wanted to get as many young people as possible onto the square to gather input on the redevelopment. During this action day, we captured what the expectations are and made the identity of the square visible with a fresco. Finally, the City also organized a meeting with local residents and traders to capture also their point of view.

Detailed description

In order to make sure the redevelopment of the square answers to the needs of its users, we applied a user-centric approach for this project. We analyzed the different stakeholders and how to reach them. For each group of stakeholders appropriate workshops were organized: 7 workshops for the schools, an action day on the square for users of the square, an evening meeting for citizens and commercial representatives. Each group identified the themes they consider important in the redevelopment: green space and sustainability, safety, sport and play, cleanliness, meeting, inclusiveness and accessibility, creativity and personal expression. The pupils also made models to visualize their wishes, with these different themes in mind. In order to make the models they had a map of the square at their disposal, on which they could draw things. They also disposed of Lego blocks to visualize their concepts. If they wanted, they could get inspiration from reference photos of similar square developments elsewhere. The service-design approach gave rise to creative proposals: from "a swing that adults also enjoy", to a pond with fountain and bridge, to a canopy with mirror for Instagram photos.

Detailed description	All these images were shown to the users of the square during a field dayand to the inhabitants of the square during a specific meeting organized for them. Some were also tempted to make there own model. Others discussed the themes to consider during re- development. The field day on the square was specifically organized for the basketball players who use the square a lot and for other associations who use the square often. All the input was gathered into a fresco that captured the identity of the square, but also by the City's public spaces department to transform it into an actual redevelopment proposal, that will be presented to the citizens again.
Contribution	This is the first time that a project was so specifically targeted at young people aged 16-18. This required an adaptation in terms of methodological approach for the workshops. The service-design approach felt appropriated. Building cooperation with schools was also new for the City. By looking for a methodology in line with certain edu- cational attainment levels, we were able to convince specific teachers to participate. In our vision to involve different target groups, this was a first step to involve young people. We would also like to take this further in future projects. During the Ecod Programme Year, we can schedule a feedback moment to the young people who participated in the workshops: the plans will then be presented to them based on the input provided. We will then take that feedback into account in the final plans for the reconstruction.
Target Group	As the square is mainly used by young people who play basketball in the square, the aim was to question them in particular about the redevelopment. We therefore deli- berately chose pupils from the surrounding schools as the target group on the one hand, and the young people who use the square today on the other. We also felt it was import- ant to let local residents and shopkeepers have their say on the square. The service-de- sign approach we used is certainly replicable for other projects. In total we reached 3 schools,and specifically 7 classes or 140 pupils, 25 citizens and 30 users of the square.
Collaboration	To reach the young people playing basket in the square, we worked with 1 spe- cific young person who could mobilize the others. Thanks to him, young people were present on the day of action in the square. Because these are young people who are not necessarily easy for city services to reach, it was important to work through an interme- diary. Also by working with the schools, we were able to reach young people who other- wise would not easily be questioned in such reconstruction projects. For example, the girls in the class could indicate in the safe context of their class group that they do not feel safe in the square at night.
Communication	The communication of this project was handled very specifically. The teachers and the intermediary for the basketball players played a very important role in participa- tion.

Communication	To reach the citizens and traders of the square, a flyer was distributed in the buses of the surrounding houses. An evaluation of the participation process was conducted after the series of workshops, formulating points of interest for integrating the ideas into the design proposals. Workshop participants will also be able to indicate the extent to which they felt their original ideas were integrated into the design.		
Project Setup	The project team consisted of the following departments of the City of Brussels: mobility, public works, urban planning, participation, commerce. The external parners involved were the schools and local associations who work with youngster.		
Description	The schools participated in the workshop. We reached out to the group of bas- ketball players, youth associations, sport clubs and citizens to participate in the field action day and the meeting.		
Budget	Workshops, Field day	Planning & implementation	16,000€
	Flyers, Animation Support	Communication costs	5,000€
	Feedback Meeting	Extra Budget	5,000€
	Execution of the Works	Operating costs	5,000,000€
	Total Budget		5,026,000€
Funding	The city is funding the project on its own resources (budget of the participation department), with regard to the planning, communication and extra costs. The execution of the works will be co-funded by the City and the Region		
Democracy Dimension	Participation		



STRATEGY | PERMANENT | URL: HTTPS://FAIREBRUXELLESSAMEN.BE/PROCESSES/CHANGEITNOW

A future governance system for the cities' climate plan

Brief Description

The City of Brussels has ambitious objectives to fight global warming and improve the quality of life of its citizens. It is actively committed to this through its Climate Plan, which has been the subject of a broad participatory process. During the spring and summer of 2021, events were organized in the neighborhoods to exchange with citizens and invite them to share their ideas for improving the quality of life in the neighborhoods. The developed actions were an opportunity to understand the effects ofclimate change in the neighborhoods, present collective projects carried out locally, get information, express needs and pass on ideas. This allowed to establish a diagnosis on the topic and identify relevant action. The Climate Plan will include the ideas exchanged during the citizens' meetings and will be submitted to the College of Mayor and Aldermen. Afterwards, the city will announce its own measures to take action against global warming, but will also make proposals to external actors so that they can play a catalytic role in the realization of the climate plan. All actions to be taken will be bundled in a joint plan that will also be followed up jointly. An appropriate governance strategy will be worked out for this purpose. The pursued vision is that, in 2050, thanks to its territorial climate governance, the City of Brussels will have succeeded in involving all the actors in its territory in pursuing the objectives of carbon neutrality in a sustainable and inclusive manner. Everyone will have been able to contribute to the territory's action and steering: citizens, associations, companies, public structures, scientists, etc. This network will also be developed in conjunction with the regional authorities and the other Brussels municipalities, as well as with Belgian and international players, in order to ensure borderless cooperation and to build the city that Brussels will have become in 2050 together.

Detailed Description

The City of Brussels is updating its entire Climate Plan, with the ambition of achieving carbon neutrality by 2050. In order to achieve this goal, the municipal authorities want to work with citizens. Reduce the heat in summer by greening a shared space or by preserving water, reduce waste by installing a collective compost, spend less by buying energy with your neighbors or by recovering and bartering.

Detailed Description These are all examples and solutions that can have a direct impact on the daily lives of residents. In 2021, a broad participation process was set up to identify citizens' concerns and recommendations on Brussels' climate policy. First, 12 street interviews moments were organized to listen to The Brussels citizens' views on global warming, their future and the possible actions to be taken. Youngsters were interviewed at the school exits. Afterwards, facilitators organized meetings around the cargo-bike, the Babbeleir, with citizens and project leaders from each neighborhood. Each meeting was an opportunity to present the projects of the neighborhood and to listen to the needs of citizens and associations who fight climate change at the local level. For the targeted youth audience (16-25 years old), the facilitators used a podcast with pre-recorded words of other young people on climate issues as a springboard for expression. In order to reach young people from different social, linguistic and gender backgrounds, specific locations were identified (school exits, sports fields, commercial places...). To conclude the exchange, they were invited to relay a message to the political world. Thematic workshops were then organized between citizens and experts, putting into perspective the concerns that emerged during the neighborhood workshops with the current projects and achievements in the existing projects and achievements within the city and other levels of competence (other municipalities, the region, projects led by citizens). Best practices on climate efficiency and citizen support were studied and permitted to identify future projects and elements of their feasibility. The city's initiatives were evaluated and new actions were proposed to be implemented in the framework of the climate plan. In total, 6 thematic workshops took place, putting forward topics as sustainable food, biodiversity and green space, waste and circular economy, water, energy and mobility. All collected feedback will be integrated into a climate plan that will consist of 2 sections: one section in which the City takes action, and a second section in which local actors work further on proposals made to them by the City. Together, this makes a complete action plan that will be overseen by a climate assembly, composed by different kind of stakeholders. Today, the City wishes to go further in this dialogue with the stakeholders of its territory, by proposing them to take a strategic place in this process. The initial participation process made it possible to identify a group of 80 ambassadors who will form the basis of this future network. The aim is for the network to grow to 2,000 members by 2050. This network will guarantee a space for continuous dialogue between the City and its territory, setting ambitious shared objectives on climate issues and a common framework for action. Its governance will evolve over the years, but its main objective has remained: "Building a resilient and carbon-neutral city together". In order to give an adapted place to youngster, a different process will be developed to involve them, on conditions that will be interesting for them. Indeed, while the City of Brussels must be exemplary in terms of climate change, the major challenge lies in the effective transition of all the stakeholders in the territory. And this is not only true for individual initiatives, but also for the collective action of the territory.

Detailed Description It is therefore necessary to establish a shared assessment and strategic objectives, a roadmap for action, but also to co-define a framework and a methodology for action in which everyone has a place. In order to open up this climate plan to the territory, a new approach to shared governance needs to be thought through and co-created with the various actors to be mobilized. According to the evaluation report carried out by the City of Brussels in 2021, the actions of its administration contribute to 2% of the territory's GHG emission reduction objectives. By working alone, the City cannot achieve the objectives set for 2030 and 2050. The main challenge will therefore be to involve and empower all citizens and organizations so that they can collectively train themselves to be real players in this collective challenge. This is why a core group of climate ambassadors will gradually be formed. Their role will be to co-define the future governance structure, to act as a relay to mobilize other actors in the territory, to spread ideas, to share efforts and results, and above all to monitor the Climate Plan in the long term. In addition to a dynamic of co-construction with the actors of the territory, it is essential that the City of Brussels develops a reinforced collaboration with other actors and territories, including the Brussels-Capital Region and the 18 Brussels municipalities, which have their own specificities but converge together towards the same regional objective requiring mutual assistance and sharing of experiences. The aim will also be to strengthen international links in order to exchange good practices, mainly with Energy Cities and the Covenant of Mayors.

Contribution

Several levels of action for change lie at the heart of citizens' practices. The administration of the City of Brussels wishes to play a role as facilitator and supporter of this ongoing change: to put tomorrow's actors in touch with each other, to share knowledge and tools, to make initiatives visible, to catalyze a multiplier effect. But also to create a dynamic of co-construction and to ensure that the Climate Plan is the founding ECoD 22/23 – Application Brussels (107), page 7/29 basis of a roadmap belonging to everyone, evolving over time to correspond to the reality of the actions carried out on the territory and adjusting itself to ensure collectively that the climate objectives are achieved. This roadmap will be a tool capable of evolving in line with the accompanying context. External actors never played such an important role within the execution of a local policy. Within the Program Year, the City can organize a meeting with this future Climate Assembly.

Target Group

The street interviews reached 212 people. The workshops with the cargo bike, the Babbeleir, reached 146 people. Another 101 persons participated at the thematic workshops and 217 young people were met. This is only a small group which is at heart of the future Climate Assembly. The idea is to create a cartography of ambassadors (by theme, public, etc.) to strategically expand the group of implicated actors.

Target Group

Together they will identify the strategic priority areas that are resulting from the city's climate plan and requiring the inclusion of the territory's actors in their implementation. By doing this, 120 actors will be reached initially. This co-governance structure is inspired by the city of Leuven, in Flanders, who was elected European Capital of Innovation, and can be reproduced by other cities.

Collaboration

The governance of the climate plan is based on a sectoral approach. For each topic to be discussed (energy, economy, commerce, water, biodiversity, mobility, culture, alimentation, waste), several types of structures are involved: enterprises, universities, local committees, schools, associations, etc. As they will co-define the action plan, each actor will be involved according to its capacity. The implication of external actors will permanently be open for new actors, by making a continuous analysis of stakeholders. Citizens will only be implicated as a public of these actors. The City of Brussels, as a fully-fledged player in the territory, will initially ensure the coordination and development of this structure, but will entrust the definition of the missions and the operating framework to the actors in the territory, keeping as a guideline that the final objective is to achieve the territory's climate ambitions.

Communication

For the initial participation phase of meeting actors in the street, several communication channels were considered in order to reach a wider public: a flyer was distributed in all the mailboxes of the inhabitants of Brussels; a photo game was launched on "my neighborhood before/after", which was also a way of reaching a wider public. Children were offered fun games during these meetings in order to reach parents as well. Direct contact was favored for both young people and citizens, by approaching them in the streets. Facilitators were mobilized and trained to reach out to the neighborhoods. The monitoring strategy will focus on the objectives shared and followed by a set of actors, that will compose the future Climate Assembly. Furthermore, thematic and transversal working groups will be organized to follow up the implementation of actions, to monitor continuously and to create an annual report. Evaluation meetings of the Climate Assembly will take place every year.

Project Setup

The project team consisted of the following departments of the City of Brussels: mobility, public works, urban planning, participation, commerce, green spaces, etc. The co-management of the 2024 network will imply a youth assembly, thematic and transversal working groups, a core group of the Climate Assembly, an exchange platform, the definition of the financial and legal set-up, the perpetuation of a shared governance model.

Description

Civil society will be part of the governance structure of the climate plan.

Budget	Diagnosis, study, benchmark	Planning & implementation	50,000€
	Flyers, Actions on the field, facilitation og workshops	Communication costs	30,000€
	Climate Assembly Meeting	Extra Budget	12,000€
	Total Budget		92,000€
Funding	unding The city is funding the project on its own resources (budget of the climate and participation department)		
Democracy Dimension	Sustainability		



TOOL | 01.06.2020-31.08.2024 | URL1: HTTPS://FAIREBRUXELLESSAMEN.BE/PROCESSES/BPNOHM URL2: HTTPS://FAIREBRUXELLESSAMEN.BE/PROCESSES/BP-QEU URL3: HTTPS://FAIREBRUXELLESSAMEN.BE/PROCESSES/BP-HAREN

Participatory budgeting

Brief Description

A citizen's budget is a part of the public investment budget whose allocation is directly determined by the inhabitants. It is based on ideas and projects that respond to the needs of a neighborhood. These ideas, proposed by the inhabitants, can then be transformed into concrete projects with the help of the city services. After a voting round, the selected projects are implemented either directly by the city services, in cooperation with the citizens, or directly by the inhabitants, with the support of the City of Brussels. For the first time, an investment amount of 1.000.000 euro was attributed to a neighborhood. With the order of magnitude of the amount, the City wants to make clear its ambition in terms of citizen participation. Moreover, this concept of citizens' budget focuses on major investment projects for the neighborhood that are proposed by citizens but implemented by city services. In addition, there also remains a funding option for citizens' initiatives to realize a citizens' project for a sum of up to €20.000.

Detailed Description

The city of Brussels wants to give its residents the opportunity to decide on major investment projects in their neighborhood. It does this by means of a citizens' budget. Everything starts with an idea. At the idea proposal stage, citizens are asked if they have an idea for improving the design or development of their neighborhood. They can submit that idea online or via a ballot paper at the nearby community center, if they at least 3 people are behind the project and are 16 years or older. An idea must meet the following conditions: fall within the City's authority, be capable of being implemented in the designated territory, be of general interest, benefit the residents of the neighborhood, and the idea must be in line with the City's priorities and the themes defined by the neighborhood council. Furthermore, the idea must involve an investment expense and must be capable of being implemented within a maximum period of two years. All submitted ideas are analyzed by the City's participation service and technical services. Furthermore, these services help translate the ideas into concrete projects. That means they help with cost estimation, setting up partnerships or bringing together people with similar ideas. The aim is to make the projects realistic and feasible.

Detailed Description All retained projects are presented to local residents during a project festival. That festival also launches the voting round. Both online and in the community centers, all citizens can indicate which project they prefer. Finally, the final vote will be submitted to the College of Aldermen. The first citizens' budget was allocated to Neder-Over-Heembeek for an amount of 1.000.000 euros, for Haren, a smaller neighborhood, 400.000 euros were reserved and for the European Quarter 700.000 euros. The budget was decided upon regarding the territory, the number of inhabitants and the other public means that were already reserved for the neighborhood. The 3 processes of participatory budgeting yielded beautiful projects: from the construction of a tiny forest, to the installation of a music kiosk or a 25m2 play area, to the creation of a care garden with animals. Each project meets a wider neighborhood expectation. The role of the neighborhood council within this process evolved over time. At the launch of the first citizens' budget in Neder-Over-Heembeek, the neighborhood council identified six topics for the participatory budget: green spaces; children's playground; public space and disabled people; safety of pedestrians and cyclists; youth involvement; activities to reinforce the social cohesion. After the voting round, the had a look at the voted projects and proposed corrections to the participatory budget amounts, as they felt that some projects had too much money and should be reduced. They also wished to keep a project that was not fundable because it had not obtained sufficient votes to be in a good position in the order of fundable projects. The members also expressed some points of attention regarding other projects. In Haren and the European Quartier, the neighborhood council didn't decide upon specific topics for the participatory budget but worked on a general diagnoses that characterizes the neighborhood. The neighborhood council played less of a role in the analysis of the ideas, because several members submitted projects of their own. The analysis of the ballot round was therefore done only with those members who had not submitted a project. For the future participatory budget in Laken, we want to involve the neighborhood council even sooner in the process. Besides the administration carrying out a technical analysis of the project ideas, the neighborhood council will also look at all project ideas and find out whether they meet the needs of the neighborhood. In this way, we want to avoid a correction after the voting round. Furthermore, we want to leave the neighborhood council the choice whether they want to fill this role of "citizen jury" or rather opt to submit a joint project for the participatory budget, after their analysis of the neighborhood. In that way the participatory budget becomes a strong tool for codecision or co-creation, depending on the chosen option by the members of the neighborhood council. Furthermore, the voting round will also be strengthened, giving each citizen a voice in deciding what project must be implemented. Regarding the implementation, each neighborhood council also stays closely involved for further questions and for bridge-building with all the citizens in the neighborhood. Once a project funded by the participatory budget is realized a little festivity is organized for the whole neighborhood.

Contribution

Participatory budgeting is a structural tool for citizen participation, in which the City aims to put the keys to a (financial) decision-making process in the hands of citizens. Through the "citizen filter" - the neighborhood council decides whether an idea meets the needs of the neighborhood - and through the voting round, where citizens indicate which project they think should be realized, mechanisms are built into this process that give citizens co-determination over a given City budget. Whereas other projects are more likely to ask for advice or exchange information, the citizens' budget has the ambition to move further up the participation ladder. Moreover, the budget allocated by the City to the citizens' budget has never been of that magnitude: €1 million for Neder-Over-Heembeek, €400,000 for Haren and €700,000 for the European Quarter. During the Ecod Programme Year, citizens' budget projects can be presented during an exploratory walk in the neighborhoods.

Target Group

The participatory budget wants to involve all citizens in a neighborhood. We seek out harder-to-reach target groups by deploying neighborhood facilitators who contact local associations and by sending them out to citizens in the neighborhoods with our special cargo bike, the Babbeleir. In Haren we've reached 180 this way and in the European district 352 persons. We see that the participatory budget is already being applied more often in other cities and municipalities. To keep the distinction between a participatory budget process and an ordinary subsidy application, it is important to us that as many citizens as possible can participate in the decision-making process on the allocation of the projects (voting round), because that is what makes the participatory budget unique.

Collaboration

With regular grant applications, we often find that it is the people who know their way to the relevant city departments who apply. With the participatory budget, we want to try to reach a wider group. On the one hand, by appealing to district council members who take up mandates by drawing lots. On the other by asking local associations to inform their specific target group (young people, seniors, people with disabilities, etc.). We also want to make it as easy as possible for everyone to submit an idea. So an initial idea does not have to be fully developed yet, but can grow along the way. Our field facilitators can help with this. By organizing methodological workshops, idea submitters receive additional guidance and engage with city services to gain technical expertise. Furthermore, the neighborhood council surveys the overall process.

Communication

The participatory budget project was publicized at the neighborhood level. Totems were placed in strategic squares and posters were distributed through local organizations, along with an information brochure. The participation cargo bike was used to publicize the project. Furthermore, a video was also made to explain the process, which was disseminated through social media. Furthermore, the site facilitators went to the

Communication	neighborhoods. A local festival, officially the launch of the voting round, also managed to gather 125 interested citizens in Haren, 50 in the European neighborhood. The moni- toring of the project is done by the City's participation service, in collaboration with the neighborhood council. Upon completion of the first participatory budget, the process was fine-tuned to improve the second participatory budget, both in terms of duration and sequencing of the different phases, as well as in the guidance of citizens and co- operation with the other services.		
Project Setup	The project teams consists of the staff of Brussels Participation: 3 project coor- dinators, 2 terrain facilitators, 1 communication, 2 administrative agents and 1 logistical support officer. They accompany citizens who submit an idea along the way: they help to clarify the project idea and they are contact persons to reach out to other depart- ments. Depending on the idea, departments such as urbanism, mobility, green spaces, etc. can be involved. They mainly intervene as experts of a specific topic. For the crea- tion of the design of the methodological workshops, and the integration of the neighbor- hood council within the process of participatory budgeting, we were assisted by Belgian experts in citizen participation. As explained in the projects' description, the neighbor- hood council itself also plays an important role in the project setup, by identifying the needs of the neighborhood and by playing the role of a citizens' jury.		
Description	The civil society could submit ideas for the participatory budget. They were also able to vote on the projects. Furthermore the citizens who compose the neighborhood council were closely involved.		
Budget	Salary, Experts	Planning & implementation	91,800€
	Execution of the project within participatory budgetting	Operating costs	2,000,000€
	Flyers, totems, local campaigns	Communication costs	10,200€
	Exploratory walk	Extra Budget	5,000.€
	Total Budget		2,107,000€



The project is financed from the city's own funds. There are two channels of financing: organizational and operational costs, and investment costs. The organizational work, but also the communication and coordination tools, are done with internal operating resources (city staff, printing, public contracts for certain tasks). The investment for the projects themselves is done with the City's investment funds.

Democracy Dimension Community





TOOL | PERMANENT | URL: HTTPS://FAIREBRUXELLESSAMEN.BE/ASSEMBLIES

Neighborhood councils

Brief Description

The Neighborhood Council is a decentralized place for listening, meeting, consultation, expression and deliberation. It aims to encourage and facilitate access to democratic participation for all inhabitants or users of a neighborhood and to encourage active, direct citizenship in relation to daily life. The first mission of the neighborhood council is to give advice in the allocation of the participatory budget, by determining the main themes to which the projects should respond and by verifying if the projects submitted correspond to the needs of the residents. The Neighborhood Council can also chose to co-create a project in the framework of the participatory budget. Secondly, the Neighborhood Council can give its opinion on city projects. The aim is to enable the city authorities to rely on the Neighborhood Council in order to benefit from its knowledge and experience of local realities. Thirdly, it can organize its proper initiatives on any subject concerning the neighborhood that he wishes to see placed on the political agenda. By setting up neighborhood councils, the City is creating a permanent structure for citizen participation. It is important for the composition of such a district council to reflect the composition of the district. In this way, the city also wants to involve citizens who are often more distant from decision-making processes. In order to achieve this diversity, a stratified drawing of lots was chosen. On the other hand, they are assisted by representatives of the associative life, in order to integrate the already existing knowledge about and from the district. They are also guided by site facilitators and project coordinators from the participation department to be prepared for their assignments. For instance, they are given an information session on how the city services work or they are given more technical explanations on certain urban planning projects.

Detailed Description

The Neighborhood Council is made up of residents chosen by lottery and representatives from the community sector. In order to ensure the greatest possible diversity within the Council, a first draw is organized on the basis of the population register, from a minimum of 5% of the inhabitants aged over 16 who live in the neighborhood concerned.

Detailed Description

A letter is sent to the people thus drawn, in order to invite them to apply for membership. An attached form collects the following socio-demographic data to guarantee the diversity: first name, name, gender, residence, age group, level of education, occupation and the language chosen for the debate, and gender. In case of missing profiles, a recruitment in the street is organized in order to improve the statistical representativeness of the candidates. A second draw is then made from all the valid applications received. This so-called "stratified draw" is performed based on an algorithm developed by a third-party service provider. The algorithm compares the sample of volunteers with the available statistical data for the neighborhood concerned (BISA data, Neighborhood monitoring, etc.). This process allows the identification of a group of 11 or 17 citizens with diverse (anonymized) profiles, reflecting as closely as possible the statistical balance of the neighborhood. The associations are recruited on the basis of a call for applications addressed to all associations with their head office in the district and developing all or part of their activities in the district.

In order to ensure the greatest possible diversity of associational life in the district, the different applications will be assessed on the basis of the following elements:

- 1. the field of activity (sports, cultural, social, shopkeeper representative, etc.);
- 2. the scope of the action;
- 3. the audience that is reached.

If the district concerned has fewer than 50,000 inhabitants, the Neighborhood Council is composed of 11 residents of the district, selected by drawing lots; 6 neighborhood associations. If the district concerned has more than 50,000 inhabitants, the Neighborhood Council is composed of 17 inhabitants of the district selected by lottery; given the size of the neighborhood, special attention will be paid to the criterion of geographical distribution, in order to take into account the statistical distribution of the number of inhabitants per neighborhood; and 8 neighborhood associations. The first Neighborhood Council was launched in the neighborhood of Neder-Over-Heembeek and Mutsaard in 2020 (population of 30.640 citizens). Due to the sanitary crisis and the lockdown, the city decided to organize the meetings online with the Zoom software. The participants thus deliberated online with the help of professional facilitators. In 2021, the neighborhood councils in the European Neighborhood of the City (population of 16.508 citizens) and in Haren (population of 6.558 citizens), a more distant neighborhood with a rural character, followed. In 2022, we started the fourth neighborhood council in Laken (people of 61.023 citizens). In the beginning, the Neighborhood Council draws up a stepby-step plan outlining the actions to be taken in order to realize their mission. Concretely, the Neighborhood Council analyses the needs of the different stakeholders of the neighborhood, it carries out a diagnosis of the neighborhood, selects priority themes for discussion and defines the framework of its work in an annual roadmap.

This roadmap is submitted to the College of Aldermen. The council members also carry out an annual assessment and adapt the roadmap accordingly. Since its start, the Neighborhood council of Neder-Over- Heembeek worked on several topics: they gave advise on the participatory budget process. Another task was a consultation process about the urban development of a specific area called "ZIR4": the council was represented in the project management theme and they gave their opinion about the three merging development scenarios for the area. In the context of the Meudon park, the neighborhood council was able to give its opinion on a survey sent to city residents. In addition, they were able to give suggestions for the priorities in the redevelopment of the park (security, water management, vegetation, maintaining traces of the past, etc.). Members were also consulted on a commercial development plan for a major commercial artery in the district. In the European neighborhood, the Neighborhood Council also worked its first year on a written recommendation about the results of the public vote on the participatory budget, which were followed by the College and then the Council. The Neighborhood Council also asked the Mobility Cabinet to be consulted on the renovation of pavements and received an answer letter on the work planned in the area from M. Dhondt, Alderman for Mobility. Finally, they were consulted by the Mobility Cabinet on the installation of bicycle stands. The Neighborhood Council of Haren also made recommendations about the results of the public vote on the participatory budget during its first year and was consulted on the new circulation scheme of Haren and the depiction of a map of hiking trails in Haren.

After three years of experience, we notice that the dynamics of each district council are very different, depending on the district, his local reality and its initial composition. Despite the different group dynamics, it is certain that thanks to the drawing of lots, we involve profiles of citizens that we did not and will not meet in district meetings where citizens respond to an invitation. Often, we see people who are somehow involved in the theme or project, or who want to defend certain interests.

Contribution

"Faire BXL Samen", making the city together, was the bilingual slogan in French and Dutch, we wanted to build our projects on. In order to do that in a structural way, we launched the concept of "neighborhood councils". This neighborhood approach appealed strongly to active citizens and local committees when we asked them about priorities at the beginning of the legislature in 2019. By using lots, we wanted to go further and make sure that we are reaching a much more diverse public than would otherwise be the case. By combining membership of local committees and associations with citizens drawn by lot, the City launched its own concept of neighborhood councils. In 2023, all the active councils will meet and share good practices in an event called the "Meeting of the Brusseleirs", a gathering for and by citizens of Brussels, similar to the one we organized in 2019.

Target Group

When drawing lots, an average of 5% of the inhabitants of a neighborhood is reached. Experience shows that in order to reach the least politically aware or available audiences, you need to be able to reach at least 2,000 citizens. As a result, the number of people reached per district is sometimes higher if the total population is lower. In Neder-Over- Heembeek that means 6,6 % inhabitants out of 30.000. In the European Quartier 12,5 % out of 16.000 citizens. In Haren, 30,7 % out of 7.000 citizens and in Laeken, 6,5 % out of 60.000. Mostly between 4 % and 18 % respond positively. The activity is aimed at all sections of the population. Lottery can be applied for the composition of other citizens' panels. The City of Brussels also applied it for composing a focus group on communication. The only condition required is having access to the population register, but also other forms of lottery exist.

Collaboration

Even if the diversity of the neighborhood council is guaranteed by lottery, we were very well aware we had to pay attention to the place each member can take within the council. That's way the councils are hosted by a terrain facilitator and a project coordinator who facilitate the meetings and who make sure that the discussed topics are understandable for everyone. Furthermore, we made a welcome pack to introduce the members to the functioning of the city, the policy areas and the city services. We also pay special attention to the group cohesion by using different kind of methodologies for the meetings. In addition, the members are assisted by the administration, for those who have difficulties to go online and to keep contact with the members between the meetings to ensure that they do not drop out. In order to make it possible for everyone to participate, members are paid on demand for their participation in the meetings.

Communication

The coming of the neighborhood council is announced by a letter, send to 5% of the population of the neighborhood. During the application period, 2 information sessions are organized for all interested parties. In addition, a brochure is distributed in the neighborhood. The local neighborhood facilitators also contact the local associations to explain the functioning of the district council and integrate it into the local network. The monitoring and evaluation is done in cooperation with the members of the council. The field facilitators keep their finger on the pulse to quickly detect any difficulties and adjust the methodology of the meetings. After each year, an evaluation is organized, where members first fill in an individual evaluation online, which is then discussed collectively. In this way, the methodology of each district council has already been slightly adjusted based on the recommendations, and so, the regulations that organize these councils, were adapted afterwards.

Project Setup Description	The project teams consists of the staff of Brussels Participation: 3 project co- ordinators, 2 field facilitators, 1 communication, 2 administrative agents and 1 logistical support officer. They accompany the councils along the way, design the meetings and are contact persons to reach out to other departments. Depending on the topic to be discussed, departments such as urbanism, mobility, green spaces, etc. can be involved. They mainly intervene as experts of a specific topic. For the creation of the concept of a neighborhood council and setting out the guidelines of the stratified lottery, we were assisted by Belgian experts in citizen participation.		
	king of the City.		
Budget	Flyers, distribution, totems, support material, salary	Communication costs	37,600€
	Salary, participation experts, organizational costs	Planning & implementation	150,400€
	Neighborhood councils Meeting (second Meeting of Brusseleirs)	Extra Budget	45,000€
	Total Budget		233,000€
Funding	The organizational work, but a done with internal operating resource tasks).	also the communication and coordin es (city staff, printing, public contrac	
Democracy Dimension	Empowerment		





BEST PRACTICE | ONE-OFF | 13.02.2020-16.08.2023 | URL1: HTTPS://FAIREBRUXELLESSAMEN.BE/PROCESSES/GOODMOVE URL2: HTTPS://WWW.BRUXELLES.BE/GOODMOVE/

GoodMove, a new circulation scheme for a more accessible, vibrant city

Good Move Pentagone, is the local implementation of the mobility plan of the Brussels-Capital Region in the hyper center of the City of Brussels. In order to develop this plan in the municipality, knowing that mobility is a particularly sensitive subject that brings together urban visions, travel habits and sometimes complex technical issues, the City of Brussels wanted to avoid the pitfall of polarized debates on the mobility measures themselves. Therefore, we decided to focus first on the development of a shared diagnosis, with input from a broad spectrum of stakeholders (municipalities, citizens, social and economic partners, civil society). This multi-party, fine-grained analysis formed the basis for the participatory process and consultation with professionals in the field. During the diagnostic phase, we valued the knowledge of the different stakeholders and mapped the local needs and wishes (where are the problems, what are the limits...). This allowed the technical working group of mobility experts and political representatives to work with the most complete picture of the challenges. All the measures and choices made were explained to the different actors afterwards. The second phase of participation concerns the evaluation, which effectively started at the same time as the diagnostic phase. From the outset, residents, but also traders and other stakeholders, could co-define the indicators that will make it possible to evaluate the success of "Good Move" one year after the implementation of the measures. Citizens could also sign up to contribute to the collection of data, in order to co-evaluate the implementation of the mobility plan. This was done by installing a "Telraam", a device that counts the number of traffic by mode and the traffic speed in front of one's house. Furthermore, there is a participatory reflection on the use - temporary or not - of the public space that will become available as a result of the traffic measures.

Brief Description

Detailed Description

The City of Brussels wants to make her neighborhoods more accessible, pleasant and safe for all modes of transport (walking, cycling, public transport or driving). Thanks to a number of specific interventions, the City of Brussels is making sure that all cars, vans, public transport, bikes and pedestrians arrives at its destination more easily. Extensive analyses have shown that one third of the car traffic in the Pentagon (the specific neighborhood that forms the city center) is transit traffic that does not have a destination. This creates air pollution, noise pollution, traffic unsafety and traffic jams that also slow down public transport. By limiting transit traffic, for example through restricted access zones and adjustments to traffic directions or one-way streets, the City is making the streets more pleasant and safer for visitors, schoolchildren, residents and public transport users. The Pentagon is one of the 8 Good Move ,meshes' on the territory of the City of Brussels. Such a ,mesh' is a large neighborhood in which transit traffic is reduced and where everyone can move safely and smoothly: by car, public transport, bicycle or on foot. The Pentagon remains however accessible for motorized traffic, such as local traffic, suppliers or people who want to park their car in a car park in the city center.

With the implementation of the regional mobility plan Good Move in Brussels, the Brussels municipal government wants to:

- Improve the quality of life in the neighborhoods by reducing through traffic.
- Ensure easy access to neighborhoods (also by car, but at low speed).

• Rethink some public spaces, giving priority to pedestrian areas, where the neighborhood lives.

• Improve air quality by reducing harmful emissions from transport. In order to respond to the real needs and concerns of the inhabitants, shopkeepers and visitors of the City of Brussels, the City wanted to involve the various stakeholders at different moments in the process. In concrete terms, the implementation of Good Move per neighborhood takes place in three phases: diagnosis of the current situation, formulation and implementation of measures, and evaluation. The city wants to involve residents, visitors and users of the city more in the various phases.

Step 1:

Diagnosis (from February until December 2020) During the diagnostic phase, we valued the knowledge of the different stakeholders and mapped the local needs and wishes (where are the problems, what are the limits...). This allowed the technical working group of mobility experts and political representatives to set to work with the most complete picture of the challenges. Residents, shopkeepers and other users of the city center were informed about the objectives an mobilized to give their opinions in different ways. They received flyers, were informed by posters in the neighborhoods, on publicity boards or social media.

There was an online platform where hundreds of useful contributions were uploaded. In addition, 5 online neighborhood meetings were organized in September and October 2020. The aldermen for mobility (Bart Dhondt) and citizen participation (Arnaud Pinxteren) explained what the regional mobility plan Good Move is and how the City intends to implement it in cooperation with the various parties involved (residents, traders, visitors, etc.). Those present had the opportunity to ask questions and contribute to the inventory of mobility problems in their neighborhood. Citizens were also stimulated to participate via street actions and a 1-minute survey on Facebook.

Phase 2:

Identification and implementation of measures (from January 2021) Since the beginning of 2021, the technical and political working group has been working on the basis of the elements gathered during the diagnostic phase, and all the knowledge already present in the form of previous studies, traffic counts, etc. The Pentagon hosts a wide variety of actors and stakeholders, each with their own needs and wishes. Therefore, the formulation of sound measures was a task that took several months. Once all the gathered elements were taken into consideration, the technical working group explained in detail the measures and choices made to the different actors. This feedback was given by inviting the public to 5 new online neighborhood meetings and by going into the streets with a cargo bicycle, equipped with a conversation table, called "The Babbeleir". The measures and choices made were also explained in detail through various channels: a website, a telephone hotline, totems in the streets. Furthermore, 70 one-to-one dialogues were held with commercial representatives, associations, hospitals, etc. The implementation of the traffic measures followed in the course of 2022.

Phase 3:

Monitoring and evaluation (ongoing) The evaluation phase actually started in February 2020, at the same time as the diagnostic phase. First of all, it was necessary to determine what the people of Brussels want to evaluate. From the outset, residents, but also traders and other stakeholders, had their say on the indicators that will make it possible to evaluate the success of "Good Move" one year after the implementation of the measures. In order to see if the concrete measures have the desired effect, the city is also counting on the contribution of the various stakeholders. Indeed, we count on citizen science to fill in the blind spots through the use of a device called "Telraam". Telraam develops high-tech and reliable measuring equipment that is made available to interested citizens. They are helped to set up their own fully automatic traffic counters. Then they mount them in their front windows, and traffic counting can start. That, in a nutshell, is Telraam. All the collected counts are made available on a website for the city and technical experts, but also to all residents and interested parties.

The Telraam device is a combination of a Raspberry Pi microcomputer, sensors and a low-resolution camera. The device is mounted on the inside of an upper-floor window with a view over the street. To send the traffic count data straight to the central database, the device needs a continuous Wi-Fi connection to the internet. Since the device is electrically powered, it also needs a power outlet within reach. Until now traffic counts have been a blind spot. Counting is currently expensive, limited in time, and rarely records all forms of transport. New technology, such as Telraam, offers possibilities for innovative ways of measuring in a continuous, multimodal, dense and efficient way. Telraam is working actively to involve citizens and provide good traffic counts. Measurements record cars, heavy vehicles, public transport, cyclists and pedestrians. Telraam handles the research work and the technology. Citizens supply the data. Participants find out about traffic in their street, and at the same time help the public authorities with good traffic counts. This data is reinforced by a campaign called Curieuzenair, during which citizens measured the air quality in Brussels. All of the gathered data will help to evaluate the newly introduced circulation scheme, but a new participation process will be set up to involve citizens into this evaluation phase.

Contribution

With GoodMove we wanted to ensure participation in one of the most debated issues in the city: mobility. Given the technical nature of the subject, we decided to involve citizens by asking them about their needs and sharing their experiences of mobility in the neighborhood, rather than presenting the circulation plan itself for discussion. In this way, we wanted to take into account a diversity of interests and points of view, as well as more detailed and decentralized information. A detailed analysis of the stake-holders and lots of bilateral contacts helped to realize this. The use of this profound analyses of all the parties involved represents the innovative character of the project, as does the ECoD 22/23 – Application Brussels (107), page 17/29 citizen science approach for continuous measurements of the impact of the circulation scheme. During the ECoD Programme Year, the project can be presented through temporary use cases of the liberated public space and by evaluating the implemented measures.

Target group

The project targeted as many stakeholders as possible: schools, business, bars, hotels, cycling groups, neighborhood committees, employer federations, citizens, etc. 923 people were reached in the diagnoses phase (online contributions, field actions). In total 70 people were reached by one-to-one dialogues. In the feedback phase, we reached 100 citizens with the cargo bike. 150 people participated at the online meetings. 53 people installed a Telraam, the citizen science device. 3000 people participated in the Curieuzenair campaign. The social media campaigns reached 108.832 people in total. Global mailing campaigns reached 8950 citizens. Within the city of Brussels the idea is to replicate this process to other neighborhoods. Our approach was also presented to the Brussels Region and other Brussels municipalities for potential application.

Collaboration

In order to make this project inclusive, we realized we had to reach out to as many people as possible, not only the cyclists or pedestrians. We believe that everybody will benefit from a city that is more secure and livable. That's why we diversified the means to collect opinions of citizens and other stakeholders : online, in meetings and in the streets. To be sure our communication would reach the different stakeholders, we launched a focus group on the communication of the project. This focus group was recruited by lottery and composed by very diverse profiles of people who could indicate how to target a specific group of people and advised us on the copywriting of the information campaign brochures and other material. Furthermore, we reached out to all the existing middle-field associations, enterprises, etc to spread the information about the new circulation scheme and the possible contributions.

Communication

Initially, a smaller scale of communication was carried out as a result of the participatory process (with neighborhood meetings, bilateral meetings, site visits, etc.) to inform the different stakeholders about the content of the Good Move action plan and the next steps in its implementation. Afterwards interested parties were kept informed through the City of Brussels website and social media and the participation website. The communication focus group, ambassadors and cabinet contacts were also used to keep a finger on the pulse so that, if necessary, targeted communications could be sent out with a specific message and/or to a specific target group. From June 2022 onwards, a large-scale press campaign was rolled out and reactive communication was used (telephone line, ambassadors in the streets, mailbox management, creation of a living FAQ, management of social media channels, etc.).

Project Setup

The project team consisted of the following parties:

- The City of Brussels (mobility, public works, urban planning and participation,
- commerce, police);
- The political cabinets of the majority Other partners that were involved:
- The Region (Brussels Mobility);
- The operating transport companies (MIVB, De Lijn) for technical advice.
- The police

Description

Civil society was involved during the diagnostic phase: the mapped the local needs and wishes (where are the problems, what are the limits related to mobility). The were also invited to participate at the citizen science program, called "Telraam", to count the traffic in front of their house, with a small device.

Budget	Branding, press, FAQ, website material, Z-card	Communication costs	135,000€
	Markings, retractable bollards, signalization, street furniture (flower boxes, etc.)	Planning & implementation	1,237,317€
	Animation of public space	Extra Budget	179,000€
	Total Budget		1,551,317€
Funding	The city funded the project on its own resources (budget of the mobility and		

The city funded the project on its own resources (budget of the mobility and participation department)

Democracy Dimension

Technology





BEST PRACTICE | 01.07.2019-01.09.2021 | URL: HTTP://MOVE-NOHW.BRUSSELS/FR/PROJECT

Citizens in the heart of the decision-making process of a new tramway line

Citizen participation was at the heart of the decision-making process in this new tramway line project for Neder-Over-Heembeek, one of Brussels guarters. Two citizen panels integrated the steering committee. The first one co-decided the tram route. The second one, co-decided the development proposals. Besides the citizen panels, all citizens were heard, informed or consulted at every stage of the project. The first stages of major infrastructure projects are often reserved for experts or political decision-makers. In the context of this project for a new tram line, we wanted to open up the debate very early on in the project by involving citizens in the initial technical discussions and by involving them transparently in the fundamental strategic decisions for its future development. That's why, already during the first phase, the impact study (2019-2020), a citizen panel was integrated in the steering committee, composed by the study offices in the fields of mobility, infrastructure, stability, environment, and the project team. Together, they shared their knowledge of the neighborhood and co-decided by collective intelligence, the tram route. This was never been done before in the Brussels history of public infrastructure project. In order to designate the consultancy firm that would carry out the development study, one of the members of the first panel took part in the appointment jury, alongside representatives of the Brussels Region, the City of Brussels and the MIVB transport agency. An new citizen panel was then composed in August 2020 to accompany the development study (2020-2021). These members were responsible for co-deciding on the development proposals. They enriched the debate with their knowledge of the neighborhood (counting parking spaces, bus stops, etc.) and co-defined the priority guidelines for the sketches, that were presented to all the inhabitants during citizens' meetings. They also participated in the creation of tools for communication with citizens.

Brief Description

Detailed Description The tramway project consists of analysing and creating an efficient and structuring public transport axis between the city centre (Rogier) and Neder-Over-Heembeek, a specific neighborhood in the northern area of Brussels. Heembeek is developing rapidly in terms of housing (including the City of Brussels' plan for 1,000 dwellings) equipment (sport infrastructures, schools,...)and employment (such as the Solvay Campus, Bpost, Bruxelles-Propreté, etc.). The aim of the project is to offer an alternative to the private car to both the inhabitants of Heembeek and the staff of the numerous companies in Heembeek.

The construction of a new tramway in Neder-Over-Heembeek will have a major impact on the neighborhood: it will provide a better connection to the city centre of Brussels and fully integrate the neighbourhood into the metropolitan dynamic, thanks to better access to the many schools, businesses, shops, and healthcare facilities. In order to ensure that the tram will serve those parts of the neighborhood that the inhabitants frequent, a citizens' panel was included in the project's steering committee, made up of the STIB (the local transport agency), the appointed study bureau, political representatives of the City and Brussels-Capital Region, and representatives of the city services and regional administrations concerned. The mission of this steering committee was to assist the Brussels Government in the decision-making process concerning the construction of this public transport line . During the first two phases of the project, participation was at the heart of decision-making. Phase 1: the impact study The impact study aimed to analyze the existing situation (population, businesses, schools, mobility, etc.) and to look ahead (developments expected or to be considered) in order to determine where the poles of attraction would be. First, a detailed diagnosis was carried out in order examine and define different routes. Then, an opportunity and cost-benefit analysis was carried to decide upon the choice of the transport mode (tram, extra buses, etc.) In order to help to identify the main issues to decide the transport mode, an online survey was organized, to which 1000 people responded. Furthermore, 3 information meetings were held, each attended by around 180 participants. Afterwards, the comparison of the route variants was studied using a multi-criteria analysis grid. For each variant considered, the analysis was carried out in a systematic and homogeneous manner. Thus, on the basis of the same level of analysis, it was possible to compare the route variants with each other and to highlight the advantages and disadvantages of each of them.

For the first citizen panel, who participated to this study, 8 representatives with different profiles were sought: 1 representative of a business, 2 representatives of local associations, 5 inhabitants with different profiles in terms of gender, age, place of residence, mode of transport. They attended each meeting of the steering committee and were able to closely follow the decision-making process. In addition, their knowledge of the neighborhood allowed them to give very relevant input on possible modes of transport.
By involving a citizen panel during the impact study phase, they were able to participate in the analysis of the existing mobility situation and the organization of a field visit for the technical experts. They were also involved in drafting the survey, which was sent to all the inhabitants, in order to question them on the different criteria that were important for them when deciding on the type of public transport: the capacity of the means of transport, the speed of travel, etc. Once the transport mode was decided, the citizen panel, participated in the methodology of the multi-criteria analysis, for which each actor of the steering committee had to assign points to each criterium (infrastructure, potential and accessibility, mobility, urbanism and environment). This lead to 5 criteria that were crucial for analyzing the more than 23 route options. Finally, the citizen panel was able to choose, from the more than 23 options, which route they thought would be the best for the construction of the tramway. In this final negotiation process, each partner in the steering group was given an equal vote and a final route was chosen through collective intelligence. This method was also innovative in this type of decision-making process by consent.

The citizen panel also participated in the creation of tools for communication with citizens, relying on their expertise as residents / shopkeepers / associations. They developed a Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) drawn up with the project stakeholders, they checked the web page on its accessibility and copy writing and disseminated info about the information evenings. Phase 2: the development study The aim of the development study was to draw up the concrete development plans for the future tramway since his itinerary was decided. To this end, a jury composed by the STIB, representatives of the City and the Region and 1 representative of the citizen panel, appointed a consortium of design offices made up of urban planners, landscape architects, mobility experts, and experts in participation and communication. This study took two years and culminated in an application for planning permission. The composition of the second citizens' panel, that accompanied this study, took into account the lessons learned from the first panel. Once again, eight representatives with different profiles were sought, but this time the nomination was followed by a voting round. Residents and users of the neighborhood could vote online for their preferred candidate. Out of more than 40 candidates, 4 residents, 2 economic stakeholders, and 2 associations were chosen. The method of selecting the candidates according to the predetermined criteria (in order: number of votes, type of candidate - association, economic actor, citizen - , segment of the route, gender, language role) was presented online and attended by around 70 people. The eight final representatives, with different backgrounds, professions, ages and gender constituted a "sample" of the Heembeek's population. By choosing for a completely transparent process, based on the above procedure called "election by consent", the city wanted to increase the legitimacy of the panel.

Furthermore, we developed guidelines for the panel, so they could better understand their mission and we organized a transition meeting with the first and the second panel to stimulate an exchange of knowledge and experiences. During the construction study, the citizens panel provided concrete information about the number of existing parking spaces and was able to advise the experts about the placement of the stops. They also communicated about the co-construction meeting for the redevelopment of a specific square, Zavelput, and worked to provide additional consultation for the residents of a particular street, Rue de l'Ancre, which would undergo a traffic change due to the installation of a future tram stop. This collective design, through dialogue and transparency, contributed to the design of qualitative public spaces that meet the needs of the inhabitants and users in the broadest sense. The limits of the co-construction and the margins of discussion linked to the constraints of the project (timing, technical feasibility, political vision, etc.) were identified in advance and clearly indicated to the citizens.

Throughout the whole process both panels were accompanied by experts in citizen participation, who offered :

- A mapping of important stakeholders;
- A "capacity building" training for citizens and traders on issues of understanding the Brussels context
- Identification of the Brussels institutions (who does what?)
- Quick explanation of the regulatory framework (planological framework: Good Move, etc., legal framework: permit application, etc.)
- A special accompaniment to allow moments of "relief" in order to avoid the over-solicitation of these "super-citizens".

In addition to the citizen panels, a wider range of communication and mobilization tools were deployed in order to mobilize a diverse public: a FAQ was developed, information meetings were held, numerous brochures were distributed, and a targeted communication campaign with a drawing contest was organized for schools. Furthermore, field events were organized to provide information on the project's progress. During the development study, an online survey aimed to ask the users of the neighborhood about their wishes in terms of design and broad outlines. Particular attention was paid to the position of a specific square called "Zavelput" (the Sablon well), which was mentioned in the above-mentioned online survey as an important point of interest for the Heembeek residents. That's why the programming of the square was worked out by the citizens. Three citizen meetings were held on 16, 23 and 27 March 2021, including one with traders, to determine the desired use for this central spot of Neder-Over-Heembeek. In order for the citizens to make projections on the future use of the space, VR-glasses were used to see possible options for development. On the basis of the work carried out at these meetings, the study bureau drew up an outline, which was the subject of an online vote.

Contribution

By integrating a citizens' panel into the steering committee of the tram project, this project fully contributed to the objective of transparency and the renewal of local policies, where decisions are not taken over the heads of citizens, but together with them. It was the first time in Brussels' history of such a large-scale redevelopment project that citizens were given such a place. Moreover, it was also unprecedented that the participation was started so early, namely during the impact study of the project, whereas it usually only happens during the construction study. Even the STIB and the study agency admitted afterwards that the citizens' expertise made it possible to develop a much higher quality project and to avoid design errors. During the Ecod Programme year, a meeting can be organized with both citizen panels who participated in the tramway project and other citizen panels active on other topics to exchange and to document guidelines for future panels.

Target Group

The call for candidates to participate in the citizens' panels was distributed to all residents of the neighborhood. During the call for the first panel, 43 citizens applied; during the call for the second panel, 66 citizens applied. In each case, 8 candidates were selected. The citizens' panels not only attended the meetings with the project team, but they also had an important role in representing the voice of the residents, associations and merchants of the neighborhood. They were also important contacts to inform people and explain the ongoing discussions. In total, a group of 350 citizens were reached in the entire participation process. Such integration of a citizens' panel into a decision-making committee can certainly be applied in other projects, nationally and internationally.

Collaboration

In order to ensure that the composition of the panel would not be questioned, the City of Brussels considered it important that the citizen panel was legitimate. The call for projects for the second citizens' panel was therefore immediately followed by an online voting process in which the inhabitants could vote for their preferred candidate. Therefore, during the analysis of the candidatures, the number of votes for the candidates was first taken into account. Only in a second phase were the other criteria (the gender, age and language role of the candidates) considered. These criteria also stimulated the diversity of the panel. In addition, the different sectors that make up the tramline's route were taken into account so that the concerns linked to each segment of the route were heard.

Communication

Different tools were used in order to communicate and disseminate the project:

- The launch of a website: www.move-nohw.brussels
- The development of a Facebook page
- Articles in the local newspaper;
- The creation of a tram house: The City of Brussels was able to provide a space to ensure a permanent presence on the route of the future tram.

	Total Budget		4,867,450€
	Meeting with citizen panels	Extra Budget	5,000€
	Execution of the works	Operating costs	4,000,000€
	Flyers, Campagne écoles, Branding, Website Facebook, tram house, etc.	Communication costs	117,160€
Budget	Impact study, Development study, execution phase	Planning & implementation	745,290€
Description	All local associations were contacted to join the citizen panel. Several of them were recruited: La Promenade Verte and the neighborhood Committee "Petit Chemin Vert" for the first panel, La Promenade Verte et Autour du Monde for the second panel. There also were citizens and commercial representatives involved in the two panels: a restaurant holder, a real estate officer Century 21 and Sumy, a sustainable urban logis-		
Project Setup	 The project team consisted of the following parties: The STIB (infrastructure department); The City of Brussels (mobility, public works, urban planning and participation, commerce); The Region (Urban, Brussels Environment, Perspective, BMA, Brussels Mobility); The citizens (members of the citizen panel accompanying the study); Cabinets of the City and the Region The infrastructure department relied on a technical agency to develop the studies. They also integrated a participation referee in their team. 		
Communication	 A communication partner provided communication tools (e.g. virtual reality), site information, contacts, plans, schedules, etc. Animations and support for shopkeepers in collaboration with the shopkeepers' associations, the City of Brussels and Hub.brussels; Creation of a WhatsApp Business group to inform local residents/shopkeepers "in real time"; Appointment of a reference person, a so called "Ombudsman" position for reporting of the nuisances/complaints caused by the construction site and treated by this ombudsman, whatever the phase of the construction site in progress. 		



Funding

The Brussels Capital Region financed the project, but the City was strategically involved to design the participation process.

Democracy Dimension Participation

ECOD APPLICATION BRUSSELS









PRESENTATION VIDEO: HTTPS://WE.TL/T-L9WHU8A0R5

"Waiting spaces" to tackle social and sustainable challenges of large cities

Challenge

Cities are becoming larger and more densely built-up. Residents face more lack of open space: green space, public space, meeting space, guiet space, etc. Space has become a need and want for which people are willing to commit. Public space has become a common that we need and we have to share in a new way. Moreover, public spaces are no longer just for transportation or movement, but freed from traffic, they can become breathing areas in a densely urban context. On the other hand, we see that major projects of re-planning public areas can take a long time: the realization of the future function can be delayed due to ongoing planning processes, financial complications or unexpected technical difficulties. Urban spaces can become "temporarily out of use" or awaiting transformation for a while. They are then in a kind of "pause" in terms of functionality. This is no different in Brussels than in other cities. Years can pass between the initial impetus and the actual start of a site renovation. Given the high demand for open space where people can meet or express themselves, these ,waiting spaces' provide opportunities for all kinds of spontaneous, alternative (temporary) activities: summer bars, vegetable gardens, theater performances, concerts, etc. Putting citizens' ideas and initiatives more central, is exactly what the do-democracy is all about. Instead of talking, debating or lobbying, citizens organize, manage and roll up their sleeves for the public good.

Solution

We propose temporary use as a participation methodology to activate social capital in a neighborhood, bring people together and experiment with new partnerships, new forms of economy and cultural added value for a neighborhood. Temporary use allows action, within a longer process of territorial planning.

Solution

This makes it possible to bring life to a neighborhood, revalue historical heritage, try out different infills or launch a shared dynamic. And allows one to better respond to the needs of residents. In this context, temporary use becomes a mobilizing tool. It contributes to the identity of a place, to social development or the re-appropriation of public space by citizens. It can also lay the foundations of future programming for urban projects. This will be applied in the project "Nouveau Marché aux Grains". While the strategy regarding its development has not yet been defined, temporary use will allow us to try out scenarios that came out of the first participation trajectory. Urban furniture will be created for the school square, that is part of the entire square, to see if the proposed scenarios are consistent with the needs of the territory. Temporary use will also be applied for certain squares that became car-free after introducing the new circulation scheme according to the GoodMove project. As the future function has not been determined yet, the time perspective for the temporary use is not limited in se and will be transformed in a more definitive development.

Impact

Temporary use is all about trying and testing, so the project can meet the needs of the citizens. For the experimental programming of the school square "Nouveau Marché aux Grains" 20 pupils of the school Institut Mot de Couvreur will be involved. Citizens and businesses living or working around the square will also be involved. The first participation process already showed that all the different stakeholders want the square to be greener, with more possibilities for meeting each other and with shelter for the rain. A place for personal expression and creativity. In the framework of GoodMove, 5 squares will be activated by proposing a temporary development of at least 2 years that reinforces the new development. Local partners (a surrounding theatre, café, library, a neighborhood committee or association of skaters, etc.) will be mobilized to meet the citizens and users of the square to take ownership of the future development. As the squares became accessible for other use than parking or circulation, it's important that citizens see the change immediately in a positive way. By testing out new projects, we appeal to imagination to make the city more livable and pleasant for all.

Implementation

First an information period will be introduced by installing signage that lets the public know why-when and how the public space is changing AND informs motorists/ cyclists of the road change. This will be done by integrating visual elements on the scene and by placing information totems in the streets. For "Nouveau Marché aux Grains », the temporary use of the school square will be integrated in the budget of the school contract, a regional urban renewal program, that aims to upgrade school neighborhoods in Brussels and strengthen the relationship between schools and their surroundings. The planned budget 45.000 euro. For "GoodMove", a partnership has been signed with Brussels Major events to make observations, contact the different stakeholders, execute the experimental programming, for a planned budget of 13.850 euro each year.

In terms of nearest, most exciting accomplishment, we hope that by deploying temporary use, we can move beyond target group thinking. Instead of targeting a specific segment of citizens, we see the stakeholders as actors, in all their diversity who together form part of a dynamic community. Through temporary use, we want to work towards a network structure, in which the City is just one of several stakeholders. To do that, efficient stakeholder management is crucial, in order to communicate with the defined stakeholders in a tailor-made and strategic way, thus engaging and reaching the right stakeholders in a participatory way.

Support

Images

The project will be in need of a communication consultant who's specialized in stakeholder management and strategic communication, in order to create support. We know that involvement and participation are absolutely necessary these days in order to give citizens a more strategic place in decision-making processes, but we also noticed that participation alone is not sufficient. In order to reach diverse groups of citizens, we would like to strengthen our communication strategies and be able to work more in a network setting. By focusing on on-site co-creation, we think local interaction will create a positive setting for partnership.



Democracy Dimension Community

December 2022



PRESENTATION VIDEO: HTTPS://WE.TL/T-GSIQZCVUU5

Towards more youth participation

Challenge

Brussels is a young city. The average age is below that of other regions in Belgium. Young people form an important part of the social fabric, but they are a very diverse group. The diversity within Brussels youth offers challenges as well as opportunities. The majority of young people identify very strongly with the city and see in Brussels the symbol of unity in diversity. However, the institutional, linguistic and ethno-cultural fault lines that run through the city pose a risk to its cohesion, according a Brussels Study called the Democratic Empowerment of Brussels Education, Students and Teachers Programm, which conducted research among 1,880 young people aged 15-16 years old to get an insight into their attitudes and focused on initiatives that connect young people. At the same time, we note that the life world and identity of Brussels youth is in constant interaction with the changing metropolitan environment in which they are growing up. Climate change, pollution and socio-economic challenges are part of this. Potentially, this context can further sharpen the fault lines. We see that the poorest neighborhoods in Brussels are most affected by the consequences of climate change, pollution or social inequity. Young people play a crucial part in building more cohesive and inclusive societies, sensitive towards the needs of all citizens, especially those facing greater challenges. Young people must get the chance to voice their opinion on decisions that impact them.

Solution

We want to strengthen social cohesion at the local level while promoting youth participation on a topic that effects all of Brussels youth: climate change. We want to support the active participation of young people in democratic life and bring together young people and local decision-makers to stimulate dialogue.

We think the climate issue is a relevant topic to start this youth participation, so that we can ensure that the city's climate plan is also grounded in the vision of future generations. For the young people who participate, it is an unique way to learn from other participants, to discover living together in all its diversity and to look for common solutions. A "Council of Future Generations" can ensure that young people themselves indicate what role they want to play in the City's climate plan: from a controlling role in the monitoring process to a decisive role in developing certain city projects. Through the diverse composition of such a council (by drawing lots), we want the voice of the diverse Brussels to have a say. We provide room for open dialogue, so that young people learn to deal with tension and handle it in a constructive way and do not fester under the surface or lead to resistance.

Impact

With the proposed project, we mainly address schools. Following a study that identified the difficulties teachers experience with culturally diverse audiences (Maréchal et al., 2014), we offer schools an opportunity to discuss the topic of climate change and its consequences with groups from different backgrounds. We offer tools to facilitate dialogue and use various techniques stemming from intercultural and non-violent communication, focusing on fostering an empathetic, curious and open attitude towards the other. Constructive dialogue here relies on mutual understanding to counter negative perceptions and polarization. Specifically, we will look for at least 40 young people from different schools to form the "Council of Future Generations". For each school, 5 pupils will be drawn by lot. They will initially be questioned about their role in the climate plan, but in a second phase they will be able to carry out concrete actions. When we interviewed young people in the streets, the minus 17-year-olds are to some extent aware of the climate issue, but are also quite remarkably unconcerned about the solutions. The few who are very concerned, are so through their families. The 17-20-year-olds we interviewed, remembered the demonstrations well and many declare they would like to take action again. This is clearly the most activist age group. We therefore would like to reach out for 5th and 6th year pupils of secondary school to compose the Climate Council.

Implementation

Information about the project will be distributed via the schools and specific contact with teachers who already teach about citizenship. The project will be implemented within the existing budget of the Climate Plan and the Participation Department., for a total of 10.000 euros. The next milestone that would be great to realize is setting up a network of teachers who believe in the project and will carry out the message within the schools. This network could be found with teachers who teach "active citizenship". They could play a role in stimulating participation in the panel and they could support their pupils, or even organize feedback within the schools to other pupils. An interactive platform could help them to exchange among teachers on the topic.



We would like to rely on partner organizations such as the Act Now Youth Network to make it possible to share knowledge, best practices, and local experiences on this topic. We see the Belgian "Bureau International Jeunesse" as a potential partner for developing this project and providing advice on how to work with young people. It would also be helpful to learn from youth associations who are already working on climate issues to know how they can support the dynamic of the project, and what the project could offer to them. In terms of consulting, we have experts at our disposal who have knowledge of facilitation techniques, but who don't necessarily have experience in working with youth.



Images

Democracy Dimension Empowerment

