

# The Participatory Budget and Violence Against Women in Peru

KARIN PATRICIA RAMIREZ FIGUEROA

ORCID: 0000-0002-9344-6831

## I. Introduction

The issue with the social inclusion of participatory budget-related topics largely relates to academic literature in countries including Argentina, Chile, Peru, and Uruguay. Through a qualitative meta analysis of these countries' work, the following categories were continuously reiterated when referencing social inclusion; age, sex, and social status. Together, these three categories prove the existence of participatory budgets- established public spaces that allow for formal discussions on issues rooted in social inequalities that have proven to be continuously solutionless. From the above mentioned countries' work, we can thus infer that young adults scarcely participate in participatory budgeting, despite their right and ability to do so since adolescence. Similarly, low-income sectors observed that the tool enabling them access to more resources is a sense of participation. However, research emphasizes the difficulties in incorporating participation in sectors with social exclusion issues. When we appeal to topics related to women's participation, we realize there is scarce research done on participatory budgets involving them. There exists a tendency for women to participate on a greater scale in Argentina and Uruguay; however, even in these countries, women's participation continues to be diminutive compared to men's. In Argentina, for example, there is evidence that in its democratically representative practices, women are at a disadvantage when appealing to issues in participatory budgeting, as men make up the majority. As a result, when larger issues are discussed, in Peru's case, we see that women pose a secondary role in politics. Therefore, participatory budgeting serves as a medium or tool to generate social inclusion. (A review of academic literature on Argentina, Chile, Peru and Uruguay, Suárez, M. 2014).

The CLAD magazine on reforms and democracy in Caracas talks about the participatory budget and the crisis that representative democracy brings, emphasizing that Latin America centers its representation around a political and social atmosphere, which creates skepticism over the effectiveness of participatory budgeting systems. This issue, which we can designate as the crisis of democracies, tells us that mechanisms like public, representative spaces characterizing all representative democracies, are often mistrusted due to the scarce effectiveness when accounting for citizens' concerns. We also observe other motivations. Font (2001), who refers to the aforementioned democracies in Latin America and other parts of Europe, indicates that invoking a political atmosphere in public spaces both creates new challenges as well as opportunities, which should extend to all citizens within systems of democratic representation. (Montesinos, 2009).

We often associate participatory budgeting in Latin America with terms like "success", "failure", or "change". The magazine of political sciences at the Pontifical Catholic University of Chile proposed that whenever local governments wanted to introduce participation mechanisms in participatory budgeting, the design and its results depended on the designers' intentions as well as the condition of the area. With such intentions in mind, governments accounted for the existing levels of decentralization as well as all existing parties of opposition. Using these points as a baseline, the university performed a controlled comparison between Caracas, Montevideo and Porto Alegre, and a more extensive set of national studies in Brazil, Bolivia, Guatemala, Nicaragua, and Peru.

They concluded that when it came to participatory budgeting topics, there is generally a low success rate that prevents participation on a local level, fiscal transparency, and efficient municipal government functioning. (Goldfrank, 2006)

Participatory budgeting within the European continent, alongside its challenges posed by the CLAD magazine in Caracas published, enables us to perform an analysis on the past few years. In this analysis, participatory democracy suffered a notable increase within Europe. This movement encompasses several countries, including those with similar struggles to those in Latin America, which allows us to comprehend democracies as a tool for European unification. Meanwhile, Latin American and a few European countries viewed participatory budgeting as a forefront for local democratic processes. In their majority in Europe, these participatory budgets have little to no experience in Porto Alegre, and on a larger scale, the same can be said for countries in Latin America. It is somewhat complicated to generate a dynamic, participatory democracy, accounting for social, economic, and political levels. Likewise, this phenomenon is too heterogeneous. Some countries say that participatory budgeting is not the same as what it is in France, Italy, Germany, or Spain. However, until now, it has not been possible to obtain a methodology that could be presented under the name of a participatory budget, much less methodologies that can be considered as that set of variants in the environment of a common base. In different Latin American experiences, it can be observed that the methodology used in Porto Alegre consisted of importing, adapting and combining different ideologies of hundreds of cities. Within each country, several types of methodologies can be observed, and even if we manage to exchange and debate some of these ideas, some groups will agree with them while others will disagree. Regardless, participatory budgets do not establish a particular methodology within Europe; on the contrary, it is viewed as a political issue that sometimes generates movements seeking to institutionalize citizen participation, taking the public budget as an axis. (Sintomer, 2005).

Within participatory budgeting, the creation of new mechanisms that allow democracy to innovate within local governments- which tell us the limits, risks, challenges, and potential possibilities each of these poses- requires more active participation from the population. Despite this, the number of participants rarely reaches 5% of the general population. Trying to overcome this percentage is difficult for almost all governments and different social movements immersed in electoral issues, alongside receiving criticism from participatory voices that question any type of legitimacy of the process. This allows us to infer the permanent and constant concern for the correct way of implementing participation, similar to the creation of a criterion that benefits individuals that do not exercise their right to participate due to existing risks that participation will not function as an exclusive element.

We have a few cases in which the main concern is expanding citizen participation through different consulting mechanisms; the internet, community assemblies, billboards, television and radio advertisements, among others. These mechanisms risk reducing all sorts of participation to a simple consult; the loss of creation within a given space and time in a discussion and construction of proposals, all those participatory causes would lose their deliberative nature. (Llamas, 2004)

## **II. WOMEN'S PARTICIPATORY BUDGETING**

### **2. Participatory Budgeting**

#### **2.1. Definition**

The participatory budget is a mechanism of equitable, rational, efficient, effective, and above all, transparent allocation of public resources through which it is possible to strengthen the relations between the state and the public. Within this context and just as local governments, regional governments must promote the development of mechanisms as well as strategy creation that will allow for participation to happen within budget programs, as well as monitor and supervise the management and correct use of public resources.

Participatory budgeting is an instrument through which decision-making is proposed and carried out in a shared manner between the state and society, having to opt for actions that can implement and fulfill the vision, just as the full development within the framework of concerted development planning. (Ministerio de Economía y Finanzas del Perú, 2005)

Following this definition, participatory budgeting is also seen as a process through which citizens- individually or through civil organizations- can voluntarily and constantly contribute to decisions around the public budget, through a set of meetings annually held with different government authorities.

## **2.2. Participatory Budgeting Phases and Particularities**

The process to create a participatory budget must take into account the territorial reality, as well as the way each local or regional government is organized. It must respect the basic procedures in place for the development of the budget in addition to its past experience and particularities, a process that enables adapting participatory budgeting according to each region or locality's needs.

### **2.2.1. Preparatory Phase**

The preparatory phase is the responsibility of regional or local governments, depending on the case, and must coordinate with their respective coordination councils. The development of these communication actions, such as raising awareness, convening, identification and training of all agents that participate in the development of this process, must be delivered in a timely manner and with sufficient anticipation, taking into account that this phase must begin the month of January from the previous year.

Before initiating actions of communication, raising awareness, convening, identification and training of all participants, the approval of this ordinance is necessary. This approval will allow for regulating the participatory budget for the fiscal year, and must also specify the schedule of said process, the formation of the technical team and various registration mechanisms of all participating agents, as well as other specifics that the approval details.

### **2.2.2. Communication**

Within this section, both regional and local governments must develop communication mechanisms for the participatory budget process to keep the population duly informed about the progress and results. To do so, governments must use various means of communication including electronic portals, among others.

We must highlight a communication aspect; the projects previously and presently in development that must continue onto next year; information on prevention projects that can be executed in various exercises the following years; confinement compromises of the various projects through FONIPREL, water projects for everyone, my neighborhood, the different international cooperation organizations, treaties, among others; lastly, the projection of the established amount oriented towards the participatory budget to avoid generating suspicions and expectations that surpass each respective government's financial capacities.

### **2.2.3. Raising Awareness**

Raising awareness is important because of the need to promote responsible participation within civil society. It must be organized in a way where all efforts are taken into account for local development, as well as for the compromise they must assume the moment they discuss local issues. On the other hand, the creation of strategic organizations that allow for greater quality in the participation process must be encouraged.

Likewise, it is important for civil society to obtain power within the process, in order for their participation to contribute to better local and regional development.

### **2.2.4. Announcement**

As previous ones, this phase is important, given that the regional or local government must coordinate with their coordination council and call on the public to participate in the participatory budget. We must use all forms of

communication and account for the scope of the jurisdiction to correctly and adequately inform all participating agents, emphasizing that this process starts in January.

For this to happen, the call must promote the integration of a representative process of various entities of the state as well as those of the civil society, within which we have: regional directorates, universities, public development entities, different business organizations, professional associations, grassroots social organizations, communities and associations of people with disabilities, women's associations, youth associations, and other youth institutions relating to vulnerability due to poverty, ethnicity, violence, or gender.

### **2.3. Identification and Registration of Participating Agents**

For this section, it is worth mentioning that both the regional and local governments must have a registration form for all agents participating in the process, the same ones that will resign or become elected for each participatory budget through the organizations that each belongs to.

### **2.4. Participant Training**

Within this section, the regional or local government must implement certain means to enable training for participating agents. Additionally, governments must facilitate the creation of programs that will develop the capacity of all participating individuals- with designated specifics for those forming part of the regional council as well as for councilors and civil society agents.

The national directorate of the public budget must coordinate with local or regional governments the development of this budget, as well as promote decentralized training programs. These training programs must aim to strengthen the participatory budget as well as other programs necessary to strengthen this process.

Training must be consistent and permanent, directed towards the needs and characteristics of each locality based on its jurisdiction. They must be executed through modalities such as workshops or meetings, where authorities and the public remain informed about different tasks involved in the participation process.

### **2.5. Consultation Phase**

In the consultation phase, all state officials and civil society officials meet to implement the development of work that can establish a diagnostic, identification, and prioritization of results and projects based on prior-made investments. The goal of this phase is to contribute to fulfilling the set goals and to obtain favorable results for citizens, and in essence, to help reach the objectives of sectors needing the most aid.

## **III. Development of Work Workshops**

We often attend work meetings that the regional president or mayor calls, through which the development of various actions and priorities to obtain specific results occur. These are investment projects as well as those with various compromises that the state has to its citizens. The regional president, as the provincial or district mayor, must convene these workshops with advanced notice.

We should note that each workshop must be carried out in one or more meetings, adjusting the amount required as necessary, and taking into account the distinct needs and characteristics of each region, province, or district. This will allow for further considerations, such as linguistic diversity- unique to each population- and provide an inclusive atmosphere where all citizens have equal access to the deliberation- regardless of whether they speak dialects or languages other than Spanish. The work workshops mentioned previously must happen before or at most by June.

On the other hand, technical teams are in charge of aiding work workshops by preparing and organizing the necessary information to carry out at each meeting. Their role will help evaluate all investment proposals, which can then be considered within institutional budgets.

Further, it is important to maintain previously mentioned actions such as situational diagnostic updates, whenever necessary, who will be in charge of technical teams. As mentioned, this team will fundamentally find an improvement in the living conditions of citizens. They will work via results that the strategic budget establishes, as well as results that may be considered critical within this jurisdiction.

Finally, a series of viable projects must be selected that can orient budgeting towards achieving prioritized results. A supreme decree must define these projects, which will react to regional, provincial, or district-based characteristic impacts depending on the context. In this case, the supreme decree is 097-2009-EF and its respective amendments.

Additionally, as these projects are a priority during the participative process during the year it was carried out, they will have also established differences between those that were considered and those that were not included into the final institutional budget. Therefore, the budget must account for the reason for which certain projects were not considered, as well as the execution of projects and investments that were. They must emphasize the acceptance of approved projects as well as their relationship to projects from the previous year. The percentage of resources that the regional government invested in this budget must also be revised- or, in its failure to comply, the local government's percentage of resource investment instead. For this purpose, governments must have a greater availability of resources through co-financing methodologies.

A corresponding report must be released, including commitments that civil society as well as other state entities assume, within past participative processes and their level of compliance in each of them. Lastly, these points allow listening to citizens through provision of public services, emphasizing the deficit of infrastructure, human resources, and materials necessary for the correct and adequate provision.

### **3.1. Workshop Identification and Prioritization of Results**

#### **Step 1: Concerted Development Presentation Plan– CDPP**

In this stage, we may find the framework for the vision and strategic objectives found in the Concerted Development Presentation Plan (CDPP), alongside its respective progress in its execution and achievement of established results. In the event the technical team recommends it, or participating agents consider necessary, these strategic objectives must undergo adjustments and be incorporated into the results-based budget.

The CDPP's vision will consider the territorial scope of public and/or private institutions, regardless of their funding source or affiliation with the government. The territorial scope of these institutions will be oriented towards initiatives and investments of various economic, social, and institutional factors, as well as for the formulation of regional or local public politics.

Several agents must be incorporated to execute all objectives for the development of the CDPP, each of whose contributing objectives must be determined prior. These projects must be prioritized depending on the participative project, whose goals are found in the CDPP, and who must focus on achieving them. Additionally, within this workshop, the regional government's president- or in its defect, the local government's president- must inform the public of the percentage budgetarily assigned to the participatory budget.

#### **Step 2: Identification and Result Prioritization**

This section aims to identify those results, established through said objectives to improve citizen wellbeing. Result identification will allow for correct allocation of public resources to achieve all budgets' goals. The technical team must present the diagnosis of the territorial scope to participating agents to inform them of and help prioritize their objectives and results.

This point must be understood as a the variation of characteristics, qualities, or situations that in one way or another affect the group's objectives- be it population size, institution, communities, or the group it is. The results are linked to finding a solution to a problem that affects the target group. Thus, a problem should not be defined

as the neglect to a possible solution, nor the lack of a good or service- but on the contrary, as a possibility of finding various alternatives when solving it.

Agents participating in the technical team's support system must establish scores for each type of criterion, where they must prioritize results that will be addressed. These prioritized results must be oriented to make an evaluation that incorporates a technical evaluation as well as defining the prioritization of some of these projects. For this reason, this phase obtains a report containing all results that have been identified and prioritized.

### **Final Reflections**

Regarding knowledge of the participatory budget, the meta analysis done determines that most of the organized population- that is, a 78% of the population- assures that they know the existence and purpose of a participatory budget, and the remaining 21% has no knowledge of either. However, despite having some knowledge on participatory budgeting, the population organized within a district does not take part in these participatory spaces due to limitations within participatory budgets, or due to the 25.38% capital expenditure that does not cover or include productive projects. Further, when 22% of the expenditure is not executed, there is a perceived disinterest and mistrust in municipal authorities.

León (2009) mentions that the participatory budget brings a generation of investment and thus promotes local development. He leaves us with the message that planned projects are large or have overwhelming demands that the district needs.

We understand that the participatory budget manages 23% of resources allocated for investment, alongside challenges existing within the climate and establishment of trust and commitment to carry out population-based investments. This process is weakened if districts cannot execute these investments that the initial project envisioned. The participatory budget finds itself constantly amended, such that municipal authorities must be directly involved to coordinate investments and consolidate them with time.

Current research agrees with León, C.'s references, as surveys fail to visualize prioritization at the time of achieving investments, nor account for the effectiveness of expenses. Therefore, we can infer that the population does not look at the participatory budget as a transparency reflection to optimize resource use and public benefit that may cover deficiencies in project execution and which require various processes. These deficiencies and mistrust in investments are a consequence of lack of credibility and therefore lack of the public's participation.

Regarding citizen participation in participatory budgeting, Rojas (2015) mentions that within workshops for participatory budgeting, participating agents tend to be active participants, as well as have access to said trainings and information, achieving effective results.

For this reason, we find similarities with the thesis Rojas (2015) developed, given that the training of participating agents and the surveillance committee must be continuous and have necessary tools at their disposal when preparing profiles of objects. These must take into account municipal strategies, and use them to monitor the execution of expenses as well as the progress of execution of all resources assigned to the participatory process within national level municipalities.

In relation to whether procedures of the participatory budget are complied to or not, it is concluded that these procedures do not comply because they are not respected. Regarding agreements made in the consultation phase during the agreement and compromise workshop, despite an existing act that agents and executives sign, many times it is not fulfilled, which weakens transparency and credibility of the authorities and officials of municipalities.

Regarding compliance to reporting, the scarcity of publicity part of participatory budgeting does not incentivize greater citizen participation for the following years. This result is expected due to delegates' limited communication, and as a result, the expression of a lack of transparency.

Another element that leads to scarce citizen participation is that participating budgets pose poor communication, dissemination, and accountability within these processes, further creating a climate of distrust and disinterest within the population.

On the other hand, wherever citizen participation is encouraged in a substantive way, it has been possible to determine the behavior of social organizations of civil society, such that participation is encouraged and complied with in democratic representation. These institutional designs are not determinants like the political will that mayors have, as well as the dynamic role that civil society possesses.

Likewise, within the difficulties or limitations that are taken into account when strengthening social surveillance and accountability, some organizations have been notable; grassroots organizations seek a space for dialogue within a local government as well as meetings for citizens to raise awareness among citizens based on their case, accounting for surveillance and accountability. Their evaluation involves all political and social entities, and there exists a coincidence within the mistrust in reports that have to do with accountability, affecting relationships among these various groups. This impacts harmonious relationships between citizens and the municipality; at the same time, they must solicit an improvement to the quality, precision, and opportunity at the information invested in these processes.

Regarding whether the execution of investments are fulfilled, it has been concluded that various projects elected within participatory budgeting workshops fail to execute in their entirety. Visualizing the existence of money transfers from previous projects, it has also been possible to corroborate the existence of non- predisposition of authorities, and as a result, participating citizens of the society have little to no weight in enforcing agreements within these projects.

## References

- [1.] Chávez, M. (2017). *Participación ciudadana y autoridades municipales en el presupuesto participativo de la municipalidad distrital de Cáceres del Perú, Jimbe 2017*. Universidad César Vallejo, Perú.
- [2.] García, K. (2016). *Evaluación de desempeño en materia de inversión del proceso de presupuesto participativo del gobierno regional de Piura, 2004-2014*. Universidad Nacional de Piura, Perú.
- [3.] Goldfrank, B. (2006). Los procesos de presupuesto participativo en América latina: éxito, fracaso y cambio. *Revista de ciencia política*, 8 (2).03-28.
- [4.] León, C. (2009). *Planificación y Presupuesto Participativo Distrital: La Experiencia de Lambayeque*. USP.
- [5.] Llamas, F. (2004). *Los presupuestos participativos: nuevos mecanismos de innovación democrática en los gobiernos locales*. Lambayeque
- [6.] Montesinos, E. (2009). *Reforma y Democracia*. Revista del CLAD.
- [7.] Rojas, C. (2015). *Factores que limitan la participación ciudadana en el presupuesto participativo, caso: distrito de Mariano Melgar*. Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú.
- [8.] Sintomer, Y. (2005). Los presupuestos participativos en Europa: retos y desafíos. *Revista del CLAD reforma y democracia*, 31 (2) 1-17.
- [9.] Suarez, M. (2014). *Los presupuestos participativos como herramientas de inclusión social: una mirada a la literatura académica sobre Argentina*. Ponencia de la Universidad de la República. Montevideo.