

3B.6 - Participation and Institutionalization: perspectives in urban policies

Isabella Rusconi¹; Fernando Nogueira (0000-0002-5820-3607)²

¹University Institute of Lisbon, Portugal. ²University of Aveiro, Portugal

The democratic crisis expressed by high electoral abstention, distrust in political system and rise of authoritarianism signals the importance of bringing citizens back to the political debate (Fung, 2015).

Several authors argue that the renovation of democracy will take place around the political debate about cities, while undergoing intense transformations (Falanga, 2020). It is urgent to rethink participation in urban policies and the evolution of planning instruments and methodologies, helping to confront the decision making with the reality of socio-economic inequalities and environmental imbalances that accompany urban development.

Although the urban political discourse contemplates participation, the existing instruments prove to be ineffective and expose known problems. Literature indicates that the effectiveness of participation arises from the interactive dynamics between institutional design - referring to norms and procedures that determine in what, who, how and when one participates, to contextual elements - which include social capital, political will, management implementation capacity and governance issues (Avritzer, 2008; Smith, 2009).

The challenges imposed on institutional arrangements relate the need to articulate social and institutional innovation (Avritzer & De Sousa Santos, 2002) for the construction of a new inclusive urban agenda, which addresses territorial problems from a proximity scale, able to transform relations between society and government, and transfer decision-making to citizens in the co-construction of solutions that guarantee the right to the city.

Portugal has been experiencing an explosion of initiatives with different institutional designs, that promote civic participation in direct transformative processes, such as the BIPZIP in Lisbon, the 'Bairros Saudáveis' on a national scale and participatory budgeting; initiatives that can promote public participation in decision-making processes in spatial planning instruments and, recently, the Lisbon Citizens' Council 'by lot'.

Despite this dynamic context, there is no evidence of a coherent system of participation, nor of how and if these practices dialogue with each other, and what is the real impact on urban and territorial development (Falanga & Ferrão, 2021).

If there are fragile systems evaluating the effectiveness and societal impacts of these initiatives, the absence of institutionalized arenas make the sustainability of these practices compromised and vulnerable to political will. This is an early-stage PhD research that seeks to contribute through a critical reflection on the need for approaches that overcome current barriers to participation in the production of cities. The process is of an applied nature, with a qualitative and practice-oriented approach. The objective is exploratory.

The hypothesis that arises is that democratic innovations can happen in articulation between practices that allow the emergence of social innovation and the institutionalization of participation in decision-making processes.

It is proposed to develop a theoretical framework contemplating the dimensions of analysis to which planning projects and participation arrangements may be subject, which will be comparatively analysed and characterized in the light of the theoretical framework. Then, through exploratory research, we will reflect on new arguments that can support improvements in institutional designs, arrangements and methodologies used in participatory processes related to cities and formulate hypotheses for the institutionalization of these practices in urban policies.

Avritzer, L. (2008). Instituições participativas e desenho institucional: Algumas considerações sobre a variação da participação no Brasil democrático. *Opinio Publica*.

Avritzer, L., & De Sousa Santos, B. (2002). Para ampliar o cânone democrático. In *Democratizar a democracia: os caminhos da democracia participativa*. Civilização Brasileira.

Falanga, R. (2020). *Participatory Design: Participatory Urban Management*. January.

Falanga, R., & Ferrão, J. (2021). The evaluation of citizen participation in policymaking: Insights from Portugal. *Evaluation and Program Planning*.

Fung, A. (2015). *Putting the Public Back into Governance: The Challenges of Citizen Participation and Its Future*. *Public Administration Review*.

Smith, G. (2009). *Democratic Innovations: Designing Institutions for Citizen Participation*. Cambridge University Press.

3B.7 - Analyzing Inclusive Citizenship in Cities and Human Settlements through a Right to the City perspective

Kelly Komatsu Agopyan
University of São Paulo, Brazil

This thematic paper, elaborated in the scope of the Global Platform for the Right to the City (GPR2C) aims to address the main aspects of inclusive citizenship in cities and human settlements, as well as its main contributions to the promotion of the right to the city. The paper discusses different interpretations of inclusive citizenship – which is a dynamic and contested concept – hoping to provide a better understanding its complexity, implications, and relevance in cities and human settlements.

Firstly, it is relevant to contextualize the concept of “citizenship”. The more disseminated notion of citizenship is a state-centric one, related to two main approaches: citizen as a (civil, political, and cultural) rights holder and citizen