

Independent Reporting Mechanism (IRM): City of Paris Final Report 2017

Samuel Goëta, Dataactivist with the support of Timothée Gidoin

The Open Government Partnership (OGP) is a voluntary international initiative that aims to secure commitments from governments to their citizenry to promote transparency, empower citizens, fight corruption, and harness new technologies to strengthen governance. In 2016, OGP opened to subnational participants in their own right as part of a pilot program. The OGP Subnational Pilot Program consists of 15 subnational governments who submitted Action Plans and signed onto the Subnational Declaration at the Paris Global OGP Summit. This report summarizes the results of the development and implementation of Paris's pilot subnational action plan from January 2017 to December 2017.

The IRM reports for OGP pioneers will be published online primarily. As a result, this template is outlined in terms of the final site layout of the report.

Site map

- [Overview page](#)
- [Context and scope of action plan](#)
- [Development process and monitoring of the action plan](#)
- [Commitments](#)
- [OGP method and sources](#)

Overview

Period under Review

| | |
|-------------------------------|-------------------|
| Action Plan under Review | 2017 |
| Dates of Actions under Review | 01/2017 – 12/2017 |

Summary of IRM Findings

All commitments in the Paris Action Plan 2017 revolved around improving civic participation. However, the government did not establish a mechanism for civil society to participate in the drafting or monitoring of commitments. As a result, an important next step is to co-create more ambitious commitments through greater collaboration with citizens.

Participation in OGP

| | |
|--|---|
| Action Plan Date | January - December 2017 |
| Lead Agency (Office, Department, etc.) | Smart City Mission, General Secretariat |

At a Glance

| Table 1: At a Glance | | |
|--|-------------|---|
| Number of Commitments | | 5 |
| Level of Completion | | |
| Completed | | 2 |
| Substantial | | 1 |
| Limited | | 2 |
| Not Started | | 0 |
| Number of Commitments with... | | |
| Clear Relevance to OGP Values | | 4 |
| Transformative Potential Impact | | 0 |
| Substantial or Complete Implementation | | 3 |
| All Three (⊕) | | 0 |
| Did It Open Government? | Major | 0 |
| | Outstanding | 0 |

Action Plan Priorities

| |
|--|
| 1. Ensure all citizens are included in participatory democracy |
| 2. Develop participation in the collection and the opening of data |
| 3. Encourage innovative approaches in policymaking |

Institutional Context

This section summarizes the Institutional and Subnational Context section. It emphasizes the description of the lead institutions responsible for the action plan, their powers of coordination and how the institutional set-up boosts or affects the OGP process.

OGP leadership in the city of Paris

The OGP efforts are led by the Smart City mission at the General Secretariat of the city of Paris, the administrative division that is the closest to the Mayor in the city's organizational chart. Although the Smart City mission acts as a point of contact with the OGP, its role within the city administration regarding OGP is to coordinate the development of the commitments which are implemented independently by the designated agencies.

The action plan was announced publically during the OGP summit on 9 December 2016 at the closing ceremony of the Paris City Hall. The five commitments were presented officially by Emmanuel Grégoire, deputy mayor for budget and the transformation of public policies, and Pauline Véron, deputy mayor for local democracy, citizen participation, associative life and youth¹. The IRM researcher could not find evidence of a legally-binding decision of the mayor or the City Council regarding OGP membership.

The government lead for OGP shifted between the development and the implementation of the action plan. The formulation of the action plan and drafting of the commitments was supervised by the then Chief of Staff of the Deputy Mayor for participation and OGP Point of Contact (POC), Julien Antelin, and the then Advisor to the Mayor in Digital Affairs, Clémence Pène. After the approval of the plan, the coordination of the OGP process was handed to the Smart and Sustainable City mission, which is the government department that continues to lead the process today.

Table 2: Summary of OGP leadership in the City of Paris

| 1. Structure | Yes | No |
|---|--------|--------|
| Is there a clearly designated government lead for OGP? | ✓ | |
| | Shared | Single |
| Is there a single lead agency or shared leadership on OGP efforts? | ✓ | |
| | Yes | No |
| Is the head of government leading the OGP initiative? | ✓ | |
| 2. Legal Mandate | Yes | No |
| Is the government's commitment to the OGP established through an official, publicly released mandate? | ✓ | |
| Is the government's commitment to OGP established through a legally binding mandate? | | ✓ |
| 3. Continuity and Instability | Yes | No |

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| Was there a change in the organization(s) leading or involved with the OGP initiatives during the action plan implementation cycle? | | ✓ |
| Was there a change in the executive leader during the duration of the OGP action plan cycle? | | ✓ |

Participation in OGP by Government Institutions

This sub-section describes which government institutions were involved at various stages in OGP.

In the city of Paris, participation in OGP was coordinated during the design of the action plan by the office of Pauline Verón, the deputy mayor for local democracy, citizen participation, community life and youth, with support from the advisor to the mayor on digital affairs. They sent invitations to develop commitments in the action plans to specific agencies known for conducting projects relevant to OGP values of accountability, participation, access to information and innovation. The specific institutions that participated in the process are listed in Table 3 below.

In the implementation of the action plan, the Smart City mission at the General Secretariat took over leadership of the OGP efforts at the city of Paris. The concrete implementation of the commitments was decentralised to the agencies responsible for each individual commitment. For more details on the development of the action plan, please see the “Process of Development and Monitoring of the Action Plan” section of this report.

Table 3: Participation in OGP by Government Institutions

| How did institutions participate? | Ministries, Departments or agencies | Legislative (parliaments or councils) | Justice institutions (including quasi-judicial agencies) | Other (special districts, authorities, parastatal bodies, etc.) |
|---|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|---|
| Consult: These institutions observed or were invited to observe the action plan, but may not be responsible for commitments in the action plan | 6 ² | 1 ³ | 0 | 3 ⁴ |
| Propose: These institutions proposed commitments for inclusion in the action plan | 1 ⁵ | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Implement: These institutions are responsible for implementing commitments in the action plan whether or not they proposed the commitments | 2 ⁶ | 0 | 0 | 1 ⁷ |

Commitment Overview

To summarize, the action plan addresses three main issues. The first issue is to ensure that all citizens are included in participatory democracy. The first commitment aims at helping inhabitants from working-class districts benefit from the participatory budget to develop projects relevant to their needs. The second commitment addresses the issue of including people beyond the “usual suspects” in local

participation, i.e., enlarging the audience of civic participation beyond those who are already familiar with these tools, especially for the youth and the underprivileged.

The second issue addressed in the action plan is the promotion of civic participation in the collection and release of data. For example, the third commitment aims at helping citizens interested in open data request the datasets they need. The fourth commitment looks to help citizens request small improvements at the street level (bus stops, benches, lighting, etc.) by using a mobile application.

The third issue relates to breaking with a top-down approach in policymaking. In order to make the city of Paris more innovative and attentive to the needs of citizens, the fifth commitment relates to the establishment of an internal innovation lab through a long-term training for 20 civil servants on the co-design of public policies.

The major achievements of the action plan include an increase in projects from working-class districts awarded through participatory budgeting, the adoption of a new participation charter reshaped with the feedback of Parisians and the future opening of an internal innovation lab. For more details on the commitment results, please see the individual commitment sections below.

The main area for improvement relates to the action plan development process, which did not derive from public inputs. Collaborating with the public during both the development and implementation of future action plans is essential. For more details, see the General Recommendations section below.

Table 4: Assessment of Progress by Commitment

| Commitment Overview | Specificity | | | | OGP value relevance | | | | Potential impact | | | | Completion | | | | Did it open government? | | | | |
|---|-------------|-----|--------|------|-----------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|---|------------------|-------|----------|----------------|-------------|---------|-------------|-----------|-------------------------|----------------|----------|-------|-------------|
| | None | Low | Medium | High | Access to Information | Civic Participation | Public Accountability | Technology & Innovation for Transparency & Accountability | None | Minor | Moderate | Transformative | Not started | Limited | Substantial | Completed | Worsens | Did not change | Marginal | Major | Outstanding |
| 1. Inclusive participatory budget | | | ✓ | | | ✓ | | | | ✓ | | | | | ✓ | | | | ✓ | | |
| 2. Tools to engage with the City of Paris | | | ✓ | | | ✓ | | | | ✓ | | | | | ✓ | | | | ✓ | | |
| 3. Community mobilization in new dataset requests | | | ✓ | | ✓ | ✓ | | | | | ✓ | | ✓ | | | | | | ✓ | | |
| 4. Geolocalised crowdsourcing with DansMaRue V2 | | | ✓ | | | ✓ | | | | ✓ | | | ✓ | | | | | ✓ | | | |
| 5. Kick-off of Innovation Lab | | | ✓ | | Unclear | | | | | ✓ | | | | | | ✓ | | ✓ | | | |

General Recommendations

The IRM researcher has four main cross-cutting recommendations for improving the OGP process in Paris. For recommendations related to the individual commitments, please see the commitment sections of this report.

Co-create the next action plan

The IRM researcher recommends developing the next action plan collaboratively based on public input. As detailed in the “Process of Developing and Monitoring the Action Plan” section of this report, the government did not create channels through which the public could influence the content of the action plan. As a result, an important next step is to establish OGP as an opportunity for civil society actors to engage with the city of Paris in designing commitments relevant to their needs. The specific steps taken by the government to co-create its next action plan should align with the new OGP Participation & Co-creation Standards, which among other things, require the establishment of an in-person and online public forum for collecting citizen demands before the writing of the action plan.

There are several existing tools for gathering ideas that the municipal government could use to co-create its next action plan. The city of Paris already has a relevant tool with “Madame la maire, j’ai une idée”, its own tool for gathering ideas. Other French municipalities are also experimenting with new civic tech tools, such as the city of Vernon in Normandy, in which 10 percent of residents downloaded the civic app Fluicity⁸ or the Nantes metropolis which conducted a large consultation on the Loire river which gathered more than 40,000 participants online and offline⁹. The Paris government can also benefit from the work conducted by the national government in consulting citizens for the OGP action plan with the use of the open source tool DemocracyOS.

Relatedly, the IRM researcher considers that there is also a need for the transparent processing of public inputs. While the government did not create a mechanism to receive public inputs during the drafting of this action plan, the government did gather comments and suggestions from citizens while implementing the plan’s commitments. Nonetheless, how the inputs were processed, synthesised and translated remains a “black box” that citizens cannot access. In the future, the government should provide clear feedback to the public on how their comments were taken into consideration during the development (and implementation) of the action plan. It is important to highlight the need to promote engagement in OGP for these tools to be effective in co creation processes. The IRM researcher recommends to utilize existing resources to meet the expectation of OGP co creation processes.

Enable the public to monitor OGP implementation

Ensuring civil society has a voice in the OGP process also means ensuring civil society can follow the implementation of the action plan they have helped design. As noted in this report, the government did not establish an online repository of information or provide regular updates on implementation. Moving forward, the city of Paris can use its own website to give frequent updates and display relevant documents. The second commitment has been exemplary on this front as the IRM researcher, as well as other stakeholders, could find most of the relevant documents, the timeline of implementation and regular updates on the consultation and adoption of the new participation charter¹⁰. In the future, this process should be replicated for the action plan as a whole. Going further, the city of Paris should ask for feedback on how commitments are being implemented to ensure that public inputs continually feed into policymaking.

Engage more government actors in the OGP process

Alongside greater citizen involvement in the OGP process, the government of Paris could also further mobilize civil servants within the public administration. Involving new departments could serve to expand the thematic reach of the commitments and establish greater ownership among implementers. To achieve this goal, the government of Paris could establish an interdepartmental working group on open

government, raise awareness of open government and OGP through trainings, or take concrete steps to build high-level political support through formal OGP events. In addition, the government could explore the possibility of creating an OGP steering committee that includes more departments to further expand buy-in across government.

Raise the ambition of commitments

One of the main findings of this report is that the five commitments in the Paris action plan led to only modest improvements in government openness. For this reason, the IRM recommends that the city of Paris make more ambitious OGP commitments in the future. To do this, the government could ensure that commitments cover high-priority public policy issues, such as open contracting, improving public services, and handling the arrival and accommodation of migrants and refugees. The government could also more directly promote the OGP value of public accountability by establishing mechanisms for the public to call on government officials to act upon criticisms, and justify or accept responsibility for their actions, particularly in the area of public service delivery. Lastly, the five commitments in the Paris action plan largely constitute initiatives that build on already existing initiatives. Moving forward, the government should look to commit to new projects—or greater improvements to existing ones—to achieve more significant changes to existing government practices.

¹ <https://www.paris.fr/actualites/parteneriat-pour-un-gouvernement-ouvert-les-5-engagements-de-la-ville-de-paris-4363>

² Local Democracy Mission, Information Systems Department, Urban Policy Department, Citizen Participation Service

³ Borough Hall

⁴ Association Service, Parisian Public Debate Commission, Parisian Youth Council

⁵ Department for Democracy, Citizens and Territories

⁶ Participatory Budget Mission, General Secretariat, Smart and Sustainable City Mission

⁷ Parisian Workshop for Urban Planning (*Atelier Parisien d'Urbanisme*)

⁸ https://www.lexpress.fr/actualite/politique/elections/la-civic-tech-ses-applis-et-plateformes-peuvent-elles-reinventer-la-politique_1868572.html. See also: <http://www.vernon27.fr/flucity/>

⁹ https://www.caissedesdepots.fr/sites/default/files/medias/banque_des_territoires/guide_civic_tech_-_hd.pdf

¹⁰ <https://www.paris.fr/actualites/consultation-numerique-charte-parisienne-de-la-participation-4580>

Institutional and Subnational Context and Scope of Action Plan

This section places the action plan commitments in the broader context. The emphasis of the IRM report is on the development and implementation of the OGP action plan. However, to ensure the credibility of the report and of OGP more broadly and to inform future versions of the action plan, researchers are asked to briefly consider the institutional context within which the OGP action plan is framed. Consider significant actions not covered by the action plan that are relevant to OGP values and the entity's participation in the Partnership. The emphasis should be on the specific subnational context, although researchers may make some reference to the broader national context as it affects implementation at the subnational level (in county, referring to ward level or in the Municipality, referring to State and Federal context).

Background

The city of Paris has several particularities for a French municipality. As Paris has historically been the core of revolutions and political unrest (e.g., the Commune de Paris in 1870), the French state shaped Parisian institutions to keep the municipality under close control. For instance, Parisians have directly elected their mayor since 1975 while every other French citizen can exercise this right since 1882. Besides, Paris remains the only French city where municipal police powers are assigned to the police prefecture headed by the Ministry of the Interior (in other French cities, the City Council has authority over the municipal police). This means that the Mayor of Paris has no authority over car traffic, safety and public health despite the 28 February 2017 law that transfers several competences of the police prefecture to the Parisian municipality such as parking management and surveillance of bathing and funerals.

Administratively, the City of Paris is both a municipality and a department. Therefore, it inherits the competences of a department such as social affairs and the management of secondary schools and those of a city such as town planning, primary schools, parks and recreation, and waste management. The city of Paris has about 2.2 million inhabitants and hires around 50,000 civil servants, which represents one of the largest administrations in France. The city is also home to most of the national-level government administration. For these reasons, France is known for a high degree of centralism, concentrated in the city of Paris.

Regarding the OGP action plan, the management of the commitments is divided between the Direction de la Démocratie des Citoyens et des Territoires (DDCT) and the General Secretary with different services and agents in charge of the implementation (participation department, local democracy mission, Chief Data officer).

Politically, Anne Hidalgo, mayor of Paris since 2014, clearly oriented her campaign for the municipal elections towards participation as a “collaborative city”, which is one of the four themes displayed in her program¹¹. Some measures of her campaign platform resulted from a consultation that gathered thousands of participants through the political association “Oser Paris”¹². For instance, while standing for municipal elections, she mentioned that she wanted to dedicate 5% of the budget to participatory budgeting and that she wanted to expand the city's open data policy.

Once in office, Anne Hidalgo appointed Pauline Véron as deputy mayor for citizen participation and local democracy. Following her election program, the first edition of the participatory budget was launched in 2014. Also in the area of participation, the city of Paris also implemented a new platform “Madame la Maire, j'ai une idée”, allowing Parisians to suggest ideas or improvements to the administration. This participatory platform is supported by online “co-construction” workshops in which public agents and citizens can exchange and discuss ideas in depth.

In the wider political context, several events were significant. First, Paris faced in 2015 and 2016 several

large-scale terrorist attacks that led to the adoption of the “state of emergency”. This state, authorized by the French constitution, enables the government to take exceptional restrictive and preventive measures such as the interdiction of demonstrations, the dissolution of organizations that are considered a threat to public order, “administrative” (i.e., non-judicial) searches, and house arrests. In particular, several NGOs in the field of transparency and participation co-signed a press release to announce that they would boycott the OGP summit because of the curtailing of civil liberties in France.¹³ In the press release, 11 NGOs aired their concerns regarding government surveillance, the frequent renewal of the state of emergency, and the state of freedom of speech and press. NGOs also criticized the government on a range of other issues, including “hollow” public consultations and open data.

In October 2017, a new antiterrorist law was adopted that enables the French government to both end the “state of emergency” and benefit from the possibility of keeping most of the extraordinary measures in a state of common law.¹⁴

Relatedly, a popular movement called “Nuit Debout” began in Place de la République in Paris following the demonstrations against the “Loi Travail” in Spring 2016.¹⁵ Although the movement originated through public opposition to the liberalization measures in the labor law, it grew to include other grievances, among them discontent with the state of emergency and security measures.¹⁶ The movement then spread to other cities in France and lasted for about two months. Beyond the political message, this event, permitted by the City of Paris despite the state of emergency, was an example of youth willingness for more civic participation and less vertical political organizations.¹⁷

Another important event in the broader context was the awarding of the 2024 Olympics in September 2017. Given the limited transparency in public procurement and in the cost of hosting previous editions of the Olympic Games, there have been public concerns about the upcoming games in Paris.¹⁸ Specifically, Transparency International noted that “the success of the Olympic Games will be measured also in terms of ethics” and called on the City of Paris to follow through on its commitment to an Olympics that is free from corruption and fraud, by implementing strong rules to prevent conflicts of interest, ensure transparency of contracts, and put in place effective and independent control mechanisms.¹⁹

Lastly, the accession of the city of Paris to the OGP subnational program took place within a larger French open data policy. Since 2010, France gradually has engaged in a nationwide open data policy, which led to the creation of the mission Etalab in 2011, the open data taskforce in charge of the development of the open data portal “data.gouv.fr”. France joined OGP in April 2014²⁰, joined its steering committee in August 2014²¹ and assumed a role as co-chair in Fall 2016²². This growing involvement of the French government in OGP opened the path for the membership of the city of Paris.

This national context is not the only reason: the city of Paris had launched several initiatives relevant to OGP values such as the participatory budget in 2014, the open data portal launched in January 2011²³ and the enactment of a participation charter in 2009 in which the city committed to include civil society in decision making. These elements and others were highlighted in the candidacy of the city of Paris to the OGP subnational pilot program²⁴. More recently, the OGP summit in December 2016, which gathered more than 4,000 participants from 140 countries for 3 days, was a key driver for the candidacy of the city of Paris in the subnational pilot program.²⁵

Stakeholder Priorities

According to the action plan, it seems that the main priority of the City of Paris is to significantly increase civic participation. Indeed, four of the five commitments are relevant to this OGP value and some commitments are focused only on this topic, such as the writing of the Parisian participation charter. Another priority is expanding the pool of participants; two commitments focus on developing tools to reach new Parisian inhabitants who aren’t accustomed to engage with the City of Paris.

As for the public, a growing priority has to do with the recent awarding of the 2024 Olympics. According to a survey conducted by the International Olympic Council, about a fourth of the Parisian

population is opposed to hosting the Olympics in Paris²⁶. This opposition could grow if the government does not ensure that the Games are designed in consultation with Parisians with sufficient transparency to build trust. It is important to note that the government has been taking action on the Olympic games heritage independent of the OGP process, as was stated by Sabine Romon from the city government. Another important issue is hospitality for migrants and refugees. This issue was raised on several occasions in the consultation on the Parisian charter for participation. As pointed out by Sabine Romon, migration and refugees falls under the responsibility of the state, however, the City Government has pushed actions forward to address this issue, but were not incorporated into the OGP action plan. Lastly, there have been concerns around the issue of public contracting, which go beyond the preparations for the Olympics.²⁷

Scope of Action Plan in Relation to Subnational Context

While it is not the job of the IRM to tell governments and civil society organizations what can or cannot be in action plans, the IRM Guiding Principles do require the IRM to identify, “The extent to which the action plan and its commitments reflect, in a certain subnational context, the OGP values of transparency, accountability, and civic participation, as articulated in the OGP Declaration of Principles and the Articles of Governance.

Paris’ action plan is centered in improving civic participation processes to better capture the input from Parisians that guide policy-making processes. It does not include commitments to address other pressing issues that are being tackled independently from the OGP process.

Although the action plan looks to improve civic participation through several means—such as the participatory budget, the participation charter, and DansMaRue—none of the commitments address the issue of public accountability. As highlighted by the Cevipof (a public research center on the French political landscape) in its January 2017 study²⁸, France faces a significant mistrust towards politicians with 70% of the French considering that democracy doesn’t work properly and 88% stating that politicians don’t take their opinions into account. In light of the election of the new president, which led to a major change in the composition of the national assembly and whose first adopted law dealt with trust in political life, the City of Paris could broaden the scope of its action plan by giving more importance to the theme of accountability. Specifically, the action plan could improve mechanisms for the public to call on government officials to answer for their actions and act upon criticisms.

In addition, the action plan does not directly seek to improve greater access to information on government spending. One practical area that could be addressed is the transparency of public service contracts such as Autolib or Velib, which have recently been the subject of controversy²⁹. Another area that the City of Paris may find valuable to focus on is the publication of ex-ante and ex-post impact assessment studies on major public spending, especially that which comes from participatory budgeting since it represents a significant share of the budget.

As mentioned in the context and recommendation sections of this report, the action plan does not cover other high-priority issues, such as improved public service delivery, open contracting, and public policies surrounding the arrival of migrants and refugees. Although the City of Paris leads activities on these issues beyond OGP, they could consider broadening the focus of future action plans and incorporate commitments to tackle major community concerns.

¹¹ <https://issuu.com/oserparis/docs/prog-0412-rvb/163>

¹² http://www.liberation.fr/france/2013/06/18/paris-maisons-de-sante-et-social-clubs-au-programme-d-hidalgo_911772

¹³ “Open Government in France : an Empty Promise ?”

<https://www.laquadrature.net/files/open%20government%20partnership%20empty%20promise.pdf>

¹⁴ Law n° 2017-1510 of 30 October 2017, <https://www.legifrance.gouv.fr/eli/loi/2017/10/30/INTX1716370L/jo/texte>

¹⁵ Nuit Debout, <https://nuitdebout.fr/>

¹⁶ <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2016/apr/08/nuit-debout-protesters-occupy-french-cities-in-a-revolutionary-call-for-change>

¹⁷ An important characteristic of the youth-led movement was its horizontal structure. Each night, the protesters held a “general assembly” with various committees debating different aspects of society. There was also no clear leader. In the words of an economist at France’s National Center for Scientific Research, the movement was practicing “horizontal democracy”. For more details, see <https://bit.ly/2KJc347> and <https://nyti.ms/2IVPYBI>.

¹⁸ http://www.huffingtonpost.fr/fabien-ollier/paris-est-une-fete-de-la-corruption-olympique_a_23205979/

¹⁹ <https://transparency-france.org/actu/paris-2024/>

²⁰ <http://www.modernisation.gouv.fr/laction-publique-se-transforme/en-ouvrant-les-donnees-publiques/france-rejoint-open-gouvernement-partnership-ogp>

²¹ <https://www.etalab.gouv.fr/la-france-entre-au-comite-directeur-de-logp>

²² <https://www.diplomatie.gouv.fr/fr/politique-etrangere-de-la-france/diplomatie-numerique/evenements/article/la-france-presidera-le-partenariat>

²³ <https://opendata.paris.fr/page/lademarche/>

²⁴ https://www.opengovpartnership.org/sites/default/files/Paris%20Candidacy%20OGP_0.pdf

²⁵ <https://www.opengovpartnership.org/about/news-and-events/ogp-global-summit-2016-paris>

²⁶ <http://www.sports.fr/jo-2024/articles/le-sondage-qui-refroidit-paris-2024-1883777/>

²⁷ Emmanuel Lévy, “Eaux usées en Ile-de-France : la justice suspend le mega-contract avec Veolia,” Marianne, 13 March 2018, <https://www.marianne.net/economie/exclu-eaux-usees-en-ile-de-france-la-justice-suspend-le-mega-contract-avec-veolia>

²⁸ <http://www.cevipof.com/fr/le-barometre-de-la-confiance-politique-du-cevipof/resultats-1/vague8/>

²⁹ https://abonnes.lemonde.fr/economie/article/2018/06/20/velib-et-autolib-paris-outrage-paris-martyrise-paris-uberise_5318219_3234.html

Process of Development and Monitoring of the Action Plan

Process of Development of the Action Plan

Governments participating in the OGP follow a process for consultation during the development and implementation of their OGP action plan. This section summarizes the performance of the city of Paris during the development of their first action plan.

OGP Basic Requirements

Subnational Governments received the following guidance on participation during action plan development and execution:

May – November 2016: Development of commitments: Participants set up ways to work with civil society organizations and other groups outside government and use these mechanisms to identify priority areas for commitments. Specific commitments should then be developed in partnership with civil society, allowing them the opportunity to support governments in drafting them and establishing milestones. Draft commitments should be shared with the OGP Support Unit as they are being developed and for comment and advice in October-November. Commitments should be finalized and agreed by the end of November, so they can be published and announced at the OGP Summit in December.

During the formulation of the action plan, the IRM researcher considers that the City of Paris did not meet all of OGP's basic requirements. Although there was informal interaction with CSO representatives, there was no specific mechanism of participation and the action plan's commitments were identified by city government representatives without direct input from the public.

The formulation of the action plan and drafting of the commitments was supervised by the then Chief of Staff of the Deputy Mayor for participation and OGP Point of Contact (POC), Julien Antelin, and the then Advisor to the Mayor in Digital Affairs, Clémence Pène. After the approval of the plan, the coordination of the OGP process was later handed to the Smart and Sustainable City mission, which continues to lead the process today.

The drafting of the action plan started in September 2016 as an internal process. As supervisors of the process, the then OGP POC along with the then advisor to the Mayor, selected divisions within the General Secretariat and the Directorate for Citizen Engagement (Direction de la Démocratie, des Citoyen.ne.s et des Territoires) to design the commitments. The action plan reflects government priorities and their interpretation of CSO needs, which come from multiple previous interactions with different organizations.

Representatives of the city government have regular interactions with CSOs through participatory mechanisms such as the Parisian participatory budget, platforms for public discussion like "*Madame la maire j'ai une idée*" (idee.paris.fr), neighborhood councils, citizen councils, and citizen conferences. These forums are in place for general engagement on different issues and are a general open line of communication between civil servants and civil society representatives. For the development of the action plan, city representatives report that they took CSO input from these previous interactions and discussions that took place outside of the OGP framework.

The IRM researcher conducted a survey to gather the opinion of different stakeholders mentioned in the action plan³⁰. 4D, a national citizen think-tank that works on sustainable development issues (identified as a partner for the first commitment on participatory budgeting), confirmed that they work in partnership with the city of Paris to achieve their overall goals; however, they were not a formal part

of the formulation of commitment. Furthermore, the then POC to OGP suggested that most commitments are in a continuum with ongoing projects conducted in partnership with CSOs.³¹

According to interviews with Government members and as confirmed by the OGP Support Unit, commitments were submitted on time on 22 November 2016.³² A press release was published on 12 December 2016 during the OGP summit presenting the five commitments.³³

Table 5: Basic Requirements

| | |
|---|-----|
| <p>1. Participatory Mechanism: Was there a way of working with CSOs and other groups?</p> <p>Guideline: Participants set up ways to work with civil society organizations and other groups outside government and use these mechanisms to identify priority areas for commitments.</p> | No |
| <p>2. Priority Identification: Was civil society able to help identify priority areas for commitments?</p> <p>Guideline: Specific commitments should then be developed in partnership with civil society, allowing them the opportunity to support governments in drafting them and establishing milestones.</p> | No |
| <p>3. Commitment Development: Did civil society participate in the development/drafting of commitments and milestones?</p> <p>Guideline: Specific commitments should then be developed in partnership with civil society, allowing them the opportunity to support governments in drafting them and establishing milestones.</p> | No |
| <p>4. Review: Were commitments submitted for review to the Open Government Partnership Support Unit prior to finalization?</p> <p>Guideline: Draft commitments should be shared with the OGP Support Unit as they are being developed and for comment and advice in October-November.</p> | No |
| <p>5. Submission: Were commitments submitted on time?</p> <p>Guideline: Commitments should be finalized and agreed by the end of November, so they can be published and announced at the OGP Summit in December.</p> | Yes |

Openness in Consultation

Who was invited?

IRM research indicates that no specific event was carried out to collaboratively design the commitments. The then point of contact to OGP, who coordinated the development of the action plan stated that beyond the existing contacts with the CSOs already engaged with the city government, they did not engage with the wider public for suggestions. The OGP summit in Paris took extensive resources from the city administration, which did not allow them to focus their attention on the co-creation of the action plan³⁴. There were no invitations sent out to larger civil society. Likewise, there were no public announcements asking for contributions to the action plan development.

How was awareness-raising carried out?

Our research indicates that no specific awareness raising was implemented. A survey conducted by the IRM researcher with the CSOs identified in the action plan, indicates that they were not consulted on

the content of the commitments and the action plan. Therefore, there were no “Rules of the game” or timelines created for developing the action plan in coordination with civil society.

Which parts of civil society participated?

City of Paris officials indicated that they designed the commitments based on the existing projects and previous conversations they had with CSOs. They confirmed that the development of the action plan was an internal process.

Level of public input

The IRM has adapted the International Association for Public Participation (IAP2) “Spectrum of Participation” to apply to OGP³⁵. This spectrum shows the potential level of public influence on the contents of the action plan. In the spirit of OGP, most countries should aspire for “collaborative.”

According to the research conducted, there was no formal mechanism to engage with the public and therefore no consultation was held for the formulation of the action plan.

The City of Paris has a long-standing relationship with civil society organizations, as was confirmed through the interviews with the CSOs. However, the process of development of the action plan did not include the direct participation of stakeholders beyond representatives of the city government. The City of Paris listed organizations in the action plan as potential partners in the implementation of commitments. The list includes the think tank 4D, COCITY (a crowdsourcing funding platform for citizen initiatives that operates in the greater Paris area), Cap ou Pas Cap (an incubator of citizen alternative initiatives), CAUE Paris (an association promoting urban, environmental and architectural quality), among others. However, the IRM researcher confirmed that they were not informed of the elaboration of Paris’ action plan. According to Sabine Romon, the head of the Smart City Mission of the City of Paris, the municipal administration was involved in multiple projects funded by international organizations that required extensive reporting and consulting with CSOs. These were prioritized over the OGP process. Additionally, the then Point of Contact to OGP explained that in this particular period, government staff and resources were focused on the organization of the OGP Summit taking place in Paris on December 2016. As a result, they relied on specific agencies for the formulation of the plan (the General Secretariat and the Directorate for citizen engagement or ‘*Direction de la Démocratie, des Citoyen.ne.s et des Territoires*’). CSOs’ influence over the development of the action plan could have been indirect, through their ongoing interaction with civil servants outside of the OGP framework; however, no formal mechanism for co-creation or consultation was set in place as requested by OGP guidelines.

Table 6: Level of public input

| Level of public input | | During development of action plan |
|-----------------------|---|-----------------------------------|
| Empower | The government handed decision-making power to members of the public. | |
| Collaborate | There was iterative dialogue AND the public helped set the agenda. | |
| Involve | The government gave feedback on how commitments were considered. | |
| Consult | The public could give inputs. | |
| Inform | The government provided the public with | |

| | | |
|------------------------|---------------------------------|---|
| | information on the action plan. | |
| No Consultation | No consultation | ✓ |

³⁰ On June 27th 2017, the IRM researcher contacted the CSOs for which a contact could have been found (4D, Co-city, APUR, Cap ou Pas Cap, Muse des territoires, Commission Parisienne du Débat Public, Conseil Parisien de la Jeunesse (CPJ), Ecole des données, La 27ème Région). As per Oct 9th, 7 CSOs out of the 10 contacted answered the survey.

³¹ Julien Antelin in an interview with the IRM researcher on 17/05/23 “We’ve worked for a long time with civil society, we are here on a continuity with our existing relations and every person working on the OGP commitments discussed it with their usual interlocutors. We did not call to other CSOs for OGP.”

³² Julien Antelin, interview with the IRM researcher, 2017/05/23.

³³ <https://presse.paris.fr/wp-content/uploads/2016/12/Partenariat-pour-un-Gouvernement-Ouvert-Les-5-engagements-de-la-Ville-de-Paris.pdf>

³⁴ Julien Antelin, interview with the IRM researcher, 2017/05/23.

³⁵ “IAP2’s Public Participation Spectrum”, International Association for Public Participation Federation, (2014) http://c.ymcdn.com/sites/www.iap2.org/resource/resmgr/foundations_course/IAP2_P2_Spectrum_FINAL.pdf

Process of Monitoring Implementation of the Action Plan

OGP Basic Requirements

Subnational governments received the following guidance on participation during action plan development and execution:

December 2016 – December 2017: Implementation of Commitments

The guidance below provides more information about the best way to manage implementation of commitments, internal reporting and consultation with civil society throughout.

- Commitments should be developed in partnership with civil society and should seek to engage the widest possible input from citizens. [This note](#) provides guidance about how to conduct successful engagement with civil society and provides advice about ongoing consultation with civil society.
- Governments should conduct regular internal assessment, to make sure that commitments are on track and that there is an ongoing role for civil society. This assessment should be carried out along the lines of the OGP template for self-assessment, to make it easier for the IRM researcher to gather information.
- At regular intervals governments should publish a brief update on progress against commitments and use that as an opportunity to invite any comments. To complement any tracking system, governments are strongly encouraged to maintain a public, online repository of all documents giving evidence of consultation and implementation of commitments.

Internal Assessment & Participatory Mechanism: There was no formal mechanism to make sure commitments were on track. However, government interviewees responsible for implementing commitments confirmed that Sabine Romon, point of contact for OGP at the City of Paris, regularly checked if commitments were implemented on time and ensured that the agents responsible of each commitment collaborated with the IRM.³⁶ The IRM researcher was given regular updates during several interviews with the POC which were essential in the follow-up of the implementation of the action plan. However, these updates were limited to the IRM researcher and civil society did not have access to this information.

Regular Updates & Opportunity to Comment: The OGP page on the city of Paris website was not updated after the publication of the action plan. Civil society was not invited to comment on progress of the implementation of the action plan.

Online Repository: Despite repeated requests from the IRM researcher, the city of Paris did not publish an online repository with relevant documents for the public to analyse the implementation of the action plan.

Table 7: Basic Requirements

| | |
|---|---------|
| <p>1. Internal Assessment & Participatory Mechanism:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Did the government conduct regular internal assessments? b. Did the government ensure an ongoing role for civil society in monitoring of the action plan? <p>Guideline: Governments should conduct regular internal assessment, to make sure that commitments are on track and that there is an ongoing role for civil society.</p> | 1.a Yes |
| | 1.b No |
| <p>2. Regular Updates & Opportunity to Comment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Did the government publish updates on progress at regular intervals? [at least once every four months] b. Were civil society organizations provided the opportunity to comment on progress of commitment implementation? <p>Guideline: At regular intervals governments should publish a brief update on progress against commitments and use that as an opportunity to invite any comments.</p> | 2.a No |
| | 2.b No |
| <p>3. Online Repository:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Did the government create a public online repository of documents? <p>Guideline: To complement any tracking system, governments are strongly encouraged to maintain a public, online repository of all documents giving evidence of consultation and implementation of commitments.</p> | 3.a No |

Openness during implementation

Who Was Invited?

The IRM researcher could not find any evidence of an invitation to civil society members to comment on the implementation of the action plan.

How Was Awareness Raising Carried Out?

The OGP action plan was promoted with an article on the city government’s website³⁷. However, the page was not updated to reflect the implementation of the commitments.

Which Parts of Civil Society Participated?

As civil society was not involved in the design of the action plan, no specific mechanism existed (or was developed) for civil society organisations to participate in the implementation of commitments. As such, there was no specific network or group of CSOs that were closely involved in the OGP process. The government could have conducted activities to reach existing civil society networks in Paris. The city of Paris has created, for instance, a dedicated place for Parisian associations to gather named “Carrefour des Associations Parisiennes” in the 12th district. This structure has the experience and contacts to mobilize key organizations in Paris. The government could also have reached local associations by contacting specific networks such as “Réseau Vivre Paris” on nightlife or CAC (Collectif Associations Citoyennes).

Level of Public Input

The IRM has adapted the International Association for Public Participation (IAP2) Scale of participation for use in OGP. The table below shows the level of public influence on the implementation of the action plan. In the spirit of OGP, most countries should aspire for “collaborate.”

The city of Paris did not develop a specific mechanism for civil society stakeholders to influence decision-making. The government also did not provide regular updates to civil society on progress in implementing the action plan. For this reason, the IRM considers that there was no consultation held on the OGP action plan during the period of implementation.

While no mechanism existed for civil society to provide feedback on the implementation of the OGP action plan as a whole, several commitments did feature participation at their core. For example, civil society played a significant role in hosting workshops to help working-class inhabitants to design relevant proposals as part of the first commitment. For the second commitment, civil society was involved in the writing of the new participation charter through regular consultations and iterative dialogue with the government on the process. Still, this participation took place within the framework of the specific commitments, rather than as part of a forum for discussing the implementation of the action plan more generally, as required by OGP.

Table 8: Level of Public Input

| Level of public input | | During implementation of the action plan |
|-----------------------|---|--|
| Empower | The government handed decision-making power to members of the public. | |
| Collaborate | There was iterative dialogue AND the public helped set the agenda. | |
| Involve | The government gave feedback on how public inputs were considered. | |
| Consult | The public could give inputs. | |
| Inform | The government provided the public with information on the action plan. | |
| No Consultation | No consultation | ✓ |

³⁶ For a full list of interviewees, please see the Method and Sources section of this report.

³⁷ <https://www.paris.fr/actualites/parteneriat-pour-un-gouvernement-ouvert-les-5-engagements-de-la-ville-de-paris-4363>

Commitments

I. A more inclusive participatory budget

Commitment text:

Objectives:

1. To better understand the role of inhabitants, collectives and working class districts in the participatory budget (submission of proposals, participation in voting, etc.)
2. Strengthen the involvement of working-class districts and priority groups, particularly the most precarious, in the participatory budget

To meet Objective 1:

The Atelier Parisien d'Urbanisme (APUR) carried out a study on the Paris 2015 participative budget in 2016.

Their work focused on the nature of the proposals submitted, their location, the predominant themes ...

A complementary study could be carried out in 2017, focusing on the sociology of the participatory budget: who participates (age, location ...), which sets of actors it reveals (role of neighborhood councils, place of associations, etc.), who plebiscite what (crossing between the digital voters and the projects for which they voted ...).

To meet Objective 2, the City wants:

- to mobilize associations and students specializing in consulting engineering to reach the inhabitants of working-class neighborhoods and involve them in the emergence of proposals for the 2017 participatory budget
- to give visibility to proposals from working-class neighborhoods in the Parisian participatory budget and enhance their chances of success

Milestones

1. Call for Proposals to Associations
2. Development of the Partnership with the University Sorbonne
3. Co-construction Workshops with Inhabitants
4. Realization of the Study on the Sociology of the Participatory Budget
5. Voting of the Participatory Budget
6. Restitution [debriefing] of the Study on the Sociology of the Participatory Budget

Commitment Overview

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Status of Completion | Substantial |
| Start Date | June 2016 |
| Intended Completion Date | November 2017 |
| Responsible Office | Direction de la Démocratie, des Citoyen.ne.s et des Territoires |
| Did It Open Government? | Marginal |

| | |
|---|----|
| <p>Is it a STAR commitment?</p> <p>Starred commitments are considered exemplary OGP commitments. To receive a star, a commitment must meet several criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It must be specific enough that a judgment can be made about its potential impact. Starred commitments will have “medium” or “high” specificity. - The commitment’s language should make clear its relevance to opening government. Specifically, it must relate to at least one of the OGP values of Access to Information, Civic Participation, or Public Accountability. - The commitment would have a "transformative" potential impact if completely implemented. - Finally, the commitment must see significant progress during the action plan implementation period, receiving an assessment of "substantial" or "complete" implementation. | No |
|---|----|

| Commitment Overview | Specificity | | | | OGP Value Relevance | | | | Potential Impact | | | | Completion | | | | Did It Open Government? | | | | |
|---------------------|-------------|-----|--------|------|-----------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|--|------------------|-------|----------|----------------|-------------|---------|-------------|----------|-------------------------|-----------|----------|-------|-------------|
| | None | Low | Medium | High | Access to Information | Civic Participation | Public Accountability | Tech. and Innov. for Transparency and Accountability | None | Minor | Moderate | Transformative | Not Started | Limited | Substantial | Complete | Worsens | No change | Marginal | Major | Outstanding |
| Overall | | | ✓ | | | ✓ | | | ✓ | | | | | ✓ | | | | ✓ | | | |

Commitment Aim

Overall Objective & Relevance

The City of Paris has learned from research conducted by the *Atelier Parisien d'Urbanisme* (APUR) that, although there is a participatory budgeting practice in place, there is a “social bias” among the participants in the budgeting process.³⁸ Consequently, budgeting projects have been found to ignore the specific needs of working class neighborhoods of Paris, such as poverty and safety issues. The objective of this commitment is to increase awareness-raising and participation in the budgeting process among working-class Parisians. In doing so, the commitment seeks to ensure that future budgetary proposals better address the interests and needs of these communities.

In 2017, the budget allocated to fund projects proposed by citizens through the Paris Participatory Budget amounts to over EUR 100 million (approximately 5% of the City’s budget), from which 30% are earmarked to fund projects in working-class neighborhoods.³⁹ Although Paris saw an increase in participation of working class communities in 2016 compared to 2015 (from 5% to 7%), the Parisian administration continues to prioritize the promotion of participation of underrepresented communities and general citizen involvement in the implementation of the budget.⁴⁰

The Paris government aims to do it by implementing dedicated public initiatives, such as municipal workshops organized in underprivileged areas to help inhabitants design proposals that match their priorities and improve the chances of their proposals being adopted. This commitment pertains to broader civic participation to ensure meaningful input of interested members of the public into government decisions. It also increases the opportunities of working-class Parisians to have their voice heard. This commitment, therefore, is relevant to civic participation.

Specificity and Potential Impact

The level of specificity of this commitment is considered **medium**. Indeed, foreseen activities, such as the call for proposals to associations and workshops, and conducting the sociological study on the participatory budget are objectively verifiable. However, as written, each activity does not clearly explain how they will contribute to achieving the overall commitment's objective nor how they will unfold. The commitment, as written, requires some interpretation from the reader to understand how activities will impact the policy issue identified, because of the lack of measurable indicators or procedures to guide the assessment.

If this commitment were fully implemented as written, it could have a **minor** impact on improving working-class citizens' ability to influence planning of the city budget and thus changing the living conditions of their district. The City of Paris has already led efforts to promote the involvement of working-class communities in the participatory budget in the past few years. This commitment constitutes a positive step towards the continuation of such efforts involving other segments of society like the student population. However, given the lack of specificity about the extent to which this commitment could reach the working-class communities, and the lack of details on how it differs from existing measures, the IRM researcher considers it could represent a positive, yet incremental step towards achieving the objective identified. Furthermore, this commitment is limited in scale. The allocation of funds for financing voted-upon proposals is only one feature of participatory budgeting, which Paris has been developing in the past years. However, the Government could aim to run a wider exercise of consultation and participatory budgeting over the different stages of the budgeting process to strengthen the involvement of different stakeholders (including working-class Parisians and other communities) in budget strategies, priorities and decision-making processes.

Completion **Substantial**

The first milestone—the call for proposals to associations—was completed. It was launched on March 2017 and ended in May 2017. The government gave 100,000€ to six associations (Co-City, ICI, CAUE, 4D/Petits Débrouillards, La Fabrik coopérative/Traverses, La Maison des Fougères/Khiasma) to help them host workshops in which citizens, particularly in working-class neighborhoods, received assistance in designing successful proposals, as detailed further below⁴¹.

On the second milestone, a partnership has been established with the master 2 program specialised in public consultation ("*sous-parcours Ingénierie de la concertation*") at Paris I Panthéon Sorbonne University. Concretely, students helped a middle school (Collège Guillaume Budé) in a working-class area in the development of their project⁴² for the participatory budget, though it was eventually rejected by citizens in the open vote to determine the winning proposals⁴³.

The third milestone—the workshops with inhabitants—led to a series of actions conducted by the associations financed in the call for proposals (first milestone). For instance, CAUE organised walks with the inhabitants of working-class neighborhoods to identify priority projects that were later designed during participatory workshops. 4D/les Petits Débrouillards hosted workshops to help children from the 19th district in the development of their projects⁴⁴. The agents in charge of the participatory budget listed 76 projects supported by the six associations financed in the call for proposals: 37 were selected, 24 were not selected as they did not follow the eligibility criteria (as an investment project for the general interest, within the competence of the city of Paris) and 15 were combined with other projects⁴⁵.

The fourth milestone—the complementary study on the sociology of the Participatory Budget—was expected to be released in January 2018 according to Ari Brodach, head of the participatory budget at the city of Paris in an email conversation with the IRM researcher on 22 November 2018.

On the fifth milestone, the results of the participatory budget were announced on 5 October 2017⁴⁶.

According to Pauline Véron, Deputy Mayor for citizen participation, 66 of the 196 projects are dedicated to working-class neighborhoods with more than 33 million euros of funding⁴⁷.

The sixth milestone remained pending as the *Atelier Parisien d'Urbanisme* (APUR) study had not been released by the close of the action plan.

Given the completion of most of the milestones, the IRM researcher considers the overall completion of this commitment to be substantial.

Early results: did it open government?

Civic Participation: Marginal

According to research by the *Atelier Parisien d'Urbanisme* (APUR), there is a “social bias” in participatory budgeting efforts, which tend to neglect the needs of working-class neighborhoods in Paris. To address this issue, the government aimed to mobilize associations and students to reach working-class neighborhoods and better involve them in the participatory budgeting process.

Regarding the OGP value of civic participation, the IRM researcher could only find marginal evidence of changes in government practices. On the one hand, as explained in the Status section above, the government funded several organizations that worked directly with the residents of working-class neighborhoods to raise awareness of participatory budgeting and support the design of proposals. The organizations used methods such as workshops, games, and walks to engage local communities and develop ideas.⁴⁸ This support resulted in 76 proposals (out of a total of 484), of which 37 were eventually selected.

On the other hand, concrete outreach to working-class communities as part of the participatory budget is not entirely new. The municipal government first began allocating a dedicated portion of the participatory budget to working-class districts in 2016, when €30 million were dedicated to these districts.⁴⁹ During this year, 6,370 people from working-class districts—or 14.1 percent of the total population of the city—voted for projects.⁵⁰ This is significant considering that overall, residents in working-class districts make up 16% of the population of Paris.⁵¹ In this sense, the government had already made great strides at the outset of the action plan.

Moreover, the 2017 results do not differ greatly from those in 2016. While a third of the awarded projects (66 out of 196) and more than a third of the participatory budget (€33,4 million out of €92 million totally) was dedicated to working-class districts in 2017⁵², this is only a slight increase compared to 2016, when 58 projects and €30 million were allocated to working-class districts⁵³. As a result, while the City of Paris is making a strong effort to ensure diversity in its participatory budget, it is not possible to conclude that there has been a major change as a result of this commitment.

Nonetheless, assessing the early results of this commitment is difficult without the release of the APUR study which could give a scientific assessment of the participation of working-class districts in the participatory budget. For example, it is not clear how many residents of working-class neighborhoods participated in the 2017 process, or how many voted as compared to the 2016 process. The IRM researcher asked for the first draft of the study, but this request was declined by the service in charge of the participatory budget, which sent maps instead. Ari Brodach, head of the participatory budget, used a choropleth map of the number of voters for each IRIS, the smallest statistical entity for urban areas in France, to demonstrate the mobilisation of voters in working-class districts. However, this map is not directly interpretable as IRIS vary in population from 1600 to 3300 inhabitants in Paris⁵⁴.

Ultimately, the outreach to working-class districts is notable, but there is little evidence available confirming that this commitment significantly improved the opportunities of working-class district inhabitants in the participatory budget.

Recommendations

The updated sociological study conducted by APUR will provide interesting insights to understand how a participatory budget can become a tool to empower working-class districts inhabitants in reshaping their urban environment. The IRM researcher suggests sharing these results with CSO networks once they are available, as participatory budgeting is one of the key actions conducted in sub-national action plans.

Besides, to allow researchers beyond APUR to conduct studies on the sociology of the participatory budget, the city of Paris can improve the transparency of the process by publishing anonymised open data on voters and projects. During a workshop of l'Ecole des Données,⁵⁵ a civil society project that offers courses and workshops, participants listed a series of suggestions in order to help citizens have a better understanding of the participatory budget with open data. For instance, they suggested publishing datasets on the advancement of selected projects, statistics of the participatory budget website, anonymised votes and the complete list of projects including those that were not selected⁵⁶.

³⁸ http://www.apur.org/sites/default/files/documents/budget_participatif_paris_analyse_projets_2015.pdf (P 22)

³⁹ <https://budgetparticipatif.paris.fr/bp/le-budget-participatif-.html>

⁴⁰ http://www.lemonde.fr/politique/article/2016/10/05/budget-participatif-la-capitale-fait-le-pari-des-projets-citoyens_5008490_823448.html

⁴¹ https://budgetparticipatif.paris.fr/bp/jsp/site/Portal.jsp?document_id=3212&portlet_id=165

⁴² <https://budgetparticipatif.paris.fr/bp/jsp/site/Portal.jsp?page=idee&campagne=D&idee=1755>

⁴³ https://budgetparticipatif.paris.fr/bp/jsp/site/Portal.jsp?document_id=3749&portlet_id=158

⁴⁴ https://budgetparticipatif.paris.fr/bp/jsp/site/Portal.jsp?document_id=3222&portlet_id=159

⁴⁵ The agents in charge of the participatory budget provided the IRM researcher a spreadsheet file listing all the projects tutored by the 6 associations. The spreadsheet can be found in the online repository: <https://goo.gl/hWCTQ7>.

⁴⁶ <https://www.paris.fr/resultatsbudgetparticipatif>

⁴⁷ <https://budgetparticipatif.paris.fr/bp/plugins/download/BP2017-DossierDePresse.pdf>

⁴⁸ https://budgetparticipatif.paris.fr/bp/jsp/site/Portal.jsp?document_id=3222&portlet_id=159

⁴⁹ <https://budgetparticipatif.paris.fr/bp/plugins/download/BP2016-DossierDePresse.pdf>

⁵⁰ <https://www.apur.org/fr/nos-travaux/budget-participatif-paris-participe>

⁵¹ Ibid.

⁵² In this edition of the participatory budget, the city of Paris used a special label on the website to distinguish projects dedicated to working-class neighborhoods. These figures are taken from the

⁵³ <https://budgetparticipatif.paris.fr/bp/plugins/download/BP2016-DossierDePresse.pdf>

⁵⁴ http://opendata.apur.org/datasets/iris-demographie?geometry=1.985%2C48.828%2C2.504%2C48.907&selectedAttribute=P12_POP

⁵⁵ <https://ecoleledesdonnees.org/le-projet/>

⁵⁶ <https://fr.okfn.org/2017/11/13/atelier-citoyen-budget-participatif-queelles-donnees-pour-queelles-analyses/>

2. To give the Parisians tools to be committed [tools to engage with the City of Paris]

Commitment text

To give all inhabitants the means to build public policies together, to strengthen the presence of citizens in all bodies of representative democracy and to build the tools of participation with all categories of inhabitants.

Objectives:

1. Train and inform citizens to rethink and reinforce the spaces of participatory democracy on the Parisian territory. To enable all inhabitants to understand the functioning of the city, to give them access and to build with them the tools of participation so that they can propose and co-construct public policies.
2. The inhabitants are the foundation of representative and participative democracy. To give the inhabitants the possibility to think and suggest a reinforcement of the spaces of representative democracy but also give them the possibility to engage innovative actions on the territory, to exchange and debate.

To meet these objectives:

1. The city created a Paris Citizens card. "This card is part of a logic of inclusion and citizenship." In connection with the identity of Paris, the Paris Citizens card is based on a civic, cultural and associative offer giving access, free of charge, to training courses, the Ateliers Citoyens de Paris (building its project, understanding institutions, Meet elected officials...). The Paris Citizens card [brings together] associations on the territory, civictech and all the inhabitants to enrich the representative democracy.
2. Drafting of a guide and a charter of participation to reaffirm proximity as the foundation of municipal action, while allowing a deep re-examination of models of governance with citizens. To do this, digital [and in person] consultations will be carried out to know the wishes of the inhabitants, to co-construct together the tools of participation and place the citizen at the center of the participatory system. All the actors present will be involved in the participation on the territory, inhabitants, associations, civictech and consultative bodies of the city of Paris.

Milestones

1. Launch of the consultation with Parisians, edition of the guide and new citizen workshops
2. [Debriefing] of the consultation
3. Writing of the parisian participation charter
4. Adoption of the parisian participation charter

Commitment Overview

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Status of Completion | Complete |
| Start Date | June 2016 |
| Intended Completion Date | November 2017 |
| Responsible Office | Direction de la Démocratie, des Citoyen.ne.s et des Territoires |
| Did It Open Government? | Marginal |

| | |
|--|----|
| <p>Is it a STAR commitment?</p> <p>Starred commitments are considered exemplary OGP commitments. To receive a star, a commitment must meet several criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It must be specific enough that a judgment can be made about its potential impact. Starred commitments will have “medium” or “high” specificity. - The commitment’s language should make clear its relevance to opening government. Specifically, it must relate to at least one of the OGP values of Access to Information, Civic Participation, or Public Accountability. - The commitment would have a "transformative" potential impact if completely implemented. - Finally, the commitment must see significant progress during the action plan implementation period, receiving an assessment of "substantial" or "complete" implementation. | No |
|--|----|

| Commitment Overview | Specificity | | | | OGP Value Relevance | | | | Potential Impact | | | | Completion | | | | Did It Open Government? | | | | |
|---------------------|-------------|-----|--------|------|-----------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|--|------------------|-------|----------|----------------|-------------|---------|-------------|----------|-------------------------|-----------|----------|-------|-------------|
| | None | Low | Medium | High | Access to Information | Civic Participation | Public Accountability | Tech. and Innov. for Transparency and Accountability | None | Minor | Moderate | Transformative | Not Started | Limited | Substantial | Complete | Worsens | No change | Marginal | Major | Outstanding |
| Overall | | | ✓ | | | ✓ | | | ✓ | | | | | | ✓ | | | ✓ | | | |

Commitment Aim

Overall Objective & Relevance

The City of Paris observed in its action plan that citizen involvement in the democratic process remains relatively low, especially among underrepresented communities. This is true for Paris and many cities nationwide, despite the current regulatory framework for public participation, which includes the 2009 Parisian Charter for Public Participation^{[1]57}. For example, often only a minority of active citizens participate in public hearings. CSO representation for some communities is insufficient, and many Parisians do not benefit from new public participation tools. According to a digital consultation carried out by the City Paris, 66% of respondents said they do not engage in public affairs⁵⁸. Without adequate participation and representation, many Parisians do not express their concerns in local democracy or influence policy decisions that impact their lives.

To address the issue of low participation and underrepresentation in general policy-making and government processes, this commitment seeks to build upon existing participatory initiatives, and to gather citizen input to develop a new public consultation guide and charter. As mentioned in the commitment text, the city of Paris launched a “citizen card” in February 2016 to provide citizens with information regarding city initiatives. This commitment aims to complement the already existing citizen card and improve existing tools by setting standards of inclusion in participation processes. To that end, the municipality committed to conduct a public consultation that involves in-person and online sessions (i.e. workshops, surveys, and interviews) and that re-examines and reconstructs the model of municipal governance.

The commitment aims to (1) draft a new public participation charter that takes into account the ideas and opinions gathered from the consultation, and (2) submit it on the agenda of the Council of Paris for

adoption. According to the action plan, the consultation process and subsequent charter would expand public participation by gathering and incorporating suggestions from citizens that previously did not make their voices heard in local democracy. The charter would also increase transparency in policy development through increased and open citizen engagement.

Specificity and Potential Impact

The level of specificity of this commitment is **medium**. The commitment language provides clear, verifiable activities (consultation process, interviews and surveys, co-construction workshops to write the Parisian charter) and measurable deliverables (public debrief on the consultation process, publication of a timeline on the City of Paris’ website and the adoption of the Parisian charter). However, it is unclear how these activities will be implemented and how they will ultimately contribute to the objective of the commitment. As written, it cannot be ascertained whether citizens beyond the “usual suspects” will be able to contribute to the participation charter during the proposed consultation. The commitment lacks a clear roadmap or strategy to increase diversity of participants on general policy-making processes.

If fully implemented, this commitment could contribute to enabling underrepresented citizens to participate in local initiatives, even if a participation charter does not have any legal power. However, the lack of specificity undermines the commitment’s potential to change the status quo. A Parisian participation charter has already existed since 2009. The proposal for a new charter should include information on the expected changes, specifically as it relates to the issue identified in the action plan, increasing diversity in participation. As written, the call for a new charter is a positive step forward, however, its impact will be determined by how it is drafted and ultimately implemented. In the past, multiple stakeholders have identified weakness with the current participation model. For example, in an academic study from 2013, two researchers who specialize in public participation identified that the 2009 charter could be revised to shift towards a model in which citizens are involved and empowered in policy making and implementation⁵⁹. Another key challenge has been improving access and visibility to the Charter itself. For example, according to Audrey Livé, Vice-President of the organization *Ensemble pour le 14e*, who participated in the consultation process for the new charter, before the meeting and despite being a very active Parisian, she did not know the previous charter, nor did the members of her associations or the citizens of the 14th district council.

The creation of a new charter with active public participation could contribute to awareness-raising and acceptance of its principles, including citizens beyond the usual suspects. However, considering further that charters lack enforcement capacities, the potential impact of this commitment is **minor**. It represents a positive incremental step towards improving guidelines on civic participation, but does not directly address the core problem that has perpetuated the underrepresentation of certain communities.

Completion
Complete

This commitment is complete. On the first milestone, the consultation with Parisians was conducted in three major steps. First, in March 2017, a survey was published on paris.fr to evaluate the Parisian participation tools, which gathered 446 answers. The government uploaded the raw data to the open data portal⁶⁰ and published a synthesis⁶¹. Second, in March-April 2017, the government conducted interviews and workshops with citizens and civil servants, and published a corresponding synthesis⁶². A consultation was also held on idee.paris to gather new ideas, which was also summarized⁶³. Third, the government hosted two workshops on May 15th⁶⁴ and June 15th 2017⁶⁵ to discuss the results of these consultations and comment on the content of the future charter.

In this sense, the second milestone was also achieved as the consultation was debriefed with multiple reports summarizing the results of participation (cited above). The two aforementioned workshops were also hosted to achieve that same goal.

The writing and adoption of the participation charter are also completed. The participation charter was adopted at the meeting of the Council of Paris on 12 December 2017.⁶⁶ The charter includes ten

commitments for improving civic participation. For example, the City of Paris commits to promoting inclusive participatory spaces, communicating the results of consultations, and publishing anonymized data on participation and source codes. Noteworthy commitments include commitments to release the raw data of consultations and to publish the source code of algorithms used to sort public comments. It is important to note, however, that the charter does not list a timeline for the full implementation of the proposed commitments, which will require additional resources.

Early results: did it open government?

Civic Participation: Marginal

This commitment addressed the issue of low citizen involvement in participatory tools. Specifically, the commitment looked to empower citizens to participate in local initiatives by co-creating a new participation charter in collaboration with the public.

Regarding the OGP value of civic participation, this commitment led to a marginal change in government practices. By assessing available tools and asking citizens out of the sphere of “usual suspects”, the city of Paris made efforts to bridge the gap with citizens who are not aware of the opportunities of participatory democracy. For example, during the first phase of consultation, about two thirds of the 446 participants considered themselves not engaged in public affairs.⁶⁷ Similarly, the vast majority of participants had not previously utilized the City of Paris’ online consultation tools.⁶⁸ In this sense, the consultation held from March to June was a positive step forward. Overall, more than 600 people participated in the process and importantly, the government published both the raw data of the consultation as well as extensive summaries of the comments received.⁶⁹

The consultation also helped the City of Paris identify several issues in how it currently involves the public in decision-making, including a need for public awareness of tools outside of the participatory budget and neighborhood council, venues for citizens to meet and participate, trainings on participatory practices and answers to the demands of citizens to build trust. These specific issues were addressed in the text of the new charter, in which the city of Paris commits to provide all information means to help citizens know about participation (3rd article), to promote the establishment of civic and democratic venues (9th article) and to follow up with citizens on the outcome of their participation (6th article)⁷⁰.

Despite the collaborative development of the new charter, its implementation remains to be seen. As the charter was adopted by the Council of Paris at the very end of the action plan, the charter did not lead to concrete changes in government practices in the time-frame of the one-year period of the plan. For this reason, the IRM considers that the new commitments—while promising—have not yet contributed to major changes in government openness.

Recommendations

The new participation charter proposes ambitious best practices to help a wider variety of people themselves in local participatory democracy. However, the charter matters only if it is actually implemented and leads to concrete changes.

To make the charter actionable, the city of Paris could produce tools to help administrations follow its principles. For instance, in a different field, the best practices of open data were translated by a group of open data projects managers into actionable checklists with 72 rules for open data producers⁷¹. In the field of participation, Etalab, the French open data taskforce, partnered with civic tech actors to list the best practices before, during and after a public consultation.⁷² This group also listed the tools available for administrations to conduct a consultation. The City of Paris could produce such resources to help administrations follow the charter’s principles both offline and online.

Beyond producing resources, the city of Paris could follow up on the charter by organising a Parisian observatory of participatory democracy. This observatory could allow the city of Paris to check if the

charter principles are actually implemented and give recommendations to its services on effective and inclusive public participation. The observatory could be a multi-stakeholder entity involving contributors to the charter.

⁵⁷ In 2013, the report “Citoyenneté et pouvoir d’agir dans les quartiers populaires” authored by MH Bacqué & M Mechmache to the ministry for urban affairs (http://www.ville.gouv.fr/IMG/pdf/rapport_participation_habitants_web_141107.pdf) has shown that youth and precarious citizens are absent in participation initiatives and that “participation is often without stakes and without effects.” According to Nicky Tremblay, co-president of Pas Sans Nous, a collective dedicated to the inclusion of citizens in working-class neighborhoods, in an interview to Public Sénat in March 2017 (<https://www.publicsenat.fr/article/societe/les-banlieues-grandes-oubliees-de-la-campagne-presidentielle-57548>), only one of the 30 proposals of the report authored by Bacqué and Mechmache led to a concrete action which is the creation of citizens councils in France major cities. Yet, this action is considered as a “failure” by Nicky Tremblay as she considers these citizens councils as “left behind” by both the inhabitants and the elected officials.

⁵⁸ The City of Paris conducted a digital consultation on participation of Parisians in public life that registered 440 participants. (March to April 2017), <https://www.paris.fr/actualites/consultation-numerique-charte-parisienne-de-la-participation-4580>

⁵⁹ http://www.participation-et-democratie.fr/sites/default/files/alexisottaviano_article_remanie_gis.pdf

⁶⁰ <https://opendata.paris.fr/explore/dataset/consultation-numerique-sur-la-participation-citoyenne-a-paris/information/>

⁶¹ <https://api-site-cdn.paris.fr/images/93853>

⁶² <https://api-site-cdn.paris.fr/images/93852>

⁶³ <https://api-site-cdn.paris.fr/images/93947>

⁶⁴ <https://api-site-cdn.paris.fr/images/93003>

⁶⁵ <https://api-site-cdn.paris.fr/images/95356>

⁶⁶ “Charte parisienne de la participation citoyenne,” <https://api-site-cdn.paris.fr/images/97386>

⁶⁷ Final Summary, <https://api-site-cdn.paris.fr/images/93853>

⁶⁸ Ibid., 24, 34, 37.

⁶⁹ Ibid.

⁷⁰ <https://api-site-cdn.paris.fr/images/95356>

⁷¹ <https://checklists.opquast.com/fr/opendata/>

⁷² <https://consultation.etalab.gouv.fr/laconsultation.html>

3. Increasing community mobilization in new dataset requests

Commitment text

This engagement is about making sure that the research, extraction and publishing of datasets match the needs of future reusers in regard to transparency and creation of new services. The publishing of new datasets usually requires important research and conviction of the services in charge of the data. Knowing that the dataset is awaited et will be used by a reuser allows to focus energy on useful objectives.

Primary objective: Allow reusers to obtain the publishing of datasets adapted to their needs in terms of transparency and creation of new services

To meet this objective: Create a trimestrial event to mobilize the community to focus its needs towards the data needed. Every trimester, a meetup et an online mobilization will take place. Those events will be shared to the community through our social media and meetup group.

Milestones

1. Call for contribution through social networks
2. Sorting of proposals (present) and possible relevance survey
3. Research and first publication
4. Note on publication and improvement

Commitment Overview

| | |
|--------------------------|---------------------|
| Status of Completion | Limited |
| Start Date | January 2017 |
| Intended Completion Date | December 2017 |
| Responsible Office | General Secretariat |
| Did It Open Government? | Marginal |

| | |
|--|-----------|
| <p><i>Is it a STAR commitment?</i></p> <p>Starred commitments are considered exemplary OGP commitments. To receive a star, a commitment must meet several criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It must be specific enough that a judgment can be made about its potential impact. Starred commitments will have “medium” or “high” specificity. - The commitment’s language should make clear its relevance to opening government. Specifically, it must relate to at least one of the OGP values of Access to Information, Civic Participation, or Public Accountability. - The commitment would have a "transformative" potential impact if completely implemented. - Finally, the commitment must see significant progress during the action plan implementation period, receiving an assessment of "substantial" or "complete" implementation. | <p>No</p> |
|--|-----------|

| Commitment Overview | Specificity | | | | OGP Value Relevance | | | | Potential Impact | | | | Completion | | | | Did It Open Government? | | | | |
|---------------------|-------------|-----|--------|------|-----------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|--|------------------|-------|----------|----------------|-------------|---------|-------------|----------|-------------------------|-----------------|----------|-------|-------------|
| | None | Low | Medium | High | Access to Information | Civic Participation | Public Accountability | Tech. and Innov. for Transparency and Accountability | None | Minor | Moderate | Transformative | Not Started | Limited | Substantial | Complete | Worsens | No Evidence Yet | Marginal | Major | Outstanding |
| Overall | | | ✓ | | ✓ | ✓ | | | | ✓ | | | ✓ | | | | | | ✓ | | |

Disclaimer: To ensure the independence of the assessment, this commitment was reviewed with the support of Timothée Gidion due to Samuel Goeta’s affiliation to the Open Government Foundation, an organization involved in the development of this commitment.

Commitment Aim

Overall Objective & Relevance

Since 2011, the city of Paris has published data through its open data programme. In 2016, the French Digital Act (loi pour une République numérique) mandated local authorities to open their datasets.⁷³ According to the action plan, supply and demand of open data does not match. Supply is limited by the civil servant's capacity to convert information into open data and, therefore, the City of Paris commits to engage with users and meet the needs of the demand, ultimately enhancing the efficiency of the demand-use-impact value chain for open data. From the point of view of the user, some datasets are still missing or lack temporal or spatial granularity. For example, in 2016, a petition led by the transportation startup Citymapper asked the Paris Transportation Agency (RATP) to open real time information on the location of metro and buses. In order to get the information, the startup had to gather support from 18,000 citizens⁷⁴.

This commitment proposes to create a quarterly meetup to mobilize the community and its requests for data. According to the action plan, two meetups will occur every trimester, one in-person and one online, to enable participants to select future datasets to be released, and ensure the city government takes their requests into account. Various channels such as the “Open Innovation Paris” Meetup and social networks will be used to organize and mediate these meetings and gather participant requests for open datasets.

This commitment is relevant to the value of access to information, considering it proposes a new method to release government-held data in higher demand. Specifically, it seeks to ensure that published data are relevant to the interests of its users, and that the government publishes data upon request from the users. As explained in the action plan, the government considers that these datasets should meet the needs of re-users for transparency and the creation of new services. Additionally, it is relevant to civic participation, considering it proposes to improve the information being published through active engagement of data users to identify the public’s priorities.

Specificity and Potential Impact

The specificity of this commitment is coded as medium. The first two milestones in the commitment (the call for contributions through social networks and for the setup of quarterly meetings) could be considered objectively verifiable. However, as written, they do not specify how the government plans to carry-out the activities nor how they will manage, process and decide upon the publication of datasets after receiving requests by citizens or CSOs.

If fully implemented as written, this commitment could enhance the efficiency of publication of datasets, meeting the needs of users by tailoring the supply. Additionally, if implemented fully, it could allow citizens to quickly get datasets in fields where data was missing. Besides, having a clarity about citizen's demands could help open data project managers in their requests, as they could benefit from the support of the public in their requests of datasets. However, the commitment is limited in scope because it does not explain how public input will be considered, whether the selection of requests will be made public, or how the survey will be outlined. Moreover, the IRM researcher expresses reservations about the scale of the commitment. Although it calls for the setup of a trimestral quarterly event, it does not specifically establish whether it will be a permanent mechanism beyond the period of the action plan. Additionally, this commitment might add redundancy to the existing freedom of information (loi CADA) legal context, which already allows citizens to request access to any public dataset. Because of these reasons, this commitment is considered to have a moderate potential impact.

Completion Limited

The first milestone—the call for contribution through social networks—was partly completed since only two calls were announced, through Twitter on 19 April⁷⁵ and 11 October 2017⁷⁶, and through an article on Paris' website⁷⁷. Also, unlike what is written in the action plan, the City of Paris did not make a call for contributions through the Meetup Open Innovation Paris, nor through an in-person meetup. The relevant official for this commitment explained that, based on discussions with current users of the Paris data portal, it would not have been relevant to organize in-person meetups since it was simpler to express suggestions directly online.⁷⁸

The second milestone was withdrawn: the government did not carry out the sorting of proposals and possible relevance survey due to the lack of contributions received. Indeed, over almost a one-year period, the City of Paris received a total of 14 proposals (three of which were not directly related to open data), in addition to four claims that were not at all linked with open data issues (such as complaints regarding neighbors' behaviors).⁷⁹ Nevertheless, the government states that they reoriented people to other platforms when their proposals did not deal with topics within the competencies of the City of Paris.

The third milestone about research and first publication was completed. The government carried out an internal assessment regarding the possibility of releasing datasets requested by users. According to the official in charge of the commitment, the City of Paris replied personally to all inquirers by giving them an expected date of publication or explanations when the release of a certain dataset was not possible. However, one of the 14 inquirers whom the IRM researchers contacted stated that he was not aware of the publication of the dataset he requested because the City of Paris did not follow up on his request.

The fourth milestone was delayed to the first trimester of 2018. Originally the note on publication and improvement was supposed to be published every semester but due to the low number of requests, the City of Paris decided to write only one note covering all of the dataset requests and to publish it after the full year of implementation.

Early results: did it open government?

Access to Information: Marginal Civic Participation: Marginal

This commitment aimed to ensure that datasets published on the open data platform matched the real needs of re-users by optimizing the internal efforts made by City of Paris' civil servants to release new datasets. The potential impact was expected to be moderate as the commitment proposed enhancing both access to information by giving citizens the opportunity to express their needs in terms of public data and civic participation by including data users in the process of decision making.

However, the early results are limited in scope. As it relates to access to information, the government updated datasets in response to the public requests, but did not publish any new datasets. In fact, most of the datasets requested by the 14 petitioners remained in the process of release, according to government information.⁸⁰ It is also important to point out that the list of changes requested by citizens—with the corresponding government response—is not available online. Still, the government did update publicly available data in response to citizen requests. For this reason, the IRM considers that there was a marginal improvement in the area of access to information.

In terms of civic participation, the government did not carry out extensive outreach to involve the public in requesting particular datasets. As explained in the Status section above, the outreach consisted of two calls announced via twitter, and an article on the government's website, which led to a total of 14 requests submitted through the online form and Twitter in the first ten months.⁸¹ This lack of integration of civil society is confirmed by members of School of Data⁸², an NGO that is mentioned as a stakeholder in the action plan, but which was not informed of this crowdsourced initiative and did not know it was mentioned in the commitment. Given the lack of substantive involvement of civil society in the decision-making process around the release of priority datasets (i.e. the public was only involved in the first step of the process in making proposals, but was not involved in determining the new datasets to be released), the IRM considers that there was only a marginal improvement in civic participation.

Recommendations

One noticeable result is that most of the public requests (12 out of 14) came shortly after the two calls for contribution on social media. It shows the relevance of communication for such a crowdsourced initiative that needs visibility to be successful. As a result, the IRM researchers recommend highlighting calls for contributions more frequently on social media and, if possible, diversifying the channels used (not only Twitter). Besides, the City of Paris could benefit from hosting in-person meetings or workshops at which re-users could express their needs to a civil servant in charge of open data who could explain to them whether some requests are out of scope, feasible or already in progress. These in-person meetings and workshops could increase the number of proposals and improve their overall relevance.

Another recommendation is to improve the transparency and the communication of the internal process of releasing datasets. For instance, the City of Paris could publish an updated dashboard on the Paris Data platform that displays all preexisting requests, with a status report for each. It would allow inquirers to be aware of current level of process and to submit only new proposals. This dashboard could be completed through meetings at which open data users could be involved in the decision-making process of releasing datasets by, for example, prioritizing requests, establishing the relevant spatial or geographical granularity of datasets or explain to public officials how they would use the requested data if released. Ultimately, the City of Paris could envisage releasing part of the dataset of submitted requests on the Paris Data platform with the type of dataset, date of submission, status report, and official answers.

⁷³ The French Digital Act can be found at: <https://www.economie.gouv.fr/republique-numerique>

⁷⁴ “ La RATP ouvre (enfin) ses données « temps réel »”

http://abonnes.lemonde.fr/economie/article/2017/01/05/la-ratp-ouvre-enfin-ses-donnees-temps-reel_5057926_3234.html

⁷⁵ <https://twitter.com/opendataParis/status/854621726109569024>

⁷⁶ <https://twitter.com/opendataParis/status/918050814043869185>

⁷⁷ <https://www.paris.fr/actualites/paris-data-les-appels-a-contribution-sont-ouverts-4665>

⁷⁸ Awa Ndiyaé, (Open Innovation and Project Manager), e-mail correspondence with the IRM researcher, 24 November 2017.

⁷⁹ The government provided evidence of this to the IRM researcher, who verified the information.

⁸⁰ The IRM researcher received the list of datasets requested, along with the government responses, and was able to verify the state of the requests by consulting the data available on the Paris open data portal.

⁸¹ Among them, eleven were really asking for new datasets and 3 of the remaining relevant proposals dealt with the same dataset: school canteen menu - which finally appears to be out of scope of City of Paris competencies

⁸² Four of them - regularly in contact with City of Paris officials - were reached by email and one interviewed by the IRM researcher.

4. Increase mobile and geolocalised crowdsourcing with DansMaRue V2

Commitment text:

DansMaRue is a tool that allows Parisians to crowdsource [and report] irregularities in the public space to the administration, through a mobile application. It was experimented [tested] with success on negative aspects of the city. It doesn't allow Parisians yet to participate in a positive [constructive] way in the co-design of the city.

The Version 2 of the tool DansMaRue will offer inhabitants and users the possibility to get involved and participate to positive crowdsourcing on a given subject. For instance, the new location of equipment, works or services.

The tool will allow Parisians and users to co-design and to share their priorities for a future construction or service by using a digital tool that already has a good user base.

Milestones

1. Publication of the new version of DansMaRue V2 focused on irregularities, public space and equipment
2. Publication of the version with positive Data crowdsourcing

Commitment Overview

| | |
|--------------------------|---------------------|
| Status of Completion | Limited |
| Start Date | June 2017 |
| Intended Completion Date | October 2017 |
| Responsible Office | General Secretariat |
| Did It Open Government? | No evidence yet |

| | |
|--|----|
| <p><i>Is it a STAR commitment?</i></p> <p>Starred commitments are considered exemplary OGP commitments. To receive a star, a commitment must meet several criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It must be specific enough that a judgment can be made about its potential impact. Starred commitments will have "medium" or "high" specificity. - The commitment's language should make clear its relevance to opening government. Specifically, it must relate to at least one of the OGP values of Access to Information, Civic Participation, or Public Accountability. - The commitment would have a "transformative" potential impact if completely implemented. - Finally, the commitment must see significant progress during the action plan implementation period, receiving an assessment of "substantial" or "complete" implementation. | No |
|--|----|

| Commitment Overview | Specificity | | | | OGP Value Relevance | | | | Potential Impact | | | | Completion | | | | Did It Open Government? | | | | |
|---------------------|-------------|-----|--------|------|-----------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|--|------------------|-------|----------|----------------|-------------|---------|-------------|----------|-------------------------|-----------|----------|-------|-------------|
| | None | Low | Medium | High | Access to Information | Civic Participation | Public Accountability | Tech. and Innov. for Transparency and Accountability | None | Minor | Moderate | Transformative | Not Started | Limited | Substantial | Complete | Worsens | No change | Marginal | Major | Outstanding |
| Overall | | | ✓ | | | ✓ | | | ✓ | | | | ✓ | | | | ✓ | | | | |

Commitment Aim

Overall Objective & Relevance

Parisian citizens currently have access to mechanisms through which they can suggest policy changes to the city of Paris, such as “Madame la maire j’ai une idée” (idee.paris.fr) and the participatory budgeting initiative called “Paris, Budget Participatif” (budgetparticipatif.paris.fr) to provide input to and monitor the budgetary process. However, there is no mechanism to capture citizen demands and ideas to improve public service delivery or maintenance of public areas (for instance, a citizen who would suggest the installation of a new bench or bicycle parking station).

This commitment builds upon the on-going efforts to improve the already existing public application called DansMaRue, developed by the City of Paris in 2012 to enable users to notify irregularities at the street level (i.e. cleanliness issues, litter, re-pavement). This commitment calls for the continued support of a new version of this app (DansMaRue V2) and the creation of a new feature to allow crowdsourcing of constructive feedback and to suggest improvements to the city of Paris. Meetings to develop the new feature of DansMaRue V2 started in May 2016⁸³ and were expected to continue during 2017 to launch the application by October 2017. According to the action plan, the government expected to collect at least 1500 monthly suggestions.

The commitment is relevant to the OGP value of civic participation because the new features of the mobile application would allow citizens to provide input for the improvement of public services. However, as articulated, the app would not call on the government to justify its actions in response to citizen feedback, which is why the commitment is not relevant to public accountability.

Specificity and Potential Impact

The specificity of this commitment is coded as **medium**. Although the two activities identified in the action plan are verifiable, it is not clear how the deliverables would achieve the expected outcome of the commitment. The action plan does not provide details on what constitutes a suggestion and under which criteria they will be taken into consideration for further action. It also lacks a clear plan to explain how the government would raise awareness and launch the application in order to ensure citizen uptake and understanding of its new use.

If implemented fully, the IRM researcher considers that the potential impact of this commitment would be **minor**. This commitment proposes the objective of opening a channel for minor street-level improvements. However, its ambition is conditioned by the quality and quantity of the input. It is unclear how the city would translate these requests into action and if existing users of DansMaRue would use it for providing suggestions instead of its original purpose which is signaling irregularities.

Besides, considering that the design of this platform started before the formulation of the action plan and that, as written, this commitment does not specify how its inclusion in the plan will enhance the new features, the IRM researcher believes that there is no clear major change expected in the status quo.

The commitment is an incremental step towards participation in the co-design of service delivery. It is limited in scope as it does not provide detail in regards to how to make use of or process the data collected, nor creates new policies on inclusion of citizen input in decision-making.

Completion

Limited

The first milestone—the release of the new version of DansMaRue V2 focused on irregularities—was achieved. The application was released on August 2017 according to the history of versions of the app on Apple’s App Store⁸⁴ and is published on Google Play Store as well⁸⁵. However, while the new version of the app features improved design and ergonomics,⁸⁶ the feature regarding street-level improvements has not been released yet, as confirmed by the government point of contact.⁸⁷ She explained that this delay was due to issues during the testing of the second version of the application.

While one of the milestones of the commitment called for the release of a new version of DansMaRue, the main objective of the commitment consisted of allowing Parisians to signal street-level issues. Therefore, an update to the app that does not include this new functionality is considered to constitute only **limited** progress.

Early results: did it open government?

Civic Participation: No change

This commitment aimed to open a channel for Parisians to propose minor street-level improvements that could not be previously submitted in the application DansMaRue as they are not issues to be fixed. This new feature had the potential to further include citizens in the design of public places, even though the process by which requests would translate into actions was unclear.

At the close of the action plan, the feature allowing Parisians to propose improvements in DansMaRue, instead of only fixing issues, had not been implemented yet. The new version of the app consisted mainly of cosmetic changes and improved design without the addition of any new functions or opportunities for influencing public policies. The IRM researcher therefore did not find evidence of changes in government practices regarding civic participation for this commitment.

Recommendations

The design and implementation of this feature to propose street-level improvements might benefit from the help of the innovation lab mentioned in the fifth commitment of the action plan. In the innovation lab, the city of Paris could learn how to co-design the app to expand collaboration between the administration and the citizens on the process of handling these requests and translating them into action. Specifically, the innovation lab might help to inform how the city can crowdsource improvements.

In addition to how the requests will be handled, selected and translated into actions, another question is how the improvements will be funded. Street-level improvements could become a new category of projects in the participatory budget, for example.

Eventually, the city of Paris should make sure that this new feature in DansMaRue follows the principles of its newly adopted participation charter to ensure that the street improvement process is inclusive and transparent. In particular, the government should provide feedback on which citizen suggestions are accepted, along with the reasons for why some suggestions were accepted and others were not.

⁸³ The meetup group “Paris Open Innovation Meetup” is visible only for its members. The content of the 2016 May 30th event “Co-concevoir le dispositif DansMaRue V2” is available in the public folder: <https://goo.gl/hWCTQ7>

⁸⁴ <https://itunes.apple.com/fr/app/dansmarue/id662045577?mt=8>

⁸⁵ <https://play.google.com/store/apps/details?id=fr.paris.android.signalement>

⁸⁶ <https://itunes.apple.com/fr/app/dansmarue/id662045577?mt=8>

⁸⁷ Sabine Romon (government point of contact for OGP), comments made during an interview with the IRM researcher, 16 November 2017.

5. Kick-off of Paris Innovation Lab

Commitment text:

Administrative practices and culture are too often defined in a closed circuit. They must evolve in favor of co-designed services, tested by users and civil servants.

The goal of this prefiguration is creating an internal innovation Lab within 18 months. The long term perspective is to equip the city of Paris with its innovation lab dedicated to assist the making of user-centered public policies, like in Mexico, Sao Paulo or Rio.

The City of Paris will engage in this prefiguration in 2017. The lab will first be used as a space open to train civil servants, spread the culture of public innovation within the administration. It will be able [it will allow], once existing, to address public policy issues of the City of Paris in an innovative way, through a design approach. The prefiguration consists in co-building the lab with civil servants and elected representatives.

Milestones

1. Recruitment of 20 civil servants volunteers to the program “La Transfo”
2. Sharing of best practices with the laboratory of the City of Mexico through the international partnership Paris-Mexico
3. Sharing of best practices with Bloomberg Innovation teams through the partnership between Bloomberg innovation and La 27e Région
4. Training Program to design thinking Methods by the team of La 27e Région

Commitment Overview

| | |
|--------------------------|---------------------|
| Status of Completion | Complete |
| Start Date | January 2017 |
| Intended Completion Date | December 2017 |
| Responsible Office | General Secretariat |
| Did It Open Government? | No evidence yet |

| | |
|--|-----------|
| <p><i>Is it a STAR commitment?</i></p> <p>Starred commitments are considered exemplary OGP commitments. To receive a star, a commitment must meet several criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It must be specific enough that a judgment can be made about its potential impact. Starred commitments will have “medium” or “high” specificity. - The commitment’s language should make clear its relevance to opening government. Specifically, it must relate to at least one of the OGP values of Access to Information, Civic Participation, or Public Accountability. - The commitment would have a "transformative" potential impact if completely implemented. - Finally, the commitment must see significant progress during the action plan implementation period, receiving an assessment of "substantial" or "complete" implementation. | <p>No</p> |
|--|-----------|

| Commitment Overview | Specificity | | | | OGP Value Relevance | | | | Potential Impact | | | | Completion | | | | Did It Open Government? | | | | | |
|---------------------|-------------|-----|--------|------|-----------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|--|------------------|-------|----------|----------------|-------------|---------|-------------|----------|-------------------------|-----------|----------|-------|-------------|--|
| | None | Low | Medium | High | Access to Information | Civic Participation | Public Accountability | Tech. and Innov. for Transparency and Accountability | None | Minor | Moderate | Transformative | Not Started | Limited | Substantial | Complete | Worsens | No change | Marginal | Major | Outstanding | |
| Overall | | | ✓ | | Unclear | | | | | ✓ | | | | | | ✓ | | ✓ | | | | |

Commitment Aim

Overall Objective & Relevance

This commitment covers an administrative problem: elected officials and civil servants tend to frequently work through using a top-down approach and in a closed loop system. Researchers in political science such as Hassenteufel (2011) call this a “ballistic design”⁸⁸ of policies, which assumes that there is a unique identifiable leader with clear objectives and that implementation will follow independently of the concrete situation of those concerned by the policy. Therefore, this approach can lead to poorly designed public policies that do not accurately reflect the needs of citizens.

According to the action plan, this commitment aims to shift the administrative culture of civil servants from a top-down approach to a bottom-up approach that is more user-centric. It also wants to diffuse an internal culture of innovation within the Parisian administration through the training of volunteers to design new ways of problem solving. To do so, it proposes the launch of an innovation laboratory dedicated to training and empowering Parisian civil servants in public innovation. There are several activities detailed to achieve this objective. The first is to recruit 20 civil servants that will form the first session of the pilot program. Volunteers will participate in workshops and exchange best practices with the laboratory of the City of Mexico and Bloomberg Innovation teams. Finally, the civil servants will participate in a training program on design-thinking methods taught by La 27e Région, an organization working with governments and citizens on the co-design of public policies, which developed a program named “La Transfo” to foster innovation labs within local governments.

Although this is a laudable activity that aims to strengthen the public administration and trust in government, the commitment restricts participation of this innovation lab to civil servants without providing a public-facing mechanism to enhance citizen participation. It has no clarity in regards to how the commitment will improve access to information by publishing government-held information, include citizens in decision-making processes through open forums, nor how this could be a mechanism for government to justify their actions to citizens. Therefore, the relevance of this commitment to OGP values is considered unclear.

Specificity and Potential Impact

The specificity of this commitment has been coded as **medium**. All milestones are clearly verifiable, though hard to measure. The proposed activity to open a lab internal to city government is not coupled with a follow-up implementation plan that outlines the steps to achieve the creation of a lab open to citizens.

The city’s inspiration to carry-out this initiative comes from experiences with innovation labs in other cities, such as Mexico City and Sao Paulo. Labs of this type have proven to have a major impact in the co-creation of policies and innovation for better public services with the use of government data⁸⁹. However, because this commitment restricts the innovation lab to civil servants, it is considered a

positive step towards constructing a culture of innovation and co-design of policies, but limited to internal city staff.

Additionally, considering it does not outline a follow-up implementation plan, it is limited in scale. Therefore, this commitment is a positive, but incremental step towards changing the internal administration culture towards civic engagement. While innovation in management and training of civil servants could potentially help reduce top-down policy making in local government as it could lead to the creation of a design-thinking approach and application of user-centric methods, the commitment as described is expected to have a potential minor impact.

Completion

Complete

The first milestone, related to the recruitment of 20 civil servant volunteers, was achieved during the first session of “La Transfo”,⁹⁰ a program run by La 27e Région (a public innovation lab) to help local authorities create their own innovation lab. The first session of the program took place on 15 November 2016, prior to the release of the action plan. The 20 participating civil servants represented a wide variety of government departments, such as the Direction de la Démocratie des Citoyens et des Territoires (DDCT), the General Secretariat (SG), and the Center for Social Action (CASVP).⁹¹

The sharing of best practices with the laboratory of the City of Mexico—the second milestone—took place in April 2017. Stéphane Vincent, head of La 27e Région, reported on the learnings of this trip⁹². In particular, the Parisian civil servants and their Mexican counterparts—Laboratorio para la Ciudad—discussed the public policy challenges in Mexico City, and the work that the Mexican innovation lab carries out to address them. It is unclear if other organizations were also involved as the agenda for the trip was not publically available.

The partnership between La 27e Région and Bloomberg Innovation was accomplished in July 2017. As part of this partnership, Bloomberg Innovation announced that it would be providing \$1.4 million to La 27e Région for it to provide training, technical support, and peer-to-peer learning to 10 cities within France, including Paris.⁹³ According to Bloomberg Innovation, the trainings focus on making the French public sector “more inventive, agile, and suited to the needs of citizens.”⁹⁴ Specifically, each participating French city identifies a group of public servants who are trained by the La 27e Région team to learn new ways of tackling complex problems, designing solutions with clear goals, evaluating progress and results, and sharing results with others.

The training program, carried out by the La 27e Région team, took place throughout the course of 2017 in a series of sessions. As reported on the blog of La Transfo Paris, 13 sessions were held by the end of 2017⁹⁵. The final 15th session took place in February 2018. Throughout the sessions, the 20 participating civil servants engaged in a series of reflections, practical case studies, and dynamic exercises. The final sessions involved the early establishment of the innovation lab through workshops in which participants co-designed innovative solutions such as resilience during heatwaves or digital mediation in libraries⁹⁶.

While the training program officially ended in early 2018, the government clearly specified in the commitment text that this would be an 18-month-long process. Indeed, the program began in late 2016 and importantly, there was no interruption in the training sessions during the period of the action plan. For this reason, the IRM researcher considers the commitment to be **completed**.

Early results: did it open government?

Access to information: No change

Civic Participation: No change

Public accountability: No change

This commitment aimed to shift the administrative culture of the city of Paris to be more user-centric and innovative through the training of volunteers to design new ways of problem solving and the launch of an innovation lab. However, the commitment text did not specify an implementation plan for the lab and the training program was limited to a small group of 20 ambassadors for an administration of 50000 employees. Moreover, the commitment did not include a public-facing mechanism to improve access to information, include citizens in decision-making processes, or improve mechanisms for government to justify their actions to citizens. Given the internal nature of the commitment, it is not relevant to the OGP values of open government. For this same reason, there was no change in the level of government openness as a result of its implementation.

Still, the early results of the innovation lab prototype are encouraging. In the final sessions of the training program, the participants were able to use co-design techniques to imagine innovative solutions to concrete city problems. The co-design practices will form the foundation of the innovation lab. Nonetheless, according to the coordinator of La Transfo training program for the city of Paris, questions remain on the human and financial resources allocated to the innovation lab, and therefore its ability to spread these practices throughout such a large administration.⁹⁷

Recommendations

Launching the innovation lab will require the city of Paris to clarify its ambition regarding this project. If the city wants to extend the innovation lab beyond a small group of civil servants and beyond a very localised impact, the resources of the lab will be a key issue. Innovative projects will also require high-level political and administrative support. The city of Paris should build awareness of its top management to support the ambitions of the innovation lab by, for instance, conducting a seminar or a training on co-design methods.

The innovation lab should also consider how the public can directly benefit from its methods. For example, the training program projects were decided based on city administration priorities. To complement this approach, the innovation lab could dedicate a percentage of its projects to issues raised by the public.

Lastly, if this theme is included in a future OGP action plan, it is important that it be more closely linked to the values of open government through the inclusion of public-facing activities. For instance, the government could commit to the co-design of innovative initiatives with the public, or the implementation of specific actions in collaboration with civil society organizations or members of the public.

⁸⁸ Hassenteufel P. (2011), *Sociologie politique : l'action publique*, Paris, A. Colin.

⁸⁹ Tönurist, Piret, Rainer Kattel, and Veiko Lember (2017). "Innovation Labs in the Public Sector: What They Are and What They Do?" *Public Management Review* 19, no. 10 .

⁹⁰ <http://latransfo.la27eregion.fr/allumez-les-moteurs-lancement-de-la-transfo-paris/>

⁹¹ The participating civil servants and their departments are photographed here: http://latransfo.la27eregion.fr/wp-content/uploads/sites/11/2016/07/TP_S5_groupfie_legende.jpg

⁹² <http://www.la27eregion.fr/mexico-megapole-creative-notes-de-voyage/>

⁹³ <https://www.bloomberg.org/press/releases/bloomberg-philanthropies-partners-la-27e-region-expand-innovation-teams-france/>

⁹⁴ Ibid.

⁹⁵ <http://latransfo.la27eregion.fr/category/transfoparis/journal-de-bord-de-la-transfo-paris/>

⁹⁶ <http://latransfo.la27eregion.fr/transfo-paris-session-I-vous-prendrez-bien-un-peu-de-labo/>

⁹⁷ Nadège Giraud (La 27e Région), interviewed by the IRM researcher on 29 September 2017.

Method and Sources

The IRM report is written by well-respected governance researchers. All IRM reports undergo a process of quality control to ensure the highest standards of research and due diligence have been applied.

Analysis of progress on OGP action plans is a combination of interviews, desk research, and feedback from nongovernmental stakeholder meetings. The IRM report builds on assessments of progress put out by civil society, the government, the private sector, or international organizations.

The first and primary objective of the IRM is to verify completion of action plan commitments and the level of participation. Beyond this, the IRM seeks to assess potential impact and early changes in behavior around open government. There are two intended outcomes: accountability and learning. The method follows these aims. A second, important function of the IRM is to act as a “listening post” for the concerns of civil society.

Each report undergoes a 4-step review and quality control process:

- Staff review: IRM staff reviews the report for grammar, readability, content, and adherence to IRM methodology
- International Experts Panel (IEP) review: IEP reviews the content of the report for rigorous evidence to support findings, evaluates the extent to which the action plan applies OGP values, and provides technical recommendations for improving the implementation of commitments and realization of OGP values through the action plan as a whole
- Pre-publication review: Government and select civil society organizations (at the discretion of the researcher) are invited to provide comments on content of the draft IRM report
- Public comment period: The public is invited to provide comments on the content of the draft IRM report.

Interviews and Focus Groups

Each IRM researcher is required to hold at least one public information-gathering event. Care is taken in inviting stakeholders outside of the list of invitees already participating in existing processes. Supplementary means are sometimes needed to gather the inputs of stakeholders in a more meaningful way (e.g. online surveys, written responses, follow-up interviews). Additionally, researchers perform specific interviews with responsible agencies when the commitments require more information than provided in the self-assessment or accessible online.

During the writing of this report, the IRM researcher conducted the following interviews:

- 14 April 2017: Interview with Sabine Romon, Point of Contact for OGP, city of Paris
- 23 May 2017: Interview with Julien Antelin (over Skype), former Advisor to the Mayor in Digital Affairs
- 23 June 2017: Interview with Sabine Romon, Point of Contact for OGP, city of Paris
- 29 September 2017: Interview with Nadège Giraud, head of programs, La 27e Région

Document Library

The public library of documents, generated through this IRM evaluation, is available online.⁹⁸ In particular, the library contains the results of the survey that is described in the following section.

Survey-Based Data

Carrying out a survey can be helpful in gauging the interest of stakeholders in OGP commitments. If an online survey was carried out, this section provides links and provides the results of the survey, including number of respondents and findings.

On 27 June 2017, the IRM researcher contacted the CSOs for which a contact was found: 4D, Co-city, the Parisian Workshop for Urban Planning (*Atelier Parisien d'Urbanisme*, APUR), Cap ou Pas Cap, Muse des territoires, Paris Commission for Public Debate (*Commission Parisienne du Débat Public*), Paris Youth Council (*Conseil Parisien de la Jeunesse*, CPJ), School of Data (*Ecole des données*), and La 27e Région. As of 9 October 2017, seven of the ten CSOs answered the survey. The results are available in the IRM document library.⁹⁹

⁹⁸ <https://drive.google.com/drive/u/1/folders/0ByGU03hlyT02MldWdUw3RjhILW8>

⁹⁹ *Ibid.*