Healthier Democracies Case Study: Mexico City, Mexico

LABORATORY FOR THE CITY

by Azucena Morán

A fountain at Plaza Loreto was transformed into an "urban toy" as part of LabCDMX's Playful City program.

Mexico City's *Laboratorio para la Ciudad* (Laboratory for the City, or LabCDMX) ran from 2013 to 2018 as a participatory space with the goal of generating common understanding and prototyping collaborative processes between citizens, the government, civil society organizations, academics and the private sector. Operating in CDMX's 16 boroughs and under the Mayor's Office, it was dubbed Mexico City's "Ministry of Imagination." LabCDMX focused on civic innovation and the creation of "forms of interaction and connections between the government's political will and the city's social energy."[1] It designed paths and spaces for exchange and deliberation between the government and the civil society.

It also experimented with different processes aimed at collaboratively solving everyday problems related to road safety, play,

[1] Gabriella Gómez-Mont, "Creatividad Urbana. Tóxico Cultura y Laboratorio para la Ciudad," *Diecisiete, teoría crítica, psicoanálisis, acontecimiento*, no. 7 (2015), https://diecisiete.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/02/laboratorio-para-la-ciudad.pdf.

PUBLIC AGENDA

community dialogue and capacity building.[2] LabCDMX did this by finding new gaps within the city's challenges, objectives and practices; raising new conversations; and borrowing experimental methodologies and frameworks already present in other areas such as academia and the private sector.[3] LabCDMX employed a wide range of experimental participatory methodologies to support mobility, urban, artistic, data and child-centered policy-making in Mexico City—a city of 9,209,944 inhabitants.[4]

CONTEXT

The government of Mexico City's system of participation fluctuated between highly participatory social movements and historically challenged spaces of deliberation. The demands of citizen movements have pushed the government to adopt and institutionalize mechanisms for participatory policymaking and provide greater autonomy to the city.[5] At the same time, government-led structures for engagement have been accused of elitism, corporatism and party-dependent sustainability.[6]

Attempts to improve institutionalized spaces of participation have often failed because of their dependence on the given party in power at the time. Consequently, processes had low levels of participation and legitimacy and seemed unable to address the challenges of representative institutions at the regional level. Citizens have tended to perceive city government as too bureaucratic.[7] According to the 2020 *Latinobarómetro* survey, 58 percent of Mexico City's population is "not satisfied at all" or "not very satisfied" with democracy in the country.

Fast Facts

MEXICO
MEXICO CITY

POPULATION
9,209,944

GDP
$266 billion

GEOGRAPHICAL AREA
573 mi²

In this case study you'll find great examples of:

For more information, see the PGI User Guide, Glossary and Lessons Learned at publicagenda.org/healthier-democracies.

[2] Bruce Barnaby and Oscar Iván Pineda, "Why Public Innovations Labs Succeed? Lessons from Latin America" (master's thesis, Hertie School, 2018).

[3] Kursty Groves Knight and Oliver Marlow, *Spaces for Innovation: The Design and Science of Inspiring Environments*, 1st edition (Amsterdam: Frame Publishers, 2016).

[4] INEGI, "Censo Población y Vivienda 2020. Ciudad de México," last accessed January 23, 2022. https://www.inegi.org.mx/contenidos/saladeprensa/boletines/2021/EstSociodemo/ResultCenso2020_CdMx.pdf.

[5] Edgar Guerra Blanco "¿Organizaciones o movimientos sociales? Esbozo de una crítica a una distinción conceptual. El caso de las organizaciones sociales en la Ciudad de México," *Territorios* 31 (July–December 2014): 15–35, https://doi.org/10.12804/territ31.2014.01; Ligia Tavera Fenollosa, "Social Movements and Civil Society: The Mexico City 1985 Earthquake Victim Movement" (dissertation, Yale University, 1998).

[6] Roberto Mellado Hernández, *Participación ciudadana institucionalizada y gobernabilidad en la ciudad de México* (Mexico: Plaza y Valdes, 2001).

[7] Gabriella Gómez-Mont (former Director. Laboratory for the City), interviewed by the author, August 26, 2021.

The Laboratory for the City was created to collaboratively address some of these challenges. As it experimented with participatory processes, LabCDMX was confronted with the need to manage the expectations of citizens and public officials.

> **We have no idea of the bureaucratic obstacles to which public servants are exposed.... The government is full of punishments. But a lot of times, what we saw is that there are not enough incentives to achieve the kind of behavioral changes you want.**
>
> ***GABRIELLA GÓMEZ-MONT,***
> ***former Director, Laboratory for the City***

STRUCTURES & PROCESSES

System of engagement: History of Neighborhood Councils

Neighborhood Councils and the Consultative Council represented a stepping stone in the inclusion of citizen participation in Mexico City's governmental processes.[8] These spaces of participation were embedded in the 1970 Organic Law of the Department of the Federal District (*Distrito Federal*), in part as a response to the demands of Mexico's 1968 student movements.[9] They were followed by the implementation of a multilevel system of participation in 1978. The system included the election of block representatives and the establishment of a delegation of neighborhood councils.[10]

In the aftermath of the 1985 earthquake in Mexico City and inspired by the participatory experimentation of the city's organized citizenry, the government carried out a series of nonbinding consultations to reform citizen participation in the territory in 1986. One decade later, mainly as a development of the Constitutional Reforms of 1993, Mexico City adopted the first Citizen Participation Law in 1995 and replaced its Neighborhood Councils with Citizen Councils. Despite its promise, this new attempt to constitute a legitimate system of civic engagement and participation failed to engage large parts of the citizenry, and Citizen Councils were dissolved only two years after their conception.[11]

The dissolution of the Citizen Councils in 1996 was accompanied by the strengthening of representative governance structures in the Federal District and the establishment of more traditional forms of direct participation, such as direct voting, referendums and popular initiatives.[12] Two more Citizen Participation Laws were passed in 1998 and in 2004 and participation mechanisms gained momentum, including public information sharing: a network of citizen comptrollers, citizen organizations and citizen assemblies. In 2011, a participatory budgeting process was also included.[13]

[8] Adrian Guillermo Aguilar, "Community Participation in Mexico City: A Case Study," *Bulletin of Latin American Research* 7, no. 1 (1988): 33–46, https://doi.org/10.2307/3338438.

[9] Luis Antonio Serna González and Miguel Aguilar Robledo, "Democracia y participación ciudadana: el presupuesto participativo en la Ciudad de México," *Argumentos. Estudios críticos de la sociedad* 94 (March 2021): 67–93, https://doi.org/10.24275/uamxoc-dcsh/argumentos/202094-03.

[10] Aguilar, "Community Participation."

[11] Mellado Hernández, *Participación ciudadana*; Mario Espinosa, "Historia y cultura política de la participación ciudadana en la Ciudad de México: entre los condicionamientos del sistema y el ensueño cívico," *Andiamos, Revista de Investigación Social* 9, no. 1 (2004), http://www.scielo.org.mx/pdf/anda/n1/n1a2.pdf.

[12] Espinosa, "Historia y cultura política."

[13] Serna González and Aguilar Robledo, "Democracia y participación."

Following regional and global trends, Miguel Ángel Mancera Espinosa adopted and institutionalized multiple democratic innovations after becoming the mayor of Mexico City in 2012. These innovations included the introduction of the open government agenda and the establishment of the Laboratory for the City.[14] Before the end of Mancera's term in 2017, citizen participation was embedded in Mexico City's first Constitution—a regional Magna Carta crowdsourced after the Federal District became a federal entity.

Organizing, supporting and funding entities

OPPORTUNITIES

The Laboratory for the City was born from the willingness of the newly elected mayor to reflect the innovative and creative character of Mexico City's organized citizenry. The idea was developed by Gabriella Gómez-Mont and Clorinda Romo, who worked with the mayor's transition team to set up LabCDMX in the new government. Once LabCDMX was established, Gómez-Mont and Romo gathered a multidisciplinary team of architects, international experts, designers, artists, activists, historians, data analysts and political scientists to implement its objectives.

> **What was the idea of bringing the humanities back? We were becoming technocratic in the way we saw cities. . . . [But] being able to paint the larger picture of what people want to be a part of—that's the very basis of political life, the very basis of public participation.**
>
> ***GABRIELLA GÓMEZ-MONT***

LabCDMX relied on both public (60 percent) and private funding (40 percent) that amounted to roughly $530,000. Public funding was primarily allocated to cover administrative and operational costs.[15] Private funding was used to design, implement, experiment and assess projects imagined by LabCDMX.

> **The Laboratory kept existing because it had funds coming from international foundations. There was an implicit disclaimer: We are experimenting but not necessarily with taxpayers' money.**
>
> ***BERNARDO RIVERA MUÑOZCANO, former Coordinator, Open City, Laboratory for the City***

In addition to receiving international financial support, LabCDMX also received technical and strategic support. It led collaborations with multiple universities, consulting firms, international organizations and development banks. LabCDMX brought these partners into conversation with government and civil society organizations to explore participatory prototypes and the experimental processes of engagement.

Mayor Mancera's support was key to the implementation and development of LabCDMX. In 2018, the left party split and the change of administration in the city led to the dismantling of LabCDMX. The new head of government in Mexico City, Claudia Sheinbaum Pardo, created the Digital Agency for Public Innovation (ADIP) in charge of "data management, open government, digital government and technological governance policies in Mexico City." ADIP is not a direct continuation of LabCDMX, but it did adopt some of the themes of its "Open City" department and its participatory agenda.

Participant recruitment and selection

The LabCDMX team identified areas where it would implement its prototypes and engage local communities. It began by mapping the spaces that most needed these types of interventions based on established indicators or collected data. This need-based and data-driven approach to the selection of spaces meant that LabCDMX worked with neighborhoods whose prior experiences had been characterized by a lack of governmental response to their particular challenges.

Next, LabCDMX gathered different stakeholders to co-design, experiment, implement and assess participatory processes. Participants included citizens, activists

[14] Barnaby and Pineda, "Why Public Innovations."

[15] Ibid.

and groups—such as migrants—who were often excluded from decision-making. Participant selection processes varied greatly depending on the design and needs of the project. While some projects were populated by invitation only, most used snowball sampling, self-selection and in-person communication strategies, including the recruitment of key community members (e.g., owners of corner shops), as well as randomized door-to-door invitations to members of the community.[16]

In addition to inviting citizens to some of its open processes, LabCDMX often engaged with activists and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) in spaces of "intense collaboration with the aim of creating new channels of dialogue and experimentation alongside other autonomous means of participation and engagement. These LabCDMX collaborations often marked the first time participants worked with the government in this way, and the experience increased trust and participation levels among activists and NGOs.[17]

> **The Lab had a specific mission: How do you get people to even engage when most of the relationship to their governments is one of pure contestation . . . or complete apathy?**
>
> ***GABRIELLA GÓMEZ-MONT***

OUTCOMES

The Laboratory for the City implemented over 50 experiments and processes in response to challenges over six policy areas, which LabCDMX dubbed "cities" or *ciudades*: *Ciudad Peatón* (Walkable City), *Ciudad Lúdica* (Playful City), *Ciudad Abierta* (Open City), *Ciudad Propuesta* (Proposed City), *Ciudad Creativa* (Creative City), and *Ciudad Global* (Global City).

CIUDAD PEATÓN (WALKABLE CITY)

The objective of Ciudad Peatón was to improve Mexico City's road safety and transportation services. Participatory projects focused on mobility rethought from the perspective of pedestrians and cyclists.[18]

One of its leading projects, *Mapatón*, was mapping the city's concessionary transport network, an informal system of 30,000 buses used by 70 percent of the population. The project gathered 3,000 people over 400 days[19] using an app in which citizens could map bus routes and win prizes for their contributions. Over 1,500 routes covering about 50,000 kilometers were identified by participants.[20]

After the routes were mapped, LabCDMX organized a hackathon in collaboration with PIDES Innovación Social, a local NGO addressing urban challenges through citizen empowerment strategies and technology. Self-selected participants and experts translated the database into useful resources for citizens. The results from the mapping process and the hackathon were given to the Secretariat of Mobility of Mexico City, which was also in charge of further analyzing the collected data.[21]

[16] Leticia Lozano (former Coordinator Playful City at Laboratory for the City), interviewed by the author, September 23, 2021.

[17] Gómez-Mont, interview.

[18] Gómez-Mont, "Creatividad Urbana."

[19] Groves Knight and Marlow, *Spaces for Innovation*.

[20] Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), *Mapatón Case Study*, https://www.oecd.org/gov/innovative-government/embracing-innovation-in-government-mexico.pdf.

[21] Ibid.

Other processes developed by Ciudad Peatón included Nochebús CDMX (Night Bus), a collaborative process to reestablish a system of public transportation in the evening.

CIUDAD LÚDICA (PLAYFUL CITY)

Ciudad Lúdica aimed to enhance the ability of children to engage and become political subjects in the city. One of the main projects of Ciudad Lúdica was *Juguetes Urbanos* (Urban Toys) developed in Mexico City's Historic Center. It invited children, families and the community at large to appropriate public spaces for youth through a series of collaborative design and participatory planning workshops. After mapping spaces based on child population density and a participatory assessment of the barriers and risks children face in playing outdoors, LabCDMX identified three public spaces for improvement. It then issued an open call for urban planners, designers, architects and citizens to propose a juguete urbano for these three community spaces. LabCDMX received 86 proposals, which were considered by children from the neighborhood invited to engage in the process. Three proposals were selected and developed jointly with interested children through collaborative workshops in *Plaza Loreto*, *Plaza Santa Catarina* and *Parque de la Equidad*.[22]

Other processes of participation led by Ciudad Lúdica engaged youth in the participatory assessment of policies that affected them (such as traffic and transportation), the recovery of streets and other public spaces, and co-design exercises led by children in collaboration with experts (such as *calle de las niñas y los niños*, a street closure project aimed at creating safer spaces for youth).

CIUDAD ABIERTA (OPEN CITY)

Ciudad Abierta focused on the creation of new methodologies, processes and institutions for citizen collaboration and participation. These experiments worked to respond rapidly and dynamically to urban challenges.

One of its most important projects—and one of "the most ambitious participatory processes in Latin America" was the collaborative drafting of Mexico City's first Constitution after it ceased being a Federal District and gained rights similar to those of a state in 2016.[23] The Constituent Assembly of Mexico City (*Asamblea Constituyente de la Ciudad de México*) consisting of 100 members was formed. It was made up of 60 members elected by citizens and 40 designated by political authorities, out of which 28 citizens were drawn from a range of Mexico City residents. LabCDMX designed numerous mechanisms of participation in parallel to the assembly's drafting of Mexico City's Constitution.[24]

Both LabCDMX and the municipality wanted to avoid self-selection biases. They designed a multilayered process that appealed to different communities based on an interest scale. Participation was thus not limited to drafting the actual constitution (which was done via a digital platform), but also included participating in surveys; convening, reflection and deliberative processes; and promoting online petitions.

One hundred essays and 1,000 comments were published on the digital platform used to collaboratively write CDMX's constitution. Results of 42,700 surveys administered in 1,474 different neighborhoods (via 183 student volunteers) were presented to the drafting committee to guide their discussions.[25] Three hundred fifty-seven (357) petitions were presented on Change.org and signed by over 280,000 citizens and 55 citizen-convened spaces of deliberation were set up to discuss the Constitution.[26]

[22] Lozano, interview.

[23] Cities of Service, "Crowdsourcing a Constitution: An Engaged Cities Award case study created by Cities of Service in partnership with 2018 award finalist Mexico City, Mexico," 2019, https://citiesofservice.jhu.edu/wp-content/uploads/2019/03/Mexico_City_Cities_of_Serivce_Case_Study.pdf.

[24] Ibid.

[25] LabCDMX, "Constitución de la CDMX," last accessed January 23, 2022, https://labcd.mx/experimentos/constitucion-cdmx.

[26] Cities of Service, "Crowdsourcing a Constitution."

CIUDAD PROPUESTA (PROPOSED CITY)

Ciudad Propuesta was in charge of researching and setting up dialogues and deliberative spaces to generate collective action and participatory democracy in the city. Its aim was to respond to the failure of co-opted or instrumentalized mechanisms of citizen participation relied on by previous Mexico City administrations. It used both participatory and engagement mechanisms such as surveys, workshops and reflection spaces.

CIUDAD CREATIVA (CREATIVE CITY)

Ciudad Creativa aimed to "enhance the creative capital of citizens" and embed creativity and design within policymaking processes.

CIUDAD GLOBAL (GLOBAL CITY)

Ciudad Global was set up to strengthen new paradigms of urban diplomacy by engaging international actors in local politics.

Methods and tools used

The Laboratory for the City developed methodologies "based on design thinking, ethnography, open government and urban geography."[27] It aimed to be the government's "creative wing," a space able to influence the city's collective imaginaries through artistic and cultural means. It introduced "Plato's poets, artists and people used to work with malleable realities" to the governmental sphere and the policymaking cycles to reinvent narratives and civic commons.[28]

> **Let's think a bit less about innovation. There was already a wave of chief innovation officers. What would happen if we started thinking about creative strategies, means, methods and their capacity to address public issues?… Our specialty was the more experimental part. That's why I always highlight the difference between innovation and experimentation. Innovation sometimes does not require experimentation. Real experimentation happens when you don't know what's going to happen on the other side.**
>
> ***GABRIELLA GÓMEZ-MONT***

Methods and tools used included:

Public Contests: LabCDMX implemented contests for citizens to collaboratively develop policy responses, map data, optimize processes and appropriate public spaces throughout the city. As noted earlier, LabCDMX's Mapatón encouraged citizens to map Mexico City's informal and discounted transportation system using crowdsourcing and gamified methodologies.

Debates: In response to city protests or widespread discontent, LabCDMX convened debates to generate collective discussions around policies and challenges. For instance, debates were implemented in 2015 when the transnational companies Uber and Cabify were introduced into the city, and in 2017 during the mass protests and blockages known as the *gasolinazo* that followed an increase in gas prices. These spaces of confrontation and participation followed a four-step process: transmedia

[27] Barnaby and Pineda, 2018: 30.

[28] Gómez-Mont, "Creatividad Urbana," 68.

mapping of opinions, multi-stakeholder working tables, a virtual platform to gather and analyze citizen input, and formulation and dissemination of collective recommendations.

Diseño de Futuros, foresight spaces: LabCDMX engaged the government, citizens and the private sector in future-thinking methodologies and foresight processes to address emerging topics such as artificial intelligence and prototyping urban planning innovations such as data donation and mobility coins. This led to the creation of collaborative databases, sustainable mobility units within LabCDMX and specialized groups within the government.

Sobremesas, after-meal discussions: LabCDMX hosted multiple after-meal discussions, which it coined *sobremesas*, to bring together people in order to deliberate pressing issues for the transformation of Mexico City. These informal spaces increased trust and broke "symbols of power" among multiple actors who shared a small meal and a drink as they deliberated topics such as participatory budgeting, entrepreneurship, data science, creativity, science, technology and strengthening of the city's social tissue.[29] This methodology was used to address issues "usually loaded with negative emotion" and shift anger into productive conversations.[30]

Hacks Legislativos, legislative hackathons: LabCDMX engaged in multiple processes to collaboratively draft and present proposed laws to the city. The most innovative example of which was the participatory drafting of CDMX's Constitution. To do this, LabCDMX and the Department of Legal Services designed four options for citizen participation:

1. **Digital platform:** Using the open-source collaborative drafting software PubPub, LabCDMX created an online platform where citizens could access, comment and share multimedia sources on all the documents written by the core group in charge of drafting the Constitution.
2. **Online petitions:** In collaboration with Change.org, LabCDMX created the "*Voces Ciudadanas en la Constitución CDMX*" (Citizen Voices in the Mexico City Constitution), which gathered together all petitions related to the Constitution and ensured the proposals didn't violate specific rights already guaranteed by law. Depending on the number of signatures, the proposals were analyzed by the members of the core drafting group, the CDMX legal advisor or the mayor.
3. **Polling:** The citywide poll "*Imagina tu Ciudad*" (Imagine Your City) consisted of 18 questions that could be answered online or in person. The in-person strategy consisted in setting up mobile stands throughout the city run by students and volunteers in collaboration with the Legal Department.
4. **Citizen-led spaces of deliberation:** LabCDMX systematized and analyzed the results of self-organized events, town halls, conferences and forums organized to deliberate and submit proposals for the new Constitution.

Urban Interventions: LabCDMX prototyped, experimented and implemented practical responses to collective challenges. For instance, participatory responses to issues such as insufficient public transportation in the evening (Nochebús CDMX); limited and unequal distribution of public spaces, parks and green areas for children (*Peatoniños*); and limited walkability throughout the city (*Parqueando*). LabCDMX cocreated responses with experts, citizens and government officials through working tables and seminars. Responses included an improved night bus service, closed streets, temporarily occupying or repurposing spaces for cars (*Periférico* and Parqueando), and multiple artistic interventions (*Artefacto Urbano* and *Cinerodada*). It also introduced technologies for planning and gathering data such as a geographic information system (GIS) and it connected citizen organizations to international movements and mechanisms of urban intervention (Parqueando and Life Sized City).

[29] Groves Knight and Marlow, *Spaces for Innovation*, 272.

[30] Ibid., 272.

LESSONS

One of the core strengths of LabCDMX was its interdisciplinary team with strong ties to organized civil society. All but one of its members were new to the government.[31] This was in response to historical concerns of corporatism and clientelism linked to previous government-led citizen participation efforts in Mexico City and low levels of participation and a lack of perceived legitimacy in engagement processes. Working with civil society actors and activists increased trust in LabCDMX, especially among autonomous movements and the organized citizenry.

However, high levels of expertise and creativity on the team often collided with members' limited understanding of political sensitivities.[32] This led the team to stumble with bureaucratic red tape and unwillingness to cooperate across governmental departments.[33] Many of the prototypes created by LabCDMX were not institutionalized or scaled up by decision makers. This factored into LabCDMX's high staff turnover and growing dissatisfaction within some sectors of the citizenry.[34]

> **The Laboratory did not create enemies, but . . . they made [the administration] work more by raising the bar. We invaded agendas and projects. Suddenly, the cool kids come in and want to tell you how to do the things you've been doing for 20 years.**
>
> ***BERNARDO RIVERA MUÑOZCANO***

Even though some of LabCDMX's prototypes were not taken up by the government, the creative component of LabCDMX's methodology allowed processes to not only be "intangible resources," but also spaces for generating "exponential" possibilities. For example, the Open City Law pioneered "how [to] . . . create [dynamic] laws for ever-changing spaces."[35] It set an institutional basis and a legal framework upon which new participatory processes could transform, change and grow.

The ability of LabCDMX to create nonlinear and hyper-dynamic processes stemmed from its community-oriented and experimental identity. This was reflected in both the Open City Law and the trial-and-error design process of the spaces used to crowdsource the Constitution, such as PubPub. The online platform had low levels of participation and was largely confined to self-selected communities with deep legal knowledge and time.[36] When LabCDMX realized that the wider citizenry wasn't using this space, they opened the process to different digital resources, time availabilities and types of knowledge in Mexico City, including citywide polls, petitions, making voting available via spaces and platforms already known and trusted by citizens, and employing community-owned processes of deliberation.

The malleability of LabCDMX's processes also led to acknowledging the importance of highly heterogeneous policymaking processes. LabCDMX not only prototyped deliberative and collaborative decision-making processes, but also convened closed-door dialogues, workshops and meetings.

> **You don't want participatory processes around [everything]. Sometimes you need experts. Sometimes you get five minutes [of citizens' time]. Sometimes they give you six years of their life on agendas that matter to you. Participation has to be multiple. It has to obey where and how people generate ideas.**
>
> ***GABRIELLA GÓMEZ-MONT***

[31] Gómez-Mont, interview.

[32] Diego Emilio Cuesy Edgar (former Coordinator Open City at Laboratory for the City), interview by the author, October 14, 2021.

[33] Bernardo Rivera Muñozcano (former Coordinator Open City at Laboratory for the City), interview by the author, September 24, 2021.

[34] Rivera Muñozcano, interview; Cuesy Edgar, interview.

[35] Gómez Mont, 2015, 167

[36] Rivera Muñozcano, interview.

Applications for public officials

Creating a system of participation within the government is not enough to create legitimate, inclusive and impactful processes able to address the shortcomings of representative democracies. A system of institutional designs for citizen participation needs open collaborations and connections to the larger ecosystem of participation in the territory (e.g., autonomous movements, citizen-driven spaces of collaborative governance, the private sector, etc.).

Setting a funding strategy that combines governmental and philanthropic resources allows institutionalized structures to not only reform and innovate, but also experiment with collaborative methodologies. Using funding from international and philanthropic organizations for new experimental processes allows decision-makers to avoid losing political support from risk-averse actors. Ideally, successful processes can be then scaled up with public funding.

Multidisciplinary teams that aim to create dynamic processes of experimentation to include citizens in decision-making processes should gather actors from the creative sector able to work with malleable realities, experienced public servants able to address political sensitivities and cross-departmental challenges, and activists able to connect government-led processes to citizen-led governance structures.

Support for this research was provided by the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation. The views expressed here do not necessarily reflect the views of the foundation.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aguilar, Adrian Guillermo. "Community Participation in Mexico City: A Case Study." *Bulletin of Latin American Research* 7, no. 1 (1988): 33–46. https://doi.org/10.2307/3338438.

Barnaby, Bruce and Oscar Iván Pineda. "Why Public Innovation Labs Succeed? Lessons from Latin America." Master's thesis, Hertie School, 2018.

Blanco, Edgar Guerra. "¿Organizaciones o movimientos sociales? Esbozo de una crítica a una distinción conceptual. El caso de las organizaciones sociales en la Ciudad de México." *Territorios* 31 (July–December 2014): 15–35. https://doi.org/10.12804/territ31.2014.01.

Cities of Service. *Crowdsourcing a Constitution: An Engaged Cities Award case study created by Cities of Service in partnership with 2018 award finalist Mexico City, Mexico*, 2019. https://citiesofservice.jhu.edu/wp-content/uploads/2019/03/Mexico_City_Cities_of_Serivce_Case_Study.pdf.

Cruz Ruiz, Ernesto. "Underrepresented Groups and Constitution-Making: The Mexico City Case." *Political Studies Review* 19, no. 2 (May 2021): 164–170. https://doi.org/10.1177/1478929920944825.

Cuesy Edgar, Diego Emilio (former Coordinator Open City at Laboratory for the City). Interview by author. October 14, 2021.

Decreto por el que se abroga la Ley de Participación Ciudadana del Distrito Federal y se expide la Ley de Participación Ciudadana de la Ciudad de México 2019, Gaceta Oficial del Ciudad de México, no. 154 Bis. https://data.consejeria.cdmx.gob.mx/portal_old/uploads/gacetas/201cd7312de8f327c965844fbc43bd98.pdf.

Espinosa, Mario."Historia y cultura política de la participación ciudadana en la Ciudad de México: entre los condicionamientos del sistema y el ensueño cívico." *Andiamos, Revista de Investigación Social* 9, no. 1 (2004). http://www.scielo.org.mx/pdf/anda/n1/n1a2.pdf.

Gómez-Mont, Gabriella (former Director Laboratory for the City). Interview by author. August 26, 2021.

————. "Creatividad Urbana: Tóxico Cultura y Laboratorio para la Ciudad." *Diecisiete, teoría crítica,*

psicoanálisis, acontecimiento, no. 7 (2015). https://diecisiete.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/02/laboratorio-para-la-ciudad.pdf.

Groves Knight, Kursty and Oliver Marlow. *Spaces for Innovation: The Design and Science of Inspiring Environments, 1st edition*. Amsterdam: Frame Publishers, 2016.

INEGI. "'Censo Población y Vivienda 2020. Ciudad de México" Last accessed January 23, 2022. https://www.inegi.org.mx/contenidos/saladeprensa/boletines/2021/EstSociodemo/ResultCenso2020_CdMx.pdf.

Ireland, Corydon. "The Makeover of Mexico City." *The Harvard Gazette*, February 26, 2015, https://news.harvard.edu/gazette/story/2015/02/the-makeover-of-mexico-city/.

LabCDMX. "Constitución de la CDMX." Last accessed January 23, 2022. https://labcd.mx/experimentos/constitucion-cdmx.

————. "Experimentación y creatividad en la Ciudad de México (Archivo 2013–2018): Laboratorio para la Ciudad." Last accessed January 23, 2022. https://labcd.mx/.

Latinobarometro. "Corporación Latinobarómetro." Last accessed January 23, 2022. https://www.latinobarometro.org/latContents.jsp.

Ley de Participación Ciudadana del Distrito Federal 2005, Gaceta Oficial del Distrito Federal No. 83. https://www.trabajo.cdmx.gob.mx/storage/app/uploads/public/581/cc7/aa4/581cc7aa45725060752761.pdf.

Lozano, Leticia (former Coordinator Playful City at Laboratory for the City). Interview by author. September 23, 2021.

Mellado Hernández, Roberto. *Participación ciudadana institucionalizada y gobernabilidad en la ciudad de México*. Mexico: Plaza y Valdes, 2001.

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). *Mapatón Case Study*. https://www.oecd.org/gov/innovative-government/embracing-innovation-in-government-mexico.pdf.

Rivera Muñozcano, Bernardo (former Coordinator Open City at Laboratory for the City). Interview by author. September 24, 2021.

Serna González, Luis Antonio and Miguel Aguilar Robledo. "Democracia y participación ciudadana: el presupuesto participativo en la Ciudad de México." *Argumentos. Estudios críticos de la sociedad* 94 (March 2021): 67–93. https://doi.org/10.24275/uamxoc-dcsh/argumentos/202094-03.

Tavera Fenollosa, Ligia. "Social Movements and Civil Society: The Mexico City 1985 Earthquake Victim Movement." Dissertation, Yale University, 1998. https://www.proquest.com/openview/aa6d5d181fc3257aef324d414f3bcc94/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=18750&diss=y.