

Applicant Name: Sierra Leone Team
 Normalized Scores 58.2

JUDGING CRITERION # 1: CREDIBILITY OF PARTNERSHIPS (0-5)

Did the applicant provide sufficient evidence of partnering with other non-government organizations in either nominating, validating and/or jointly implementing the initiative?

0 - 1	1 - 2	2 - 3	3 - 4	4 - 5
<i>Showed no consultation in nominating an initiative; may have been jointly implemented but shows very weak validation of claims</i>	<i>Some effort in consulting with other partners in nominating an initiative; initiative was not jointly implemented but provided minimal validation of claims</i>	<i>Provided sufficient evidence of consulting with other partners to nominate an initiative, was jointly implemented and presented somewhat convincing validation of claims</i>	<i>Demonstrated compelling mechanisms for consulting others in nominating an initiative; was not jointly implemented but shows convincing validation of claims</i>	<i>Shows strong evidence of consulting others in nominating an initiative; jointly implemented with a partner agency and strong validation of claims</i>

3.8 / 5

Judge Name: Tri Mumpuni
Score: 3.8
Comment: Ogi has tried to be established under the Office of The President and involving many others institutions

4.4 / 5

Judge Name: Don Don Parafina
Score: 4.4
Comment: Solid account on the partnership, but it could have been more convincing if more civil society partners shared their testimonies.

2.1 / 5

Judge Name: Gilbert Sendugwa
Score: 2.1
Comment: Information regarding consultation among civil society and government of the nomination is noted to have been made mainly to OGP Steering Committee. Since the steering committee is representative of wider communities it would have been great getting ways to consult these constituencies as well.

3.1 / 5

Judge Name: Maxine Tanya Hamada
Score: 3.1
Comment: OGI is a strong example of government commitment to take a first step to open up and engage citizens and other institutions of government. The enthusiasm of the OGI is clear in the submission. Citizen and civil society ownership of this direction can be further strengthened

1.7 / 5

Judge Name: Igor Vidacak
Score: 1.7
Comment: Open Government Initiative (OGI) is nominated by OGI coordinator office located in the Office of the President, after gaining concurrence from CSOs by emails and calls. The nomination process was rather top-down driven, but there is enough evidence in the validation letter that CSOs had their say on the choice of initiative at the National OGP committee meeting. The responsibility for the implementation of the initiative is within the Office of the President OGI Office.

JUDGING CRITERION # 2: DEPTH OF ENGAGEMENT (0-5)

Does the initiative provide incentives for the participation of citizens and offer direct, innovative channels for citizens to engage with government?

0 - 1	1 - 2	2 - 3	3 - 4	4 - 5
<i>Offered no incentives for participation; provides basic information to citizens but no avenues for real engagement to influence policy/service design or implementation; doesn't define a target population</i>	<i>Provided few incentives for participation; obtained basic feedback from some of its target population; however, did not indicate how feedback would be used</i>	<i>Demonstrated sufficient incentives for participation; created indirect ways to solicit citizens' aspirations; strived to exceed the intended level of engagement of its target population</i>	<i>Created reliable ways to incentivize participation; used direct and innovative ways to get citizen feedback; secured participation of at least half of target population</i>	<i>Employed compelling measures to incentivize participation; used direct and innovative methods to partner with citizens in decision-making; reached an ambitious level of engagement with its target population</i>

2.7 / 5

Judge Name: Tri Mumpuni
Score: 2.7
Comment: Even though many organizations involve but there is not clear their engagement here and how to proceed their program

3.6 / 5

Judge Name: Don Don Parafina
Score: 3.6
Comment: OGI Sierra Leone proved to be a novel effort to invite participation through the townhall meetings. The methodology needs to clarify how citizens' inputs are captured, documented, processed, analysed, reported and used or translated into actionable feedback. Need to show how its ability to reach the entire population can be verified.

2.8 / 5

Judge Name: Gilbert Sendugwa
Score: 2.8
Comment: As described civil society would have some incentives to for civil society to participate especially considering that by establishing this space and implementing outcomes of such consultations shows commitment of Government for openness and consultations. The down side could be that given that the candidate idea is broad, incentives for participation could change from time to time depending on the matter under consideration. Further, arrangement of meetings could imply a supply driven process in which one party organises and another participates with limited options to influence agenda, target group, dates, among other important issues. Perhaps consideration of an idea that that provides for ongoing engagement rather than events would offer higher opportunities for citizen engagement.

3.6 / 5

Judge Name: Maxine Tanya Hamada
Score: 3.6
Comment: The OGI clearly defined its different layers of stakeholders from government leaders, chiefs and media to organized civil society and citizens. The incentive is the active engagement of government leadership in this initiative.

2 / 5

Judge Name: Igor Vidacak
Score: 2.0
Comment: Organizing big town hall meetings to provide forum for direct debate among citizens, members of Parliament, representatives of Government and even members of judiciary and police - is an excellent and praiseworthy initiative. The fact that 80,000 people have already attended these meetings provides sufficient proof on the recognition of the value of this effort among citizens. As these are plenary sessions where Government disseminates information to citizens which have the possibility of asking questions and commenting, the application does not contain enough information on how citizens's inputs are actually taken into account. What is the follow up of the meetings? How will citizens know whether their contributions have been taken into account in developing new policies? Answers to these questions would allow me to give higher score in this category.

JUDGING CRITERION # 3: EVIDENCE OF RESULTS (0-5)

Did citizen engagement influence the design or delivery of government policy and services? Is there any evidence of concrete benefits to citizens and the government as a result?

0 - 1	1 - 2	2 - 3	3 - 4	4 - 5
<i>Shows that citizens may be informed but provided little to no evidence of change in public policy or service</i>	<i>Nominally influenced a public policy or service; and shows some benefits to citizens as a result</i>	<i>Sufficiently changed a public policy or service; and demonstrated reliable benefits to citizens as a result</i>	<i>Significantly influenced a public policy or service; resulted in compelling benefits to citizens and the government</i>	<i>Transformed a public policy or service; set new standards for the relationship between government and citizens; resulted in concrete benefits for both</i>

3 / 5

Judge Name: Tri Mumpuni
Score: 3.0
Comment: There is no clear result yet can be described as considered as an achievement

2.8 / 5

Judge Name: Don Don Parafina
Score: 2.8
Comment: The initiative is strong in connecting government with the citizens, which manifested in trust and confidence in OGI. No concrete benefits in terms of passing pro-people policy or improving service have been reported. Effect is still at the level of awareness and relations that reinforce transparency and accountability.

2.7 / 5

Judge Name: Gilbert Sendugwa
Score: 2.7
Comment: The initiative, started seven years ago, has provided an important platform on which to build OGP. It is possible that recent law and policies on transparency such as the Freedom of information Act and Publish what Pay could have gained from the initiative but these are not mentioned in the application.

1.7 / 5

Judge Name: Maxine Tanya Hamada
Score: 1.7
Comment: The OGI has clearly raised the level of engagement and interest in government as presented as well as the openness of government to public feedback. It will be very interesting to know what policies, programs and delivery of services were influenced by the OGI moving forward.

1.9 / 5

Judge Name: Igor Vidacak
Score: 1.9
Comment: Probably the greatest benefit of OGI is its contribution to the increase of public trust and confidence in the work of public institutions. Through widening the space for citizens and CSOs to have their say on public policies and engage in direct, offline communication with policy makers, OGI contributes to more transparency and accountability of government bodies. I would suggest to conduct national survey and gather concrete data on citizens views on the benefits of the initiative as this will provide strong evidence of its contribution to transformation of public service.

JUDGING CRITERION # 4: SUSTAINABILITY (0-5)

Does the applicant make a compelling case that the initiative will be institutionalized or scaled-up over time?

0 - 1	1 - 2	2 - 3	3 - 4	4 - 5
<i>Demonstrates few plans in moving the initiative beyond the pilot stage; does not address any potential threats or challenges to the initiative</i>	<i>Shows some commitment to institutionalizing the initiative; but presents unrealistic ways of managing challenges faced by the initiative</i>	<i>Lists activities to institutionalize the initiative; but only somewhat addresses how challenges will be addressed</i>	<i>Outlines a clear path to either institutionalize or scale-up the initiative; makes a good case on how potential challenges will be addressed</i>	<i>Presents a durable model that can be institutionalized and/or scaled-up; makes a compelling case for how challenges will be managed</i>

2.4 / 5

Judge Name: Tri Mumpuni
Score: 2.4
Comment: Even though it has in placed for 6 years but there is no explanation how this institution is being funded, presumably by the government but how it will be secured? And the involvement of teh civil society to utilize this ORGI is not clear described.

4.3 / 5

Judge Name: Don Don Parafina
Score: 4.3
Comment: Six years of continuous implementation of OGI Sierra Leone is a strong argument for its sustainability. The model can be appreciated better if a rigorous study can show the factors that make it durable, such as an irreversible legal anchor of the unit running the OGI, adequate organisational support in all levels of coordination, continuing budget, and social acceptability of the methods.

3.4 / 5

Judge Name: Gilbert Sendugwa
Score: 3.4
Comment: Ideas on institutionalization have been outlined but yet to be elaborated and consulted upon with wider stakeholder community.

2.3 / 5

Judge Name: Maxine Tanya Hamada
Score: 2.3
Comment: The relevance and interest in OGI is very clear. The commitment of OGI to continue its work is also presented. There was no specific information on the challenges and the steps to institutionalize and broaden citizen engagement moving forward - although the interest of, and support from media and civil society may be factors in sustaining and further evolving this partnership.

3.9 / 5

Judge Name: Igor Vidacak
Score: 3.9
Comment: Being located in the Office of the President, OGI has obvious strong political support, but it seems to have gained substantial public support as well. As it is a very top-down initiative, centralizing communication with citizens from one place, the only risk I could identify is in missing the opportunity to empower policy makers across public administration to develop meaningful dialogue with civil society on everyday basis. This would lead to citizens engagement becoming part of embedded culture of dialogue across government bodies at all levels. Otherwise, I must say that I am pleasantly surprised by the initiative and enthusiasm that is visible in the work of OGI coordinator. Congratulations and keep up the good work!