

Applicant Name: Tunisia Team  
Normalized Scores 59.4

**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>Shows 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>
			2.9 / 5	
<hr/>				
<b>Judge Name:</b>	Ma'i Elimat			
<b>Score:</b>	2.9			
<b>Comment:</b>	(1) The consultation process for nominating the initiative is not clear nor the details of the timeline and who participated (only indicated CSOs), and if there was another initiatives nominated or another step taken before selecting the current initiative presented at this application. (2) No partnerships during the development and management of the portal were outlined in the application. (3) The validation of claims was presented by a letter from one of the CSOs to support the nomination and importance of this initiative.			
			3.5 / 5	
<hr/>				
<b>Judge Name:</b>	Jennifer Gustetic			
<b>Score:</b>	3.5			
<b>Comment:</b>	consultation: they described some consultation but not a detailed nomination or selection process. (3) implementation: the initiative was co-nominated but it's not clear if the NGO had any role in implementing the initiative as well... (2) validation of claims: convincing (4)			
			2.7 / 5	
<hr/>				
<b>Judge Name:</b>	Katju Holkeri			
<b>Score:</b>	2.7			
<b>Comment:</b>				
			3.8 / 5	
<hr/>				
<b>Judge Name:</b>	Oluseun Onidbinde			
<b>Score:</b>	3.8			
<b>Comment:</b>	Evidence of consulting with a CSO as a partner in nominating the initiative was seen with valid claims.			
			4 / 5	
<hr/>				
<b>Judge Name:</b>	Diana Parra Silva			
<b>Score:</b>	4.0			
<b>Comment:</b>	Shows efforts in consulting with other partners in nominating an initiative: OGP Tunisia team consulted with members of civil society and selected jointly this initiative. It was co-presented with the association Albawala. No information on how other partners were involved in the implementation of the initiative but shows convincing validation of claims.			

**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>
			2.9 / 5	
<hr/>				
<b>Judge Name:</b>	Ma'i Elimat			
<b>Score:</b>	2.9			
<b>Comment:</b>	(1) The initiative is a good step toward citizens engagement. However, the applicant provided only few incentives for citizens to participate. Moreover, (2) The applicant didn't include how is the online-unconnected citizens would be engaged. Since the initiative is targeting all citizens to participate in deciding some of the legislations or policies or plans or services that touch their daily life, then the unconnected faction has to be included in another way to avoid being unengaged. (3) The dissemination approaches to encourage people to participate is good. However, I recommend using further approaches such as TV/radio broadcasting, national campaign in assistant with the local CSOs. etc.			
			4 / 5	
<hr/>				
<b>Judge Name:</b>	Jennifer Gustetic			
<b>Score:</b>	4.0			
<b>Comment:</b>	incentives: the incentives for participation they provided seemed to be a credible chance for the ideas to be heard in the policy making process-a first for tunisia. there was no financial incentives. they have nada number of dialogues on a variety of topics. unclear what the participation numbers have been on each topic and if people are coming back (2) feedback mechanisms: online platform for submitting ideas. promoting using social media as well as other seminars. unclear if there is also an offline component or if its all online. framed the feedback around specific policy issues to keep the dialogues focused. (4) engagement levels: said "thousands" had been involved but unclear which topics they engaged on and how much of a percentage of a population this is. they say they'll use this for public opinion polls and surveys; do they plan to consider statistical significance of response in their consideration of views during policy making? (3)			
			3.5 / 5	
<hr/>				
<b>Judge Name:</b>	Katju Holkeri			
<b>Score:</b>	3.5			
<b>Comment:</b>				
			2.9 / 5	
<hr/>				
<b>Judge Name:</b>	Oluseun Onidbinde			
<b>Score:</b>	2.9			
<b>Comment:</b>	It has not clearly demonstrated enough incentives for citizens to use the platform. For instance, how many citizens used the platform and what are the specific changes in the policy due to public voting?			
			3 / 5	
<hr/>				
<b>Judge Name:</b>	Diana Parra Silva			
<b>Score:</b>	3.0			
<b>Comment:</b>	Incentives for the participation of citizens and channels for citizens to engage with government: No information on incentives for participation was provided. However, it is mentioned that has been promoted through social networks. They created reliable ways to solicit citizens' aspirations but there is no information on how citizens have influenced policy/service design or implementation.			

**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>
			2.6 / 5	
<hr/>				
<b>Judge Name:</b>	Ma'i Elimat			
<b>Score:</b>	2.6			
<b>Comment:</b>	(1) The actual outcomes outlined by the applicant still very limited comparing to the intended outcomes. (2) The portal (I checked) still need a lot of work to respond to the intended outcomes (i.e. no component in the portal was addressing the intended result of improvement of public services delivery needs). Thus, the applicant is encouraged to scale the initiative up to respond to the intended results. (3) From reviewing the portal the issues under consultation is very important. However, further much important issues should be highlighted and be under consultation if we are targeting the local policy or service level.			
			2.9 / 5	
<hr/>				
<b>Judge Name:</b>	Jennifer Gustetic			
<b>Score:</b>	2.9			
<b>Comment:</b>	there was evidence that feedback from forums was considered but not clear which ideas, if any, were actually incorporated. the process has the potential to chance many public policies and services but it's unclear how it has thus far.			
			2.5 / 5	
<hr/>				
<b>Judge Name:</b>	Katju Holkeri			
<b>Score:</b>	2.5			
<b>Comment:</b>				
			3.1 / 5	
<hr/>				
<b>Judge Name:</b>	Oluseun Onidbinde			
<b>Score:</b>	3.1			
<b>Comment:</b>	Claims of change in public policy needs to be seen empirical terms to adequately quantify impact. This has not been stated properly but in broad terms.			
			2.5 / 5	
<hr/>				
<b>Judge Name:</b>	Diana Parra Silva			
<b>Score:</b>	2.5			
<b>Comment:</b>	Shows that citizens may be informed but not enough evidence of change in public policy or service was provided; while the benefits are clear and they mentioned that various exercises in several topics had been carried out, no information was provided on how citizen engagement influences the design or delivery of government policy/services.			

**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>
			1.9 / 5	
<hr/>				
<b>Judge Name:</b>	Ma'i Elimat			
<b>Score:</b>	1.9			
<b>Comment:</b>	(1) The applicant didn't make any plans or clear activities for sustainability. The applicant rather explained how important this initiative for the government and that its (must be sustained!). (2) No challenges were included or any plan to overcome these challenges. the applicant is encouraged to outline concrete plan to sustain and scale the initiative up.			
			2.9 / 5	
<hr/>				
<b>Judge Name:</b>	Jennifer Gustetic			
<b>Score:</b>	2.9			
<b>Comment:</b>	they recognize the need for this kind of tool and seem to be working on ways to institutionalize it but there is no clear plan. they also don't explicitly point out any challenges to implementation.			
			3.2 / 5	
<hr/>				
<b>Judge Name:</b>	Katju Holkeri			
<b>Score:</b>	3.2			
<b>Comment:</b>				
			2.2 / 5	
<hr/>				
<b>Judge Name:</b>	Oluseun Onidbinde			
<b>Score:</b>	2.2			
<b>Comment:</b>	How the application will scale across the country considering that several approach will be needed was not clearly stated.			
			2.4 / 5	
<hr/>				
<b>Judge Name:</b>	Diana Parra Silva			
<b>Score:</b>	2.4			
<b>Comment:</b>	Plans for scaling up and/or sustaining the initiative in the future, any threats or operational challenges and risk management: Shows interest in maintaining the initiative. However, there wasn't any description of a plan to moving the initiative to next stages. Potential threats or challenges are not sufficiently defined and clearly identified, neither how they will be addressed in the future.			