

Submission

Applicant Name: Montenegro Team
Normalized Scores 86.2

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>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>

3.8 / 5

Judge Name: Katju Holkeri
Score: 3.8
Comment:

5 / 5

Judge Name: Gertrude Muguzi
Score: 5.0
Comment: Evidence of consultation includes formal written endorsements from non-government organisations. The initiative is jointly implemented with the Faculty of Engineering at the University of Montenegro.

4.5 / 5

Judge Name: Oluseun Onidbinde
Score: 4.5
Comment: A brilliant solution which has the involvement of government institutions from the start.

4.6 / 5

Judge Name: Tiago Peixoto
Score: 4.6
Comment: Provided evidence of consultation and partnerships.

4 / 5

Judge Name: Stef van Grieken
Score: 4.0
Comment: The government worked with academia and some civic society groups.

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>

3.9 / 5

Judge Name: Katju Holkeri
Score: 3.9
Comment: In a very important area - grey economy - an excellent way to let citizens be co-partners. Technology well used but also well thought of target groups so that also those who have not as good tech-skills can inform. And an excellent think to bring back part of the money to the initiatives citizens can choose. A good direct incentive.

4.6 / 5

Judge Name: Gertrude Muguzi
Score: 4.6
Comment: This initiative is both an effective and innovative way of addressing a longstanding problem through citizen/state collaboration. It is a win-win for everyone. The problem gets addressed and people see tangible outcomes. I want this in my country!

3.7 / 5

Judge Name: Oluseun Onidbinde
Score: 3.7
Comment: Using funds to deliver services that citizens can relate with is a good incentive to scale and this is very commendable but 2,500 citizens is not close to the potential number of users expected.

4.8 / 5

Judge Name: Tiago Peixoto
Score: 4.8
Comment: The incentives for participation were well thought out. First by reducing the transaction costs associated with the act of participating by the creation of an app but also, equally important, phone hotlines. Furthermore, the fact that part of the revenue generated goes back to the community is not only an incentive but may create a virtuous cycle of participation.

4.3 / 5

Judge Name: Stef van Grieken
Score: 4.3
Comment: The app allows people to report tax avoidance in the grey market

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>

4 / 5

Judge Name: Katju Holkeri
Score: 4.0
Comment: There is very clear evidence in numbers.

4.9 / 5

Judge Name: Gertrude Muguzi
Score: 4.9
Comment: Increased citizen reporting of instances of grey economy illegalities 10-fold. 250.000 of the 500.000 Euros was used for five community projects chosen by citizens via the project website. 2500 citizens participated in assisting government to address a problem with which it had been struggling for years. All very impressive.

3.8 / 5

Judge Name: Oluseun Onidbinde
Score: 3.8
Comment: Improving government revenue efficiency is a good idea and has shown empirical service delivery that citizens can relate with. It needs to scale further with mobile app usage.

5 / 5

Judge Name: Tiago Peixoto
Score: 5.0
Comment: The delivery of government policy and services was enhanced in a number of ways. First by creating a system that helps to reduce tax evasion, this latter a limiting factor for good service delivery. The fact that part of the revenues goes to a participatory process affects policy in the sense that new channels for participation of budget revenues were created.

2.9 / 5

Judge Name: Stef van Grieken
Score: 2.9
Comment: This project is a campaign directed to solve the grey market issue, it is not an initiative citizens wanted to take to improve on a government 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>

4.1 / 5

Judge Name: Katju Holkeri
Score: 4.1
Comment: Future looks promising, but might be a challenge also to keep up the interest of citizens. New innovative ideas might be needed in addition to the already existing excellent ones.

5 / 5

Judge Name: Gertrude Muguzi
Score: 5.0
Comment: The government has now employed 2 members of staff on this project full time. The most impressive advantage of this initiative from a sustainability standpoint is that it is able to pay for itself financially a from the additional revenue raised from fines. In addition, it gives back to the community by supporting projects chosen by citizens.

4.1 / 5

Judge Name: Oluseun Onidbinde
Score: 4.1
Comment: The strategy for scaling the initiative to beaches was stated but the current and potential challenges are not stated.

5 / 5

Judge Name: Tiago Peixoto
Score: 5.0
Comment: Activities to institutionalize the initiative are mentioned, however little thought is given to challenges. Having said this, the fact that the initiative aligns incentives for both sides (i.e. government / citizens) is the greatest factor of sustainability.

4.2 / 5

Judge Name: Stef van Grieken
Score: 4.2
Comment: I think it is a good example of campaigning and technology to solve a social problem, it could scale easily to governments facing similar issues