

Applicant Name: Estonia Team  
Normalized Scores 77.7

**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>

4.7 / 5

**Judge Name:** Salpi Ghazarian  
**Score:** 4.7  
**Comment:** Street protests were taken seriously by civil society organizations whose interest, in turn, was validated by the government which offered them a platform to bring change. Serious!

5 / 5

**Judge Name:** Alex Irwan  
**Score:** 5.0  
**Comment:** The OGP SC Committee consists of six government and six CSO representatives, and it was an program that was initiated by civil society that was nominated. It gives the impression that CSO representatives are at par with their government counterparts.

3.3 / 5

**Judge Name:** Tri Mumpuni  
**Score:** 3.3  
**Comment:** This initiative seems quite new to be judge at the moment even it shows that they are successfully making many parties committed to join this effort

4.2 / 5

**Judge Name:** Maxine Tanya Hamada  
**Score:** 4.2  
**Comment:** The Rahvakogu is a good example of a citizen/CSO-led initiative supported by the state and implemented in a partnership. The steering committee served as nominator and decision maker for the submission of this initiative.

4 / 5

**Judge Name:** Igor Vidacak  
**Score:** 4.0  
**Comment:** Estonian National OGP Steering Committee, composed of equal number of CSOs and Government agencies, proposed the initiative. The application also shows convincing validation of claims. The whole initiative is highly collaborative, especially in implementation part. For highest score, more information of involving other CSOs (non-members of OGP Committee) in the nomination process would be helpful.

**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>

4.2 / 5

**Judge Name:** Salpi Ghazarian  
**Score:** 4.2  
**Comment:** Street protests are a stark form of citizen feedback. By responding to them with such a civic mechanism, the message to citizens is that their feedback matters, even off the street. The solutions are innovative and direct.

4.8 / 5

**Judge Name:** Alex Irwan  
**Score:** 4.8  
**Comment:** The People's Assembly offers incentives to citizen in form of participation in amending legislations to become more responsive to their needs. It uses innovative crowd sourcing modern communication technology to reach as may citizen as possible.

2.7 / 5

**Judge Name:** Tri Mumpuni  
**Score:** 2.7  
**Comment:** It seems very hard to have a proof yet how deep is their engagement, still need sometimes to prove it but I consider this is a good starting point

3.2 / 5

**Judge Name:** Maxine Tanya Hamada  
**Score:** 3.2  
**Comment:** Rahvakogu was an innovative response to a political crisis. The crisis was the main opportunity, incentive and driver for participation.

4.3 / 5

**Judge Name:** Igor Vidacak  
**Score:** 4.3  
**Comment:** Rahvakogu is a very ambitious and inspiring e-participation project focused on crowd sourcing policy proposals that have the potential to reform Estonian electoral system, financing of political parties and ensuring more extensive civic participation between the elections. More than 6000 ideas and comments gathered from citizens, and then assessed by scholars and practitioners, before being presented to the Parliament for formal discussion. Rahvakogu seems to have found the way to strike a good balance between citizens and expert participation. To give the highest score, I miss the information on the criteria for recruiting representative sample of 500 citizens that were invited to take part in Deliberation Day.

**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 / 5

**Judge Name:** Salpi Ghazarian  
**Score:** 4.5  
**Comment:** The public policy that was influenced was the active, pro-active solicitation of public opinion on matters of policy. So, the policy that was influenced was a policy that would serve as a tool to further enhance specific policies.

3.9 / 5

**Judge Name:** Alex Irwan  
**Score:** 3.9  
**Comment:** Several legislative amendments have been adopted. But the proposal does not give evidence whether the amendments provide real benefits to the citizens or not.

3 / 5

**Judge Name:** Tri Mumpuni  
**Score:** 3.0  
**Comment:** The issues that has been recorded in their activities is mostly political issues and they starting to involve the NGOs, but not yet confirm how the involvement will proceed of solve the problem in the future. The result in their work mostly on political issue development, not yet touching on the real community issue.

4 / 5

**Judge Name:** Maxine Tanya Hamada  
**Score:** 4.0  
**Comment:** Direct petition in a democracy provided in law redefines the relationship between the Estonia parliament and its citizens. For the Silvergate political crisis, the initiative presents Rahvakogu as component to the resolution of important aspects of that crisis such as political party finance and reform while enshrining in law peoples participation

4.4 / 5

**Judge Name:** Igor Vidacak  
**Score:** 4.4  
**Comment:** Out of 15 proposals presented by People's Assembly (Rahvakogu) to the Parliament, 3 were actually adopted. This is a great example of the power of collaborative citizens and experts effort in agenda setting.

**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:** Salpi Ghazarian  
**Score:** 4.1  
**Comment:** The continuation, institutionalization by its own demand depend on the legislature's willingness to take public input seriously. The quantity of input implies that the public will be its expansion and expect / demand appropriate legislative responses.

3.7 / 5

**Judge Name:** Alex Irwan  
**Score:** 3.7  
**Comment:** Being included in the OGP National Action Plan promises sustainability in the shorter term. Sustainability in the longer term would only be ensured if the government passed a legislation to institutionalize it as part of the political system.

3 / 5

**Judge Name:** Tri Mumpuni  
**Score:** 3.0  
**Comment:** Since the initiative is not yet in place for so many years, we still need to wait.

3.6 / 5

**Judge Name:** Maxine Tanya Hamada  
**Score:** 3.6  
**Comment:** The team has a very clear understanding of the challenges faced by the initiative. The submission lays out the political and technical principles for the solution (bipartisanship and crowd sourcing) with the details for discussion. The initiative is presented as included in the Estonia OGP Action Plan as a flagship project

3.1 / 5

**Judge Name:** Igor Vidacak  
**Score:** 3.1  
**Comment:** It is still unclear under which arrangement Rahvakogu will continue operating, but it is encouraging to see that a similar, upgraded web-based discussion forum is planned to be developed as part of next Estonian OGP Action plan. More information on how the potential challenges of upgraded Rahvakogu would be addressed is needed for higher score.