

Applicant Name: Norway Team
Normalized Scores 72.5

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>
			3.3 / 5	

Judge Name: Tri Mumpuni
Score: 3.3
Comment: This initiative is still new and bringing the press in order to create participation of public in the government affairs but no specific issues yet being discussed. Hopefully the press can engaging the government issue with the citizen of Norway

4.7 / 5

Judge Name: Don Don Parafina
Score: 4.7
Comment: Clear roles of Difi, on the part of the government, and the media groups in crucial stages of developing and running the initiative, including setting the policy framework and designing, testing, and evaluation. The involvement of numerous stakeholders in the nomination process gave a strong impression of inclusivity and ownership.

3.5 / 5

Judge Name: Gilbert Sendugwa
Score: 3.5
Comment: The nomination of Electronic Public Records (OEP) involved public and civil society actors at the different stages of the process. Importantly, more than 70 state agencies and civil society attended a key meeting that generated a list of ideas for consideration. The final decision was made jointly by equal representation from Government and civil society, a spirit of partnership.

4.7 / 5

Judge Name: Maxine Tanya Hamada
Score: 4.7
Comment: OEP is presented as a good example of a jointly-designed, implemented and continually improving partnership for open government. The partnership stakeholders and the initiative users are clear. The nomination was open and the final selection by a smaller taskforce.

4.1 / 5

Judge Name: Igor Vidacak
Score: 4.1
Comment: OEP initiative was chosen based on invitation sent to more than 70 entities from Government and CSOs, and after a meeting on the subject where 2 possible initiatives were identified. A joint Government-CSO task force decided on final proposal. There is a strong evidence on involving various stakeholders (especially Norwegian Press Association) in nominating, validating and jointly implementing the initiative. It would be helpful to learn more information on criteria for choosing CSOs to which invitation for submission of nominations was sent, as well as for taking part in task force.

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>
			3.4 / 5	

Judge Name: Tri Mumpuni
Score: 3.4
Comment: In order to create transparency in the government system, the press engaging the other parties to be involved through electronically system that can be accessed by many parties, but there is not commitment yet ca be seen how they are going to work together unless the journalist as an initiator.

2.5 / 5

Judge Name: Don Don Parafina
Score: 2.5
Comment: Enhancing findability or making the experience of processing FOI requests as convenient as online shopping is an attractive incentive to participation. Participation in this sense consists mainly in access. Citizens' opportunity to feedback comes only in the form of verifying whether or not an information is accessible or not within a particular time-period. The system will need additional functionality to directly address aspirations for policy reform and service delivery improvement.

3.5 / 5

Judge Name: Gilbert Sendugwa
Score: 3.5
Comment: OEP provides incentives for citizens to engage by allowing them to access and use public information more easily and cheaply. Information provided indicate that over 203,000 people have used the system- rising from 56,000 over the last four years. The key incentive seems to be the ease of use of the tool and the responsiveness of agencies to provide what people need.

4.4 / 5

Judge Name: Maxine Tanya Hamada
Score: 4.4
Comment: There is deep engagement between the state agency responsible for management of the initiative and the primary users/stakeholders. The main incentive created by the initiative is ease of use and accessibility. By widening the coverage of the initiative, the stakeholder base can be broadened as well to include other citizen groups.

3 / 5

Judge Name: Igor Vidacak
Score: 3.0
Comment: OEP initiative is a powerful proof that the highest standards of access to information are possible. Thanks to OEP, citizens are able to access government records almost in real time and, therefore, are in better position to engage and influence government decisions. Access to documents is a key pre-condition for meaningful citizens engagement and this one-stop shop for handling of FOIA requests seems to me the most advanced I have ever come across. It would be great to see how Norway team will build on this excellent FOIA one stop shop towards more proactive publishing of open data and, even more important for the Opengovawards context, towards more proactive online and offline involvement of citizens in shaping public policies. The initiative is mostly relying on the press, media and academic community as key users. More evidence of proactive incentivizing citizens participation in using OEP for more active citizens involvement in decision-making would allow me to give higher score under this criterion.

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>Showed 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: The result according to the explanation is that now everybody has the right to know the government affairs, but in what field is not yet being defined.

3.3 / 5

Judge Name: Don Don Parafina
Score: 3.3
Comment: Remarkable change in implementing the public policy on info access as indicated by the number of requests and streamlined case processing. No clear indicator on the percentage of requests that were realised or orders that were delivered. The claim on improved quality of news reporting because of the opportunity for people to check online information needs clear mechanism to operationalise and verify.

3.5 / 5

Judge Name: Gilbert Sendugwa
Score: 3.5
Comment: The system was establish to support citizens' realisation of their right to information by overcoming a number of stated barriers: what records does an agency have, how can they be accessed, financial and human resources of responding? Evidence point to substantial benefits for citizens with the increase of requesters from 56,000 to over 203,000 after its introduction.

3.9 / 5

Judge Name: Maxine Tanya Hamada
Score: 3.9
Comment: Creating the enabling environment for FOIA in any democracy would entail reducing the cost, barriers to access and ease of use. The OEP addresses each and the increase in usage of the portal indicates a result of these efforts.

2.2 / 5

Judge Name: Igor Vidacak
Score: 2.2
Comment: OEP definitely contributes to empowerment of citizens by enabling them to be fully informed on all ongoing files dealt with by the Government. It strengthens public trust in participation. Continuous increase in number of FOIA requests shows that the initiative is recognized by the public - mostly by journalists that account to 50% of its use. To give higher score in this area, I would need more information on how this increased access to public documents increased citizens engagement and what concrete changes resulted from that engagement. More evidence on proactive incentives for involving citizens in developing public policies would be needed.

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 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>
			4.2 / 5	

Judge Name: Tri Mumpuni
Score: 4.2
Comment: The government involvement is not yet explained whether financially will also give some fund to run the system or not, but most likely the group here when they talk about support there is not an issue, maybe it is not an issue due to the strong commitment to several parties who can see this initiative result in the future.

4.2 / 5

Judge Name: Don Don Parafina
Score: 4.2
Comment: Policy anchor and budget provision make the initiative sustainable. The budgetary aspect has to be explicit about it being a continuing allocation under the national budget. Needs to present clear incentives for local governments to cooperate, including the aspect of budget provision wherein their counterpart should also be secured.

4.2 / 5

Judge Name: Gilbert Sendugwa
Score: 4.2
Comment: OEP is backed by law and its implementation is funded under the national budget, two important pillars for sustainability. In addition, increasing demand and use of the service provides a vital incentive for continued funding and scale up of the initiative.

4.7 / 5

Judge Name: Maxine Tanya Hamada
Score: 4.7
Comment: OEP is a platform for existing statutes and supported by national budget with strong stakeholder ownership and a clear direction for further iteration. It also has elements of innovation especially along the line of ease of use and analytical value added interfaces.

2.2 / 5

Judge Name: Igor Vidacak
Score: 2.2
Comment: OEP sustainability seems to be ensured by the fact that is well rooted in Norwegian legal system and continuously funded from State budget. There are plans on how to shift from FOIA requests approach towards more proactive publishing of data that would reduce number of FOIA requests. It would be helpful to receive more information on the timing of these changes and how potential challenges will be addressed.