

Applicant Name: Indonesia Team  
Normalized Scores 62.6

**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>

4.2 / 5

**Judge Name:** Hernan Charosky  
**Score:** 4.2  
**Comment:** There was a rich and active process of consultation and participation in the implementation and selection.

4.3 / 5

**Judge Name:** Ma'i Elimat  
**Score:** 4.3  
**Comment:** (1) The applicant took an impressive process for initiative nomination. The process engaged different parties and was implemented on more than one level with clear timeline and segregation of roles. However, (2) The applicant did not show a strong partnership at the implementation level. The applicant didn't provide the name and title of a single point of contact at the partner organization nor it explained the details of the partnership, despite mentioning in the initiative design section that some of non-governmental organisations assisted them in the dissemination process to encourage citizens' participation in the initiative. (3) The validation was clear and provided by well known civil society actors in the country; one is a local office for international organization and the other consider as an umbrella organization.

2.3 / 5

**Judge Name:** Salpi Ghazarian  
**Score:** 2.3  
**Comment:** The process remains a top-down government driven process depending on good intentions and on-the-spur of the moment engagement. The consultations with partners are more informational rather than collective decision-making and action.

2.5 / 5

**Judge Name:** Jennifer Gustetic  
**Score:** 2.5  
**Comment:** Provided sufficient evidence of consulting with other partners to nominate an initiative. Does not seem to be jointly implemented. Though events were held at a lot of sites like universities, this appears to be a central government led activity. Provided a validation of claims for the nomination process but that same validation was not terribly convincing in validating the outcomes of the project itself (the participation numbers, the number of ideas that ended up in the national action plan, etc).

4.3 / 5

**Judge Name:** Gertrude Muguzi  
**Score:** 4.3  
**Comment:** The consultation process for nominating this initiative was elaborate and a clear effort was made to be inclusive in making this decision. Some of the time frames in the nomination process (eg. 3 days to identify and recommend organisations for nomination) seem a bit tight to me and this could have limited the opportunity to nominate the best initiatives. However, I am not familiar with the context and cannot ascertain whether this timeframe would be appropriate in Indonesia.

**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>

3.3 / 5

**Judge Name:** Hernan Charosky  
**Score:** 3.3  
**Comment:** The evidence presented shows that there were, so far, effective channels for citizen feedback, and the possibility of seeing the citizen input as part of decision making processes. It is not clear what was exactly the quantification of target population. In any case, the quantity of entries and contribution to the participative initiative presented is relevant, even when we can't define it representativeness as a sample.

3.2 / 5

**Judge Name:** Ma'i Elimat  
**Score:** 3.2  
**Comment:** (1) The applicant provided good examples of engaging more citizens using different methods. However, more efforts would of be made due to the large population of Indonesia (i.e TV shows, radio broadcast, etc. (2) Having online and offline tools for citizens' engagement was great to get more people involved, but as said by the applicant 70% still unconnected. To solve this obstacle the applicant was visiting universities, public services, and public areas, However, applicant didn't mentioned how many citizens were reached or if those already out of the online connected citizens. So I think more people should be reached using other tools, citizens that in villages away from the places targeted. (3) The participating citizens according to the applicant can submit infographics and written applications, but what if a local citizen who can't write due to literacy or disability has great ideas to participate with. how could we engage such citizens in the process? (4) The applicant didn't make it clear on the incentives for participation, according to them they "made it clear from the beginning that relevant solutions from the public would be incorporated to the Indonesia Action Plan for Open Government for 2014-2015". the question is did all population in such large country know about OGP. my opinion is that the applicant should made more efforts on explaining the important of citizen's participation in the local policies and plans, rather than only stating OGP action plan. I like the trip though, it was out of the box but people need to feel engaged in the policy level and this is the idea behind the OGP AWARD. (5) The applicant made it clear that the feedback was incorporated in the OGP action plan, but the winning participation (20 out of 3,314) is very limited and the applicant did not include what happened to the remaining ideas? is it going to be incorporated on another level? how?.

2.4 / 5

**Judge Name:** Salpi Ghazarian  
**Score:** 2.4  
**Comment:** The channels are not innovative, but standard: a road show to encourage participation is good, but insufficient to be compelling. Given the challenges posed by geography and limited Internet penetration, the type of engagement proposed must be more creative.

4.6 / 5

**Judge Name:** Jennifer Gustetic  
**Score:** 4.6  
**Comment:** The incentives (a vacation for the winner and inclusion in the national action plan) may not have been properly aligned with the participants. Vacation may get more typical citizens to join in, but inclusion in a national plan, though it demonstrates a commitment at least on paper to implement, might not be compelling enough to get additional citizens at the table--especially if they lack trust in the government. May consider cash awards the next time. The idea process seemed to allow a wide variety of types of ideas into the process and the number of submission exceeded their target number. However, they set their target population as quite broad (the whole country) and while they were successful in reaching a geographically diverse group of people, I'm not sure how the sample size plays with respect to the overall population; this is why i can't award this a "4" because its not clear if it secured participation of at least "half" of the target population. Also, not clear how many people submitted manually versus online. Also, while the ideas made it into a plan, they have not affected "decision making" yet as it's unclear if the ideas have yet been implemented.

4.2 / 5

**Judge Name:** Gertrude Muguzi  
**Score:** 4.2  
**Comment:** I think that combining electronic and in-person ways of reaching out to people was an appropriate and clear way of reaching out to the population in a representative manner. I also think that the number of cities the initiative was able to visit is impressive. I also think that making this a competition helped to incentivize participation. The concept is simple and what it lacked in innovation, it made up for in ambition in an attempt to reach across 60% of a population exceeding 240 million and a valiant effort was made to reach as many people as possible. The proposal was silent in terms of what proportion of the population was actually reached. This would also have helped me to see how many of those reached participated in the competition.

**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:** Hernan Charosky  
**Score:** 3.0  
**Comment:** A series of contribution through this initiative ended up as part of the Indonesia OGP Action Plan.

2 / 5

**Judge Name:** Ma'i Elimat  
**Score:** 2.0  
**Comment:** Since the outcome of this initiative is incorporating 20 commitments ideas on the OGP action plan, it can be said that its still expected outcome and its too early to decide if its influencing policies. Yes, citizens were engaged in the process and provided their ideas, but any way OGP obligate public consultation in the process of developing the action plan. we can't determine if the initiative really influencing a public policy until the end of the OGP 2014-2015 plan and evaluate the level of completion. I believe that this initiative encouraged the government to engage citizens in reviewing and plan its policies which is a step forward toward citizen's engagement. This is proved as well by what the applicant stated in the outcome section "For the government, the biggest lesson learnt is that public service delivery works better when there is collaboration with its people." However, this outcome is limited and we still need to verify the level of commitment achievement to decide on policy level outcomes.

2.3 / 5

**Judge Name:** Salpi Ghazarian  
**Score:** 2.3  
**Comment:** There is insufficient information to judge whether public input influenced public policy. There are numbers: 3,314 submissions from the initial target of 3,000 entries. Around 20 ideas were incorporated to the Action Plan. The nature and impact of the kind of proposals is unclear.

2.6 / 5

**Judge Name:** Jennifer Gustetic  
**Score:** 2.6  
**Comment:** It's a good step that the ideas showed up in the open government plan, but it's unclear what the progress is on implementing those ideas. Are they just in a plan or are they becoming a reality? Have they actually changed any policy or public service offerings? It's unclear from the submission what the impact of the ideas are other than being included in a plan. Also, since no details on the ideas themselves were described it's unclear how the ideas would actually benefit citizens. What kinds of ideas were they?

2.6 / 5

**Judge Name:** Gertrude Muguzi  
**Score:** 2.6  
**Comment:** While some assertions are made in the submission which states that 20 of the best entries into the competition made it into the Open Government Action Plan, no concrete changes to policy or services are described.

**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>

3.2 / 5

**Judge Name:** Hernan Charosky  
**Score:** 3.2  
**Comment:** The narrative of this initiative suggests a sustainable and scalable course of action.

3.6 / 5

**Judge Name:** Ma'i Elimat  
**Score:** 3.6  
**Comment:** The applicant didn't include sufficient activities to sustain the initiative. it focused more on the significance of the initiative and the possibility of replicating it in the future based on the need. The challenges were not analysed concretely. In my opinion more challenges would be found not only change of administration (i.e. level of implementation of the commitments that responded to the citizens' selected ideas), the applicant also provided insufficient solution for challenges (i.e. regulation, citizens or organization consortium to guarantee the initiative. sustainability, etc.).

2.5 / 5

**Judge Name:** Salpi Ghazarian  
**Score:** 2.5  
**Comment:** There is no indication of how momentum will be created or sustained or enhanced. So long as outreach depends on individual face-to-face meetings, opportunities for expansion are limited. The initiative demonstrates an awareness of the importance of public participation but does not demonstrate how that will be achieved continuously or in significant numbers.

2.6 / 5

**Judge Name:** Jennifer Gustetic  
**Score:** 2.6  
**Comment:** It is clear they'd like to do this again and they recognize it may be difficult with an election in the fall. The model they've created is repeatable for public engagement, but it doesn't seem they have a definitive plan at this time to do another dialogue until after the election.

2.9 / 5

**Judge Name:** Gertrude Muguzi  
**Score:** 2.9  
**Comment:** Inclusion of the best entries into the Open Government Action Plan is a form of institutionalisation and the scale of this initiative is already impressively large. However, an initiative such as this one is likely to be very costly, particularly the in-person portion. The submission does not describe how it will sustain this initiative financially, whether it will be a permanent addition onto the government budget or whether efforts are being made to secure finances from other sources, such as the private sector.