

Applicant Name: Dominican Republic Team
 Normalized Scores 66.2

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>
4.6 / 5				
Judge Name:	Juanita Burgos			
Score:	4.6			
Comment:				
4.2 / 5				
Judge Name:	Hernan Charosky			
Score:	4.2			
Comment:	The letters and the narrative of the IPAC initiative shows involvement and consultation with Civil Society partners			
3.5 / 5				
Judge Name:	Diana Parra Silva			
Score:	3.5			
Comment:	They said that they launched an extended scheme of IPAC Assemblies to postulate the initiative, but no evidence of that process was provided. The initiative was jointly implemented. And letter from two organizations were presented as validation of claims. They could have provided links to show strong evidence of consulting others in nominating an initiative.			
3.4 / 5				
Judge Name:	Alvaro Ramirez Alujas			
Score:	3.4			
Comment:	It has participation from various institutions (government and international character) but do not appear national civil society organizations more closely linked to the issues of transparency, accountability and anti-corruption (eg transparency international chapter)			
4.4 / 5				
Judge Name:	Jorge Soto			
Score:	4.4			
Comment:	It is a clear multi stakeholder strategy from different sectors			

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>
3.1 / 5				
Judge Name:	Juanita Burgos			
Score:	3.1			
Comment:				
3.1 / 5				
Judge Name:	Hernan Charosky			
Score:	3.1			
Comment:	A series of accomplished targets described in the proposal show that participation has been effective so far, at least to a reasonable extent. Even when the incentives and channels are, in a way, "traditional" (workshops, multistakeholder tables), the will of following up shows an innovation and a stronger incentives for participants.			
3.4 / 5				
Judge Name:	Diana Parra Silva			
Score:	3.4			
Comment:	The incentives are not clearly expressed but the fact that contributions have actually been taken into account, and from the highest level, is in itself a great motivator. However it must be remembered that while expressing their interest to revive the initiative, these exercises were performed between 2010 and 2012.			
2.5 / 5				
Judge Name:	Alvaro Ramirez Alujas			
Score:	2.5			
Comment:	Rather, it is an initiative whose focus is transparency and the fight against corruption, from a consultation process with specific institutions in these areas. Moreover, it is not clear that there is a wider space for other actors and civil society According to the information provided, there are no clear results achieved beyond consultation processes developed			
3.5 / 5				
Judge Name:	Jorge Soto			
Score:	3.5			
Comment:	There is no clear which channels nor the innovation of them, or what is happening with the citizen's feedback			

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>
3.6 / 5				
Judge Name:	Juanita Burgos			
Score:	3.6			
Comment:				
3.8 / 5				
Judge Name:	Hernan Charosky			
Score:	3.8			
Comment:	The proposal describes a series of accomplishments of goals that had been a result of the consensus between govt. and CSOs.			
3.3 / 5				
Judge Name:	Diana Parra Silva			
Score:	3.3			
Comment:	The initiative was created in response to a request from the Presidency of the Republic and, after different stages, presented a series of recommendations that were incorporated by the government and went through a proper follow. In this way, it has influenced public policy and showed benefits to citizens as a result.			
1.7 / 5				
Judge Name:	Alvaro Ramirez Alujas			
Score:	1.7			
Comment:	Little evidence is available and the impact of the proposals generated from consultation process developed are unknown (no more detail on the subject)			
3.3 / 5				
Judge Name:	Jorge Soto			
Score:	3.3			
Comment:	Evidence can be improved as from what is happening with the citizen's participation			

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>
2.8 / 5				
Judge Name:	Juanita Burgos			
Score:	2.8			
Comment:	The initiative represents an example of citizen participation and engagement, where the citizens can be part of the decision making process. The initiative could be institutionalized, but also, depends on the willingness of the national authority.			
4.1 / 5				
Judge Name:	Hernan Charosky			
Score:	4.1			
Comment:	Yes, the idea of taking this initiative from the point it was developed so far, and giving institutional support in a specific agency of the Public Administration is a good indicator of sustainability.			
3.5 / 5				
Judge Name:	Diana Parra Silva			
Score:	3.5			
Comment:	The initiative was implemented between 2010 and 2012, a period in which it is shown that there was a high institutional commitment in accordance with the information provided on its website. In this website, there is no information on activities carried out during 2013 and 2014, although in the application they pointed their interest to reactivate the initiative as a permanent official mechanism.			
1.9 / 5				
Judge Name:	Alvaro Ramirez Alujas			
Score:	1.9			
Comment:	Shows some commitment to institutionalizing the initiative; but presents unrealistic ways of managing challenges faced by the initiative			
2.5 / 5				
Judge Name:	Jorge Soto			
Score:	2.5			
Comment:	They don't show a scaling strategy nor concrete next steps			