

Submission

Applicant Name: Jordan Team  
Normalized Scores 71.0

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>
<div>3.3 / 5</div>				
<div></div>				
<b>Judge Name:</b>	Salpi Ghazarian			
<b>Score:</b>	3.3			
<b>Comment:</b>	Although the process of inclusion remains top down and is selective, the numbers of those who were engaged is rather high and represents a good crosssection of society.			
<div>4.5 / 5</div>				
<div></div>				
<b>Judge Name:</b>	Jennifer Gustetic			
<b>Score:</b>	4.5			
<b>Comment:</b>	Consultation: Did consult with civil society in selecting the initiative (4) Implementation: was not jointly implemented but does have strong validation of claims (4)			
<div>4.1 / 5</div>				
<div></div>				
<b>Judge Name:</b>	Katju Holkeri			
<b>Score:</b>	4.1			
<b>Comment:</b>	There was partnership in choosing the initiative and also in the other steps of the way. Well organised, but if one would wish to add something it might have been an open call, but on the other hand the initiative looks so impressive would have likely been chosen then too.			
<div>4 / 5</div>				
<div></div>				
<b>Judge Name:</b>	Alex Irwan			
<b>Score:</b>	4.0			
<b>Comment:</b>	It is not a joint application. However, the Ministry of Public Sector Development (MOPSD) that was in charge of reviewing the suggested initiatives consulted civil society organizations along the way, not just at the national but also governorate level. as confirmed by some key Jordanian civil society organizations.			
<div>2.7 / 5</div>				
<div></div>				
<b>Judge Name:</b>	Don Don Parafina			
<b>Score:</b>	2.7			
<b>Comment:</b>	Consultation process is largely driven by the government. Testimonies on youth and women's participation came from government instrumentalities handling youth and women sectors, and therefore, do not provide direct voice of the 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>
<div>2.4 / 5</div>				
<div></div>				
<b>Judge Name:</b>	Salpi Ghazarian			
<b>Score:</b>	2.4			
<b>Comment:</b>	The incentives for participation are the traditional patriotism, trust, striving for better -- all the good attributes of good citizenship, but not necessarily catalysts for active engagement, taking initiative, risking innovative participation. The reliance on citizen goodwill and commitment is great, innovative channels are limited.			
<div>3.3 / 5</div>				
<div></div>				
<b>Judge Name:</b>	Jennifer Gustetic			
<b>Score:</b>	3.3			
<b>Comment:</b>	Incentives: They did not detail any incentives provided to the members of the citizenry that provided feedback other than being part of a process where ideas were incorporated into a final government plan. Maybe having a voice in a transparent process was the incentive? (2) Level of Feedback: It is unclear HOW they sought feedback (online? in person) but it is clear they communicated the opportunity to provide feedback through a number of channels (radio, TV, newspapers). They sought feedback on a draft plan which suggests they wanted direct feedback, not aspirations. (2) Level of Engagement: They got 1000 ideas from the citizenry. This is a pretty good number of entries but unsure how it relates to the overall population size since those numbers were not provided (3)			
<div>3.9 / 5</div>				
<div></div>				
<b>Judge Name:</b>	Katju Holkeri			
<b>Score:</b>	3.9			
<b>Comment:</b>	Impressive that there were opportunities for all Jordans to give their views. Also a big plus for the media campaign. If one would like to make this evenm more perfect maybe even more representatives of the civil society could have been involved in the committees. But very impressive work.			
<div>3.9 / 5</div>				
<div></div>				
<b>Judge Name:</b>	Alex Irwan			
<b>Score:</b>	3.9			
<b>Comment:</b>	The "Enhancing the National Integrity System" program used various media such as TVs, radios, daily newspapers and online media and reached out to different CSOs to engage as many citizens as possible at the national and local level in the development of the National Integrity Charter and the Executive Plan.			
<div>3.1 / 5</div>				
<div></div>				
<b>Judge Name:</b>	Don Don Parafina			
<b>Score:</b>	3.1			
<b>Comment:</b>	Nationwide campaign for the integrity system clearly showed the effort to reach out to citizens. Need validation of the result of the process of reviewing feedback, voting on ideas, and finalizing the draft charter on the National Integrity System.			

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>
<div>2.3 / 5</div>				
<div></div>				
<b>Judge Name:</b>	Salpi Ghazarian			
<b>Score:</b>	2.3			
<b>Comment:</b>	It seems the outcome was a reaffirmation of the commitment to Integrity. This is not a change in public policy, rather a repeated call to implement good, ethical policy. The affirmation is not a channel for participation, it's a call for participation, an urging to abide by laws and ethics.			
<div>4.3 / 5</div>				
<div></div>				
<b>Judge Name:</b>	Jennifer Gustetic			
<b>Score:</b>	4.3			
<b>Comment:</b>	The consultation resulted in a plan which is currently being implemented. There is oversight in place to track progress against the implementation of the plan. Unclear if those reports are publicly available. The types of ideas to strengthen the integrity system were not discussed in detail. This initiative assumes that increased integrity in government will have other spillover benefits to citizen (over and above increased trust in government) but those benefits were not articulated in detail. The plan in and of itself is a change to a public policy so that is transformative for Jordan. Unclear what the results are to the citizen quite yet.			
<div>4.3 / 5</div>				
<div></div>				
<b>Judge Name:</b>	Katju Holkeri			
<b>Score:</b>	4.3			
<b>Comment:</b>	A very vital and impressive work, due to the fact that the initiative was launched rather recenetly all benefits can not of course be yet seen. But looks very promising indeed.			
<div>4.6 / 5</div>				
<div></div>				
<b>Judge Name:</b>	Alex Irwan			
<b>Score:</b>	4.6			
<b>Comment:</b>	Implementation of the various steps outlined in the action plan has started to show changes in public policies. A number of governmental and non-governmental initiatives are already underway to strengthen budgetary and auditing processes, reorient government work towards achieving results, reinforce monitoring and evaluation mechanisms, and restructure government agencies. Citizens will benefit from less budgetary leakages and better targeted and more effective programs. Meanwhile the government gains more public legitimacy and political stability amidst the politically turbulent region.			
<div>3 / 5</div>				
<div></div>				
<b>Judge Name:</b>	Don Don Parafina			
<b>Score:</b>	3.0			
<b>Comment:</b>	It has influenced public policy on integrity and culminated in the presentation of the plan to the King. The benefit will come when the plan is translated into action steps and successful implementation ensues.			

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>
<div>2.5 / 5</div>				
<div></div>				
<b>Judge Name:</b>	Salpi Ghazarian			
<b>Score:</b>	2.5			
<b>Comment:</b>	The institutionalization of the initiative relies on public goodwill and government agencies adopting the provisions of the Charter. There is no road map for how.			
<div>3.9 / 5</div>				
<div></div>				
<b>Judge Name:</b>	Jennifer Gustetic			
<b>Score:</b>	3.9			
<b>Comment:</b>	Unclear if this is a one time consultation process or if there are plans to use it again for other public policy development processes. the resulting plan from this consultation is still in implementation mode until 2018 and it's unclear how the reporting on progress is made publicly available. They have made plans to ensure the implementation continues through 2018 to the best of their ability but the consultation process seems to be limited to the charter and plan development. Does list challenges to implementation and means to mitigate those risks.			
<div>4.1 / 5</div>				
<div></div>				
<b>Judge Name:</b>	Katju Holkeri			
<b>Score:</b>	4.1			
<b>Comment:</b>	The media campaign and the involvement of citizens is ecellent and crucial. It is good that it is recognised that the public ownership is vital. and that there is work going on to ensure that.			
<div>4.5 / 5</div>				
<div></div>				
<b>Judge Name:</b>	Alex Irwan			
<b>Score:</b>	4.5			
<b>Comment:</b>	The current political context, the Arab Spring movements and constitutional amendment, provides avenues for sustainability of the National Integrity political reform. The government has even set up two committees, the Royal Committee to oversee the work of government and non-government institutions and the Higher Steering committee to follow up on progress with all government institutions to promote the sustainability of the program. However, the program still needs to be institutionalized through a law or legislation to protect its sustainability from leadership changes at the national level.			
<div>2.3 / 5</div>				
<div></div>				
<b>Judge Name:</b>	Don Don Parafina			
<b>Score:</b>	2.3			
<b>Comment:</b>	Political risks and challenges were not discussed. Citizen involvement after drafting the charter happens only through publishing reports and awareness raising. No clear mechanics to realise public pressure on state institutions to implement integrity system.			