

Applicant Name: Spain Team
Normalized Scores 66.0

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>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>

3 / 5

Judge Name: Jennifer Gustetic
Score: 3.0
Comment: They didn't talk at all about how they selected this initiative or if they consulted with civil society in its selection. (0) It was implemented with partners but not civil society. the partners were private sector contractors, universities and endorsers. (5) validation of of claims from some partners is strong but there is no civil society endorsement here... (2.5)

3.7 / 5

Judge Name: Katju Holkeri
Score: 3.7
Comment:

2.9 / 5

Judge Name: Gertrude Muguzi
Score: 2.9
Comment: The process for selecting this initiative for the Open Government Awards was not elaborated in the submission. Therefore no evidence that others were consulted in its selection. The project is jointly implemented by the office of the Presidency and CDTI.

4.5 / 5

Judge Name: Oluseun Onidbinde
Score: 4.5
Comment: SieLocal app has scaled across countries and with the validation documents attached, it has shown enough evidence of consultation with civil society and corporate partners.

3 / 5

Judge Name: Tiago Peixoto
Score: 3.0
Comment: On "THE NOMINATION" question the authors of the submission make no mention as to whether "any nomination or consultation process held with civil society partners or others when selecting the initiative."

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>

2.6 / 5

Judge Name: Jennifer Gustetic
Score: 2.6
Comment: incentives: the incentives for rating a report or providing feedback were non-monetary. it seems the incentive to participate in the feedback element was making change in their local community. some initial successes but unclear how they are specifically incentivizing the feedback portion of this initiative. its very strong on the data sharing and reporting side, but unclear how much they are pushing the engagement piece (1.5) feedback: they provide a voting method and it appears some ways to comment via social media but it's unclear how these proposals are vetting and seen by decision makers to influence change in policy. is the website the oily forum for input or do they also consider the articles the press writes using the data and advocating for change to be "feedback"? People can only provide feedback on the report areas that are pre-generated by the tool. (2) reach: the website is getting alot of traffic but unclear how many "votes" were part of those "hits". how many people are actually using the engagement piece or is this more of an open data project? (2)

3.6 / 5

Judge Name: Katju Holkeri
Score: 3.6
Comment: Excellent provision of information, but participatory side is not as visible.

3.2 / 5

Judge Name: Gertrude Muguzi
Score: 3.2
Comment: While this is an extremely useful resource for someone who is comfortable around technical data, it is more likely to be used by ordinary citizens as an indirect source of information via the media and other reports due to the time necessary to learn how to navigate the portal and figure out how it can be useful given the vast amount of information on it.

2.9 / 5

Judge Name: Oluseun Onidbinde
Score: 2.9
Comment: The application did not fully demonstrate how feedback was used for further improvement and it is yet to half of the target audience. Incentives for participation were not clearly shown.

2.4 / 5

Judge Name: Tiago Peixoto
Score: 2.4
Comment: The initiative is - for most of its part - a transparency initiative, not offering real opportunities to engage with government or affect decision-making related to policies or services.

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>

3.3 / 5

Judge Name: Jennifer Gustetic
Score: 3.3
Comment: This is meant to be a platform that could improve a number of public policies or services. it has already had some initial successes and is an important basis for future improvement. however, they should focus more on creating additional avenues (in person and online, subject matter based and open) for people to take this information and be able to act on it with policy and service improvement proposals.

3.5 / 5

Judge Name: Katju Holkeri
Score: 3.5
Comment:

2.6 / 5

Judge Name: Gertrude Muguzi
Score: 2.6
Comment: Besides increased interest, no evidence of change in government policy or service delivery was presented in the submission.

2.8 / 5

Judge Name: Oluseun Onidbinde
Score: 2.8
Comment: The application shows benefits of citizens but it has not provided clear numbers on impact of citizen engagement to policy review and change in service delivery or transparency.

2.2 / 5

Judge Name: Tiago Peixoto
Score: 2.2
Comment: No real evidence of results is provided. While the initiative seems to have resonated with local media, there seems to be no systematic evidence as to whether it has influenced a policy or a service.

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>

4.3 / 5

Judge Name: Jennifer Gustetic
Score: 4.3
Comment: yes, they have a plan for spreading to additional countries. however, they should strengthen their plan for feedback and engagement mechanisms around this data for the future.

4.7 / 5

Judge Name: Katju Holkeri
Score: 4.7
Comment:

3.5 / 5

Judge Name: Gertrude Muguzi
Score: 3.5
Comment: Activities for scaling up the initiative locally and internationally were clearly articulated. How this would happen, what challenges would be faced (particularly when applied in a number of different countries), how to address these challenges was not as clear.

4.5 / 5

Judge Name: Oluseun Onidbinde
Score: 4.5
Comment: This tool has a good sustainability plan but a case has not been for potential challenges in the future especially as regards continuous scale to other countries.

2.8 / 5

Judge Name: Tiago Peixoto
Score: 2.8
Comment: While the submission shows commitment to the sustainability and scaling up of the initiative, it is unclear how that can be achieved in the medium and long term.