Submission Y Applicant Name: Argentina Team Normalized Scores 60.2 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 - 11 - 2 2 - 3 3 - 44 - 5 Showed no consultation in Some effort in consulting with Provided sufficient evidence of Demonstrated compelling Shows strong evidence of consulting with other partners to nominating an initiative; may other partners in nominating an mechanisms for consulting consulting others in nominating an initiative; jointly implemented have been jointly implemented initiative; initiative was not nominate an initiative, was others in nominating an jointly implemented and but shows very weak validation jointly implemented but provided initiative; was not jointly with a partner agency and strong validation of claims of claims minimal validation of claims presented somewhat convincing implemented but shows validation of claims convincing validation of claims 2.8 / 5 Judge Name: Juanita Burgos Score: 2.8 Comment: 4/5 Diana Parra Silva Judge Name: Score: 4.0 Comment: It was reported that the initiative was selected at a meeting of one of its working groups; and a letter of support was provided by one member of that same WG. A stronger evidence of consulting others, could be the minutes of meeting signed by all the participants; and consultation could have be done in more than 1 of the 12 WC of the forum. 3.9 / 5Judge Name: Tiago Peixoto Score: 3.9 Comment: While there is some evidence that partners have been consulted it is not clear the extent to which the initiative is jointly implemented or not. 2.5 / 5 Judge Name: Alvaro Ramirez Alujas Score: It seems more an initiative of e-government (under what can be understood by public participation) Comment: Jorge Soto Judge Name: Score: Comment: There is not a clear leader from the non-government sector of this project 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 Offered no incentives for Provided few incentives for Demonstrated sufficient Created reliable ways to Employed compelling measures participation; obtained basic incentivize participation; used to incentivize participation; used participation; provides basic incentives for participation; feedback from some of its target information to citizens but no direct and innovative ways to get direct and innovative methods to created indirect ways to solicit citizens' aspirations; strived to avenues for real engagement to population; however, did not citizen feedback; secured partner with citizens in decisioninfluence policy/service design indicate how feedback would be exceed the intended level of making; reached an ambitious participation of at least half of or implementation; doesn't engagement of its target target population level of engagement with its used define a target population population target population 3.1/5Judge Name: Juanita Burgos Score: 3.1 Comment: 2.3 / 5 Judge Name: Diana Parra Silva Score: Comment: The general public is set as part of the target population, as well as non governmental organizations, experts and government representatives. The way that contributions are made by this target could not be found, as well as how their feedback is used. On the Forum website, discussion tools are restricted (username and password is needed), so there is no evidence of how ordinary citizens can make their contributions. While it is understood that meetings are conducted in person, there is no evidence of decisions taken in them. Policy documents for the period 2012-2015 could not be found, as well as information on compliance with agreed commitments, so citizens could at least monitor the progress. 3.3 / 5 Judge Name: Tiago Peixoto Score: 3.3 Comment: It is unclear how the participants are selected and the extent to which it is an inclusive process of the target population. Judge Name: Alvaro Ramirez Alujas Score: Comment: The initiative is an area of ongoing work with various stakeholders to discuss issues related to the digital agenda, that relate to the topics of OGP (open data, public information reuse, interoperability, etc.) 2.3 / 5 Judge Name: Jorge Soto 2.3 Score: Comment: They mention products around the digital agenda but not a clear relationship between the forum and those products nor the participation of regular citizens 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 Shows that citizens may be Nominally influenced a public Sufficiently changed a public Significantly influenced a public Transformed a public policy or informed but provided little to no policy or service; and shows policy or service; and policy or service; resulted in service; set new standards for compelling benefits to citizens evidence of change in public some benefits to citizens as a demonstrated reliable benefits to the relationship between policy or service citizens as a result and the government government and citizens; result resulted in concrete benefits for both 3.6/5 Judge Name: Juanita Burgos Score: 3.6 Comment: 2.1/5 Diana Parra Silva Judge Name: Score: Comment: There is no evidence on how citizens are informed or if their contributions have change or improve a public policy or service. The application states that citizen participation is benefited by the projects executed as part of the decisions made in the forum, but this does not means that citizen engagement influence the development of the initiative. Tiago Peixoto Judge Name: Score: Comment: It is unclear to which extent the initiative actually had an impact on policies or services. While outcomes such as "hackathons" and "open data portal" is mentioned, it is unclear to which extent the FAD actually had an impact on the implementation of these activities. Furthermore, there is no evidence whatsoever on the extent to which the open data portal, hackathons, or the Digitalization Manual have had an impact on either policies or services. In other words, there is evidence of outputs, but none about results (i.e. outcomes). Judge Name: Alvaro Ramirez Alujas Score: Comment: Nominally influenced a public policy or service; and shows some benefits to citizens as a result In the proposal, are mentioned and include the 12 working groups are active, and commitments to develop under the OGP action plan, but little evidence on the outcomes and impact to date (the digital agenda forum exists since 2009) 1.6/5 Judge Name: Jorge Soto Score: 1.6 Comment: It is a targeted group of experts and there is no clear evidence that shows that the products are result of the discussion of the forum 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 3 - 4 2 - 3 4 - 5 Demonstrates few plans in Shows some commitment to Lists activities to institutionalize Outlines a clear path to either Presents a durable model that moving the initiative beyond the institutionalizing the initiative; the initiative; but only somewhat institutionalize or scale-up the can be institutionalized and/or pilot stage; does not address any but presents unrealistic ways of addresses how challenges will be initiative; makes a good case on scaled-up; makes a compelling potential threats or challenges to managing challenges faced by addressed how potential challenges will be case for how challenges will be the initiative addressed the initiative managed 4.1/5 Judge Name: Juanita Burgos Score: 4.1 Comment: 3.5 / 5 Judge Name: Diana Parra Silva Score: 3.5 Comment: Being a mechanism that accompanies a public policy, to maintain an active discussion on the issues related, it can be assumed that sustainability is guaranteed at least until next year (which is the period set for the policy). But there is no information on how the initiative will scale-up or how potential challenges will be addressed. Tiago Peixoto Judge Name: Score: 4.0 Comment: The fact that the initiative has been going on since 2009 and the fact that the ADA follows a presidential decree shows some degree of sustainability. Nevertheless, it is not clear how future challenges will be addressed nor how the initiative will be scaled up in terms of stakeholders or influence over policymaking and service delivery.

3.8 / 5

This is an initiative that has been developed since 2009 by what is assumed to have a high level of institutionalization and sustainability

2.5 / 5

Judge Name:

Judge Name:

Comment:

Comment:

Score:

Score:

Alvaro Ramirez Alujas

It is already institutionalized but not a scale strategy

Jorge Soto

2.5