

Applicant Name: Costa Rica Team  
Normalized Scores 61.8

**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 / 5

**Judge Name:** Juanita Burgos  
**Score:** 3.5  
**Comment:**

1.9 / 5

**Judge Name:** Hernan Charosky  
**Score:** 1.9  
**Comment:**

Even when there is a letter attached from the Chamber of Importers, in which they explain clearly the interest and benefits of the initiative here is no evidence of a consultation process or joint implementation.

1.8 / 5

**Judge Name:** Diana Parra Silva  
**Score:** 1.8  
**Comment:**

No information was provided on how other partners were consulted in nominating the initiative nor demonstrated compelling mechanisms for consulting others in nominating the initiative. A letter of support was provided by a representative of the key "client" of the solution, the Chamber of Importers, Distributors and Representatives, so initiative was not jointly implemented but provided validation of claims.

2.9 / 5

**Judge Name:** Alvaro Ramirez Alujas  
**Score:** 2.9  
**Comment:**

It is less clear that this initiative falls within the scope of citizen participation, more like a project on electronic procurement with involvement of other actors. There is not enough support on the alliance with other organizations outside government (especially civil society organizations, beyond the private sector)

2.1 / 5

**Judge Name:** Jorge Soto  
**Score:** 2.1  
**Comment:**

No consultation nor point of contact nor partnership with civil society is shown

**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>

3.4 / 5

**Judge Name:** Juanita Burgos  
**Score:** 3.4  
**Comment:**

2.2 / 5

**Judge Name:** Hernan Charosky  
**Score:** 2.2  
**Comment:**

The proposed platform, an Observatory within the e-procurement system, might provide useful information to oversight bodies, and probably competitors in bidding processes might find the information useful for their activities and to control the fairness of processes. Nevertheless, it is not clear how either regular citizens and bidders would use the information and be incentivized to participate and provide feedback.

2.7 / 5

**Judge Name:** Diana Parra Silva  
**Score:** 2.7  
**Comment:**

As pointed out by CRECEX (the partner that supported the initiative), Mer-link is an e-commerce solution. Transparency and efficiency are the main drivers of a e-procurement platform solution, more than be a citizen engagement initiative. Open Contracting is mentioned but there is not indication on how it has been developed. It seems that this is more an issue planned to be incorporated in the future.

3.1 / 5

**Judge Name:** Alvaro Ramirez Alujas  
**Score:** 3.1  
**Comment:**

Provides information and interaction spaces for specific actors (preferably within the public sector market) While the purpose of the initiative involves expanding spaces of transparency and participation, it is more linked to the field of business and private sector's ecosystem rather than civil society It seems more an initiative of e-government (under what can be understood by public participation)

3.2 / 5

**Judge Name:** Jorge Soto  
**Score:** 3.2  
**Comment:**

It is only for contractors and there is no feedback, nor innovation

**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 involved 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>

3.8 / 5

**Judge Name:** Juanita Burgos  
**Score:** 3.8  
**Comment:**

1.6 / 5

**Judge Name:** Hernan Charosky  
**Score:** 1.6  
**Comment:**

Contingently the collection of information within the e-platform by the observatory would provide oversight bodies, private firms competing for contracts, journalists and citizens in general of information about the prices, providers, and kinds of competition in each procurement process. It is not clear the way in which all these stakeholders would be engaged, how would they use the information and therefore, how the observatory would provide any improvement in the procurement policy.

3.3 / 5

**Judge Name:** Diana Parra Silva  
**Score:** 3.3  
**Comment:**

There is no evidence on how citizen engagement influenced the design of Mer-Link or the services it delivery. Being a solution that impacts the way the Government buys, there has been a positive change in the service but which is not necessarily linked as a consequence of the citizen engagement.

3.3 / 5

**Judge Name:** Alvaro Ramirez Alujas  
**Score:** 3.3  
**Comment:**

It offers concrete benefits in terms of transparency and access to information related to public procurement processes (especially for the market and the suppliers of goods and services to government) No further details on outcome data and impact of this initiative to allow better evaluation to this effort

3.7 / 5

**Judge Name:** Jorge Soto  
**Score:** 3.7  
**Comment:**

Clear transparent channels for public procurements

**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 / 5

**Judge Name:** Juanita Burgos  
**Score:** 4.0  
**Comment:**

Mer-link constitutes a platform which builds citizens' trust in the procurement process and also promotes transparency and efficiency. It is a great initiative to involve citizen participation.

2.8 / 5

**Judge Name:** Hernan Charosky  
**Score:** 2.8  
**Comment:**

Costa Rica counts with an institutionalized that can make the initiative dure, learn and improve. Nevertheless, there is no clear indication of challenges and how to address them.

4 / 5

**Judge Name:** Diana Parra Silva  
**Score:** 4.0  
**Comment:**

The applicant does make a compelling case that the initiative will be institutionalized and scaled-up over time. The initiative has been institutionalized and they are working in increasingly improve their services and functionalities. Also the next steps and are clearly identified and they made a good case on how potential challenges will be addressed.

4.3 / 5

**Judge Name:** Alvaro Ramirez Alujas  
**Score:** 4.3  
**Comment:**

4.2 / 5

**Judge Name:** Jorge Soto  
**Score:** 4.2  
**Comment:**

The observatory is a good and clear next step that will also open up spaces for civil society