

Applicant Name: Macedonia Team
Normalized Scores 61.4**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>
2.9 / 5				

Judge Name: Gertrude Muguzi
Score: 2.9
Comment: The process for nominating this initiative for the Open government awards was not elaborated in the submission. The project is jointly implemented by MISA with MCIC, a civil society partner, whose role was to monitor the development of legislation in Macedonia. Th only concrete evidence of real cooperation presented was government acknowledgement of MCIC findings and publishing their monitoring results on its website. Otherwise, from the submission, they seem to be 2 separate, but complementary initiatives.

3.8 / 5

Judge Name: Marija Novkovic
Score: 3.8
Comment: The initiative is proposed and implemented by the line ministry and NGO partner.

4.3 / 5

Judge Name: Oluseun Onidbinde
Score: 4.3
Comment: MCIC has been involved as a CSO partner for Government in the Mirror and also stated its case as a partner. It is als o commendable that this is part of the OGP Action Plan

2.1 / 5

Judge Name: Stef van Grieken
Score: 2.1
Comment: The application does not mention any consultation of ngo's in designing the program.

3.6 / 5

Judge Name: Hennie van Vuuren
Score: 3.6
Comment: Good example of complimentarily between the government and NGO.

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>
2.7 / 5				

Judge Name: Gertrude Muguzi
Score: 2.7
Comment: While more innovative ways of eliciting citizen feedback on the legislative process could have been employed, the two initiatives ENER and Open Government in the Mirror do provide a way enable citizens to monitor how this process is being implemented in reality while an independent intermediary organisation interprets and analyses the data, making it public in an easily understandable format and so the public can engage with it meaningfully provide informed feedback.

3.3 / 5

Judge Name: Marija Novkovic
Score: 3.3
Comment: Moderate scoring is awarded to the Macedonian initiative here, on account of the fact that the initiative did not manage to pique the interest of the population, i.e. 83 comments in 2013 is not a breathtaking demonstration of the usefulness of the tool.

2.9 / 5

Judge Name: Oluseun Onidbinde
Score: 2.9
Comment: Incentives for participation have not been sorted and the program still needs to find creative ways to drive usability and citizen engagement. However, it is good that it is monitoring feedback.

2.6 / 5

Judge Name: Stef van Grieken
Score: 2.6
Comment: The site allows citizens to comment on legal text. A total of 83 comments were proposed. This is a very low level of engagement. How this engagement influenced these laws is not clear from the application.

3.1 / 5

Judge Name: Hennie van Vuuren
Score: 3.1
Comment: The project uses an innovative tool to ensure that citizen feedback is obtained. However, this remains limited (despite the increase from 3 - 83 comments between 2011 and 2013).

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>
2.9 / 5				

Judge Name: Gertrude Muguzi
Score: 2.9
Comment: The examples of influence in the design and delivery of government policy and/or services is that government changed its portal to enable users to give longer feedback and publishing the monitoring results of the Open Government Mirror on the ENER website. These may improve future results of this initiative and may assist in holding public servants to account provided that naming and shaming is a sufficient incentive for civil servants to change their behaviour. However, no evidence was presented in the submission that such behavior change has occurred.

2.9 / 5

Judge Name: Marija Novkovic
Score: 2.9
Comment: Again, a moderate score is handed based on the fact that there is little visible change to public policies or services. The initiative did, however, take into account users' comments and amended the conditions for public input (word limits were increased).

2.1 / 5

Judge Name: Oluseun Onidbinde
Score: 2.1
Comment: Opportunities to change civil service is still stated in the future tense but there is a potential if there are better ways to amplify usage by citizens and civil society.

2.9 / 5

Judge Name: Stef van Grieken
Score: 2.9
Comment: The outcomes of the 83 comments are not clear from the application. It could have some influence, i doubt it had more influence that regular law making processes giving the low number of people engaging.

2.7 / 5

Judge Name: Hennie van Vuuren
Score: 2.7
Comment: While this tool is useful it unfortunately shows little value on the impact that citizen engagement has had,

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>
2.6 / 5				

Judge Name: Gertrude Muguzi
Score: 2.6
Comment: The project funding is secure for the next five years. After that, sustainability will depend on continued government commitment. Given that some of the information published for the next five years the government in the best light, what preemptive mechanisms will be considered by the project to ensure that this commitment continues to be guaranteed should a key government institution face significant reputational risk from certain findings that could come to light on this project?

4.4 / 5

Judge Name: Marija Novkovic
Score: 4.4
Comment: Plans for taking the initiative further are well thought through.

4.1 / 5

Judge Name: Oluseun Onidbinde
Score: 4.1
Comment: MCIC has made commitments in documents and also has stated funding plans for the next five years which is commendable. Institutionalising this in other tiers of government and making it a durable model is necessary. Being part of the OGP plan of the Macedonia puts on a "green light" for sustainability.

2.4 / 5

Judge Name: Stef van Grieken
Score: 2.4
Comment: The program does not seem to be an effective way of engaging citizens.

3.1 / 5

Judge Name: Hennie van Vuuren
Score: 3.1
Comment: The project displays commitment from both parties to ensure its sustainability. However, there is not a sufficient plan detailing how it plans to increase citizen engagement and measure the response of government to such feedback. This would be very helpful - and of great use in maximising the impact of the project.