

Applicant Name: Netherlands Team
Normalized Scores 85.0

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>

4.2 / 5

Judge Name: Hernan Charosky
Score: 4.2
Comment: There was a partnership between representatives of CSOs and government both in the nomination and implementation of the initiative.

5 / 5

Judge Name: Ma'i Elimat
Score: 5.0
Comment: (1) The nomination of the initiative was fairly organised and engage different parties according to clear timeline. (2)The initiative was jointly implement according to the applicant who provided clear picture of who was involved and the role of each partner. (3) The applicant provided a strong validation of claims.

5 / 5

Judge Name: Jennifer Gustetic
Score: 5.0
Comment: Consultation: Had a public nomination process and a diverse group of judges to select the initiative (5) Implementation: Was jointly implemented with a partner agency (5) Validation of Claims: Validation of claims provide from partner agency (5)

4.7 / 5

Judge Name: Katju Holkeri
Score: 4.7
Comment:

5 / 5

Judge Name: Diana Parra Silva
Score: 5.0
Comment: Shows strong evidence of consulting others in nominating an initiative; jointly implemented with a partner agency and strong validation of claims. The nomination was selected by a jury after an open call, having a public procedure for projects to apply. They used various channels to promote that stakeholders know about this call. And a jury of various stakeholders chose the project that was nominated.

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>

4.8 / 5

Judge Name: Hernan Charosky
Score: 4.8
Comment: There is a strong incentive for citizen participation: a fair tax estimation, and the initiative itself is about channeling the citizen views about the estimation.

4.1 / 5

Judge Name: Ma'i Elimat
Score: 4.1
Comment: 1) The applicant provided reliable incentive for citizens to be engaged which is the impact on their property appreciation by carefully examining their corrections, and that is really touching directly their interests. However, (2) The applicant can provide more innovative way to get citizen feedback. (3) It was not clear to me from the application how many population has participated out of the targeted. I believe the applicant made clear efforts thought to include as much as possible from both citizens who did and didn't participated in the projects.

4 / 5

Judge Name: Jennifer Gustetic
Score: 4.0
Comment: Incentives: The incentive to participate was to ensure the assessment on your property was accurate before taxes were levied on that amount. This could save people money and also increase their confidence in the assessment process. No additional incentive provided though the financial savings could be enough (4) Feedback Methods: Citizens would use the website to seek a change in their assessment once they were notified they were available. It's not clear if they were seeking ideas or inputs for HOW assessments are determined (the formula) or if, recognizing they might have old or inaccurate data about a property as the basis for their formula, they are merely giving the public the opportunity to correct data that powers the formula. It's less about feedback about how a tax is assessed and more about transparency and participation earlier in the process of conducting a public service. (2) Participation Level: They focused on one particular locality. It's unclear the numbers of people that participated. That data was no provided. They did however identify clearly their target population (3)

3.1 / 5

Judge Name: Katju Holkeri
Score: 3.1
Comment:

4.5 / 5

Judge Name: Diana Parra Silva
Score: 4.5
Comment: 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. Via a letter, citizens were invited personally to come and visit the website. A reminder was sent to the citizens several days before the deadline of participation. And outcomes are, of course, the best incentive.

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>

4.5 / 5

Judge Name: Hernan Charosky
Score: 4.5
Comment: There has been a quantitative evaluation of the experience showing the impact of the initiative in the citizen experience and the communication with the government.

4.3 / 5

Judge Name: Ma'i Elimat
Score: 4.3
Comment: This initiative really impacted the people daily life by influencing their economic interests. it made their life easier and the trust in the government decision pertaining their tax appreciation better. More important, it made them feel engaged and control over government decision that influence their lives. The benefits for both government and citizens were very clear from the results of the questionnaire on people feedback about the service.

4.6 / 5

Judge Name: Jennifer Gustetic
Score: 4.6
Comment: influence: this activity definitely influenced the performance of a public service and changed the way in which the process was conducted, but the service itself was not changed (Assessments are still the basis of taxes and unsure if homeowners were involved in redesigning the formula and process for assessments itself). However, the performance of the existing derive, but engaging people earlier in the process certainly improved. (4) benefits: the results they are seeing with this process change are great and people seem to be satisfied and the process itself has improved significantly (5)

3 / 5

Judge Name: Katju Holkeri
Score: 3.0
Comment:

4.4 / 5

Judge Name: Diana Parra Silva
Score: 4.4
Comment: Transformed a public policy or service; set new standards for the relationship between government and citizens; resulted in concrete benefits for both. During three years they have been able to improve the initiative. Figures show how the service has improved, data quality has been improved and work processes have been optimized.

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 / 5

Judge Name: Hernan Charosky
Score: 4.5
Comment: Scaling up is the main focus of the idea of nominating this experience.

3.3 / 5

Judge Name: Ma'i Elimat
Score: 3.3
Comment: The sustainability plan was insured in the design of the initiative to be replicated to other areas., which is good step forward. However, there is no enough efforts to disseminate it or overcome the challenge of other municipalities refusal to join the initiative. maybe creating lobbying groups from the citizens at these areas would be a step to encourage these municipalities to join the initiative. maybe national level law or bylaw! So I encourage the applicant to work harder on the sustainability part as this is really great initiative. I believe also that same citizens who helped the implementation and design of this initiative would provide innovative ways as well to maintain its sustainability.

3.9 / 5

Judge Name: Jennifer Gustetic
Score: 3.9
Comment: This seems to be an ongoing program for the locality in which it's currently conducted. They have considered challenges for scaling to other localities as well but not sure how aggressively they are pursuing that scaling.

3.1 / 5

Judge Name: Katju Holkeri
Score: 3.1
Comment:

5 / 5

Judge Name: Diana Parra Silva
Score: 5.0
Comment: Presents a durable model of how it has been institutionalized. The initiative already has three years of development and has been institutionalized by its outcomes. An specific need was chosen, on which they have been working during an important period, achieving major results. Makes a compelling case for how challenges are being managed. They are ambitious, looking for this initiative to be replicated by others.