

Applicant Name: Peru Team
Normalized Scores 82.1

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>
3.8 / 5				
Judge Name:	Juanita Burgos			
Score:	3.8			
Comment:				
4.2 / 5				
Judge Name:	Hernan Charosky			
Score:	4.2			
Comment:	It shows evidence of active participation of Civil Society in the selection and implementation processes, two relevant NGOs, in the context an OGP working sub-group lead the identification of the initiative.			
4.9 / 5				
Judge Name:	Diana Parra Silva			
Score:	4.9			
Comment:	It shows evidence of consulting others in nominating an initiative: a sub-working group of the Standing Multisectoral Commission for the Follow-up of the Implementation of the Peru Action Plan for Open Government identified the project. It is jointly implemented with partner agencies, both public and private, and strong validation of claims.			
3.9 / 5				
Judge Name:	Alvaro Ramirez Alujas			
Score:	3.9			
Comment:	There is sufficient evidence about the relationship between local gov (owner of the initiative) and other social and civic organizations			
4.1 / 5				
Judge Name:	Jorge Soto			
Score:	4.1			
Comment:	There is no clear role of the civil society or non-government sector as a partner			

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>
4.2 / 5				
Judge Name:	Juanita Burgos			
Score:	4.2			
Comment:				
4 / 5				
Judge Name:	Hernan Charosky			
Score:	4.0			
Comment:	There is no reference to the size of the target population, but there is an indicator of the increase of its participation (1300%).			
4.4 / 5				
Judge Name:	Diana Parra Silva			
Score:	4.4			
Comment:	Employed compelling measures to incentivize participation; used direct and innovative methods to partner with citizens (child in this case) in decision-making; reached an ambitious level of engagement with its target population. They work with several schools, both public and private, to incentivize participation. And outcomes are, of course, the best incentive.			
3.6 / 5				
Judge Name:	Alvaro Ramirez Alujas			
Score:	3.6			
Comment:	There is a strong commitment among the stakeholders involved in the initiative. The fact guide the project towards the development of skills in children and encourage training and civic responsibility in the government affairs			
4.6 / 5				
Judge Name:	Jorge Soto			
Score:	4.6			
Comment:	Very innovative to target children, although the mechanisms are traditional			

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>
3.8 / 5				
Judge Name:	Juanita Burgos			
Score:	3.8			
Comment:				
3.6 / 5				
Judge Name:	Hernan Charosky			
Score:	3.6			
Comment:	There were a series of impact of the participatory mechanisms of this initiatives in several areas, such as citizen security and waste recycling.			
4.8 / 5				
Judge Name:	Diana Parra Silva			
Score:	4.8			
Comment:	Transformed a public policy or service; set new standards for the relationship between government and citizens; resulted in concrete benefits for both. Decisions made by children in the Council has translated into concrete initiatives implemented by the Municipality. Figures show how their engagement has resulted in concrete benefits for the kids (and the families) and the administration.			
3.3 / 5				
Judge Name:	Alvaro Ramirez Alujas			
Score:	3.3			
Comment:	The results presented realize an innovative and important initiative as a space to build a strong, responsible and engaged citizenship with the resolution of public problems			
4.3 / 5				
Judge Name:	Jorge Soto			
Score:	4.3			
Comment:	They are creating a civic culture inside children's minds			

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>
4.2 / 5				
Judge Name:	Juanita Burgos			
Score:	4.2			
Comment:	This initiative represents an example of citizen participation and engagement, where the target population (children) are involve not only in the decision making process but also in the implementations and assessment of the policies. The initiative could be institutionalized, but also, depends on the willingness of the regional authority.			
4 / 5				
Judge Name:	Hernan Charosky			
Score:	4.0			
Comment:	There is specialized personnel and municipal government programs for the follow up of the initiative.			
3.9 / 5				
Judge Name:	Diana Parra Silva			
Score:	3.9			
Comment:	On the criterion of sustainability: It shows commitment to continuing the initiative over a permanent way. The results are in turn a way to strengthen institutionalization. But is not committed clearly how it will be scaled-up over time. There is also information on how potential challenges will be addressed.			
3.8 / 5				
Judge Name:	Alvaro Ramirez Alujas			
Score:	3.8			
Comment:	It is an initiative that has already been developed and has visible results, and is feasible to be replicated as a model for enhancing civic attitudes, participation and civic engagement			
4.7 / 5				
Judge Name:	Jorge Soto			
Score:	4.7			
Comment:	Institutionalized via traditional mechanisms like laws			