

Applicant Name: United States Team
 Normalized Scores 81.5

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: Salpi Ghazarian
Score: 3.8
Comment: The consultation process is with significant organizations -- but all focused on a specific direction: crowd-sourced knowledge expansion.

4 / 5

Judge Name: Alex Irwan
Score: 4.0
Comment: The Collaboration and Innovation through Prizes, Crowdsourcing, and Citizen Science was selected primarily because it was an element of President Barack Obama's Strategy for American Innovation, and not to promote information transparency and participation in public decision making processes. However, the nomination was consulted with civil society and the program was carried out in partnership with civil society.

3 / 5

Judge Name: Diana Parra Silva
Score: 3.0
Comment: They say they "consulted with experts inside and outside of government, as well as with civil society through an in-person Open Government Working Group meeting, the online U.S. Open Government Discussion Group, and outreach to members of the public". Finally the Administration nominated several bundled initiatives under a single entry, that respond to the Strategy for Innovation. It is then a "set of initiatives" that share the same spirit, rather than a single initiative. And this is why they presented a validation letter for each initiative separately. This situation hampers the review compared to the proposals presented by the other countries. To review it as a whole, it should be understood as a sort of "plan for collaboration and innovation through prizes, crowdsourcing, and citizen science" and validation letters should support that plan.

4.8 / 5

Judge Name: Alvaro Ramirez Alujas
Score: 4.8
Comment: Shows strong evidence of consulting others in nominating an initiative; jointly implemented with a partner agency and strong validation of claims Very impressive partnership and relationship efforts between involved organizations

4.7 / 5

Judge Name: Jorge Soto
Score: 4.7
Comment: There is clear collaboration. Perhaps an independent organization that helps implement the initiative is not clearly demonstrated

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>

3.1 / 5

Judge Name: Salpi Ghazarian
Score: 3.1
Comment: The target population for engagement is a specific segment of the population and their engagement is solicited broadly, but not to engage in decision-making or policy-making; the engagement is successful and useful but focused on collaborative knowledge-generation, not policy.

2.7 / 5

Judge Name: Alex Irwan
Score: 2.7
Comment: The initiative is primarily geared to promote innovation, not to promote transparency and participation to influence public policies and services to become more responsive.

4.7 / 5

Judge Name: Diana Parra Silva
Score: 4.7
Comment: Bearing in mind the situation described in the previous section, incentives should be aimed at encouraging participation in the above mentioned plan. This is encouraged by the COMPETES Reauthorization Act of 2010, that "provided broad authority to all U.S. Federal agencies to use prizes and competitions to spur innovation in creating solutions to problems".

5 / 5

Judge Name: Alvaro Ramirez Alujas
Score: 5.0
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 The model goes beyond mere participation, puts focus on partnership and in generating public value different perspectives (new services, solutions to public problems, etc.)

4.7 / 5

Judge Name: Jorge Soto
Score: 4.7
Comment: Shows clear results, projects and economic impact.

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>

3.3 / 5

Judge Name: Salpi Ghazarian
Score: 3.3
Comment: There is contribution to services, but not to policy. The engagement of citizens in enhancing the public information pool is a benefit to society.

2.5 / 5

Judge Name: Alex Irwan
Score: 2.5
Comment: Citizens have received benefits from various areas through science, technology, and innovation, but not through the transformation of public policy and services.

4.6 / 5

Judge Name: Diana Parra Silva
Score: 4.6
Comment: According to the information provided, citizen engagement has transformed several services. Viewed as a whole, the proposal has set new standards for the relationship between government and citizens, resulted in concrete benefits for users (due to the economic incentives, as well as major improvements in services) and for the Administration.

4.9 / 5

Judge Name: Alvaro Ramirez Alujas
Score: 4.9
Comment: Transformed a public policy or service; set new standards for the relationship between government and citizens; resulted in concrete benefits for both

4.4 / 5

Judge Name: Jorge Soto
Score: 4.4
Comment: Shows how the government is not the problem solver, but is encouraging problem solvers to flourish

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: Salpi Ghazarian
Score: 4.2
Comment: Agencies will continue to incentivize public participation in problem-solving and information gathering in a variety of fields.

2.8 / 5

Judge Name: Alex Irwan
Score: 2.8
Comment: There is no effort to institutionalize it through a law or legislation. Sustainability depends on the mutual benefits that collaborating partners receive from each other. Scaling up also depends on the mutual benefits that the partners receive.

4.8 / 5

Judge Name: Diana Parra Silva
Score: 4.8
Comment: Sustainability is underpinned by the evolution and improvements that initiatives have had. The existing regulatory and institutional framework shows that it is already institutionalized. It can be understood that they have identified as a challenge that government employees should have skills and tools to carry out such initiatives, so they have provided training and support materials. But they did not outline a path to scale-up the plan.

4.8 / 5

Judge Name: Alvaro Ramirez Alujas
Score: 4.8
Comment: Presents a durable model that can be institutionalized and/or scaled-up; makes a compelling case for how challenges will be managed It is a perfectly scalable and replicable model in other areas of public management

4.7 / 5

Judge Name: Jorge Soto
Score: 4.7
Comment: It is designed institutionalized and is year after year scaling