

Applicant Name: Georgia Team  
Normalized Scores 62.5

**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>
			3.1 / 5	

**Judge Name:** Marija Novkovic  
**Score:** 3.1  
**Comment:** There is evidence that the initiative was selected by NGO partners as the national candidate for the Citizen Engagement Awards, but little to no evidence of joint implementation. It is a Government-led project which is merely supported by the civil society partners.

3.3 / 5

**Judge Name:** Gilbert Sendugwa  
**Score:** 3.3  
**Comment:** Information provided confirm that the nomination of Community Centres for Citizen Engagement was arrived at in joint consultation of not only civil society members of the national Open Government Forum but also soliciting ideas from stakeholders outside the committee including private sector. In addition, nomination was discussed over a number of meetings and each time opportunities for inputs and counter proposals were invited.

3.7 / 5

**Judge Name:** Maxine Tanya Hamada  
**Score:** 3.7  
**Comment:** Community Centers for Citizen Engagement is presented as a government-led initiative that has generated citizen demand for expansion and deepening. The OGP forum as a process for nomination and selection of the initiative was also conscious of the public consultations on the community centers.

3.1 / 5

**Judge Name:** Hennie van Vuuren  
**Score:** 3.1  
**Comment:** The applicant made a good effort at ensuring engagement in the application process and has provided some validation from a civil society partner. However, there is little evidence of which civil society organizations participated in the implementation - it would have been useful to give an indication of the sectors they are drawn from as an indication.

4.4 / 5

**Judge Name:** Chris Vein  
**Score:** 4.4  
**Comment:** The application clearly shows the consultation in the nomination process, implementation, and outcome involved partnerships.

**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>
			2.5 / 5	

**Judge Name:** Marija Novkovic  
**Score:** 2.5  
**Comment:** The initiative is worthwhile but it does not seek to actively solicit feedback from citizens. It is very clear from the application form that the process has been designed and delivered by the central Government. There are hints of feedback mechanisms, e.g. "Based on the results of surveys and consultations with local citizens Government of Georgia defined its vision and the strategy for development of CCs." but this should have been elaborated in greater detail. On a more positive note, the centers are used to conduct consultations on OGP national priorities.

3.2 / 5

**Judge Name:** Gilbert Sendugwa  
**Score:** 3.2  
**Comment:** Community Centres for Citizen engagements addresses two important felt needs- making rural based populations to access public information on the basis of which they engage with Government on key policy reforms. The second aspect is blending technology with policy discuss for rural communities. A key point mentioned is the reduction of barriers to access to information and citizen engagement which would be the case without the Centres.

2.2 / 5

**Judge Name:** Maxine Tanya Hamada  
**Score:** 2.2  
**Comment:** The initiative combines many objectives for engaging citizens at the local level. The video cites as example the community center where a painting competition catalyzed citizen interest in center activities. The ability to provide incentives for citizen use and visits to community centers can build on the different needs and feedback from the citizens in the different areas.

2.9 / 5

**Judge Name:** Hennie van Vuuren  
**Score:** 2.9  
**Comment:** This project commendably makes use of existing infrastructure (libraries) to create community centres. The ten (pilot?) centres each host on average one event (including exhibition) a month and there a number of recorded individual interactions. It has also been used within the OGP context but no indication of how the feedback was used. However, the project represents a good start.

3.3 / 5

**Judge Name:** Chris Vein  
**Score:** 3.3  
**Comment:** The application clearly states that the Government designed a creative and unique concept of Community Centers unifying modern technologies, public and private sector services, transformed functions and roles for the libraries and venues for civic engagement in one space. Less clear in the process of incentivizing participation, partnering for decision-making.

**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>
			2.4 / 5	

**Judge Name:** Marija Novkovic  
**Score:** 2.4  
**Comment:** As was indicated in the comments to the previous judging criterion, there is very little evidence that the Community Centers aim to provide ways to citizens to influence or change public policies.

3.5 / 5

**Judge Name:** Gilbert Sendugwa  
**Score:** 3.5  
**Comment:** The piloting of CCs has influenced scale-up by establishing new centres and broadening the practice of consultations around key decisions on the policies and services. Whereas the team has not pointed out a specific policy reform arising from CCs, it is clear that their importance and lessons are appreciated and informed decision on inclusion in the country's OGP action plan. Institutionalizing CCs through policy action e.g. amendments to codes governing traditional libraries or making it mandatory for Local Governments and municipalities to consult through CCs all major policies and decisions will be an important consideration.

2.4 / 5

**Judge Name:** Maxine Tanya Hamada  
**Score:** 2.4  
**Comment:** Input to the OGP Action Plan for Georgia was sourced through the mechanisms of the Community Centers for Citizen Engagement. This can potentially be used for direct feedback on government services, statutes and programs.

2.6 / 5

**Judge Name:** Hennie van Vuuren  
**Score:** 2.6  
**Comment:** The project has created an element of citizen engagement, public participation and benefitted linguistic minorities. However, there is little evidence of how this influenced the design of government policy or the concrete benefits to government and citizens.

3.7 / 5

**Judge Name:** Chris Vein  
**Score:** 3.7  
**Comment:** The statistics provided in the application clearly show a transformed public service with high standards and results.

**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>
			3.7 / 5	

**Judge Name:** Marija Novkovic  
**Score:** 3.7  
**Comment:** Sound plans for scaling the initiative are in place, but there is no mention of risk management nor further engagement campaigns.

3.7 / 5

**Judge Name:** Gilbert Sendugwa  
**Score:** 3.7  
**Comment:** The number of CCs has increased to 12 will soon rise to 18 when those under construction are completed. It is mentioned that CCs enjoy the highest political support and their inclusion in OGP country action plan points to efforts for institutionalisation and scale-up, probably with a policy or legislation.

2.9 / 5

**Judge Name:** Maxine Tanya Hamada  
**Score:** 2.9  
**Comment:** There is high political support for this initiative and external funding commitment and support. Citizen demand and use of the centers may strengthen the practice and usability of citizen engagement centers.

2.9 / 5

**Judge Name:** Hennie van Vuuren  
**Score:** 2.9  
**Comment:** There appears a commitment to institutionalize the pilot but little information is provided on how challenges will be dealt with. Unfortunately the project does not present a compelling vision for citizen engagement.

3 / 5

**Judge Name:** Chris Vein  
**Score:** 3.0  
**Comment:** The application states that the construction of 6 additional community centers is underway. The action plan for the development of the CCs and the highest political support and their inclusion in OGP country action plan points to efforts for institutionalisation and scale-up, probably with a policy or legislation. The application of libraries includes further steps. However, the initiative is not specific about challenges faced and will be managed including how direct citizen feedback will be incorporated into the improvement of service delivery.