

Applicant Name: South Africa Team
 Normalized Scores 71.8

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>

4.5 / 5

Judge Name: Hernan Charosky
Score: 4.5
Comment: There was a consultation process for the nomination, in which government offices and a CSOs validated the selection. The project is, in fact, a device for citizen consultation in which government and non government sectors are involved.

3.8 / 5

Judge Name: Ma'i Elimat
Score: 3.8
Comment: (1) The consultation during the nomination process was positive, However, the applicant didn't include if more initiatives were also under selection or the timeline and steps for consultation. (2)The partnership created to implement the initiative was significant and contribution was proven by the validation of claims' documents. However, more partnerships are encouraged especially with media, CBOs, and local groups; taking into account the nature of this initiative and its need to be disseminated as much as possible to make the best use of it. (3) The validation of claims provided by the applicant were very comprehensive and sufficient.

4.5 / 5

Judge Name: Jennifer Gustetic
Score: 4.5
Comment: consultation: showed consultation in the selection of this project with 20 NGOs but didn't have an open nomination process to pick the project considered (2) jointly implemented: this effort was mostly implemented by a number of government agencies but at least one CSO was an official partner (4) validation of claims: have very convincing validation of claims (5)

4.1 / 5

Judge Name: Katju Holkeri
Score: 4.1
Comment:

3.4 / 5

Judge Name: Tiago Peixoto
Score: 3.4
Comment: According to the submission there was no consultation with partners. Engagement with external stakeholders was limited to "consideration and endorsement".

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>

4.5 / 5

Judge Name: Hernan Charosky
Score: 4.5
Comment: Channeling citizen opinions and experiences on public services is the aim of the project.

2.9 / 5

Judge Name: Ma'i Elimat
Score: 2.9
Comment: (1) The depth of engagement was not clear. how the applicant incentivise the partners and citizens to participate is not clear as well. However, the applicant succeed in gathering adequate participation around the development and piloting of the initiative. (2) On the other hand, the applicant didn't make it clear how the citizens' feedback would be used systematically "what is the rules?". the applicant mentioned some of the results based on citizens' feedback though (i.e. unpopular police commander was removed).

2.6 / 5

Judge Name: Jennifer Gustetic
Score: 2.6
Comment: incentives: unclear that they provided any incentives to the initial participants other than being able to influence the way services are delivered on a local level (which might be incentive enough). looks like the may plan to pay participants for their involvement in the future but thats not clear (2.5) feedback method: they state that they have local dialogues but it's unclear if those are in person, or online, and how they are convened a how often. how many opportunities for feedback are there? are there innovative ways to submit that feedback? unclear. (1.5) level of engagement: they got 5000 people involved so far in 9 regions. They intend to have 20,000 people involved. Unsure how many citizens are in those regions to assess if half the target was adequately engaged. However, they do seem to be getting pretty good involvement. (3)

3.1 / 5

Judge Name: Katju Holkeri
Score: 3.1
Comment:

3.9 / 5

Judge Name: Tiago Peixoto
Score: 3.9
Comment: The number of participants indicated shows some level of engagement. However, it is unclear about the design of the participatory processes (e.g. method of participant selection) and what incentives are in place for participation.

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>

4.4 / 5

Judge Name: Hernan Charosky
Score: 4.4
Comment: There is an on going exercise of government-beneficiaries dialogue, providing inputs for service improvement

2.6 / 5

Judge Name: Ma'i Elimat
Score: 2.6
Comment: Given the fact that the initiative is relatively new and still in a pilot phase, and that the outcomes stated by the applicant is from the first 6 months of the initiative which included some examples, its not easy to judge how the initiative would influence public policy or service. However, it can be said that the preliminary results are encouraging. it still needs more investigation in systematic ways to find the real impact of this initiative and provide evidence though.

2.6 / 5

Judge Name: Jennifer Gustetic
Score: 2.6
Comment: there are some results starting to emerge but the pilots won't be over until late 2015. The results have been things like letting a particular police commissioner go. Whether they are identifying root cause issues or just implementing one off ideas that come in through the forums is unclear. unclear how the changes that have been made to date are unique to each local service area or are more system level.

2.7 / 5

Judge Name: Katju Holkeri
Score: 2.7
Comment:

3.8 / 5

Judge Name: Tiago Peixoto
Score: 3.8
Comment: A few impacts have been documented in the submission (e.g. unpopular police commander was removed, repair of govt. vehicles). However, the extent to which services or policies are being improved through citizen engagement remains uncertain.

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>

4.6 / 5

Judge Name: Hernan Charosky
Score: 4.6
Comment: The framework intends to be a model embedded in the evaluation practices of the Evaluation area of the SA government.

4 / 5

Judge Name: Ma'i Elimat
Score: 4.0
Comment: (1) The initiative needs more concrete steps to maintain its sustainability. it has some activity now but further activities is encouraged. (2) The applicant outlined the challenges. However, it didn't provide risk plan for all challenges (i.e. insuring buy-in and support from officials in government departments).

2.6 / 5

Judge Name: Jennifer Gustetic
Score: 2.6
Comment: the are currently in the pilot phase and won't wrap it up until 2015 after which they will have an independent evaluation. they are considering options to move out of pilot but don't have a concrete plan.

2.8 / 5

Judge Name: Katju Holkeri
Score: 2.8
Comment: Good intiatie and good commitment from government, but still vat a very early stage.

4.4 / 5

Judge Name: Tiago Peixoto
Score: 4.4
Comment: The learning approach used increases the chances to institutionalize the initiative and adapt as challenges emerge. There is not however major assurances that the project will be either institutionalized or scaled up, which is partly due to its pilot nature.