

Applicant Name: Denmark Team
Normalized Scores 87.4

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>Showed 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>

4.4 / 5

Judge Name: Tri Mumpuni
Score: 4.4
Comment: This initiative shows clearly how every party partnering to address the issues hat become a common problems. And by looking at the result, it seems that the group have been working together for so many years and successfully making any different,

4.9 / 5

Judge Name: Gilbert Sendugwa
Score: 4.9
Comment: The applicant has provided evidence that the idea was originated by civil society/ citizen groups and eventually recognised by Government through a legislative action. Information has been provided that civil society took lead in nominating the idea.

4.6 / 5

Judge Name: Maxine Tanya Hamada
Score: 4.6
Comment: Statutory Senior Citizens' Councils, as presented were jointly nominated and implemented. The strengthening of this sector-specific representation is a fine example of a jointly owned and implemented citizen engagement strategy.

4.5 / 5

Judge Name: Chris Vein
Score: 4.5
Comment: The application shows strong evidence of consultation in the nomination process, implementation, and a strong validation of claims.

4.8 / 5

Judge Name: Igor Vidacak
Score: 4.8
Comment: This was an open nomination process which enabled everyone to nominate initiatives. The process has been led by civil society organisations. Danish Red Cross and Transparency International Denmark have actually selected the initiative which shows great willingness to allow civil society to have more ownership of the process. It would be good to know why these two CSOs were chosen to lead the overall selection process. Nevertheless, the whole nomination process is truly bottom-up and praiseworthy. The only small dilemma which prevented me from giving the highest score in this category - it is not clear from the application which government institution is formally endorsing the initiative. NASCC is mentioned as Government contact point, but its status is not fully clear - it seems to be a civil society organisation. In other words, it is a bit vague whether the initiative was actually formally nominated in Government-CSO partnership. As this should be the partnership initiative, a validation letter from local government bodies would be helpful to assess to what extent the initiative has been embedded in local decision-making practices, and owned from local government side as well. If NASCC is considered as network of SCC (as public consultative bodies), this comments is to be neglected.

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>

4.9 / 5

Judge Name: Tri Mumpuni
Score: 4.9
Comment: The activities done by the group showing a good result and they provide a very clear goal in their activities to achieve the common objective that become a common problem for them to solve.

4.1 / 5

Judge Name: Gilbert Sendugwa
Score: 4.1
Comment: The legal requirement for municipalities and Government to consult Senior Citizens' Council provides citizens a sure way for their participation and confidence that their needs are addressed. A significant number of would be voiceless citizens participant in influencing decisions- on matters that affect a special category of people.

4.8 / 5

Judge Name: Maxine Tanya Hamada
Score: 4.8
Comment: Because the target population is clear, the engagement strategy has clear incentive and the correlation of engagement to decision-making power is direct, i would give this high marks on depth of engagement

3.6 / 5

Judge Name: Chris Vein
Score: 3.6
Comment: Of particular note in the application is the following: "In addition to consulting the local SCC in formal decision-making processes, many local city councils involve the SCC earlier in the process, such as in the planning phase of construction of new care housing, relocation of bus stops, developing special measures for people with Alzheimer's, etc. The Council members are critical, but also view every issue as a whole and respect that it may be necessary for politicians to prioritise and make tough choices."

4 / 5

Judge Name: Igor Vidacak
Score: 4.0
Comment: This is a marvelous and very original initiative which has the potential to inspire other countries and be replicated as best practice example throughout OGP community. Senior citizens councils members are elected by and among local senior citizens which is an excellent example of democratic participatory engagement of citizens in local decision making. The fact that the turnout for SCC elections is 50% shows that this mechanism of citizens involvement is widely recognized. I would need more details on the actual functioning of SCC sessions and their links with local government bodies to assess the innovation aspect of the methods used and give highest score.

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>

5 / 5

Judge Name: Tri Mumpuni
Score: 5.0
Comment: The problems they solve such as an elderly problem, disabled etc give them a confidence to move more forward in solving the common problem they face in Denmark

4.3 / 5

Judge Name: Gilbert Sendugwa
Score: 4.3
Comment: Information provided that what started as a push for the right to participation resulted in the enactment of a law that establishes Senior Citizens Councils and obliges government entities to consult them. Planning of public services like housing, transport and healthcare ensures that senior citizens are not excluded.

4 / 5

Judge Name: Maxine Tanya Hamada
Score: 4.0
Comment: The initiative as presented has influenced and transformed local political representation of senior citizens. The submission speaks of SCC influence in health, public safety, local budget and elderly policy.

3.6 / 5

Judge Name: Chris Vein
Score: 3.6
Comment: According to the application: "A national survey among SCC chairmen, civil servants and local politicians show that all three parties generally agree that hearing statements from SCC are taken seriously by city councils and that SCC have a real impact on local politicians' decisions. Most importantly, the SCC have proven their worth, merit, and legitimacy." In this context, the actual impact of the SCCs in local government policy making is perhaps the greatest accomplishment.

3.4 / 5

Judge Name: Igor Vidacak
Score: 3.4
Comment: The model of Senior Citizens Councils seems to have transformed the way how policies that affect elderly people have been taken at local level across Denmark. This is a great example of institutionalizing structures for dialogue with key target groups and enabling them to have direct access to design of public policies. More information and concrete data from the mentioned national survey among SCC chairmen, civil servants and local politicians should be provided in order to fully assess the outcomes of the initiative. For example, the actual number of local government acts that were submitted for consultations to SCC and concrete examples of changes in local decisions/policies would be useful to get better overall picture on the impact of SCCs.

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 institutionalize 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>

4.8 / 5

Judge Name: Tri Mumpuni
Score: 4.8
Comment: For years it found this activities has shown some evidence from the goal they achieve in their activities and the fund support guarantee that the government put a good intention in making this initiative work well.

4.9 / 5

Judge Name: Gilbert Sendugwa
Score: 4.9
Comment: The initiative is already recognised through statutory action and mainstreamed in municipalities. In addition, it enjoys great interest of members with half of the membership participating in key decision making such as elections. These two elements are strong pillars for sustainability.

4.3 / 5

Judge Name: Maxine Tanya Hamada
Score: 4.3
Comment: The initiative is presented as durable and with public support funds for the organization of SCCs. other challenges discussed are the voluntary nature of the post and the ability of the SCC to be both opponent and partner.

3.8 / 5

Judge Name: Chris Vein
Score: 3.8
Comment: According to the application: "NASCC's members are the 98 SCC of the 98 municipalities in Denmark, and the organisation is supported by the Danish Government with DKK 1,000,000 a year (approx. EUR 134,000) and is backed by the Danish Ministry of Children, Gender Equality, Integration and Social Affairs." Therefore, there is political support and government funding to back-up that support. The application also suggests that the model is being used in two other areas of government.

4.7 / 5

Judge Name: Igor Vidacak
Score: 4.7
Comment: The sustainability of the initiative seems to be ensured by the fact that city councils are required by Danish Law to consult local SCCs before making final decision on issues relevant for elderly population. The initiative is obviously institutionalized in local government decision-making practices. Also, there is a Danish Government financial support provided for NASCC - the national organisation supporting the work of SCCs. This is a great example of sustainable model of vast experience and skills of senior citizens across the country in decision making. Congratulations! You found the way of tapping into the wisdom of society before making important local decisions. The only dilemma I have in scoring this criterion is whether the initiative would still be sustainable without Danish Government grant provided to NASCC that provides everyday support to SCCs in their work.