

Applicant Name: Brazil Team
 Normalized Scores 73.5

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>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>

4.7 / 5

Judge Name: Gertrude Muguzi
Score: 4.7
Comment: According to the public, the nomination process was web-based and open to the public. A large number of civil society organizations have participated in the implementation of the initiative, including an initiative to allow civil society to use the training material to train others, which would expand the project's already impressive reach considerably. The pairwise methodology used to select initiatives is interesting although I think it may have been limited because it does not give the voters a wide choice for selection, so they could end up with two projects that they would not have picked where they given the choice and they would be forced to select one. I also did not understand how it is possible for the chosen initiative to have only 82 points when there were 1438 votes and only 4 projects, unless the points do not represent actual votes. Further clarification on the selection methodology is required here.

2.6 / 5

Judge Name: Oluseun Onidbinde
Score: 2.6
Comment: I did not get a link to the public nomination results on the web. This accounts for my judgement to score that claims about public voting cannot be validated. However, I still respect the inclusion of wide network of NGOs.

2.3 / 5

Judge Name: Maxine Tanya Hamada
Score: 2.3
Comment: The "Keeping an eye on Public Money" Program is a strong example of a government-led initiative that finds support and roles in implementation from civil society and local governments. The nomination was by government with an online vote to select among the nominees.

4 / 5

Judge Name: Stef van Grieken
Score: 4.0
Comment: It seems the initiative and design of the program was executed by the government and local ngo's were contracted for its execution.

4.7 / 5

Judge Name: Hennie van Vuuren
Score: 4.7
Comment: The applicant displays an extremely impressive breadth of NGO's partners and has provided evidence of this claim. Given the over 420 partners it is understandable that they have not chosen to single out a single partner in submitting this application. However, the section of the project for submission to the OGP was undertaken through a transparent, participatory process which is commendable.

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: Gertrude Muguzi
Score: 4.2
Comment: The reach of this project is impressive although it has been in existence for a long time both of which are evidence that the population values its service. Given Brazil's federal system of government it makes sense to apply a collective action approach between citizens and local government to solve local problems. From the number of people who have been through their training, it seems that the public sees the value of this training in addressing issues that are important to them.

4.3 / 5

Judge Name: Oluseun Onidbinde
Score: 4.3
Comment: Access to free courseware and also engagement with focus group civil society is commendable but the current engagement has not reached half of target population.

2.9 / 5

Judge Name: Maxine Tanya Hamada
Score: 2.9
Comment: There is strong and clear commitment as presented to deepen the engagement of both the public servants and the citizens. My understanding also is that a primary target population of this capacity-building and mobilization initiative are the municipal councils for public policies. It would be good to milestone how many of the 5,570 municipalities have utilized this program for their councils. The 1800 municipalities mentioned did not specify if these were the councils or citizens from these municipalities

2.6 / 5

Judge Name: Stef van Grieken
Score: 2.6
Comment: The program has reached an impressive amount of citizens through e-learning. I believe that education can be a strong driver of engagement. However, the application fails to address what the actual influence of the program was in reducing waste and corruption in public spending.

4.7 / 5

Judge Name: Hennie van Vuuren
Score: 4.7
Comment: The initiative provides an excellent platform for encouragement of citizen engagement in social auditing and has reached tens of thousands of participants through innovative approaches (importantly including face-face training).

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>

2.6 / 5

Judge Name: Gertrude Muguzi
Score: 2.6
Comment: While the initiative itself in ensuring more informed and meaningful participation by citizens is well articulated, the submission is silent on how the CGU uses the feedback it obtains from this participation to improve its work.

3.6 / 5

Judge Name: Oluseun Onidbinde
Score: 3.6
Comment: Good approach on raising citizen understanding on Keeping Public Eye on Money. It is not clear if after the courses have been taken, if there is a dialogue between the civil society and government insitutions to discuss issues of corruption raised. However, this has raised the interaction between citizen and institutional engagement.

3.7 / 5

Judge Name: Maxine Tanya Hamada
Score: 3.7
Comment: The "Keeping an eye on Public Money" Program as presented shows a government commitment to build the capacity and interest for constructive engagement between informed citizens and a receptive government bureaucracy. The presentation showed an increase in interest from the citizens. It mentions highest changes in health, education and social care policies. It would be good to know more about what these specific changes were.

2.5 / 5

Judge Name: Stef van Grieken
Score: 2.5
Comment: The program delivered in terms of educating the public. The application provides no tangible insights into the actual benefits or change in public spending or corruption.

3.9 / 5

Judge Name: Hennie van Vuuren
Score: 3.9
Comment: This is very good and some evidence is presented to validate this by partner organizations. However, the submission does not display an example of 'measurable' impact. A few case studies would have been very helpful to understand what the impact has been over time of this extremely ambitious and clearly important project.

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>

2.9 / 5

Judge Name: Gertrude Muguzi
Score: 2.9
Comment: This initiative seems to be institutionalized already since it has been in existence and growing for over 11 years. The use and expansion of multipliers to enable others to use their training methodology for their training makes sense. However, how they will address such issues as quality control for training that is no longer delivered or managed by them is not made explicit in the submission.

4.5 / 5

Judge Name: Oluseun Onidbinde
Score: 4.5
Comment: A good approach to distill this down to the local and municipal level is commendable and it is obvious that the program is planned to scale. Effectively results of that will have reinforced sustainability. However, a good case of how challenges will be managed was not stated.

3.9 / 5

Judge Name: Maxine Tanya Hamada
Score: 3.9
Comment: The presentation cites specific steps and milestones in scaling-up the reach of this government initiative. It would be interesting to know how citizens and civil society are contributing to, and also beginning to have ownership of the shape, content and focus of this capacity-building and mobilization program. There was no specific challenge mentioned.

4.2 / 5

Judge Name: Stef van Grieken
Score: 4.2
Comment: The program has been running since 2003 and thus proved it can be sustainable over time in Brazil. Wether it scales to other countries is not clear from the application.

4.7 / 5

Judge Name: Hennie van Vuuren
Score: 4.7
Comment: This is clearly a project that has proven a measure of sustainability (spanning multiple administrations), with political will to make it work and broad engagement and support by civil society organizations. There are also ambitious plans for increasing the scope of the work and deepening channels of engagement. Very impressive. One element that is not fully addressed is how challenges will be dealt with (which must exist with a project of this scale and focus) - what happens when there is resistance to implementing the project or citizen social auditors are placed under pressure from authorities - does the project provide support? It would have been helpful to address this.