

Applicant Name: Philippines Team
Normalized Scores 85.8**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>

5 / 5

Judge Name: Marija Novkovic
Score: 5.0
Comment: The submission is very strong in terms of the nomination process. Meaningful consultations with the NGO partners have been conducted, whereas claims are validated by an NGO partner and World Bank. The initiative seems to have exceptional breadth.

4.8 / 5

Judge Name: Gilbert Sendugwa
Score: 4.8
Comment: It is worth noting that Grassroots Participatory Budgeting was jointly nominated by civil society and Government-both within the OGP Steering Committee and outside the committee. The team is also appreciated for opening the nomination of ideas to come from different possible sources and commitment to listen to these voices. The idea itself is jointly run by Government with active participation of civil society which makes it a real partnership.

4.7 / 5

Judge Name: Stef van Grieken
Score: 4.7
Comment: Both in the design and in local execution the government worked with ngo's and other partners.

4.7 / 5

Judge Name: Hennie van Vuuren
Score: 4.7
Comment: This is an impressive project in its scope of engagement between government and civil society and government in nominating, validating and implementing the project. It also engages a wide variety of CSO's including those representing marginalized communities. Commendable!

4.4 / 5

Judge Name: Chris Vein
Score: 4.4
Comment: One of the strongest partnerships I've seen: "The CSO representatives in the committee conducted an online consultation with more than 20 CSOs that participated in the OGP Regional Conference in Bali, Indonesia. While 2 other programs were nominated, more than 70% of those who responded recommended this initiative given its scale and impact." "The program goes beyond mere consultation as decisions are made through a body composed of 50% government and 50% CSO representatives."

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>

5 / 5

Judge Name: Marija Novkovic
Score: 5.0
Comment: I am very impressed with the fact that all local governments are implementing Grassroots Participatory Budgeting. The figures are also staggering: "The process has resulted in 6,000 projects in 2013 (amounting to over US\$200 million) and 19,000 projects in 2014 (amounting to over US\$500 million) that are now being implemented across the country." The video is very compelling too, as it brings to the fore the issues faced by indigenous people, marginalized groups and the poor.

3.4 / 5

Judge Name: Gilbert Sendugwa
Score: 3.4
Comment: GPB offers citizens opportunity and incentives for the participation in various ways. It is a requirement that civil society participate in budget processes and where civil society disagree with the contents, the national Government disallows approval of the budget. The fact that there is official space for civil society to contribute to budget policy process and opportunities for civil society capacity building provides important incentives for their participation and engagement with government.

4.3 / 5

Judge Name: Stef van Grieken
Score: 4.3
Comment: Instead of local politicians deciding, locals now have an opportunity to define projects in the budget.

4.6 / 5

Judge Name: Hennie van Vuuren
Score: 4.6
Comment: The scale of the project allows for a breadth and depth of engagement by civil society and government in participatory budgeting.

4.3 / 5

Judge Name: Chris Vein
Score: 4.3
Comment: Again, this application is strong: "The importance given to CSOs in this process and the projects that are implemented as a result have encouraged more than 8,000 organizations to participate in the program."

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>

4.9 / 5

Judge Name: Marija Novkovic
Score: 4.9
Comment: "The program goes beyond mere consultation as decisions are made through a body composed of 50% government and 50% CSO representatives. CSO representatives are elected through a city/municipal level assembly. National government does not accept proposals that are not signed by CSO representatives. The importance given to CSOs in this process and the projects that are implemented as a result have encouraged more than 8,000 organizations to participate in the program." The statements presented in the submission are impressive. Compliments for a well designed initiative. Co-decision in budget allocations is certainly a change maker.

2.9 / 5

Judge Name: Gilbert Sendugwa
Score: 2.9
Comment: The initiative which started as a pilot has been rolled over to all local governments in the country and over 6,000 projects completed over the past one year, impacting delivery of services. While issues with implementation are noted, the point to the overall goal of improving responsiveness of governments.

5 / 5

Judge Name: Stef van Grieken
Score: 5.0
Comment: Testimonials from the NGO's and the application show clear execution of projects aligned with local needs.

3.8 / 5

Judge Name: Hennie van Vuuren
Score: 3.8
Comment: While the engagement has led to the creation of project there is, at this stage, insufficient evidence of the impact this project has on the lives of citizens. It may well be too early to assess this. Such information would be extremely helpful in assess the impact of the application.

3.8 / 5

Judge Name: Chris Vein
Score: 3.8
Comment: Again strong from their application: "As of first quarter of 2014, 64% of the 6,000 projects identified for the 2013 budget are now completed or have visible physical accomplishments on the ground."

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: The plans for sustainability are not elaborated in detail, though there is a commitment to keep the programme running.

3.1 / 5

Judge Name: Gilbert Sendugwa
Score: 3.1
Comment: A statement of intention to institutionalize the initiative has been noted. The initial progress should provide important lessons for the institutionalisation of the initiative.

4.5 / 5

Judge Name: Stef van Grieken
Score: 4.5
Comment: The scale of implementation of participatory budgeting is remarkable. Definitely something other governments can learn from.

4.8 / 5

Judge Name: Hennie van Vuuren
Score: 4.8
Comment: This is clearly an ambitious that has significant government backing in terms of funding and political will and engagement by a large group of CSO's. If this is sustained it could have a huge impact on the lives of ordinary people.

4.1 / 5

Judge Name: Chris Vein
Score: 4.1
Comment: The program clearly has a multi-pronged strategy for sustainability that includes political support from the government along with funding, to the active and equal involvement of CSOs, to the involvement of citizens. The application does not shy away from illustrating the build into the core of this initiative.