

Applicant Name: South Korea Team
 Normalized Scores 66.1

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>
			2 / 5		
Judge Name:	Marija Novkovic				
Score:	2.0				
Comment:	There is no mention of the process behind selecting this initiative as the candidate for Citizen Engagement Award.				
			1.9 / 5		
Judge Name:	Oluseun Onidbinde				
Score:	1.9				
Comment:	Claims provided by the applicant have shown a multi-stakeholder approach but without links for validation.				
				4 / 5	
Judge Name:	Stef van Grieken				
Score:	4.0				
Comment:	The applicant worked with several ngo's, however, their contributions were not clear.				
				4.3 / 5	
Judge Name:	Hennie van Vuuren				
Score:	4.3				
Comment:	This long standing project reflects extensive engagement with civil society organizations who have been involved in jointly nominating, validating and implementing the project.				
			2.2 / 5		
Judge Name:	Chris Vein				
Score:	2.2				
Comment:	The application does not clearly identify a consultation process for submitting this project for the award.				

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>
				3.3 / 5	
Judge Name:	Marija Novkovic				
Score:	3.3				
Comment:	There seems to be evidence of engagement through local conferences, focus groups and seminars.				
				3.7 / 5	
Judge Name:	Oluseun Onidbinde				
Score:	3.7				
Comment:	South Korea has empirical results but the application has not clearly shown how it incentivise target population to take action. It has also not stated its target population in empirical terms.				
				3.8 / 5	
Judge Name:	Stef van Grieken				
Score:	3.8				
Comment:	Citizens were engaged in the planning process of the lake. What their exact contributions were is still unknown				
				3.4 / 5	
Judge Name:	Hennie van Vuuren				
Score:	3.4				
Comment:	Following the first phase of implementation it appears that the regular 'conferences' have proven successful in promoting citizen engagement.				
				3 / 5	
Judge Name:	Chris Vein				
Score:	3.0				
Comment:	The application states that: "Since January 2004, a total of 352 conferences pertaining to the Sihwa district development project have been held" which is impressive. However, the application does not describe how residents are incentivized to continue to participate. The application does not seem to suggest a partnership with either CSOs or citizens.				

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>
			2.9 / 5		
Judge Name:	Marija Novkovic				
Score:	2.9				
Comment:	It seems like the citizens were able to influence the design of the Sihwa development project.				
				3.3 / 5	
Judge Name:	Oluseun Onidbinde				
Score:	3.3				
Comment:	The project for the span of the time that it had existed has shown considerable progress.				
				3.6 / 5	
Judge Name:	Stef van Grieken				
Score:	3.6				
Comment:	The program focussed on planning of a lake and industrial area. It doesn't seem to improve an actual service or change a policy.				
					4.9 / 5
Judge Name:	Hennie van Vuuren				
Score:	4.9				
Comment:	The applicants are able to show tangible, measurable, impact of results which is commendable. The apparent impact this project has had on the environment and the communities in the Shiwa district represents an example of the positive impact that can result from effective citizen engagement.				
				2.9 / 5	
Judge Name:	Chris Vein				
Score:	2.9				
Comment:	The application describes a number of outcomes that range from better planning to changes in the existing initiative as well as ongoing change.				

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>
			1.9 / 5		
Judge Name:	Marija Novkovic				
Score:	1.9				
Comment:	There is very little information based on which the sustainability of this initiative could be judged.				
				4.5 / 5	
Judge Name:	Oluseun Onidbinde				
Score:	4.5				
Comment:	The feedback from the citizens was good and also how they are impressed about the work that was done. Also how the challenges highlighted were met is also commendable. However, further potential challenges were not addressed.				
				3.2 / 5	
Judge Name:	Stef van Grieken				
Score:	3.2				
Comment:	The example seems to be related strongly to a local lake. It is hard to distill from the application whether it could scale.				
				4 / 5	
Judge Name:	Hennie van Vuuren				
Score:	4.0				
Comment:	The project has been implemented, over stages, for a ten year period which reflects commitment and investment in this approach. The proposal to replicate the project is an indicator of its success.				
				3.3 / 5	
Judge Name:	Chris Vein				
Score:	3.3				
Comment:	The application states that the results of this activity will be on going but does not talk about scaling it beyond this need. Since there has been a number of years since it was initiated, an opportunity exists to see it applied in other situations. The challenges in doing so were not discussed.				