

Submission ▼

Applicant Name: Croatia Team
Normalized Scores 76.3

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>
				4.2 / 5

Judge Name: Hernan Charosky
Score: 4.2
Comment: The reports on the evolution of consultation processes and the letter from the local chapter of Transparency International show that consultation and participation are key inputs of this proposal.

4.7 / 5

Judge Name: Salpi Ghazarian
Score: 4.7
Comment: The selection of Transparency Intl as the partner demonstrates seriousness. The additional cooperation with the government office on cooperation with NGOs demonstrates government buy-in, and also the mere existence of such an office points to seriousness on the part of the government to engage civil society.

3.3 / 5

Judge Name: Alex Irwan
Score: 3.3
Comment: It is not clear whether the CSO representatives are at par with their government counterparts in the Croatia's OGP Council. Did the CSO representatives participate meaningfully in the decision making or did they just rubber stamp what was proposed by the government representatives?

4.8 / 5

Judge Name: Alvaro Ramirez Alujas
Score: 4.8
Comment: This initiative is notable for focusing on the issue of expanding opportunities for citizen participation and promote greater accountability and improvements in government policies

4 / 5

Judge Name: Jorge Soto
Score: 4.0
Comment: There is a horizontal communication and feedback between organizations and government around OGP

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>
			3.2 / 5	

Judge Name: Hernan Charosky
Score: 3.2
Comment: Given the evidence of the increase of citizen responding government consultations, strengthening the institutional channels look like adequate incentives to steward this progressive evolution.

4.2 / 5

Judge Name: Salpi Ghazarian
Score: 4.2
Comment: New legislation that a. requires that all new draft legislation demonstrate citizen consultations and b. designs access to protect citizens' right to information and offers an enabling agency to support that right, are evidence of serious intent to seek citizen participation.

2.4 / 5

Judge Name: Alex Irwan
Score: 2.4
Comment: There is no online system for public consultations. Results of consultations have yet to be integrated into the government portal for easier public access.

4.7 / 5

Judge Name: Alvaro Ramirez Alujas
Score: 4.7
Comment: A great merit of this initiative is the change in attitude generated in the processes of consultation and participation, and the results achieved (eg 374 public consultations in 2013) It is a comprehensive strategy that goes beyond the regulatory and institutional mechanisms, incorporating a look inside the public sector (building the capacity of governing bodies) and innovative ways to incorporate a process with more dialogue with civil society

3.7 / 5

Judge Name: Jorge Soto
Score: 3.7
Comment: The channels for participation are not clear but the results and feedback shows impact

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>
			3.3 / 5	

Judge Name: Hernan Charosky
Score: 3.3
Comment: The idea of fully informing the citizenry about the result and impact of citizen participation in consultation processes is significant in terms of legitimizing and making sustainable participatory policies.

2.8 / 5

Judge Name: Salpi Ghazarian
Score: 2.8
Comment: The focus is more on formats of cooperation rather than the actual outcome of cooperation. If public policy or service is inclusion as a target itself, then it can be said that inclusion bred greater inclusion.

3 / 5

Judge Name: Alex Irwan
Score: 3.0
Comment: The program should show how much public inputs are accommodated in the final regulations. It should have a mechanism for the public to ensure that what they have proposed really change public policies to become more responsive to their needs.

4.4 / 5

Judge Name: Alvaro Ramirez Alujas
Score: 4.4
Comment: While evidence that presented on the results of applying the model is clear (as a process and openness to citizen participation), not the same for purposes of concrete results in terms of legislation or policy design

3.7 / 5

Judge Name: Jorge Soto
Score: 3.7
Comment: Clear evidence on the participation but not on how it was implemented and institutionalized

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>
		2.6 / 5		

Judge Name: Hernan Charosky
Score: 2.6
Comment: Even when the strategic outline of the initiative is clear in terms of providing citizens information to follow up to what extent participation works, it is not clear the series of steps neither the challenges the initiative would face.

4.6 / 5

Judge Name: Salpi Ghazarian
Score: 4.6
Comment: The initiative has been transformed to legislation that affects government agency activities, and establishes the office of commissioner to oversee continuous public access to information. This can only scale-up demand.

4.6 / 5

Judge Name: Alex Irwan
Score: 4.6
Comment: While the program has been institutionalized and training has been carried out to promote sustainability, mechanism to allow the public to monitor the implementation of the regulations has yet to be set up.

4.3 / 5

Judge Name: Alvaro Ramirez Alujas
Score: 4.3
Comment: The model can scaling and develop better because it has a strong normative and institutional basis, and an concrete experience that can expand your results and impact on the future

3.8 / 5

Judge Name: Jorge Soto
Score: 3.8
Comment: It is institutionalized but needs more concrete steps for what they are doing with the feedback