

Applicant Name: Italy Team
Normalized Scores 85.5

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>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>

4.8 / 5

Judge Name: Ma'i Elimat
Score: 4.8
Comment: (1) The consultation process for the nomination of the initiative was strongly evident. The public consultation period was very limited though (one week). I recommend in future consultation processes to increase the length of the period to obtain better feedback. (2) The applicant provided clear evidence as well on the partnerships during the implementation with clear role of each partner. The validation of claims was also strongly presented.

5 / 5

Judge Name: Katju Holkeri
Score: 5.0
Comment:

5 / 5

Judge Name: Gertrude Muguzi
Score: 5.0
Comment: The selection process was open to the public and inclusive and the initiative was chosen from 4 nominated initiatives with 82% of a public web-based vote.

4.6 / 5

Judge Name: Oluseun Onidbinde
Score: 4.6
Comment: Strong evidence as regards nomination as separate ideas were considered.

5 / 5

Judge Name: Alvaro Ramirez Alujas
Score: 5.0
Comment: It has a strong commitment and support of all stakeholders involved in the initiative (and beyond)

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: Ma'i Elimat
Score: 3.2
Comment: (1) The applicant didn't make it very clear on the incentives for participation. It rather focus on the initiative impact of engaging more citizens, and address their feedback, and the benefits they can get from this initiative (which maybe the applicant considered as incentives). I would recommend more innovative incentives to encourage citizens to participate and benefit from the initiative. (3) I liked very much engaging the school students which was innovative way to solicit citizens especially with this generation. (4) The applicant didn't make it clear on how the feedback from the citizens "the monitoring reports through Monithon " is being used.

4.3 / 5

Judge Name: Katju Holkeri
Score: 4.3
Comment: The initiative is excellent in giving out information and in allowing citizens to monitor and increasing citizen engagement. Almost perfect but there could be still a stronger aspect on citizens actually being engaged in the decision-making processes.

3.2 / 5

Judge Name: Gertrude Muguzi
Score: 3.2
Comment: The selection of a monitoring focus that is high on the public agenda provided an incentive for the public to want to be involved. The linking of the open data portal with a form of social audit makes the exercise a fun learning experience. It also creates a culture for future adults to get used to engaging with data from an early age. Data is only updated every 2 months. This is a problem if data is to be accessed early enough to enable civic engagement.

4.9 / 5

Judge Name: Oluseun Onidbinde
Score: 4.9
Comment: Strong partnership with leading civil society groups makes a strong claim on engagement across board. Full marks to 4 points cannot be awarded as it has not reached half of the target population.

3.6 / 5

Judge Name: Alvaro Ramirez Alujas
Score: 3.6
Comment: It is a good tool / project to follow up and monitor initiatives on open government in Italy (particularly in the axle linked to focus in open data and reuse of public sector information)

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>

4.3 / 5

Judge Name: Ma'i Elimat
Score: 4.3
Comment: I found that this is very innovative initiative that really created impact on the life of citizens, and the cooperation between CSOs and the government toward more transparency in the public fund especially with the country contexts.

4.7 / 5

Judge Name: Katju Holkeri
Score: 4.7
Comment:

4.2 / 5

Judge Name: Gertrude Muguzi
Score: 4.2
Comment: The evidence presented in terms of changed policy is with the Ministry of Education where their validation letter indicates that they have recently instructed the the OpenCohesion school project be rolled out to all public schools. This is a significant impact of the project on how the government conducts its business.

4.9 / 5

Judge Name: Oluseun Onidbinde
Score: 4.9
Comment: Engaging top civil society organizations to the use of the platform and also allowing them to use different approaches is commendable and it shows that there have been significant benefits of the project to the civil society and citizens.

3.9 / 5

Judge Name: Alvaro Ramirez Alujas
Score: 3.9
Comment: Presents sufficient information on results achieved, especially at the local level/communities (civic monitoring and focus in schools)

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>

4.3 / 5

Judge Name: Ma'i Elimat
Score: 4.3
Comment: (1) The path for sustainability of the initiative and scale it up is clearly outlined. However, (2) The applicant didn't outline and projected challenges or how to overcome these challenges. (i.e. resistance of some political targets to such initiative, financial constraints, etc.)

4.8 / 5

Judge Name: Katju Holkeri
Score: 4.8
Comment:

3.8 / 5

Judge Name: Gertrude Muguzi
Score: 3.8
Comment: The pathway to sustainability is clear but until the second phase of funding is approved, it is uncertain. The Department has also articulated plans to improve the portal in ways that will attract more users. The adoption of the approach in other sectors of government and society will definitely continue to sustainability and is clear evidence of the project being scaled up.

2.7 / 5

Judge Name: Oluseun Onidbinde
Score: 2.7
Comment: A good case to scale platforms but this has not fully addressed how challenges faced with adoption of projects will be handled.

4.3 / 5

Judge Name: Alvaro Ramirez Alujas
Score: 4.3
Comment: This is a consolidated and institutionalized initiative with active participation of stakeholders beyond government and enjoys an attractive approach towards civic monitoring, engaging society on issues of open government and to promote accountability and active participation from others communities (researchers, journalists, etc.)