

Applicant Name: Ghana Team
Normalized Scores 57.0

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> |

3 / 5

Judge Name: Jennifer Gustetic
Score: 3.0
Comment: consultation: not clear what their consultation process for selecting the initiative was though it seems there are CSOs on their steering committee (2) jointly implemented: worked with private sector to build and are going to be working with CSOs and the libraries to extend use (2.5) validation of claims: convincing (4)

3.4 / 5

Judge Name: Katju Holkeri
Score: 3.4

2.3 / 5

Judge Name: Alex Irwan
Score: 2.3
Comment: The initiative was selected by the Ghana Open Government Partnership Steering Committee, which members are from the government and civil society. However, there is no explanation whether the civil society representatives are at par with their government counterparts or whether the government representatives actually dominate decision making.

3.1 / 5

Judge Name: Gertrude Muguzi
Score: 3.1
Comment: The decision was made by the OGP steering committee without wider consultation. Although some may say that the OGP Steering Committee does have representation from various sectors of society, it is still a small group that cannot be said to fairly represent the breadth of organisations in the project's target group. Validation was only from the partner organisation. No additional external user validation was provided.

3.7 / 5

Judge Name: Tiago Peixoto
Score: 3.7
Comment: The initiative mentions that the nomination was done e initiative was selected by the "Ghana Open Government Partnership Steering Committee." However it is not clear if the project was jointly implemented nor the extent to which relevant stakeholders have been consulted.

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> |

2.6 / 5

Judge Name: Jennifer Gustetic
Score: 2.6
Comment: incentives: it appears they spent the first couple years trying to build the platform and are just now getting into encouraging more use through things like hackathons. unclear what incentives they'll offer other than the intrinsic motivators of those participating (1.5) feedback methods: There is a "feedback" link with a form to email in feedback about the site. They have communities to drive use of some types of data in specific service/ topic areas. The communities have forums and blogs specific to those issue areas that might ultimately elect more meaningful and specific feedback. Unclear how the feedback that comes in through these forums will be suggested back to the decision makers to ultimately influence decisions. (2) level of engagement: their clicks are increasing every month and there are many downloads but unclear how these clicks are improving government services, yet. (2)

2.7 / 5

Judge Name: Katju Holkeri
Score: 2.7
Comment: There is good work on building the Open data community and some innovative ideas like the roadshow and TV-show to encourage and teach, but these have not yet been realised. So good but still work to be done.

3.6 / 5

Judge Name: Alex Irwan
Score: 3.6
Comment: Citizens can rate and comment on data sets, request new data sets and send feedback to government agencies. Outreach are also conducted to get more citizens and businesses to use the open data portal. Hackatons will be held to develop more applications for use by citizens.

2.1 / 5

Judge Name: Gertrude Muguzi
Score: 2.1
Comment: While having a portal is useful, given that less than 15% of the Ghanaian population use the internet (World Bank data) I would question whether this is the best initiative to make data available to the public. The website as is currently laid out is not easy to navigate for an average user and contains too much IT jargon on the home page. It is therefore unclear how feedback has been used to inform the design. If your target were only business and the elite public, I would have been more convinced,

2.6 / 5

Judge Name: Tiago Peixoto
Score: 2.6
Comment: At this stage it seems that the largest output from the initiative is the existence of an open data portal which, per se, is not an avenue for citizen engagement nor an avenue to influence policy / service design or implementation.

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> |

2.2 / 5

Judge Name: Jennifer Gustetic
Score: 2.2
Comment: since the platform is still at its early stages they don't have many stories for how use of the data or apps has improved a decision or a public service yet. those stories over the coming years will be important to ultimately determine the success of this platform. this is a god start but it's not showing engagement in decision making results, yet.

1.7 / 5

Judge Name: Katju Holkeri
Score: 1.7
Comment: Shows promising amounts of open data but the profits of the open data still remain fully to be seen, due to the fact that the initiative is still rather young, but has potential.

2.5 / 5

Judge Name: Alex Irwan
Score: 2.5
Comment: The program has not reached the stage where citizens use the data to influence a public policy of service. It is still at an early stage where citizen participate in the development of the open data portal and the development of applications.

2.4 / 5

Judge Name: Gertrude Muguzi
Score: 2.4
Comment: No evidence of change in government policy or service delivery resulting from this initiative was presented. My understanding is that the initiative is still in its testing phase. It is therefore too early to gather this type of information.

2.7 / 5

Judge Name: Tiago Peixoto
Score: 2.7
Comment: The initiative remains a "transparency project" at this stage, and shows no evidence of change in policies or service delivery.

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> |

4.6 / 5

Judge Name: Jennifer Gustetic
Score: 4.6
Comment: They have secured funding for 2015 (congrats!) to do even more so I'm sure they'll see more engagement in the future. They should focus on use of the data and encouraging use in domains that are open to public feedback and help in the way services are delivered.

2.3 / 5

Judge Name: Katju Holkeri
Score: 2.3
Comment: It seems there is hope at the moment, but also challenges so not yet on completely solid ground.

2.3 / 5

Judge Name: Alex Irwan
Score: 2.3
Comment: There is no mention that the government is planning to institutionalize GODI by passing a law or regulation. It is mentioned that the government has earmarked \$1 million dollar for the eTransform program which could be used to finance GODI. But the allocation is for 2015 and it remains to be seen whether the government would keep the promise and how much of those would be used to support GODI.

3.5 / 5

Judge Name: Gertrude Muguzi
Score: 3.5
Comment: An earmarked budget in a low to middle income country for an initiative such as this one is a demonstration of commitment. The question is whether this is the best initiative to commit to to reach the identified target audience. The project may have focused on the average citizen as an indirect user (eg via the media) and not a direct one but that is not what is stated in the submission. More clarity on how the project intends to address the challenge of limited internet usage needs to be elaborated.

3.7 / 5

Judge Name: Tiago Peixoto
Score: 3.7
Comment: The initiative seem to have funding secured for 2015 and it is stated that additional funding will be sought. Nevertheless, it seems that no further strategic thinking in terms of sustainability or continuity.