

Submission

Applicant Name: Tunisia Team
Normalized Scores 79.8

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>

3.5 / 5

Judge Name: Don Don Parafina
Score: 3.5
Comment: The OGP group (people involved in implementing OGP action plan) was the platform used to consult partners about the nomination. Consultation was done through email and the decision was made by the committee, which is different from the OGP group. A more deliberate process of reaching a broader consensus could make the selection more credible.

4.7 / 5

Judge Name: Justine Dupuys
Score: 4.7
Comment: according to the application, there is evidence of a large non governmental participation in the whole process of nominating, validating and jointly implementing the initiative.

3.6 / 5

Judge Name: Haidy Ear-Dupuy
Score: 3.6
Comment: Solicitation of projects were demonstrated however, a stronger description of how this project was selected would have strengthened the proposal.

3.6 / 5

Judge Name: Virginia Pardo
Score: 3.6
Comment: The selection was canalized in the framework of Open Government group and their representatives. Not open to the general process is conducted. The initiative is developed and produced exclusively by the government, but has support of Soc. Civil.

5 / 5

Judge Name: Ben Taylor
Score: 5.0
Comment: Jointly implemented, consulted in nomination, strong validation

JUDGING CRITERION # 2: STRENGTH AND INNOVATION IN OPEN GOVERNMENT APPROACHES (0-5)

Does the initiative make a compelling case of using open government approaches [e.g. increasing access to information, civic participation, public accountability and/or technology for transparency] to improve public service delivery?

0 - 1	1 - 2	2 - 3	3 - 4	4 - 5
<i>Exhibits a centralized, top-down approach to improving public services rather than public-facing approach; Target population largely have a passive role</i>	<i>Somewhat articulates the importance of using open government approaches but these are sporadic, not well-thought out; Needs of the target population is unclear</i>	<i>Makes a convincing case of the need to use open government approaches and addresses a need of the target population for improved public services</i>	<i>Establishes strong rationale for using open government approaches which are somewhat innovative; targets a large number of the population and clearly identifies a need</i>	<i>Employs innovative open government approaches given the country context; targets an ambitious number of the population and is responding to a real need or demand</i>

4.1 / 5

Judge Name: Don Don Parafina
Score: 4.1
Comment: Opening up procurement information and process to the public is always a laudable effort as it is risky. Need to supply more info on the extent of reach of the system, how friendly it is to various types of users, and how it's encouraging competition.

4.1 / 5

Judge Name: Justine Dupuys
Score: 4.1
Comment: The platform objective is to transparent and facilitate all the procurement process in Tunisia at the national level. This platform provides information through the use of modern technology and facilitates the process for suppliers. It also permits the citizens to access relevant and control the process. However, it is not clear that the citizen can monitor this process with success. The only way is to ask for more information emailing to a public officer.

4.1 / 5

Judge Name: Haidy Ear-Dupuy
Score: 4.1
Comment: Good demonstration of the need for the project. Not a new method to use e-procurement but it is a good step taken by the government in order to bring about more transparency and accessibility to more groups.

4.1 / 5

Judge Name: Virginia Pardo
Score: 4.1
Comment: The proposal presents a transparent technology solution for the management of state purchases. It is part of a solution to improve services directly to public purchasers and Suppliers alone. Strengthens the pillars of transparency and improved public management, although it is a pioneer in the region, is not seen as a highly innovative solution for the proposed theme.

5 / 5

Judge Name: Ben Taylor
Score: 5.0
Comment: Ambitious goals, innovative in the context. Unclear how wide the system is applied - is it optional / compulsory / in which situations?

JUDGING CRITERION # 3: EVIDENCE OF RESULTS (0-5)

Is there any evidence of the initiative achieving the four initiative outcomes listed in the application and/or concrete improvements in public services or access to services?

0 - 1	1 - 2	2 - 3	3 - 4	4 - 5
<i>Shows little evidence of achieving any of the outcomes or of an improvement in public services; target population has barely been reached</i>	<i>Shows some signs of achieving outcomes but the evidence is unconvincing; change in public service is incremental and has reached some of the target population</i>	<i>Demonstrates achieving one or more of the outcomes, but it is unclear whether the quality of the public service or access to the service has improved</i>	<i>Uses clear indicators to prove that one or more of the outcomes were achieved; initiative has widened access or improved the quality of a public service for more than half of the target population</i>	<i>Achieved two or more of the outcomes to ultimately expand access or improve service quality for a majority of the target population; set new standards for the relationship between government and citizens</i>

3.7 / 5

Judge Name: Don Don Parafina
Score: 3.7
Comment: Access to information is definitely enhanced, but there is no definite demonstration yet that it has been utilised by the broader public or the civil society. Such demonstration will indicate how useful and usable are the information and how friendly the system is.

4.5 / 5

Judge Name: Justine Dupuys
Score: 4.5
Comment: the platform is a very good effort to improve e-government and to transparent the procurement process. This platform has been improved in various public institutions at national level and can be scaled-up. It makes the process easier for suppliers and the citizen can access to a lot of information online. there is contract that have been signed by government after this new and transparent process but there is no clear and specific indicators of the success of this platform in term of fighting corruption.

3.2 / 5

Judge Name: Haidy Ear-Dupuy
Score: 3.2
Comment: Early phase of the project yet and not strong demonstration of results. Perhaps allowing a few years to operate would help create more results for the project. Should consider resubmitting after a few years.

2.9 / 5

Judge Name: Virginia Pardo
Score: 2.9
Comment: It is detailed in the proposed number of data use and access by users of the tool, as well as trained staff. No evidence of indicators of satisfaction, improved perception of the users, in order to check the social impact of the solution is shown. Unable to access the Web application to verify functionality, usability and content quality.

4.6 / 5

Judge Name: Ben Taylor
Score: 4.6
Comment: Excellent means for citizens to monitor procurement decisions.

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: Don Don Parafina
Score: 4.6
Comment: "Generalising" and popularising the practice are necessary steps to institutionalise the initiative as these allow the implementers to manage both internal and external influences.

4.4 / 5

Judge Name: Justine Dupuys
Score: 4.4
Comment: The government launched this initiative in 2013 and is now replicating the experience in different institutions. This model can be scaled up and replicate. there is a list of activities the government plan to do.

2.9 / 5

Judge Name: Haidy Ear-Dupuy
Score: 2.9
Comment: Good potential for sustainability, provided the communications plan for publicity of the system and the training on its use is to be continued.

3 / 5

Judge Name: Virginia Pardo
Score: 3.0
Comment: The proposal is presented from a technological point of view, as a tool to improve transparency and public procurement. It not reflected in the proposal process and methodology to ensure a substantial improvement of the process, users feedback, to ensure real impact on transparency and accountability.

4.2 / 5

Judge Name: Ben Taylor
Score: 4.2
Comment: Moves towards scaling up already in place. Unclear whether any changes to the legal and/or regulatory environment are also needed to fully embed the initiative. Also, no mention of any links with the international Open Contracting Partnership - which would help with sustainability.

JUDGING CRITERION # 5: SPECIAL RECOGNITION (0-5)

Does this open government initiative demonstrate that it successfully improved service delivery access and/or outcomes for a vulnerable population (e.g. poor, elderly, minorities, women), thereby promoting more inclusive development? *Please note that this criterion will not be used in the overall score.

0 - 1	1 - 2	2 - 3	3 - 4	4 - 5
<i>Select this range for No</i>	<i>Do Not Select</i>	<i>Do Not Select</i>	<i>Do Not Select</i>	<i>Select this range for Yes</i>

5 / 5

Judge Name: Don Don Parafina
Score: 5.0
Comment: The procurement process discussed here pertained to contracting only and did not touch on implementation. It may have effect on service delivery but it can be explicitly explained only through the processes related to contract implementation.

0 / 5

Judge Name: Justine Dupuys
Score: 0.0
Comment: there is no direct improvement for vulnerable population

0 / 5

Judge Name: Haidy Ear-Dupuy
Score: 0.0
Comment: Can potentially benefit more people as internet usability and understanding of the e-procurement platform increases.

0 / 5

Judge Name: Virginia Pardo
Score: 0.0
Comment: Initiative does not apply directly to vulnerable populations or specific sectors of the population that need special attention.

0 / 5

Judge Name: Ben Taylor
Score: 0.0
Comment: Initiative not specifically targeted at a particular poor or vulnerable group.