Submission

Applicant Name: Estonia Team
Normalized Scores 86.8

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
Showed no consultation in nominating an initiative; may have been jointly implemented but shows very weak validation of claims	*Some effort in consulting with other partners in nominating an initiative; initiative was not jointly implemented but provided minimal validation of claims*	*Provided sufficient evidence of consulting with other partners to nominate an initiative, was jointly implemented and presented somewhat convincing validation of claims.*	*Demonstrated compelling mechanisms for consulting others in nominating an initiative; was not jointly implemented but shows convincing validation of claims*	*Shows strong evidence of consulting others in nominating an initiative; jointly implemented with a partner agency and strong validation of claims*

3.2 / 5

Judge Name: Mohamed Adnene Trojette
Score: 3.2
Comment: Nomination was suggested by the Government, in consultation with civil society and government partners in format of Coordinating Body for the OGP National Action Plan. A think tank and the Estonian Chamber of Commerce and Industry validated the claims.

3.5 / 5

Judge Name: Bernadette Leon
Score: 3.5
Comment: This submission was nominated through the coordinating committee for the OGP action plan and is a project in the action plan. It does not appear to be jointly implemented with an NGO but is an initiative of a number of government departments working together and the letters of support from NGOs provide convincing evidence of support for this initiative.

3.3 / 5

Judge Name: Gertrude Muguzi
Score: 3.3
Comment: This initiative was nominated by government with some consultation with non-government actors. Validation comprised of letters from one private sector and one research institution. the initiative was implemented by government as part of the OGP Action plan, which by its very nature requires consultation beyond government.

4.1 / 5

Judge Name: Bibhu Prasad Sahu
Score: 4.1
Comment: Evidence need to be more convincing. Active participation of civil society not demonstrated clearly.

3.3 / 5

Judge Name: Ben Taylor
Score: 3.3
Comment: Validation is fine, but there is little evidence of partnership (with civil society) in implementation

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
Exhibits a centralized, top-down approach to improving public services rather than public-facing approach; Target population largely have a passive role	*Somewhat articulates the importance of using open government approaches but these are sporadic, not well-thought out; Needs of the target population is unclear*	*Makes a convincing case of the need to use open government approaches and addresses a need of the target population for improved public services*	*Establishes strong rationale for using open government approaches which are somewhat innovative; targets a large number of the population and clearly identifies a need*	*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*

4.6 / 5

Judge Name: Mohamed Adnene Trojette
Score: 4.6
Comment: Two ambitious targets: 1. the first is the direct target -> non residents 2. the second is indirect -> the Estonian people who benefit from non residents investing in Estonia. The initiative is based on a governmental start-up approach, with fast and agile processes, numerous iterations with users.

4.5 / 5

Judge Name: Bernadette Leon
Score: 4.5
Comment: Using a digital platform to enable easier and open access to government services and information for foreign business and students is extremely innovative - targeting this foreign business and student community is particularly relevant in the content of shrinking economies and he need to be an attractive destination for investment.

5 / 5

Judge Name: Gertrude Muguzi
Score: 5.0
Comment: What I like most about this innovation is that it identified an initiative based on the unique context and reinterpreted the brief to suit the local situation. A country with a population that is less than 30% of most African cities and with a very advanced online transparency potentially reaching over 80% of the population, it makes total sense to go beyond one's borders to increase opportunities for local residents by making the environment attractive to foreign investors. This initiative does exactly that.

4.2 / 5

Judge Name: Bibhu Prasad Sahu
Score: 4.2
Comment: Use of technology commendable. Civic participation and public accountability is not convinced. More cases need to demonstrate.

4.9 / 5

Judge Name: Ben Taylor
Score: 4.9
Comment: A very ambitious project in terms of scale, very innovative use of technology. Globally ground-breaking.

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
Shows little evidence of achieving any of the outcomes or of an improvement in public services; target population has barely been reached	*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*	*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*	*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*	*Achieved two or more of the outcomes to ultimately expand access or improve service quality for a majority of the target population; yet new standards for the relationship between government and citizens*

4.9 / 5

Judge Name: Mohamed Adnene Trojette
Score: 4.9
Comment: Non residents and non native residents have better access to information on public services. Incidently, residents and citizens get access to better and simpler public services, for instance entrepreneurs. Qualifying the public version beta allows Government to be in touch with users for a continuous improvement of the service, and also a more intense involvement of residents and non residents. The goal set for the target population was overreached in the first six months.

4 / 5

Judge Name: Bernadette Leon
Score: 4.0
Comment: At least 2 of the outcomes were achieved, being improving access to services and providing opportunities for service users to give inputs into designing service improvements. Although the initiative is relatively young, the information provided shows that a large number of potential business users are using the system from more than 90 countries.

4.5 / 5

Judge Name: Gertrude Muguzi
Score: 4.5
Comment: The initiative exceeded its annual target population, although the target population seems small for a world wide playing field, it is really only targeting business people eligible and interested to conduct business in Estonia. I am not sure how big this target is and how their results compares to the target group. Assuming they assessed their target correctly, their reach has been impressive. The quality of service for potential residents has clearly improved. This is an innovative way to market the country as a gateway into the EU without the unnecessary bureaucracy. Because foreign investment also normally spurs local investment, this is a good way for a small, sparsely populated country with limited options to take control of its own development.

4.1 / 5

Judge Name: Bibhu Prasad Sahu
Score: 4.1
Comment: Not convinced citizen participation in design and delivery and making a social audit.

4.4 / 5

Judge Name: Ben Taylor
Score: 4.4
Comment: I have interpreted "citizens" to include citizens of other countries, as they are the target population here. The initiative has impressively improved access to services by non-residents.

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
Demonstrates few plans in moving the initiative beyond the pilot stage; does not address any potential threats or challenges to the initiative	*Shows some commitment to institutionalizing the initiative; but presents unrealistic ways of managing challenges faced by the initiative*	*Lists activities to institutionalize the initiative; but only somewhat addresses how challenges will be addressed*	*Outlines a clear path to either institutionalize or scale-up the initiative; makes a good case on how potential challenges will be addressed*	*Presents a durable model that can be institutionalized and/or scaled-up; makes a compelling case for how challenges will be managed*

5 / 5

Judge Name: Mohamed Adnene Trojette
Score: 5.0
Comment: The initiative is already part of the more global e-Estonia programme. It is already widely open to the public. Registration is even open to "fans of e-Residency". According to the applicant, sustainability strongly depends on the ability to continuously improve services provided by the initiative.

5 / 5

Judge Name: Bernadette Leon
Score: 5.0
Comment: There appears to be a rigorous monitoring of the demand for this service and constant flexible re-design to expand the services offered through this platform. The challenge would be to have the resources to quickly expand and adjust and to manage this risk they are managing this as a high-priority project with Cabinet oversight, which is good strategy to ensuring resources can be mobilised quickly.

4.9 / 5

Judge Name: Gertrude Muguzi
Score: 4.9
Comment: This is an income generating initiative which makes it more likely to remain a priority in allocation of resources than other transparency initiatives. Provided the system continues to operate efficiently and attract investment that grows the economy, it is difficult to see how the initiative would not be something that the government would continue to invest in. Constant communication with government with a view to remaining in line with the country's economic aspirations has also been presented as the primary means through which challenges will be addressed.

4.4 / 5

Judge Name: Bibhu Prasad Sahu
Score: 4.4
Comment: Sustainability action plan is good and risk mitigation plan looks OK.

5 / 5

Judge Name: Ben Taylor
Score: 5.0
Comment: Has already been institutionalised and is growing rapidly.

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
Select this range for No	*Do Not Select*	*Do Not Select*	*Do Not Select*	*Select this range for Yes*

0 / 5

Judge Name: Mohamed Adnene Trojette
Score: 0.0
Comment: The initiative is not particularly designed for a vulnerable population. However, it concerns foreigners.

5 / 5

Judge Name: Bernadette Leon
Score: 5.0
Comment: This initiative is not targeted at the traditional vulnerable groups BUT to some extend it does target non-residents and is aimed at improving access to government for them. Given that, for non-resident businesses and students it can be daunting got access government, this initiative promote their inclusion.

0 / 5

Judge Name: Gertrude Muguzi
Score: 0.0
Comment: There is no mention of vulnerable groups as direct beneficiaries or of efforts towards greater societal inclusiveness.

5 / 5

Judge Name: Bibhu Prasad Sahu
Score: 5.0
Comment: Not sufficiently convinced. No clear demonstration of beneficiaries and target population. Citizen participation in design, delivery services and monitoring.

0 / 5

Judge Name: Ben Taylor
Score: 0.0
Comment: Not a service aimed particularly at a vulnerable group.