

Submission

Applicant Name: Netherlands Team  
Normalized Scores 72.9

**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>
<input type="text" value="4.3 / 5"/>				
<p><b>Judge Name:</b> Justine Dupuys <b>Score:</b> 4.3 <b>Comment:</b> This initiative is jointly implemented and has a whole process of online selection opened to citizenship at both nomination and selection levels. the validation of claim is not so convincing</p> <input type="text" value="3 / 5"/>				
<p><b>Judge Name:</b> Haidy Ear-Dupuy <b>Score:</b> 3.0 <b>Comment:</b> Partnership with private entity is listed. The consultation and calling for nomination could be strengthened. It was difficult to know how many nomination was received and whether or not the selected project was the most competitive one.</p> <input type="text" value="5 / 5"/>				
<p><b>Judge Name:</b> Virginia Pardo <b>Score:</b> 5.0 <b>Comment:</b> Selection process was conducted through open call website within the framework of Open Government, together with a voting process. The initiative is endorsed and was presented by referring to Governance and Civil Society.</p> <input type="text" value="2.6 / 5"/>				
<p><b>Judge Name:</b> Alvaro Ramirez Alujas <b>Score:</b> 2.6 <b>Comment:</b> While it is not part of the OGP action plan, it has the support of a private organization.</p> <input type="text" value="4.7 / 5"/>				
<p><b>Judge Name:</b> Ben Taylor <b>Score:</b> 4.7 <b>Comment:</b> Implemented in partnership, submitted in partnership. Lack of a validation letter.</p>				

**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>
<input type="text" value="4.4 / 5"/>				
<p><b>Judge Name:</b> Justine Dupuys <b>Score:</b> 4.4 <b>Comment:</b> By the mean of new technology, the initiative improves the exchange and debate between citizenship and government on public issues in order to design public policies. The platform tries to trigger the debate on social issues in order to co-elaborate solutions to social problems. The platform promotes information exchange, nevertheless it isn't clear that this initiative permits access to more information and accountability and which kind of solutions are going to be implemented.</p> <input type="text" value="3.8 / 5"/>				
<p><b>Judge Name:</b> Haidy Ear-Dupuy <b>Score:</b> 3.8 <b>Comment:</b> The project is innovative, but could use some publicity to encourage more use. Has the potential to be a good source for debate on problem facing government. However, need to demonstrate a strong engagement plan on how to get people to participate on this online platform. Could have benefited from a discussion on how many percentage of the people are online and are using the platform.</p> <input type="text" value="4.9 / 5"/>				
<p><b>Judge Name:</b> Virginia Pardo <b>Score:</b> 4.9 <b>Comment:</b> The proposal present a tool for citizen participation to improve the perception of citizens about democracy, and close the gap with the state. It allows, in an innovative and collaborative way to strengthen the management and generation of ideas for local government Utrecht. Strengthens the pillars of transparency, collaboration and participation of the Open Government through a tool easy to use and accessible to citizens.</p> <input type="text" value="3.5 / 5"/>				
<p><b>Judge Name:</b> Alvaro Ramirez Alujas <b>Score:</b> 3.5 <b>Comment:</b> While it is a digital platform to structure and organize debates to improve local services, it remains unclear results and practical impact.</p> <input type="text" value="3.9 / 5"/>				
<p><b>Judge Name:</b> Ben Taylor <b>Score:</b> 3.9 <b>Comment:</b> Reasonably compelling use of technology to increase public participation in policy making.</p>				

**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 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>
<input type="text" value="3 / 5"/>				
<p><b>Judge Name:</b> Justine Dupuys <b>Score:</b> 3.0 <b>Comment:</b> The platform was launched recently so there is few evidence of its success.</p> <input type="text" value="2.5 / 5"/>				
<p><b>Judge Name:</b> Haidy Ear-Dupuy <b>Score:</b> 2.5 <b>Comment:</b> The initiative is at an early phase and does not have enough time to show its success. Perhaps in a few years we can see the success.</p> <input type="text" value="3.6 / 5"/>				
<p><b>Judge Name:</b> Virginia Pardo <b>Score:</b> 3.6 <b>Comment:</b> Evidence of use by citizens is checked through the ideas incorporated in the website itself. Is not reflected in the proposal that guarantees a subsequent process management ideas from the government, in this case the local government, as well as implementations of the ideas raised.</p> <input type="text" value="3.8 / 5"/>				
<p><b>Judge Name:</b> Alvaro Ramirez Alujas <b>Score:</b> 3.8 <b>Comment:</b> Lack detail and information on metrics and indicators to assess the results and impact of the proposed initiative.</p> <input type="text" value="3.3 / 5"/>				
<p><b>Judge Name:</b> Ben Taylor <b>Score:</b> 3.3 <b>Comment:</b> Still early, but engagement levels so far have been disappointing.</p>				

**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>
<input type="text" value="4.4 / 5"/>				
<p><b>Judge Name:</b> Justine Dupuys <b>Score:</b> 4.4 <b>Comment:</b> this initiative is implemented at subnational governmental level and can be scaled-up by replicating the model in other local government or at national level.</p> <input type="text" value="2.9 / 5"/>				
<p><b>Judge Name:</b> Haidy Ear-Dupuy <b>Score:</b> 2.9 <b>Comment:</b> Did not address sustainability question. Assumption of sustainability and that online users are responsive.</p> <input type="text" value="3 / 5"/>				
<p><b>Judge Name:</b> Virginia Pardo <b>Score:</b> 3.0 <b>Comment:</b> The proposal is well presented from the technological point of view, as an innovative tool for participation. It is not proven the sustainability of the process and methodology to ensure processing, commitment, and feedback of the organism to carry out the ideas.</p> <input type="text" value="3.2 / 5"/>				
<p><b>Judge Name:</b> Alvaro Ramirez Alujas <b>Score:</b> 3.2 <b>Comment:</b> It seems sustainable, at least locally. The experience could be useful in other contexts and scale be applied to other local governments or public services.</p> <input type="text" value="3.1 / 5"/>				
<p><b>Judge Name:</b> Ben Taylor <b>Score:</b> 3.1 <b>Comment:</b> Need to address the challenge of increasing participation levels, but has clear potential for scaling up on a big scale.</p>				

**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>
<input type="text" value="0 / 5"/>				
<p><b>Judge Name:</b> Justine Dupuys <b>Score:</b> 0.0 <b>Comment:</b> however the platform tries to focus the debate on social problems, it is not clear that it will improve the service delivery access and outcomes for a vulnerable population.</p> <input type="text" value="0 / 5"/>				
<p><b>Judge Name:</b> Haidy Ear-Dupuy <b>Score:</b> 0.0 <b>Comment:</b> It is a good project from technology perspective however, can easily marginalized those who do not use internet and are not able to access it for one reason or another.</p> <input type="text" value="0 / 5"/>				
<p><b>Judge Name:</b> Virginia Pardo <b>Score:</b> 0.0 <b>Comment:</b> Initiative does not apply directly to vulnerable populations or specific sectors of the population that need special attention</p> <input type="text" value="5 / 5"/>				
<p><b>Judge Name:</b> Alvaro Ramirez Alujas <b>Score:</b> 5.0 <b>Comment:</b> The initiative enhances a debate on improving public services and policies, involving citizens through the digital platform.</p> <input type="text" value="0 / 5"/>				
<p><b>Judge Name:</b> Ben Taylor <b>Score:</b> 0.0 <b>Comment:</b> not applicable - target community is internet-connected people in a wealthy, democratic community.</p>				