

Submission

Applicant Name: United States 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>

4.4 / 5

Judge Name: Siapha Kamara
Score: 4.4
Comment: The application , references and video confirmed the section process was a joint effort of the OGP stakeholders including civil society

3.4 / 5

Judge Name: Bernadette Leon
Score: 3.4
Comment: It appears that the initiative was nominated by the OPGP working committee so some consultation did take place. The support letters do provide a strong basis to validate support for this initiative - but the support letters are from research institutions who study the initiative but who are not partners in implementing or using the service. It is said that, during the design process, NGOs who work in the digital area were consulted.

4.9 / 5

Judge Name: Tiago Peixoto
Score: 4.9
Comment: Shows strong evidence in consulting nomination and it is a truly collaborative effort.

4.6 / 5

Judge Name: Radu Puchiu
Score: 4.6
Comment: The applicant showed strong evidence of consulting with experts on the subject from inside and outside of government, through various ways of interaction (in-person Open Government Working Group meeting, the online U.S. Open Government Discussion Group, and outreach to members of the public.)

4.5 / 5

Judge Name: Ritva Reinikka
Score: 4.5
Comment: Federal Government is partnering with a large number of cities (local governments) that are implementing the Open311 initiative. Open source apps have been/are being developed by CSOs, their coalitions and even the general public for various Open311 interfaces. Several large US foundations provide funding for the initiative. Researchers are actively involved in assessing impact. Gov. consulted CSOs through in-person Open Government Working Group on the submission. Several experts inside and outside government were also consulted. Validation is based on several relevant expert views, including solid empirical evidence produced on the initiative. One major transparency CSO (Sunlight Foundation) also endorses it.

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>

4.8 / 5

Judge Name: Siapha Kamara
Score: 4.8
Comment: This is an innovative approach employing different open government approaches to get citizens and government to work simultaneously on diverse issues at different levels-state, city and community

2.8 / 5

Judge Name: Bernadette Leon
Score: 2.8
Comment: The Open311 ecosystem is innovative, not only because of its current use by US cities but because it provides such an open and flexible platform on which cities and governments can design different types of engagements forums with citizens and between citizens. As such it responds to a need for more modern engagement approaches and can potentially target a large population although in this submission it is not clear what the user size is.

5 / 5

Judge Name: Tiago Peixoto
Score: 5.0
Comment: Very compelling case on how to use technology to improve access to service delivery.

4.8 / 5

Judge Name: Radu Puchiu
Score: 4.8
Comment: The initiative shows a innovative participatory way for governments to deliver services to citizens. It also provides a platform to build community through collective problem solving.

4.4 / 5

Judge Name: Ritva Reinikka
Score: 4.4
Comment: The initiative, which comes across as a strong multi-faceted partnership, uses practically all open government approaches. First, its essence is making use of the most modern technology for transparency in government. Second, public accountability is at the heart of Open311 as each submission (complaint) by the public and the response to it by local government are publicly available. Response scores are also calculated by city and available on the web. Third, civic participation is another key element as it is the public that submits the cases to local governments/cities, while CSOs and others have developed/are developing the platforms/interfaces. Fourth, all this results in a massive increase in access to information and openness in addressing problems in service delivery. On the negative, it takes time before the web sites and apps become common knowledge -- and there might be an overload of information.

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>

4.1 / 5

Judge Name: Siapha Kamara
Score: 4.1
Comment: This is an effective citizen feedback mechanism but creates opportunities for citizen government engagement to address specific issues

2.8 / 5

Judge Name: Bernadette Leon
Score: 2.8
Comment: I feel that the information provided is limited, making it difficult to assess real outcome and widened access. It is clear that more and more cities are using the platform so we can assume wider access to more responsive complaints systems for citizens - but insufficient information in this application.

5 / 5

Judge Name: Tiago Peixoto
Score: 5.0
Comment: All of the outcomes are met, and the publicization of public complaints sets new standards for the relationship between government and citizens.

4.5 / 5

Judge Name: Radu Puchiu
Score: 4.5
Comment: More than two outcomes were reached. It is clearly presented and documented the impact of the initiative in terms of improving the service delivery through civic participation.

3.7 / 5

Judge Name: Ritva Reinikka
Score: 3.7
Comment: The application lists real-time citizen monitoring, new ways for cities to interact, etc. as objectives. These represent more the means rather than the ends, which would be increase in access to and improvement in the quality of services. In a similar vein, top academic institutions have produced solid evidence on the initiative, but less so on results. One study showed that attitudes towards government had improved -- but it did not say anything about actual results. Another examined which groups were more likely to use Open311. These studies provide relevant and high-quality information but at the same time raise a question: are these factors reflected in outputs and outcomes? How much is Open311 improving service delivery? Or, is it still too early to say? A convincing piece of evidence comes from San Francisco where Open311 cases now account 25% of the city's service requests. Many people know the old 311 phone number but I am not sure how well known Open311 is.

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>

4.7 / 5

Judge Name: Siapha Kamara
Score: 4.7
Comment: This initiative provides evidence of institutionalization of the model in different economic and technology contexts- developed and developing countries

3.6 / 5

Judge Name: Bernadette Leon
Score: 3.6
Comment: There is no clear description of how to scale up the initiative or how challenges will be managed BUT because of the flexibility of the platform the scale-up happens on its own as the platform is constantly being used and adapted within USA and also internationally.

4.9 / 5

Judge Name: Tiago Peixoto
Score: 4.9
Comment: The model is durable as it is embedded into governments IT systems and follows a decentralized patten of co-production that ensures sustainability.

4.5 / 5

Judge Name: Radu Puchiu
Score: 4.5
Comment: The initiative is clearly a model to be scaled-up. It helped foster sharing and reuse of tools in other cities at international level by sharing its open source system.

4.1 / 5

Judge Name: Ritva Reinikka
Score: 4.1
Comment: The application outlines a path for extension domestically and internationally. The initiative appears sustainable given how many US cities are already part of it -- and e-government will no doubt expand everywhere in the world over time. The application does not list any challenges, however. One wonders: will this be the model the general public adopts? Will it increase access to and improve the quality of services? How does one know? Will the tech partners continue their efforts. One of the web sites mentioned in the application was already discontinued. Maybe it fulfilled its tasks or others took over?

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>

0 / 5

Judge Name: Siapha Kamara
Score: 0.0
Comment: There is no evidence of the initiative being used to reach or improve services for the most marginalized but it is possible for example a person with disability can use mobile phone to call 311

0 / 5

Judge Name: Bernadette Leon
Score: 0.0
Comment: The initiative does not specifically target improved service delivery outcomes for vulnerable groups.

5 / 5

Judge Name: Tiago Peixoto
Score: 5.0
Comment: Yes, this is one of the few cases where there is evidence that disadvantaged groups are using the services.

5 / 5

Judge Name: Radu Puchiu
Score: 5.0
Comment: The application cited a study published in the Public Administration Review showing that "lower-income residents as well as young, college-aged individuals were more likely to use the Open311-enabled smartphone app than the traditional phone number or website." Also, due to the possibility to reuse the model platform, other organizations implemented similar project in other countries like Mozambique.

5 / 5

Judge Name: Ritva Reinikka
Score: 5.0
Comment: This initiative is aimed at the general public. One of the studies mentioned in the application found that poorer people may not use the service as much as better-off do. At the same time, the effort/cost required to contact government has been made small. If the counterfactual is the old system, Open311 may turn out to be quite inclusive.