

Applicant Name: Georgia Team
Normalized Scores 69.9

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>

2 / 5

Judge Name: Mohamed Adnene Trojette
Score: 2.0
Comment: The initiative was nominated by the national coordination mechanism for OGP Georgia, after discussions in several meeting of the Forum, but with little evidence of collective brainstorming. Although the applicant claims this is a joint application, it does not seem to be the case: as its validation of claims letter shows it, the joint applicant was not involved in designing, implementing nor monitoring the initiative jointly with the government. Moreover, there is only one validation of claims, written by the co-chair of the Open Government Georgia's Forum (the other co-chair is a Government representative).

3.7 / 5

Judge Name: Tim Hughes
Score: 3.7
Comment: The initiative was selected through Georgia's Open Government Forum with civil society, but there appears to have been no consultation with stakeholders beyond the forum. The application is a joint application, but it is not clear what role the CSO listed had in developing or monitoring the initiative. The initiative has a strong letter of validation from civil society representatives.

4.4 / 5

Judge Name: Alvaro Ramirez Alujas
Score: 4.4
Comment: The initiative has the support and backing of civil society organizations (SCO).

4.3 / 5

Judge Name: Tania Sanchez
Score: 4.3
Comment: Not a lot of detail on how the initiative was selected, but it was a decision by the National OGP Fórum. It is a joint application, but is not jointly implemented. One letter of validation.

3.4 / 5

Judge Name: Ben Taylor
Score: 3.4
Comment: Jointed nominated and convincingly validated, but not jointly implemented.

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>

2.5 / 5

Judge Name: Mohamed Adnene Trojette
Score: 2.5
Comment: The initiative brings a new approach for G2C relations, as it allows citizens to provide with feedback on public services. However, access to the initiative requires filling in application forms at special desks located in public administrations, or to make a phone call. Digitalising these processes is only planned for the future.

4.3 / 5

Judge Name: Tim Hughes
Score: 4.3
Comment: The strong emphasis of the initiative of creating feedback loops to those who leave feedback is particularly to be commended. The initiative appears to be accessible to a large percentage of the population through the Public Service Halls, which the application states serves 28,400 customers a day. The application states that the initiative has been used on 1139 occasions, but it's not clear in the context of the number of daily visits the extent to which this is a success.

4.3 / 5

Judge Name: Alvaro Ramirez Alujas
Score: 4.3
Comment: It is an interesting initiative on how to involve more directly to citizens in the design and delivery of public services (from listening the voice of the people, their needs and problems accessing public services, and improve the delivering through a open participation process). It relates to civic participation to improve public service delivery.

3.8 / 5

Judge Name: Tania Sanchez
Score: 3.8
Comment: Voice of the Customer builds on a previous initiative, which is the Public Service Hall (PSH). It uses an open government approach to receive feedback from users and improve the PSH, allowing users to further shape it and track the results of the feedback they provide.

3.4 / 5

Judge Name: Ben Taylor
Score: 3.4
Comment: Not hugely innovative, but a good, solidly feedback mechanism, well designed to link quickly back to service providers.

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>

2.3 / 5

Judge Name: Mohamed Adnene Trojette
Score: 2.3
Comment: The initiative has started showing the achievement of outcomes, with 1,139 received applications and with the impact of feedback in providing more adequate public services. However, the overall improvement of public services remains unclear and it seems that much still needs to be done for the target population to be reached.

3.8 / 5

Judge Name: Tim Hughes
Score: 3.8
Comment: The application presents some clear case studies of public services responding to feedback and improving services as a result. However, it's unclear the extent to which this has taken place, and whether these changes have gone beyond one-off service improvements to help drive systemic changes in the way services are delivered.

3.8 / 5

Judge Name: Alvaro Ramirez Alujas
Score: 3.8
Comment: Lack of information on more robust indicators or metrics to assess the results and impact of the initiative. On the other hand and the logic of the principles of open government, the initiative should be called "the voice of the people" (given that access and quality of public services is related more to guarantee rights that simply serve clients - or customer concept).

3.9 / 5

Judge Name: Tania Sanchez
Score: 3.9
Comment: An indicator of the number of citizens who have provided their feedback through this system is clear; the idea is that it will have a direct impact in improving the provision of public services through the PSH.

3.4 / 5

Judge Name: Ben Taylor
Score: 3.4
Comment: Good feedback mechanism, engagement to date hasn't been very high.

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>

2.7 / 5

Judge Name: Mohamed Adnene Trojette
Score: 2.7
Comment: The applicant seems to have identified some of the flaws of the current solution and intends to address them in the near future, for instance through the digitalisation of the processes and the reaching of users on social networks.

3.6 / 5

Judge Name: Tim Hughes
Score: 3.6
Comment: The applicant sets out some plans for institutionalising the initiative, but does not list or address any risks or challenges. Possible areas to consider might be how to ensure widespread use of the feedback system across societal groups and how to use the system to develop systemic improvements across services and regions.

4 / 5

Judge Name: Alvaro Ramirez Alujas
Score: 4.0
Comment: This is an initiative that proves sustainable and useful for improving public services involving citizens.

3.4 / 5

Judge Name: Tania Sanchez
Score: 3.4
Comment: Does not discuss challenges, but describes how the initiative will be further developed and subject to being shared with other agencies.

2.9 / 5

Judge Name: Ben Taylor
Score: 2.9
Comment: Good links with service providers mean there is a clear means for scaling up, limited engagement means not certain that this will be achieved.

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: Mohamed Adnene Trojette
Score: 0.0
Comment: The initiative doesn't seem to address specific vulnerable populations, although it may help improve public services provided to them by allowing them to offer feedback.

0 / 5

Judge Name: Tim Hughes
Score: 0.0
Comment: The application does not make reference to improving service delivery access or outcomes for a vulnerable population. Evidence from other contexts suggests that vulnerable or excluded populations are underrepresented in using feedback mechanisms. Extra attention, therefore, needs to be given to engaging them.

5 / 5

Judge Name: Alvaro Ramirez Alujas
Score: 5.0
Comment: In the field of the open government's principles, the initiative should be called "the voice of the people" or "the voice of the citizens".

0 / 5

Judge Name: Tania Sanchez
Score: 0.0
Comment: The initiative does not target a vulnerable population; but rather to every person who uses the PHS.

0 / 5

Judge Name: Ben Taylor
Score: 0.0
Comment: Not specifically targeted at any vulnerable population.