

Applicant Name: Brazil Team
Normalized Scores 80.5

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>

5 / 5

Judge Name: Mohamed Adnene Trojette
Score: 5.0
Comment: Non-government organisations were involved in: 1. nominating the initiative (call for projects). 2. validating the initiative (vote by citizens). 3. implementing the initiative (8 projects could receive subsidies). However, the application was not jointly-submitted to the OGP.

4.5 / 5

Judge Name: Don Don Parafina
Score: 4.5
Comment: Civil society participation is an integral part of the initiative, but the number of participating civil society groups is quite limited and their identification or selection needs further clarification.

4.2 / 5

Judge Name: Haidy Ear-Dupuy
Score: 4.2
Comment: The initiative demonstrates inputs from communities (taxpayers) and has CSOs partners as implementer.

4.3 / 5

Judge Name: Ben Taylor
Score: 4.3
Comment: A nice, participatory initiative that involved other organisations both in implementation and in validation of the application.

4.9 / 5

Judge Name: Florence Thibault
Score: 4.9
Comment: We have a good description about the consultation in nominating the initiative (process organized by the Office of the Comptroller General, public voting, number of computerd votes, criteria...). We have several letters from partners very positive.

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>

4.3 / 5

Judge Name: Mohamed Adnene Trojette
Score: 4.3
Comment: Target population has to voluntarily choose one in eight projects to receive subsidies and civil society has to back these projects' initiative by bringing together at least 20% of the total amount. An ambitious number of the population is targetted even though only a little part got involved in the first year. The project is responding to a real need for transparency in public subsidies allocation.

4.1 / 5

Judge Name: Don Don Parafina
Score: 4.1
Comment: Not enough options are made available to enable taxpayers to identify the programs they want their money to be used for.

4.3 / 5

Judge Name: Haidy Ear-Dupuy
Score: 4.3
Comment: Project demonstrate a partnership with communities and provided opportunity for contribution by the people. Project demonstrated tools used for citizen to engage with government. There are innovation in the way government engages with citizens.

3.4 / 5

Judge Name: Ben Taylor
Score: 3.4
Comment: Great use of civic participation. It potentially could reach a large number of people either as beneficiaries or as those engaged in decision making, but it's reach thus far has been fairly small.

3.3 / 5

Judge Name: Florence Thibault
Score: 3.3
Comment: Here, all the process is open with a focus on an important subject : what government is doing with my money and how can I decide with him ? But all the projects for which people can vote are responding to a real need (disabled people, poor people, hospitals....). Then, may be the approach that Canas offers here (vote) do not change so much things for people ? May be, what is more interesting here is that the selected project has to be implemented with the population.

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>

3.6 / 5

Judge Name: Mohamed Adnene Trojette
Score: 3.6
Comment: Citizens have better access to information regarding part of public ressource allocation and have ways to actively participate in the design and delivery of public services. This seems to be only the beginning and only experienced on a little part of public services. Nevertheless, this may set new standards for the relationship between government and citizens in the near future.

4.3 / 5

Judge Name: Don Don Parafina
Score: 4.3
Comment: Strong on indicators 3 and 4; quite weak on indicators 1 and 2. Giving taxpayers the opportunity to identify the use of half of their taxes is highly commendable, but mechanics for selecting beneficiaries may need to be polished.

4.4 / 5

Judge Name: Haidy Ear-Dupuy
Score: 4.4
Comment: Description of result given, with certain area reaching 50% of target. Narrative provided descriptive evidence.

2.5 / 5

Judge Name: Ben Taylor
Score: 2.5
Comment: There is no counter-factual - no case for what would have happened to the money if it had not been allocated in this way. Further, though it improves participation in public decision making, there is little evidence that it has improved access or quality of public services beyond a handful of cases.

3.7 / 5

Judge Name: Florence Thibault
Score: 3.7
Comment: On the one hand, the quality of the public service or access to the service has probably improved in a lot of case. But we do know if it's the consequence of the open government approach. In the other hand, people developpe the culture of direct participation in the application of Urban Property Tax resource and there is a Partnership of community and civil society organizations.

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>

3.9 / 5

Judge Name: Mohamed Adnene Trojette
Score: 3.9
Comment: The initiative is already part of an institutionalised approach. It is the 13th tool created as part of the System of Popular and Citizen Participation of Canoas. The project is totally scalable but its sustainability will depend on the applicant's capacity to draw social involvement.

4.3 / 5

Judge Name: Don Don Parafina
Score: 4.3
Comment: Not clear if the initiative can transcend changes in political leadership.

4.9 / 5

Judge Name: Haidy Ear-Dupuy
Score: 4.9
Comment: Clear demonstration on how successes will be replicated. Provided proof of how initiative benefit community by providing them to have decision rights. This model has good potential for sustainability, both monetary and ideas wise. Community confidence can only lead to increased buy-ins and support from taxpayers.

4.2 / 5

Judge Name: Ben Taylor
Score: 4.2
Comment: The initiative has started fairly small, but there is a lot of opportunity to scale up, and evidence of demand from the community to do so.

2.4 / 5

Judge Name: Florence Thibault
Score: 2.4
Comment: The candidate emphasize that "one of the main challenges is the constant construction of the partnership culture and participation. It's necessary the constant update of the strategies with civil society". But we have no information about how is going to do in order to attempt this goal

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: Mohamed Adnene Trojette
Score: 5.0
Comment: Some of the projects to which public subsidies are allocated as part of the initiative are directed to ill or disabled people.

5 / 5

Judge Name: Don Don Parafina
Score: 5.0
Comment: Very clearly, it has ensured allocation of funds for marginalised members of the society, such as the PWDs.

5 / 5

Judge Name: Haidy Ear-Dupuy
Score: 5.0
Comment: This project demonstrated benefit for the marginalized groups. People living with disability and those in need of health care.

0 / 5

Judge Name: Ben Taylor
Score: 0.0
Comment: Potentially the initiative could be focussed on vulnerable populations, but this depends on the projects chosen for support. Putting spending decisions directly in the hands of taxpayers could have this effect, but it is not designed specifically with that in mind.

5 / 5

Judge Name: Florence Thibault
Score: 5.0
Comment: In this case, that's no easy to answer "yes" or "no" because the initiative deals with social projects. It's better with the open approach ? I'm not sure.