

Submission

Applicant Name: Philippines Team
Normalized Scores 83.7

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>

4.6 / 5

Judge Name: Tim Hughes
Score: 4.6
Comment: The initiative was selected by the Philippine OGP Steering Committee, which includes CSOs, though it's unclear whether there was any consultation beyond those on the committee. The application is a joint application with a CSO and includes a number of very strong supporting statements. The initiative is jointly implemented with a range of partners.

4.8 / 5

Judge Name: Siapha Kamara
Score: 4.8
Comment: Application, references and video documentations provides evidence of the OGP stakeholders ownership of this initiative.. All stakeholders were involved in the nomination processes of this initiative and implementation .

4.6 / 5

Judge Name: Tanvi Nagpal
Score: 4.6
Comment: There are a lot of letters of validation attached to this application. I am not sure how they were elicited. Its a bit unclear.

4.4 / 5

Judge Name: Radu Puchiu
Score: 4.4
Comment: Strong evidence of consultation on the Philippine OGP Steering Committee, composed of 4 government agencies, and 5 networks from civil society and business. The joint application was also submitted following an online voting process.

4.3 / 5

Judge Name: Ritva Reinikka
Score: 4.3
Comment: The SGLG initiative is an extensive partnership between central and local governments, CSOs, businesses, and aid donors. The national OGP Steering Committee selected the nomination, a number of different partners validated the nomination, and it is also a joint application.

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 articulating 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: Tim Hughes
Score: 4.8
Comment: The initiative is extremely ambitious in aiming to address a range of important needs across 1,715 provincial, city and municipal governments, and presents evidence of improvements across a large proportion of these. The application makes a strong case for how the Seal has helped to make local government more open and transparent to citizens. It could have benefitted from more detail of how this enhanced openness has in turn contributed to improvements in outcomes in the six components of the Seal. The participatory approach to monitoring performance on this scale is a particularly noteworthy and laudable innovation.

4.7 / 5

Judge Name: Siapha Kamara
Score: 4.7
Comment: Through the incentive mechanisms the initiative is improving the performance of thousands of local government authorities in strategic areas, for example financial accountability . Even the private sector is adopting ideas from this initiative

3 / 5

Judge Name: Tanvi Nagpal
Score: 3.0
Comment: The initiative appears to be one to improve transparency of all LGU accounts. It is attached to a central government scheme which associates grants with transparency at the local level. I am not sure that its targeted or that the increase in services offered at the LGU level are associated with transparency. They may just be the result of increased central government transfers.

4.9 / 5

Judge Name: Radu Puchiu
Score: 4.9
Comment: This program seeks to provide incentives for local governments to provide or improve services delivered in the above mentioned areas. It gathers together a wide variety of stakeholders from government agencies, chambers of commerce, NGOs, business entities. It targets the entire population of the country.

2.6 / 5

Judge Name: Ritva Reinikka
Score: 2.6
Comment: The Seal of Good Financial Housekeeping (SGFH) was the precursor to the Seal of Good Local Government (SGLG) which was introduced only last year. The SGFH -- which represents more of a "standard governance approach" with a focus on improving public financial management and governance in local governments and rewarding progress financially -- is now one of the six performance areas assessed under the SGLG. The SGFH has been firmly entrenched as a qualification requirement for several major programs that provide financial assistance to local governments and for local governments to access bank loans. The SGFH qualification rate for 2014 (for the minimum level) was around 80% and the incentive/penalty effects and overall credibility of the SGFH among local governments seems to be strong. This strong credibility of the SGFH seems to be carrying over to the SGLG which has added a range of service delivery areas to the program, i.e., disaster preparedness, social protection, business friendliness and competitiveness, peace and order, and environmental management. This approach is consistent with the experience that governance reforms alone do not necessarily improve services. However, the five selected areas seem to be a bit of an odd mix -- and surely represent an ambitious agenda. Incremental addition of services might work better. While the program is fundamentally about financial management and service delivery, a number of open government approaches are embedded in it. Examples of these are "full disclosure policy portal" where local government revenue and spending can be easily viewed by the public. The performance challenge fund grants are disclosed on a separate web site which also allows citizen feedback to be uploaded.

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>

4.9 / 5

Judge Name: Tim Hughes
Score: 4.9
Comment: The application presents evidence of the Seal supporting greater transparency of local government, promoting the rights of citizens (particularly vulnerable groups) and enabling civil society to monitor local government. Evidence is also presented of some significant improvements in the administration and provision of services. It is clear that the Seal is helping to transform expectations of local government services.

4.6 / 5

Judge Name: Siapha Kamara
Score: 4.6
Comment: The high performance of local government in the six areas translated into large segment of the population being reached with improved services

2.2 / 5

Judge Name: Tanvi Nagpal
Score: 2.2
Comment: The website www.fdpd.dilg.gov.ph did not work for me. Also, while there are grand claims of all CSO cooperation, I am not sure how exactly CSOs are involved in improving services.

4.3 / 5

Judge Name: Radu Puchiu
Score: 4.3
Comment: More than two outcomes were achieved. It sets a new relation between government and citizens through a new model of giving incentives for local governments to provide or improve services doubled with a participatory model for validation.

3.7 / 5

Judge Name: Ritva Reinikka
Score: 3.7
Comment: The SGLG induces improved local government performance across three major dimensions: public financial management, governance, and service delivery. The program addresses a wide range of concerns. It is possible that the SGLG may aspire to do too much. The incentive program in its early stages prioritized financial management/governance concerns and assumed that improvements to service delivery would follow. As this is not necessarily the case, the SGLG has broadened the focus to prioritize service delivery, although governance still remains at the core. The SGLG is an ambitious -- and recent -- escalation from the SGFH. It adds five new targets to the existing good financial housekeeping. It is common for incentive programs to extend and improve their designs over time, although good practices suggest that an incremental approach may be preferable. The application provides evidence on better citizen access to information on public spending and increased access to public services. There is also strong evidence that the precursor of this initiative has established itself as an effective tool to improve financial management of local governments and to provide them performance based financing. The expanded program is perhaps too new to assess results on the ground. There are a large number of indicators. It seems that the indicators are still at the initial stage of development. Best practices imply that measurement/verification of performance should be carried out by an independent entity. The application mentions that CSOs do some of the verification but elsewhere one gets the impression that the regional government evaluates local government performance.

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>

5 / 5

Judge Name: Tim Hughes
Score: 5.0
Comment: The application makes a strong case for how the Seal has become institutionalised, with a range of mechanisms supporting it (e.g. strong stakeholder engagement, a stable budget, and financial incentives to comply from external organisations). The application does not address any challenges, though the apparent strength of the model helps to mitigate this in part.

5 / 5

Judge Name: Siapha Kamara
Score: 5.0
Comment: Strong OGP stakeholder ownership and benefits of this initiative will make it sustainable

3 / 5

Judge Name: Tanvi Nagpal
Score: 3.0
Comment: No challenges are mentioned. It appears that the SEAL program is already institutionalized but its completely unclear how it has led to service improvements.

4.2 / 5

Judge Name: Radu Puchiu
Score: 4.2
Comment: The model is durable and is planned to be scaled-up.

4.1 / 5

Judge Name: Ritva Reinikka
Score: 4.1
Comment: Given the credibility of the precursor, the Seal of Good Financial Housekeeping, this initiative has a strong foundation to build on. The partnership is extensive which will also enhance its sustainability. The application raises a few issues, however. While there is little information in the application, the indicator sets under each of the six performance areas of the SGLG seem to be primarily process-based and compliance-focused, rather than outcomes (or even outputs) based on local services. So it's difficult to predict the effect of the SGLG and "quality" of local government service delivery if an empirical assessment were to be done. The complexity of assessing a large number of indicators for every local government is also an issue. All in all, since being introduced in 2010, the SGFH seems poised to be institutionalized as a basic screening/compliance standard for local governments. The basic concept of the SGLG is strong and there's a clear logic that local governments understand how it builds on the basic requirements of the SGFH. One expects the indicators to evolve over time to focus more on service delivery outcomes once data becomes available. Over time this program has much potential. The critical issue with the SGLG at this early stage (it was introduced only in 2014) is the credibility of the assessment -- which will boil down to the regularity and timeliness of the disclosure of the results, the transparency of the assessment process, and the availability of the detailed assessment data so that the results can be validated by a third party.

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: Tim Hughes
Score: 5.0
Comment: The application and supporting statements make a strong case for the initiative having supported the rights and access to services of women, indigenous people and the disabled.

5 / 5

Judge Name: Siapha Kamara
Score: 5.0
Comment: indigenous people, , persons with disability and women are differently benefiting from the initiative

0 / 5

Judge Name: Tanvi Nagpal
Score: 0.0
Comment: Appears that the LGUs are now able to provide certain health and other services which they were not providing previously. Not sure if this is a result of the SEAL initiative or just an increase in local resources.

5 / 5

Judge Name: Radu Puchiu
Score: 5.0
Comment: The project has a set of criteria under six components: (1) Financial Good Housekeeping; (2) Disaster Preparedness; (3) Social Protection, (4) Business Friendliness and Competitiveness; (5) Peace and Order; and (6) Environmental Management most of them focusing on vulnerable population.

5 / 5

Judge Name: Ritva Reinikka
Score: 5.0
Comment: The SGLG has five service areas among its six components. One of the service areas is social protection which encompasses a number of vulnerable groups: pregnant women, persons with disabilities, and indigenous peoples. While there is evidence of increased representation, some increase in access to services and increased participation in local government, given that the initiative is very recent (launched only last year), at this stage it is difficult to demonstrate that it successfully improved service delivery access and/or outcomes for the vulnerable groups.