

Submission

Applicant Name: Croatia Team
Normalized Scores 89.2

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: Mohamed Adnene Trojette
Score: 4.6
Comment: Open call for applications and validation by a Council with representatives from the civil society. Not jointly implemented but four convincing validations of claims.

4.6 / 5

Judge Name: Gertrude Muguzi
Score: 4.6
Comment: A diverse and representative OGP Council made the selection and validation letters from three organisations were provided.

3.8 / 5

Judge Name: Tanvi Nagpal
Score: 3.8
Comment: No civil society partners were consulted in the nomination but several submitted letters of validation.

5 / 5

Judge Name: Tania Sanchez
Score: 5.0
Comment: There was a wide open call to nominate, and the decision was taken by the National OGP Council, but there is no detail as to what were the criteria used to select. This is an initiative included in their OGP NAP which involves many government agencies, and strongly backed with 3 validation claims.

4.9 / 5

Judge Name: Florence Thibault
Score: 4.9
Comment: We have a good explanation about the consultation and all the process elaborated to nominate the initiative : public call for proposals of initiatives that could best showcase Croatian open government efforts, decision taken by a council composed of representatives of Civil Society, Media, Business, Government, Parliament... Furthermore we have several letters from nongovernmental actors, who attest to the veracity of the claims made in the 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 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>

4.5 / 5

Judge Name: Mohamed Adnene Trojette
Score: 4.5
Comment: Targets the whole population and offers it new tools to get involved in the public debate.

5 / 5

Judge Name: Gertrude Muguzi
Score: 5.0
Comment: This initiative is a very interesting way of making government truly open. It also demonstrates how improved transparency can actually improve efficiency and effectiveness in government which is not always the case. I especially like the improvement in communication between teachers, students and parents and the reduction in bureaucracy to access government administrative services in this regard.

3.3 / 5

Judge Name: Tanvi Nagpal
Score: 3.3
Comment: The portal provides a direct link between some government services and citizens-- teachers and parents, pharmacies etc. and it appears to be widely used. However, it's unclear whether citizens are actually using this portal for anything more than to receive information (in the case of parents) or order prescriptions (does not mean that they are receiving better care!)

5 / 5

Judge Name: Tania Sanchez
Score: 5.0
Comment: The scope of the initiative is impressive. It not only brings government closer to citizens by setting up a one-stop-shop for information of all public services and for e-services, but its features also enable participation on draft legislation and on other government documents. Moreover, citizens can track the state administration responses to the submitted comments.

5 / 5

Judge Name: Florence Thibault
Score: 5.0
Comment: The initiative concern all the population and all public services. It's responding to a real demand. Considering the country context, what is important to stress is the unique building blocks developed. We have to be sure that behind the national portal there is not a lot of portal with any logical approach but we can not appreciate this point here.

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>

4.7 / 5

Judge Name: Mohamed Adnene Trojette
Score: 4.7
Comment: E-Consultations allows citizens' better access to public policy information and gives them ways to get involved in designing and evaluating public services. Personal Mailbox creates a direct bi-directional channel for citizens to report issues and for Government to resolve these issues.

4.2 / 5

Judge Name: Gertrude Muguzi
Score: 4.2
Comment: All 4 outcomes are addressed in this project. The new efficiency standards set through online access of personal documentation is definitely a plus. Since just over half of the Croatian population has internet access, this is a very useful way to increase accessibility of government services and give a large proportion of the public the opportunity to participate in public decision-making.

4.2 / 5

Judge Name: Tanvi Nagpal
Score: 4.2
Comment: See previous comment. There is no evidence that service itself has improved.

4.8 / 5

Judge Name: Tania Sanchez
Score: 4.8
Comment: The initiative seems to be reaching a wide public, enabling easier access to public services, but also allowing for participating in decision making and in monitoring performance. It would be interesting to have more data on the performance of the platform.

3.7 / 5

Judge Name: Florence Thibault
Score: 3.7
Comment: Here, the initiative deals with a national project. The number of users is not important (153000 for the portal and 90000 for the mailbox) and do not represent more than half of the target population but they have accessed to the National portal a lot of times (2.5 millions times). We can suppose that is because the service quality is better or easier.

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>

4.2 / 5

Judge Name: Mohamed Adnene Trojette
Score: 4.2
Comment: Public administrations' involvement has been made compulsory by law. The application shows strong political will/support.

4 / 5

Judge Name: Gertrude Muguzi
Score: 4.0
Comment: The initiative derives its mandate from the law which makes it compulsory for all government institutions to make use of it for certain functions. This is therefore already institutionalized. Further institutionalization is planned. My only concern is the privacy and security of information risks associated with increased online storage, transfer and use of personal information. This was mentioned a risk in the application but I do not have enough technical knowledge to assess the solution that was proposed.

4.5 / 5

Judge Name: Tanvi Nagpal
Score: 4.5
Comment: The initiative is quite large and supported centrally. There is no reason to believe that it cannot or will not be scaled. However, it's unclear that it will actually improve the quality of public services.

4.7 / 5

Judge Name: Tania Sanchez
Score: 4.7
Comment: There is high level political will to institutionalize the e-Citizen system; all government agencies are legally obliged to use it for every e-service. An important challenge was addressing the security issue to use personal IDs. Moreover, the government is planning on implementing innovative strategies to get more citizens to use the platform.

4.5 / 5

Judge Name: Florence Thibault
Score: 4.5
Comment: As I have explained before, we deal here with an important national project that presents a durable model. May be there is an point that is not mentioned here : how the government can help people that do not have a computer/mobile... and how the government can help people for with this mean of communication is not easy ?

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: This initiative suggests that vulnerable populations will get better service. However, this is not proved by the applicant. Moreover, internet access and literacy are pre-requisites for these populations to enjoy the full experience of E-Citizens.

0 / 5

Judge Name: Gertrude Muguzi
Score: 0.0
Comment: Vulnerable populations such as the elderly and people with disabilities are mentioned as primary beneficiary target groups of the initiative but there is no substantiation of how and/or to what extent they have been successful in reaching these groups.

0 / 5

Judge Name: Tanvi Nagpal
Score: 0.0
Comment: No. It does not demonstrate that improved access for any special groups or vulnerable populations.

0 / 5

Judge Name: Tania Sanchez
Score: 0.0
Comment: It is not targeted for a vulnerable population, but by decreasing the costs to process public services it could have a greater impact on the poor population.

0 / 5

Judge Name: Florence Thibault
Score: 0.0
Comment: We are not in this case because the initiative is for all the population and not only for vulnerable populations