Submission Y Applicant Name: Latvia Team Normalized Scores 66.2 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 - 11 - 2 2 - 33 - 44 - 5 Some effort in consulting with Showed no consultation in Provided sufficient evidence of Demonstrated compelling Shows strong evidence of consulting with other partners to consulting others in nominating other partners in nominating an mechanisms for consulting nominating an initiative; may have been jointly implemented an initiative; jointly implemented initiative; initiative was not nominate an initiative, was others in nominating an but shows very weak validation jointly implemented but provided jointly implemented and initiative; was not jointly with a partner agency and strong of claims minimal validation of claims presented somewhat convincing implemented but shows validation of claims convincing validation of claims validation of claims. 2.2 / 5 Judge Name: Mohamed Adnene Trojette Score: 2.2 The initiative was not nominated by a consultation but rather based on previous awards gained by the project. Comment: 2.2 / 5 Judge Name: Gertrude Muguzi Score: 2.2 Comment: There is no evidence of any local consultation beyond government in the nomination process. Validation of claims is made from a government institution and an award given to the initiative by an international body of business leaders. I would have expected more civil society validation from an initiative such as this one. 3.3 / 5 Judge Name: Tanvi Nagpal Score: 3.3 Looks like the initiative was jointly designed and implemented with an ad agency and the government but the former is not a CSO! Comment: 2.2 / 5 Judge Name: Bibhu Prasad Sahu Score: Application not consulted with CSOs, no validation and hence scored low. Comment: 2.8/5 Florence Thibault Judge Name: Score: To select the initiative, any consultation was organised. The project was selected because is part of an official long term initiative in the level Comment: of the Cabinet of the Ministers and because it was awarded in several contests. I think we can considere than an award and a video for all the population is a validation of claims but that's not perfect. 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 Exhibits a centralized, top-down Somewhat articulates the Makes a convincing case of the Employs innovative open Establishes strong rationale for approach to improving public importance of using open need to use open government using open government government approaches given services rather than publicapproaches and addresses a approaches which are somewhat the country context; targets an government approaches but facing approach; Target these are sporadic, not wellneed of the target population for innovative; targets a large ambitious number of the population largely have a thought out; Needs of the target improved public services number of the population and population and is responding to a real need or demand population is unclear clearly identifies a need passive role Judge Name: Mohamed Adnene Trojette Score: The initiative is based on a smartphone application which is available to everyone and gives the ability to evaluate public services. Comment: 3.2/5 Judge Name: Gertrude Muguzi Score: 3.2 Comment: An App that acts as an online public feedback mechanism is a good idea and the problem being addressed is clearly identified. It also has the potential to produce vast amounts of useful information on public opinion and citizen views. However, the initiative does not explain how this feedback is actually being used or whether and to what extent it si applied to systematically improve public services and the problems identified. Judge Name: Tanvi Nagpal Score: Comment: This is a large undertaking by the central government in an attempt to improve bureaucratic responsiveness and culture. It's unclear that service delivery has actually improved. 2.6/5 Judge Name: Bibhu Prasad Sahu Score: Only technological innovation demonstrated but the case is unclear about the exact benefits and target beneficiaries. Comment: 3.8/5 Florence Thibault Judge Name: Score: Comment: "Let's Share the Burden!" is a programm for all the population and the need is clear and important: to find how to improve public administration that is to say how to reduce administrative burden and improve the quality of customer service with the analyses of the population. A mobile application was created to attempt this goal: it's an innovative open government approache. 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 - 11 - 2 4 - 5 2 - 3 3 - 4 Shows little evidence of Demonstrates achieving one or Shows some signs of achieving Uses clear indicators to prove Achieved two or more of the achieving any of the outcomes or outcomes but the evidence is more of the outcomes, but it is that one or more of the outcomes outcomes to ultimately expand of an improvement in public unclear whether the quality of were achieved; initiative has unconvincing; change in public access or improve service quality the public service or access to services; target population has service is incremental and has widened access or improved the for a majority of the target barely been reached the service has improved population; set new standards reached some of the target quality of a public service for population more than half of the target for the relationship between population government and citizens 3.6/5 Mohamed Adnene Trojette Judge Name: Score: 3.6 Comment: The applicant claims that the initiative's reach and feedback is correct, in comparison with traditional citizen involvement in the country. It remains unclear, though, whether the Government implemented actual correctives to bureaucracy. Judge Name: Gertrude Muguzi Score: Comment: The initiative provides a platform in which Government seeks citizen feedback but questions such as how feedback is analysed and subsequently used to improve services. What evidence is there of using the information to resolve actual public service delivery problems? Whether any responses are provided to the public on the feedback received, even in aggregate form? etc. are not addressed at all. Judge Name: Tanvi Nagpal Score: 4.2 Comment: Unclear if there have been improvements in the services bout there is a feedback loop built into the application so that people can provide anonymous feedback about the service they received. 2.3/5 Judge Name: Bibhu Prasad Sahu Score: No clear evidence of quality of public service. Limited feedback from citizens and no citizens participation in design and delivery. No Comment: mechanism for citizen monitoring. Need to restrategise the whole process for more results as per OGP norms. Florence Thibault Judge Name: Score: Comment: We have several indicators: so far mobile application has been downloaded close to 5000 times and more than 300 constructive citizen proposals and suggestions how to improve public administration have been received. That's not so much if we considere that all the population is concerned but that's interessant. According to me, it's important to see that the application also functions as database of public administration institutions (address, contact information, working hours, location in the map etc.) . 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 - 11 - 2 2 - 3 3 - 44 - 5 Demonstrates few plans in Shows some committment to Lists activities to institutionalize Outlines a clear path to either Presents a durable model that moving the initiative beyond the institutionalizing the initiative; the initiative; but only somewhat institutionalize or scale-up the can be institutionalized and/or pilot stage; does not address any but presents unrealistic ways of initiative; makes a good case on scaled-up; makes a compelling addresses how challenges will be potential threats or challenges to managing challenges faced by how potential challenges will be case for how challenges will be addressed the initiative the initiative addressed managed 4.2 / 5 Judge Name: Mohamed Adnene Trojette Score: Comment: The applicant claims that he will continue the development of new promising features, such as individual evaluation, based on a positive approach. The initiative seems long-term and sustainable. 2.7/5 Judge Name: Gertrude Muguzi Score: 2.7 Comment: The initiative seems to be already institutionalized, although, my comments on question 4 also apply here. 4.2/5 Judge Name: Tanvi Nagpal Score: The site will be expanded to pair with a mobile application. It's meant to be expanded. Comment: Bibhu Prasad Sahu Judge Name: Score: Comment: No clear road map just technological scalling up demonstrated. Risks and mitigation plan not demonstrated. Need to redesign the sustainability plan. 3.3 / 5 Judge Name: Florence Thibault Score: 3.3 Comment: As if we can note that the project is a long-term and sustainable Initiative we have not so much informations about how this challenge will be managed. We have information only on the next step: "Thank you" for witch I'm not convinced. I can understand that is to implement and cultivate client oriented culture within public administration sector but I'm not sure is the best way to attempt this goal and I'm a little bit afraid about that (management of results, management of civil servants, other infomations that can contribute to the quotation...). We have no information about "how can I have a better participation in the futur and after several years?". 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 Do Not Select Select this range for No Do Not Select Do Not Select Select this range for Yes 0/5 Judge Name: Mohamed Adnene Trojette Score: There is no claim toward vulnerable population targetting. Comment: 0/5Gertrude Muguzi Judge Name: Score: Comment: There is no mention of vulnerable groups in the application. 0/5

Judge Name: Florence Thibault

No evidence provided of reaching minorities, vulnerable population.

Weak case for recognition. Needs more improvements following OGP norms.

The initiative concern all the population and no a vulnerable population especially

Tanvi Nagpal

Bibhu Prasad Sahu

Judge Name:

Judge Name:

Comment:

Score:

Score:

Comment:

Score: Comment:

0/5