Submission Applicant Name: Israel Team Normalized Scores 60.9 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 - 11 - 2 2 - 3 3 - 44 - 5 Shows strong evidence of Showed no consultation in Some effort in consulting with Provided sufficient evidence of Demonstrated compelling other partners in nominating an consulting with other partners to mechanisms for consulting consulting others in nominating nominating an initiative; may have been jointly implemented initiative: initiative was not others in nominating an an initiative; jointly implemented nominate an initiative, was with a partner agency and strong but shows very weak validation jointly implemented but provided jointly implemented and initiative; was not jointly minimal validation of claims implemented but shows validation of claims of claims presented somewhat convincing validation of claims. convincing validation of claims 1.9 / 5Judge Name: Tim Hughes Score: 1.9 No consultation or joint application. Collaboration with other government agencies outlined, but none with external organisations. One letter Comment: of recommendation from a civil society organisation. 1.9 / 5Judge Name: Siapha Kamara Score: there is no evidence of consulting with others outside government Comment: 1.7 / 5 Judge Name: Tanvi Nagpal Score: Comment: The initiative is implemented by many agencies of the government but it does not appear to have an CSO participation. 1.7 / 5 Judge Name: Radu Puchiu Score: 1.7 Comment: The proposed project it is joint application from a government agency and a civil society organization. There are two recommendations from two civil society NGOs endorsing the project. No other evidence of consultation was provided. Still, being included in the country's NAP it might have some consultation process implied. 1.7 / 5 Judge Name: Ritva Reinikka Score: 1.7 Comment: The application is not clear regarding the nomination process. Partnership within government comes across strong and extensive. The two informative validation letters come from relevant CSOs. 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 Somewhat articulates the Exhibits a centralized, top-down Makes a convincing case of the Employs innovative open Establishes strong rationale for need to use open government approach to improving public importance of using open using open government government approaches given the country context; targets an services rather than publicapproaches and addresses a approaches which are somewhat 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 2.6/5 Judge Name: Tim Hughes Score: 2.6 While the application outlines how the central website will support the making of freedom of information requests, it does not make the case Comment: for how this will improve public service delivery. 4.1/5 Judge Name: Siapha Kamara Score: Comment: This is a definitive an innovative approach that makes access to information easier and faster; . This one-shop stop platform is definitely what is required in many countries and institutions. Reducing the bureaucracy empowers citizen to want to engage and influence governance. 3.8/5 Judge Name: Tanvi Nagpal Score: 3.8 The goal of the initiative is to centralize access to all information regarding the services that the government offers and remove duplication. It Comment: uses one impressive data base which brings together data from hundreds of agencies. The goal of the freedom of information site is not however to improve service delivery per se but to improve access to information. Judge Name: Radu Puchiu Score: Comment: The project is focused in increasing access to information by building a Freedom of Information Central Website (FOICW) which aims to serve as the main platform on which information already provided by the authorities, as well as information about agreements and contracts with private parties. It affects a large number of population. 4.4/5 Judge Name: Ritva Reinikka Score: 4.4 Comment: The initiative makes an exceptionally compelling case for increasing access to information by using modern technology. This initiative is most likely to increase transparency and public accountability in a big way -- in the entire country. It is interesting to note that centralizing in this case makes eminent sense from the citizen point of view. 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? 1 - 2 0 - 1 2 - 3 3 - 4 4 - 5 Shows little evidence of Achieved two or more of the Shows some signs of achieving Demonstrates achieving one or Uses clear indicators to prove outcomes but the evidence is achieving any of the outcomes or 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 access or improve service quality unconvincing; change in public were achieved; initiative has service is incremental and has the public service or access to services; target population has widened access or improved the for a majority of the target reached some of the target population; set new standards barely been reached quality of a public service for the service has improved population more than half of the target for the relationship between population government and citizens 3/5 Judge Name: Tim Hughes Score: 3.0 Some evidence of an increase in freedom of information requests provided, though it's unclear the extent to which the central website (rather Comment: than other changes) contributed to this. No evidence provided of impact on access to or quality of public services. 2.2/5 Judge Name: Siapha Kamara Score: Comment: The information provided points to potential, but there is no concrete evidence either in the application or the supportive documentation/video of utilization by citizens., This initiative is in the formative stage 4.2 / 5 Judge Name: Tanvi Nagpal Score: 4.2 The site is up and working and thousands of people use it to get information so that objective was fulfilled. The goal of the initiative is to Comment: gather more information on the services in one place but not necessarily to improve services. Judge Name: Radu Puchiu Score: More than two outcomes were achieved. According to the submission, during 2014 there was an increase of 40% Freedom of Information applications that were submitted to the central government although this was a result of more factors (implementation of the project was one of them). 3/5 Judge Name: Ritva Reinikka Score: 3.0 The application notes that there was a 40% increase in FOI applications submitted to central government, partly because the centralized web Comment: site lowered the bureaucratic barriers. This is the only indicator mentioned in the application. 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 - 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 institutionalize or scale-up the moving the initiative beyond the institutionalizing the initiative; the initiative; but only somewhat can be institutionalized and/or initiative; makes a good case on pilot stage; does not address any but presents unrealistic ways of addresses how challenges will be scaled-up; makes a compelling addressed 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 managed 3.5/5 Judge Name: Tim Hughes Score: Comment: The application outlines a number of challenges for institutionalising the initiative, but provides limited information on how they will be addressed. Unclear as to how the applicant plans to raise awareness of the website, and whether this will be sufficient to overcome the challenges listed. 3.8 / 5 Siapha Kamara Judge Name: Score: Applicant has demonstrated commitment to institutionalize the initiative; is aware of the challenges and has plans to address them. Comment: 4.9/5 Judge Name: Tanvi Nagpal Score: Yes, there is no reason to believe that the site will not continue to exist or include more information although the team has listed that as being Comment: one of the foreseeable challenges. 3.6/5 Judge Name: Radu Puchiu Score: 3.6 The applicant described a clear way to overcome the challenges and presented a durable model for scaling-up. Comment: 3.1/5 Ritva Reinikka Judge Name: Score: 3.1 The application explains challenges well. Given strong within-government collaboration and support from CSOs this initiative appears to be Comment: quite sustainable. 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,

0 - 1 1 - 2 2 - 3 3 - 4 Do Not Select Do Not Select Do Not Select Select this range for No Select this range for Yes 0/5

4 - 5

minorities, women), thereby promoting more inclusive development? *Please note that this criterion will not be used in the overall score.

Comment: No reference made to vulnerable populations or to the improvement of access to or outcomes of public services. 0/5

0.0

0.0

0.0

Judge Name:

Judge Name:

Judge Name:

Score:

Comment:

Score:

Score:

Tim Hughes

Siapha Kamara

Tanvi Nagpal

0/5

This initiative is at the development phase catering to the wider population.

No. There are no special features to accommodate vulnerable populations or special needs. Comment: 0/5

Radu Puchiu Judge Name: Score: The project aims mostly the access to information. There is not clear if the vulnerable population was targeted or a more inclusive Comment: development was implied.

Judge Name: Ritva Reinikka

While an initiative for all, it is possible that some of the vulnerable groups mentioned above will benefit from the considerably easier access to Comment: information facilitated by the central web site.