

Applicant Name: France Team
Normalized Scores 82.8

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: Milena Nedeva
Score: 4.6
Comment: As part of the National Action Plan consultation process the nomination was broadly consulted with the stakeholders.

2.9 / 5

Judge Name: Mendi Njonjo
Score: 2.9
Comment: Applicant provides sufficient evidence of partnering with other non-government organizations in the validating and the joint implementation of the initiative.

3.9 / 5

Judge Name: Marija Novkovic
Score: 3.9
Comment: There is very little evidence on consulting other partners in nominating the initiative, though there are elements of user engagement in the development of the actual product.

4.7 / 5

Judge Name: Stefano Pizzicannella
Score: 4.7
Comment: The initiative wasn't nominated by a specific consultation but was included in the OGP Action Plan consultation process. It shows a panel of partners succeeded one another during the past years and a new mechanism to jointly implement the initiative.

4.8 / 5

Judge Name: Maxine Tanya Hamada
Score: 4.8
Comment: The initiative, by design, is inclusive and necessitates direct participation of citizens. The challenge of simplifying a complex array of rights and responsibilities into an accessible interface that citizens can query will need continuous partnership with users. It would be good to, over time, also see which sector of the population uses it most.

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: Milena Nedeva
Score: 4.3
Comment: Clearly described need affecting a large number of the population and a solution that directly addresses the needs identified.

4.4 / 5

Judge Name: Mendi Njonjo
Score: 4.4
Comment: The initiative make a compelling case of using open government approaches where it allows citizens to get access to info on public services (dues) owed to them. Noteworthy- it allows citizens to "own" their data (unique tailored response for citizens)and it's innovation quotient is high where program that crunches large amounts of data to simplified info that (marginalized) citizens can access.

4.7 / 5

Judge Name: Marija Novkovic
Score: 4.7
Comment: The problem definition is very clear and relevant.

4.6 / 5

Judge Name: Stefano Pizzicannella
Score: 4.6
Comment: The initiative shows how to "reuse" legacy tools to "rebuild" new services with the new paradigms of Open Government. These open paradigms have been used also to implement the initiative, so creating an end-to-end Open approach allowing citizens to access easily, openly and directly laws and regulations.

4.7 / 5

Judge Name: Maxine Tanya Hamada
Score: 4.7
Comment: This is a good example of using technology to institutionalize a direct relationship between the citizen and the public institutions that deliver needed public services. It will be good to see in the coming months and years if this changes the relationship of the citizen with the state and the behaviour of public service delivery institutions towards more open and active partnership with citizens

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>

3.5 / 5

Judge Name: Milena Nedeva
Score: 3.5
Comment: As the initiative is still in its beat version and being tested and fine-tuned it has not yet become a new standard for the relationship between government and citizens

4.7 / 5

Judge Name: Mendi Njonjo
Score: 4.7
Comment: The initiative shows potential of providing concrete improvements in public services or access to services. As described, it will allow citizens (especially those most marginalized) to know what they're entitled to re social services in an easy way. As described this is an iterative process that builds on/ is improved by user interaction.

3.2 / 5

Judge Name: Marija Novkovic
Score: 3.2
Comment: The application lack information on the number of users. Therefore, I cannot assess whether the initiative widened access to social benefits for the target population.

4.1 / 5

Judge Name: Stefano Pizzicannella
Score: 4.1
Comment: Even if this project reinforces transparency, citizen empowerment, public effectiveness, and public action modernization, it has a lack of indicators to show its use by a large section of the target population.

3.5 / 5

Judge Name: Maxine Tanya Hamada
Score: 3.5
Comment: The submission cited a specific goal of addressing the problem that 36% of potential beneficiaries did not avail of a public service package in 2012. There is no indication yet from the submission if this has been achieved. It will be good to hear if there are such changes in the availment rates of marginalized sectors of the population.

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>

3.5 / 5

Judge Name: Milena Nedeva
Score: 3.5
Comment: Further tests and experiments are planned before the initiative becomes a durable model.

4.2 / 5

Judge Name: Mendi Njonjo
Score: 4.2
Comment: Applicant makes a good case that the initiative will be institutionalized/ scaled-up over time where it's part of National OGP plans, and the Municipalities have been "urged" to participate. More information on proposed Municipal uptake would have been useful.

3.7 / 5

Judge Name: Marija Novkovic
Score: 3.7
Comment: There seems to be a solid path towards launching the system so as to better serve the citizens of France. However, the applicant should consider how poor, marginalised groups without access to internet or a personal computer would be able to access the service. This is still a major concern.

4.6 / 5

Judge Name: Stefano Pizzicannella
Score: 4.6
Comment: The application shows clear path to enlarge the initiative to other areas and have a clear view of the challenges it will face in the future. The leading implementer, SGMAP, is working to include further services and administrations in the service provided and the team is well placed to do so in the Prime Minister's office.

4.2 / 5

Judge Name: Maxine Tanya Hamada
Score: 4.2
Comment: There is a clear model for expanding the platform to include other services, regulations and policies. A large factor in scaling up will be the feedback and level of use by the citizens that would drive other public service delivery institutions to also re-use and adopt the platform and citizen direct queries.

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: Milena Nedeva
Score: 5.0
Comment: The low-income, elderly and vulnerable groups are a clear target of the initiative as they are the main users of social assistance.

5 / 5

Judge Name: Mendi Njonjo
Score: 5.0
Comment: The applicant makes a very compelling case that vulnerable population will profit from this program. It is worth noting that this is designed for marginalized and vulnerable populations.

5 / 5

Judge Name: Marija Novkovic
Score: 5.0
Comment: Yes, provided that the hurdle of access to a computer with internet connection is overcome.

5 / 5

Judge Name: Stefano Pizzicannella
Score: 5.0
Comment: This initiative has a clear target in the vulnerable population that could not accede to the social benefits.

5 / 5

Judge Name: Maxine Tanya Hamada
Score: 5.0
Comment: The potential is there, there is no data yet that actually demonstrates that the service delivery outcome for the marginalized population has been achieved. But access has been greatly improved