Submission

Applicant Name: Indonesia Team
Normalized Scores 92.1

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
Showed no consultation in nominating an initiative; may have been jointly implemented but shows very weak validation of claims	*Some effort in consulting with other partners in nominating an initiative; initiative was not jointly implemented but provided minimal validation of claims*	*Provided sufficient evidence of consulting with other partners to nominate an initiative, was jointly implemented and presented somewhat convincing validation of claims.*	*Demonstrated compelling mechanisms for consulting others in nominating an initiative; was not jointly implemented but shows convincing validation of claims*	*Shows strong evidence of consulting others in nominating an initiative; jointly implemented with a partner agency and strong validation of claims*

5 / 5

Judge Name: Tim Hughes
Score: 5.0
Comment: The application describes a multi-stage consultation process, with an open call for nominations and a diverse panel making the final selection. The initiative was jointly implemented and the application includes strong validation letters from a range of organisations.

5 / 5

Judge Name: Mendi Njonjo
Score: 5.0
Comment: The applicant provided sufficient evidence of partnering with other non-government organizations in nominating and validating the initiative? As described, this was a collaborative nomination and selection process involving CSOs, Government and the public. Worth noting was the clear and open information provided by applicant on the make up of jury that represented various stakeholders including academics, the youth, civil society and the Government.

5 / 5

Judge Name: Marija Novkovic
Score: 5.0
Comment: This is a very compelling case of broad, meaningful and participatory consultations on the national nomination for the OpenGov Award. The enclosed references speak highly of the initiative.

5 / 5

Judge Name: Stefano Pizzicannella
Score: 5.0
Comment: The initiative shows strong participation and a very wide and exhaustive consultation process for the nomination. It is jointly implemented with a wide partnership among public, private and NGO sectors and has strong validation of claims. This is also due to the long standing implementation of the initiaive.

4.7 / 5

Judge Name: Radu Puchiu
Score: 4.7
Comment: The nomination of the project was not only a result of a very strong collaboration and endorsement from all the important stakeholders: Government, through the Office of the President, NGOs and business entities. Also, the project was jointly implemented by the Government and NGOs.

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 approach to improving public services rather than public-facing approach; Target population largely have a passive role	*Somewhat articulates the importance of using open government approaches but these are sporadic, not well-thought out; Needs of the target population is unclear*	*Makes a convincing case of the need to use open government approaches and addresses a need of the target population for improved public services*	*Establishes strong rationale for using open government approaches which are somewhat innovative; targets a large number of the population and clearly identifies a need*	*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*

4.5 / 5

Judge Name: Tim Hughes
Score: 4.5
Comment: Pencerah Nusantara is a very ambitious initiative which targets a large percentage of the population and is clearly responding to a range of pressing needs. The application outlines how Pencerah Nusantara has used some open government mechanisms, but it could have been strengthened with more detail on the operation and impact of these approaches (e.g. on the initiative design, and outcomes). The partnership with business and civil society to deliver the initiative is clearly articulated, but the partnership with citizens is less so.

4.3 / 5

Judge Name: Mendi Njonjo
Score: 4.3
Comment: Applicant makes a compelling case of using open government approaches to improve public service delivery. Specifically, the project improves access to information, increases civic participation and health outcomes.

4.2 / 5

Judge Name: Marija Novkovic
Score: 4.2
Comment: The initiative is well designed to respond to an acute need for more accessible, more effective services, while also taking into account the specificity of the local context.

4.7 / 5

Judge Name: Stefano Pizzicannella
Score: 4.7
Comment: The initiative targets a specific population sector with very clear needs and adopts the open governments approaches both for the population and for the participants / partner to the initiative; the technology is used as a tool to reach the goals and not as a goal by itself.

4 / 5

Judge Name: Radu Puchiu
Score: 4.0
Comment: The project makes a good case of using the power of collaboration in difficult environment situation. Although targets only a small number of communities it showes a model in terms of approach.

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
Shows little evidence of achieving any of the outcomes or of an improvement in public services; target population has barely been reached	*Shows some signs of achieving outcomes but the evidence is unconvincing; change in public services is incremental and has reached some of the target population*	*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*	*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*	*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*

4.6 / 5

Judge Name: Tim Hughes
Score: 4.6
Comment: The evidence presented demonstrates that the initiative is having a positive impact on the accessibility and quality of health services for citizens in the 7 districts. Aspects of the initiative appear to be increasing citizens access to information on local services and providing opportunities to shape them, though the detail and evidence here is less clear. It would be useful to understand the extent to which the improvements in services are being driven by the open government mechanisms, rather than other factors (e.g. increased funding, capacity building, etc.).

4.7 / 5

Judge Name: Mendi Njonjo
Score: 4.7
Comment: Applicant provides evidence of the initiative achieving concrete improvements in public services or access to services. In the areas where the health services have been launched, there is evidence of uptake (including citizen participation in monitoring services) that has been presented by applicant.

4.9 / 5

Judge Name: Marija Novkovic
Score: 4.9
Comment: The initiative provides ample opportunity for citizen feedback and co-decision on future priorities.

5 / 5

Judge Name: Stefano Pizzicannella
Score: 5.0
Comment: The initiative sets a new standard to deploy health services in the country, spreading the open government principles of participation, transparency and accountability among citizens and local government staff. On the other side it raises awareness on these principles in the youth of the country.

4.3 / 5

Judge Name: Radu Puchiu
Score: 4.3
Comment: More than two outcomes were achieved. The described community health centres in deprived and least developed areas are aiming both the quality of services and beneficiaries satisfaction. Also the project set a new standard by the proposed model of community management.

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
Demonstrates few plans in moving the initiative beyond the pilot stage; does not address any potential threats or challenges to the initiative	*Shows some commitment to institutionalizing the initiative; but presents unrealistic ways of managing challenges faced by the initiative*	*Lists activities to institutionalize the initiative; but only somewhat addresses how challenges will be addressed*	*Outlines a clear path to either institutionalize or scale-up the initiative; makes a good case on how potential challenges will be addressed*	*Presents a durable model that can be institutionalized and/or scaled-up; makes a compelling case for how challenges will be managed*

3.3 / 5

Judge Name: Tim Hughes
Score: 3.3
Comment: The application outlines a number of activities being undertaken to support the institutionalisation and sustainability of the initiative. The application does not, however, list or address any challenges. Scaling the initiative to cover a country the size of Indonesia will undoubtedly raise many.

4.9 / 5

Judge Name: Mendi Njonjo
Score: 4.9
Comment: Applicant make a compelling case that the initiative will be institutionalized or scaled-up over time, and of note is that this initiative aims to scale up to other areas where health services are scarce.

4.8 / 5

Judge Name: Marija Novkovic
Score: 4.8
Comment: There is evidence of initiative being scaled up to the national level. There are also compelling claims of broadening the partnership network,

5 / 5

Judge Name: Stefano Pizzicannella
Score: 5.0
Comment: The model of the initiative has been adopted by the country government to be deployed at national scale with full endorsment by the President.

4.2 / 5

Judge Name: Radu Puchiu
Score: 4.2
Comment: Giving the high level endorsement and the model designed for scaling-up, the project makes a strong case for large scale implementation and a good example at international level.

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
Select this range for No	*Do Not Select*	*Do Not Select*	*Do Not Select*	*Select this range for Yes*

5 / 5

Judge Name: Tim Hughes
Score: 5.0
Comment: The application places a clear emphasis on raising the access and quality of services for vulnerable populations.

5 / 5

Judge Name: Mendi Njonjo
Score: 5.0
Comment: Applicant successfully demonstrates that it can successfully improve service delivery access to vulnerable populations. Worth noting that this is a program designed with an aim to end marginalization.

5 / 5

Judge Name: Marija Novkovic
Score: 5.0
Comment: This is a solid example of inclusive development. I fully support the initiative.

5 / 5

Judge Name: Stefano Pizzicannella
Score: 5.0
Comment: The initiative has targeted vulnerable population since its conception.

5 / 5

Judge Name: Radu Puchiu
Score: 5.0
Comment: The project targets especially the communities in deprived and least developed areas.