Submission

Applicant Name: Canada Team
Normalized Scores 58.3

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*

2 / 5

Judge Name: Don Don Parafina
Score: 2.0
Comment: The proponent did not consult, but only assumed the stakeholders' endorsement of the project based on the impact of the results and the positive feedback on the event.

2.1 / 5

Judge Name: Milena Nedeva
Score: 2.1
Comment: The application contains some information about the stakeholders involved in the implementation of the initiative, but no description of the consultation process for the nomination of the initiative.

4.3 / 5

Judge Name: Mendi Njonjo
Score: 4.3
Comment: Applicant provides sufficient evidence of partnering with other non-government organizations in development and implementing of the initiative with others. The implementation requires the collaboration of stakeholders from civil society and government. The development of the Open Data Charter (and its subsequent use and implementation presumably) was collaborative and included open data proponents from academia, private sector, government and civil society actors who participated in the IODC.

3.2 / 5

Judge Name: Stefano Pizzicannella
Score: 3.2
Comment: The initiative has a large panel of partnerships with NGOs but is not formally submitted as a joint application. As far as the selection procedure in concerned, there is no evidence of consultation for the selection of the initiative and it seems that other initiatives, experiences of good practices were not considered.

2.3 / 5

Judge Name: Maxine Tanya Hamada
Score: 2.3
Comment: Forwarding the IODC 2015 for the OGP awards sends a strong signal and support for a more global approach to this emerging practice. I regret that the nomination was not a joint one given the broad partnerships that made the 2015 IODC possible.

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*

2.9 / 5

Judge Name: Don Don Parafina
Score: 2.9
Comment: Standardization is an important pre-requisite for open government and improved service delivery, but does not and cannot demonstrate actual openness and improvement.

2.4 / 5

Judge Name: Milena Nedeva
Score: 2.4
Comment: The initiative identifies clearly the problem to be solved, but focuses solely on one tool for its solution (an international conference) whereas the process requires a combination of approaches.

4.3 / 5

Judge Name: Mendi Njonjo
Score: 4.3
Comment: The initiative makes a compelling case for the use of Open Government approaches. Specifically, the development of standards that can be universally used and applied provide a much needed enabling environment for Open Data standards to be used across various organizations, entities and jurisdictions. It therefore sets the stage for a way through which there can be a universal understanding and application of open data for public service delivery (amongst others).

2.3 / 5

Judge Name: Stefano Pizzicannella
Score: 2.3
Comment: The proposed initiative doesn't seem make a direct link between the spread of open data and improved public services that are not targeted; it fosters instead the adoption of the open data paradigm that could improve the public service delivery once adopted by administrations and governments. The score is low for this criterion given this weak link. As far as the target population is concerned, this is not clear since it could be identified with the participants of the Conference, that are not public service users, or in the world citizens that are not affected by the initiative (yet).

2.8 / 5

Judge Name: Maxine Tanya Hamada
Score: 2.8
Comment: There are two key innovations here from my perspective and from the verification submissions. First is the open approach to the conduct, planning and ownership of IODC 215 and second is the emergence of consensus on an Open Data Charter. Only because there is still no way to ascertain direct impact on public service delivery in the countries that joined, it is difficult to score this higher than having articulated the importance of using open data approaches

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 service 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*

2.5 / 5

Judge Name: Don Don Parafina
Score: 2.5
Comment: Same reason as above. The conference is several steps away from real adoption and actual implementation by the countries.

2.6 / 5

Judge Name: Milena Nedeva
Score: 2.6
Comment: The set objectives were achieved but no clear case is made as to how the achievement of the objectives resulted in improved public services or access to services.

3.5 / 5

Judge Name: Mendi Njonjo
Score: 3.5
Comment: Through the development of the Open Data Charter, and the potential usage of this by Government, and other stakeholders, this sets the stage for creating the environment through which the citizens can get more information about services, government can get feedback; and citizens can participate in and monitor public service provision. As mentioned above, this is an initiative that potentially opens up standardized, and inter-operable open data standards to all (most) stakeholders.

2.7 / 5

Judge Name: Stefano Pizzicannella
Score: 2.7
Comment: Shows very little evidence of achieving any of the outcomes or of an improvement in public services; the conference aims to put the basis for a shared open data world wide approach.

2 / 5

Judge Name: Maxine Tanya Hamada
Score: 2.0
Comment: The submission clearly posits that the global impact of IODC 2015 will be felt for years to come. Since this is the inception of the open data charter, there is no evidence yet available for the impact on public services. I do not doubt that there will be impact in policy and behaviour. The direct link to public services will still have to be established in time.

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 / 5

Judge Name: Don Don Parafina
Score: 3.0
Comment: I don't see the need to institutionalise the conduct of an event.

3.1 / 5

Judge Name: Milena Nedeva
Score: 3.1
Comment: Clear institutionalization path was outlined for the initiative but no consideration is given to the challenge of moving beyond the proposals and into practical implementation of the agreed ideas.

3.7 / 5

Judge Name: Mendi Njonjo
Score: 3.7
Comment: Applicant makes a strong case for the initiative being scaled up over time. The collaborative nature of the initiative's development are indicative of potential uptake of the Open Data Charter by open data proponents.

3.9 / 5

Judge Name: Stefano Pizzicannella
Score: 3.9
Comment: There are clear indicators that this initiative contributes to create an international open data movement. IODC 2016 is already planned but no assumption can be made on the impact in the future of the open data Charter.

2.7 / 5

Judge Name: Maxine Tanya Hamada
Score: 2.7
Comment: The submission outlines some initiatives for the consolidation and adoption of the Open Data Charter by governments. A roadmap is mentioned but not detailed. It would be good to, as early as now, include in the roll-out ways to measure and benchmark the changes that the Charter will enable.

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*

0 / 5

Judge Name: Don Don Parafina
Score: 0.0
Comment: I don't see how conference can improve service delivery.

0 / 5

Judge Name: Milena Nedeva
Score: 0.0
Comment: No information provided on a special focus on vulnerable groups.

0 / 5

Judge Name: Mendi Njonjo
Score: 0.0
Comment: Project doesn't make a compelling case for addressing marginalized communities, or how marginalized or vulnerable groups would be privileged (or emerge) through the use of this initiative.

0 / 5

Judge Name: Stefano Pizzicannella
Score: 0.0
Comment: This initiative doesn't address any specific vulnerable population.

0 / 5

Judge Name: Maxine Tanya Hamada
Score: 0.0
Comment: Because this is a broad initiative, it does not specifically address vulnerable populations. But as in the previous comment, there is a strategic opportunity for the Open Data Charter to be rolled out with benchmarks and mechanisms to measure its impact on vulnerable populations