

Submission

Applicant Name: Argentina Team  
Normalized Scores 66.6

### 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>




**Judge Name:** Justine Dupuys  
**Score:** 3.4  
**Comment:** The initiative was not jointly implemented but there was a mechanism of selection and nomination with different partners and a debate online




**Judge Name:** Virginia Pardo  
**Score:** 2.0  
**Comment:** Se tiene el aval de la postulación de 2 organizaciones (CIPPEC y PuntoGov). No se realizo propuesta en conjunto con Soc. Civil. Se muestra alguna evidencia que se consultó previamente para la postulación, pero no se puede verificar bien alcance de convocados.



**Judge Name:** Tiago Peixoto  
**Score:** 2.7  
**Comment:** No, it mentions it consulted "organos" but do not specify who contributed to the consultation.



**Judge Name:** Alvaro Ramirez Alujas  
**Score:** 3.5  
**Comment:** Existe evidencia suficiente sobre el apoyo de otras organizaciones no gubernamentales en avalar la iniciativa presentada (CIPPEC y Punto Gov). Además, la postulación de la iniciativa ha sido el resultado de un proceso participativo para la selección, por parte del Grupo de Trabajo de Gobierno Abierto en Argentina.



**Judge Name:** Tania Sanchez  
**Score:** 1.9  
**Comment:** The consultation process is somewhat ambiguously described (although there was not quite a lot of room to explain with detail). The initiative is implemented solely by the government agency. Presented 2 letters of validation


### 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>




**Judge Name:** Justine Dupuys  
**Score:** 2.6  
**Comment:** The initiative looks like an improvement of website more than an OGP initiative. If the DINE made a strong effort to release a lot of important information and open data on election process, it appears to be a top-down approach and the target population have a passive role.




**Judge Name:** Virginia Pardo  
**Score:** 3.2  
**Comment:** Propuesta que fortalece incremento al acceso a la información pública, rendición de cuentas y se basa en tecnología para la transparencia. Iniciativa enfocada en la transparencia en la gestión mediante la publicación y acceso a la información por parte de la ciudadanía, factor innovador de la misma débil.




**Judge Name:** Tiago Peixoto  
**Score:** 3.5  
**Comment:** It does make a convincing case for making electoral information more transparent, which is extremely important. However there is no relationship with public services (it should not have anyway). This question penalizes initiatives as this one that - albeit important - do not have a direct impact on service delivery.



**Judge Name:** Alvaro Ramirez Alujas  
**Score:** 3.5  
**Comment:** Si bien la iniciativa se relaciona directamente con la administración del sistema electoral y no necesariamente con la idea de mejoramiento de servicios públicos\* (eje temático de esta convocatoria), cumple con incorporar la idea de uso y reutilización de la información pública, su accesibilidad y las posibilidades de control y monitoreo del proceso electoral (favorece la transparencia, la inclusión y acceso a datos públicos; y eventualmente, a la participación e interacción con los ciudadanos por la vía de herramientas digitales). (\*) La convocatoria para el OGP Awards define como eje para el 2015 el "mostrar cómo las iniciativas de gobierno abierto se han traducido en mejoras concretas en la prestación de servicios públicos, por ejemplo, programas de bienestar económico, salud, educación, agua, carreteras, seguridad pública, etc. OGP ha elegido este tema para 2015 en reconocimiento del hecho de que los servicios públicos son la interfaz más común entre los ciudadanos y el gobierno, y que los gobiernos deben garantizar la transparencia, rendición de cuentas y capacidad de respuesta en su diseño y ejecución. Buena calidad y servicios públicos eficaces responden a las necesidades de las personas, incluidos los grupos vulnerables, y forman la base del desarrollo inclusivo".




**Judge Name:** Tania Sanchez  
**Score:** 3.4  
**Comment:** The initiative makes a strong case of the need to publish disaggregated open data on political/ elections finance in order to encourage and facilitate citizen control of the electoral process; it stresses the fact that access to the electoral information is universal, and adapted for the visually and auditive challenged public.




### 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>




**Judge Name:** Justine Dupuys  
**Score:** 3.7  
**Comment:** The platform improves access to information for citizens and provides a better accountability on election but it shows little evidence of achieving an important interaction between government and citizenship and on the control the civil society can operate based on this information




**Judge Name:** Virginia Pardo  
**Score:** 4.4  
**Comment:** Se comprueba la existencia del sitio Web con la información disponible. No se tiene evidencia sobre cantidad de accesos, uso y valoración por parte de los interesados. Si hay +23.000 seguidores en Twitter pero no se menciona como parte de la propuesta.




**Judge Name:** Tiago Peixoto  
**Score:** 2.8  
**Comment:** No, this is about electoral processes transparency. As such, it should not bear any direct impact on service delivery, particularly in the short term.



**Judge Name:** Alvaro Ramirez Alujas  
**Score:** 2.8  
**Comment:** Se presenta un detalle de los beneficios esperados de la iniciativa pero no se adjunta mayor información sobre el potencial impacto y resultados de la misma en términos de lo que se entiende por "servicio público" (el video que acompaña la postulación entrega información adicional pero no es suficiente y falta mayor fundamentación - como indicadores y/o métricas que permitan relevar su potencial y beneficios concretos hacia la ciudadanía más allá de lo que un sistema de administración electoral debe contemplar como base - y en lo relativo a la aplicación de tecnología y/o digitalización de ciertos procesos o entrega de información).




**Judge Name:** Tania Sanchez  
**Score:** 2.7  
**Comment:** The initiative describes the type of information that has been published for the first time in this country, but does not necessarily provide evidence of having reached 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>



**Judge Name:** Justine Dupuys  
**Score:** 3.5  
**Comment:** this initiative is institutionalized and have been implemented during the last election process in Argentina but there is no plan to improve the tools or to scale-up the initiative




**Judge Name:** Virginia Pardo  
**Score:** 4.8  
**Comment:** Se detalla como forma de sostenibilidad convenios específicos con ONGs vinculadas a temas electorales. Sumando a la institucionalidad dada por la propia DINE, mas vinculado con Datos Abiertos.



**Judge Name:** Tiago Peixoto  
**Score:** 4.6  
**Comment:** Yes, there are compelling arguments to make it believe that the initiative will continue to exist.



**Judge Name:** Alvaro Ramirez Alujas  
**Score:** 4.0  
**Comment:** De acuerdo a la información disponible en la Web y en los antecedentes presentados en la postulación, se trata de una iniciativa en actual desarrollo e institucionalización, y muestra un interesante caso de facilitar el acceso a datos y a los procesos ligados al sistema electoral.




**Judge Name:** Tania Sanchez  
**Score:** 3.6  
**Comment:** Describes the institutional arrangements that have been made, including creating certain departments within the agency to be responsible for continuing to produce and publish data, and partnering with civil society to further develop the initiative. But, does not provide details on how they will deal with challenges.



### 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>




**Judge Name:** Justine Dupuys  
**Score:** 0.0  
**Comment:** In spite of the mention of improving the inclusion of vulnerable population, the initiative does not demonstrate that it successfully permitted this inclusion.




**Judge Name:** Virginia Pardo  
**Score:** 0.0  
**Comment:** Iniciativa que no aplica directamente a poblaciones vulnerables o sectores específicos de la población que requieren especial atención.



**Judge Name:** Tiago Peixoto  
**Score:** 0.0  
**Comment:** No, since it is related to electoral process it does not guarantee improved service delivery access and / or outcomes, at least in the short term, and not directly.



**Judge Name:** Alvaro Ramirez Alujas  
**Score:** 0.0  
**Comment:** Dado que se trata de una iniciativa que relaciona y hace más transparente, accesible e incluye el elemento de administración en Argentina, ello no necesariamente se relaciona con el mejoramiento en la entrega y/o provisión de servicios públicos \* (en la forma tradicional de entenderlo) y en su potencial impacto en la calidad de vida o bienestar de las personas (sino más bien en la mejora de las vías para perfeccionar la democracia, sustentar procesos político-electorales que puedan ser monitoreados desde la sociedad, y ejercer control social en dicho ámbito). (\*) La convocatoria para el OGP Awards define como eje para el 2015 el "mostrar cómo las iniciativas de gobierno abierto se han traducido en mejoras concretas en la prestación de servicios públicos, por ejemplo, programas de bienestar económico, salud, educación, agua, carreteras, seguridad pública, etc. OGP ha elegido este tema para 2015 en reconocimiento del hecho de que los servicios públicos son la interfaz más común entre los ciudadanos y el gobierno, y que los gobiernos deben garantizar la transparencia, rendición de cuentas y capacidad de respuesta en su diseño y ejecución. Buena calidad y servicios públicos eficaces responden a las necesidades de las personas, incluidos los grupos vulnerables, y forman la base del desarrollo inclusivo".



**Judge Name:** Tania Sanchez  
**Score:** 0.0  
**Comment:** It is not targeted for a vulnerable population; does not provide evidence of improvement, but rather describes the amount and type of information being published and how this should help to increase trust on the electoral institutions and processes.