Submission Applicant Name: Albania Team Normalized Scores 60.8 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 - 11 - 2 2 - 33 - 44 - 5 Some effort in consulting with Provided sufficient evidence of Showed no consultation in Demonstrated compelling Shows strong evidence of consulting others in nominating other partners in nominating an consulting with other partners to mechanisms for consulting nominating an initiative; may nominate an initiative, was an initiative; jointly implemented have been jointly implemented initiative; initiative was not others in nominating an but shows very weak validation jointly implemented and initiative; was not jointly with a partner agency and strong jointly implemented but provided validation of claims of claims minimal validation of claims presented somewhat convincing implemented but shows validation of claims. convincing validation of claims 1.8 / 5Judge Name: Bernadette Leon Score: 1.8 Comment: Difficult to make a judgement - it appears that the nomination as done by a government committee, but with no civil society input. The initiative also appears to be government driven with limited to no NGO partnership. Judge Name: Gertrude Muguzi Score: 2.6 Comment: Two organisations, one research institution and one international NGO validated the claims in this application. However, there is no evidence of consultation outside of government in developing the initiative. 2/5 Judge Name: Tiago Peixoto Score: 2.0 No evidence of partnering or consulting CSOs in the process. Comment: 2.2/5 Bibhu Prasad Sahu Judge Name: Score: No mention of consultation with CSOs before nomination. But attached documents for validation of claim. Could have consult with CSOs, Comment: and media and mention in the application. 1.8 / 5Judge Name: Florence Thibault Score: Comment: Only each Ministry engaged in the National Action Plan of Albania. No civil society partners. A few letters with no real validation of claims 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 - 11 - 2 2 - 3 3 - 4 4 - 5 Exhibits a centralized, top-down Somewhat articulates the Makes a convincing case of the Establishes strong rationale for Employs innovative open need to use open government government approaches given approach to improving public importance of using open using open government services rather than publicgovernment approaches but approaches and addresses a approaches which are somewhat the country context; targets an innovative; targets a large facing approach; Target these are sporadic, not wellneed of the target population for 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 population is unclear clearly identifies a need a real need or demand passive role 4.5/5 Judge Name: Bernadette Leon Score: Comment: This on-line portal for public service recruitment processes was targeted to raise peoples trust in the recruitment processes of the public service and to move to a transparent and efficient process of recruitment - a valuable innovation responding to a trust-deficit problem in the country. 3.2/5 Judge Name: Gertrude Muguzi Score: 3.2 Comment: While this initiative is more about improving service delivery and efficiency and effectiveness in government and its primary role does not come across as greater transparency to the public, it does make good use of technology for transparency to achieve its objective. Judge Name: Tiago Peixoto Score: Comment: The project is basically an e-government solution for the hiring of civil servants. While there is some transparency given to the process (through the publishing), which may have benefits, it is not evident how this makes government more accountable. More transparency on the selection process in itself would be a significant advance. 3.2/5 Bibhu Prasad Sahu Judge Name: Score: Comment: Insufficient evidence of compelling facts. Justifications and cases are unclear and hence need to provide concrete case, sufficient information and data which make the case credential. 2.5/5 Florence Thibault Judge Name: Score: 2.5 Comment: There is no feed back from the target population here, except to be an applicant. All the population of the country is concerned because all the population want more transparency in recruitment. But the special target population is more reduced ans we don't exactly what they think about that. It's probably very good but we don't have indicator to appreciate. 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 some signs of achieving Uses clear indicators to prove Achieved two or more of the Shows little evidence of Demonstrates achieving one or 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 unclear whether the quality of were achieved; initiative has access or improve service quality of an improvement in public unconvincing; change in public services; target population has service is incremental and has the public service or access to widened access or improved the for a majority of the target population; set new standards barely been reached reached some of the target the service has improved quality of a public service for more than half of the target for the relationship between population population government and citizens 2.8 / 5 Judge Name: Bernadette Leon Score: Comment: At most this innovation respond to one or two of the outcomes - it improves access to information and citizens are able to submit queries and complaints regarding the recruitment process. The quality of the recruitment process has improved for those who use the system in that they are able to track progress online...a significant improvement. 2.8 / 5 Judge Name: Gertrude Muguzi Score: Comment: Evidence provided shows that access to information on the public recruitment process has clearly improved and this has the potential to increase the quality of personnel within the entire public service. However whether this actually ends up improving the quality of performance by public servants is dependent on many other factors as well and is much longer term incremental process. Judge Name: Tiago Peixoto Score: 3.8 Comment: It is not clear how two of the outcomes were achieved, notably (i) " Citizens have ways to actively participate in the design and delivery of public services, and (ii) Citizens have mechanisms to monitor and oversee public works and services 3.4/5 Judge Name: Bibhu Prasad Sahu Score: No evidence (information and facts) of improving quality of services. Citizens and CSOs active participation in the online recruitment process Comment: demonstrated. Unclear of scope of citizen participation in monitoring and oversee. So need to provide more facts if available or create a system as per the OGP norms. Florence Thibault Judge Name: Score: Comment: As before, we don't now the part of the vacancies in the public administration is concerned by this recruitment and the number of winners is not very high. It's probably interisting for each applicant in order to see where is his (her) application (result 1) but he doesn't now if the winners are realy better than him (diploma, sexe, parent in administration...). Result 2 is probably true. Nothing about results 3 and 4 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 3 - 42 - 3 4 - 5 Demonstrates few plans in Shows some committment to Lists activities to institutionalize Outlines a clear path to either Presents a durable model that moving the initiative beyond the institutionalizing the initiative; the initiative; but only somewhat institutionalize or scale-up the can be institutionalized and/or pilot stage; does not address any addresses how challenges will be initiative; makes a good case on scaled-up; makes a compelling but presents unrealistic ways of potential threats or challenges to addressed case for how challenges will be managing challenges faced by how potential challenges will be the initiative the initiative addressed managed 3/5 Bernadette Leon Judge Name: Score: 3.0 The submission does not provide information on how scale up will be done and how risks will be managed - risks are identified but no Comment: information provided on how this will be managed. 3.9/5 Judge Name: Gertrude Muguzi Score: Given that this initiative is operationalising a law, potential for insitutionalisation is very high if not already achieved. Two challenges were Comment: listed as well as what needs to be done to address them although no articulated plan for how or when this will be done. 4.1/5 Judge Name: Tiago Peixoto Score: 4.1 Comment: The project seems to be institutionalized, however it does not present clear evidence on how to avoid reversing such process. 2.9/5 Bibhu Prasad Sahu Judge Name: 2.9 Score: Comment: No such clear cut evidence of road map (strategy) for make the initiative sustainable. Could have design a strategic plan for make this programme sustainable. No mention of probable risks and mitigation strategy. 4.3 / 5 Judge Name: Florence Thibault Score: 4.3 It's a public project and there is no problem here, except to appreciate the part of public vacancies concerned. Considering the goal of the Comment: project, they have to improve the transparency of recruitment with better indicators for their communication with civil society. 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. 2 - 3 0 - 1 1 - 2 3 - 4 4 - 5 Do Not Select Do Not Select Select this range for Yes Select this range for No Do Not Select 5/5 Judge Name: Bernadette Leon Score: 5.0 Comment: Difficult to say - the access to employment in the public service will be improved for youth and women who apply for jobs online 0/5Gertrude Muguzi Judge Name: Score: There is no mention of minority groups in the application. Comment: 0/5Judge Name: Tiago Peixoto Score:

No evidence that it has improved access by vulnerable groups.

That's not a goal of the project wich is for all the population

Insufficient evidence, no CSO participation demonstrated, outcomes are not satisfactory and sustainable approach not clear.

Bibhu Prasad Sahu

Florence Thibault

0.0

Comment:

Judge Name:

Judge Name:

Comment:

Score:

Comment:

Score:

0/5

0/5