

Applicant Name: Romania Team
Normalized Scores 78.8

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>

5 / 5

Judge Name: Mohamed Adnene Trojette
Score: 5.0
Comment: According to the applicant, "the selection process involved public voting and joint decisions of government and civil society representatives". Convincing validation of this claims is provided in the application.

3.5 / 5

Judge Name: Bernadette Leon
Score: 3.5
Comment: This free mobile complaints application was nominated because it won the Romanian Open Government Partnership Award for "The best app" at the end of 2014 and that award involved public voting by government and civil society representatives - hence very strong consultation. There is no partner agency

4.6 / 5

Judge Name: Gertrude Muguzi
Score: 4.6
Comment: The general public was also given a chance to participate in the nomination process through a public voting mechanism. Validation of claims came from a civil society organisation and links from sources not directly in relation to the OGP awards which implies that the sources were unsolicited and therefore more convincing, although they were not in English so I could not understand what was said.

4.4 / 5

Judge Name: Bibhu Prasad Sahu
Score: 4.4
Comment: Public voting to select a case is good initiative. But CSO consultation information insufficient.

3.6 / 5

Judge Name: Florence Thibault
Score: 3.6
Comment: The initiative was not selected especially for the Open Government Awards. It was selected because it won the Romanian Open Government Partnership Award 2014 and because the selection process involved public voting and joint decisions of government and civil society representatives. We have several documents that attest to the veracity of the claims made in the application concerning the application. But we have not really information about what the population think about in application and how important is the initiative for citizens.

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>

3.5 / 5

Judge Name: Mohamed Adnene Trojette
Score: 3.5
Comment: The initiative makes an interesting use of new technologies and targets a city population. The need is clearly identified and an open government approach is totally appropriate to address them.

4.5 / 5

Judge Name: Bernadette Leon
Score: 4.5
Comment: The system is innovative in that it allows an open and real time platform for government-citizen interaction about service delivery challenges and allows for transparent monitoring of progress and of performance - aimed at boosting confidence in local public service operators. Potentially all city service users can use the platform.

3.2 / 5

Judge Name: Gertrude Muguzi
Score: 3.2
Comment: The initiative used technology for transparency and public accountability directly. I particularly liked the fact that they are transparent about their feedback mechanisms and response times in relation to the information they receive. This will enable citizens to monitor the effectiveness of the initiative on an ongoing basis,

4.1 / 5

Judge Name: Bibhu Prasad Sahu
Score: 4.1
Comment: Civic participation only limited to lodging grievance. Unclear about target population like those don't have smart phone. Mobile application is an excellent idea.

3.8 / 5

Judge Name: Florence Thibault
Score: 3.8
Comment: Oradea City Report use open government approach in order to improve public services public : not only those directly provided by its own departments but including those provided by public and/or private outsourced operators. This application targets a large number of the population (around 196 000 citizens) but the number of downloads from Google Play Store is 4882 in 7 months. That's probably good but it can be better. The need is clear : a better and more quickly answer from public services (roads, green areas, public illumination, sanitation, water, taxes...) and a system very simple and quickly for the population.

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>

3.9 / 5

Judge Name: Mohamed Adnene Trojette
Score: 3.9
Comment: The initiative allows better access to information (who to contact when one wants to file a complaint) and establishes a C2G feedback channel. Government is able to respond complaints and to use data gathered through the application to improve public services. However, it remains unclear how much they actually improved.

4.7 / 5

Judge Name: Bernadette Leon
Score: 4.7
Comment: Yes, access to information for citizens is improved, citizen monitoring of government is improved, citizens can influence design of improvement services through their use of this system and citizens can complain easier and government can respond quicker. It appears that citizens do use the system increasingly which points to an improved relationship of trust between citizens and the city government

4.2 / 5

Judge Name: Gertrude Muguzi
Score: 4.2
Comment: Clear mechanisms are articulated for feedback from citizens and a transparent response mechanism from government.enables citizens to better monitor public accountability for the delivery of public infrastructure and services and their quality. The number of users and competitive response times give an indication that the initiative is affecting service quality in a positive way.

3.7 / 5

Judge Name: Bibhu Prasad Sahu
Score: 3.7
Comment: Information about number cases resolved and efficiency of resolution of problems (e.g. time taken, easy process etc.) no mentioned. Citizens active participation in design and delivery of services unclear. No mechanism for social audit.

3.1 / 5

Judge Name: Florence Thibault
Score: 3.1
Comment: We can see that the application exists, that it people can use it very easily and we can appreciate which kind of notifications you can transmit to the municipality. But we can't appreciate if the quality of the public service has increase (or how) because we don't have any information about the level of indicators before (number of complaints received, average number of complaints per day, response time...). Furthermore, we don't know which part of all the complaints received by the municipality comes from this application or if the complaints have increased because it's very easy to send a message to the municipality.

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: Mohamed Adnene Trojette
Score: 3.5
Comment: The applicant intends to continuously improve the initiative, for instance by creating G2C alerts on public services-related issues. However, the Government doesn't seem to intend a country-wide extension.

3.5 / 5

Judge Name: Bernadette Leon
Score: 3.5
Comment: Expanding the service is already being planned - to use the platform for sending alerts to citizens about city-related issues. This submission does not identify challenges and do not provide insights into how these challenges will be managed.

4.6 / 5

Judge Name: Gertrude Muguzi
Score: 4.6
Comment: The risk of poor government response discouraging future evidence is clearly articulated and the response of adding features on the app that would enable citizens to play more of a watchdog role and provide them with platforms for further participation in public decision-making is a convincing way to mitigate the risk under the circumstances. There is no mention of scaling up coverage further in the application although there is a clear pathway for scaling up functionality of the app.

3.8 / 5

Judge Name: Bibhu Prasad Sahu
Score: 3.8
Comment: No clear cut action plan for sustainability. No risk assessment and mitigation planning done.

3.6 / 5

Judge Name: Florence Thibault
Score: 3.6
Comment: Oradea City Report lists activities to scale-up the initiative but it's no clear the way the municipality will take in order to have a special respon with this application and to convince a large part of the population to use it. They have no ambition in terms of part of the population that must use Oradea City Report or the part of complaints, or the quality of the respons. Is it only a new media or is there something better with this application ?

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>

0 / 5

Judge Name: Mohamed Adnene Trojette
Score: 0.0
Comment: The initiative doesn't seem to aim at any specific vulnerable population.

5 / 5

Judge Name: Bernadette Leon
Score: 5.0
Comment: Not explicitly - it is not clear that service delivery access and outcomes for vulnerable groups will improve but one can assume it will benefit all city residents.

0 / 5

Judge Name: Gertrude Muguzi
Score: 0.0
Comment: There is no mention of vulnerable groups in the application.

5 / 5

Judge Name: Bibhu Prasad Sahu
Score: 5.0
Comment: Applicant can't convenience the exact plan of action though OGP norms are respected. Strong case of use of mobile technology but insufficiently demonstrated results, citizen monitoring and improved in quality of service delivery to the poor.

0 / 5

Judge Name: Florence Thibault
Score: 0.0
Comment: This application is for all the citizens of Oradea.