Submission Applicant Name: Netherlands Team Normalized Scores 72.9 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 Showed no consultation in Provided sufficient evidence of Demonstrated compelling Shows strong evidence of mechanisms for consulting consulting others in nominating nominating an initiative; may other partners in nominating an consulting with other partners to initiative; initiative was not an initiative; jointly implemented have been jointly implemented nominate an initiative, was others in nominating an but shows very weak validation jointly implemented but provided jointly implemented and initiative; was not jointly with a partner agency and strong validation of claims of claims minimal validation of claims presented somewhat convincing implemented but shows validation of claims. convincing validation of claims 4.3 / 5 Judge Name: Justine Dupuys Score: 4.3 Comment: This initiative is jointly implemented and has a whole process of online selection opened to citizenship at both nomination and selection levels, the validation of claim is not so convincing 3/5 Judge Name: Haidy Ear-Dupuy Score: Partnership with private entity is listed. The consultation and calling for nomination could be strengthened. It was difficult to know how many Comment: nomination was received and whether or not the selected project was the most competitive one. Judge Name: Virginia Pardo Score: 5.0 Selection process was conducted through open call website within the framework of Open Government, together with a voting process. The Comment: initiative is endorsed and was presented by referring to Governance and Civil Society. Judge Name: Alvaro Ramirez Alujas Score: While it is not part of the OGP action plan, it has the support of a private organization. Comment: 4.7 / 5 Judge Name: Ben Taylor Score: 4.7 Comment: Implemented in partnership, submitted in partnership. Lack of a validation letter. 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 government approaches given approach to improving public importance of using open need to use open government using open government the country context; targets an government approaches but services rather than publicapproaches and addresses a approaches which are somewhat facing approach; Target these are sporadic, not wellneed of the target population for innovative; targets a large ambitious number of the thought out; Needs of the target number of the population and population largely have a improved public services population and is responding to population is unclear clearly identifies a need a real need or demand passive role Judge Name: Justine Dupuys Score: Comment: By the mean of new technology, the initiative improves the exchange and debate between citizenship and government on public issues in order to design public policies. The platform tries to trigger the debate on social issues in order to co-elaborate solutions to social problems. The platform promotes information exchange, nevertheless it isn't clear that this initiative permits access to more information and accountability and which kind of solutions are going to be implemented. Judge Name: Haidy Ear-Dupuy Score: Comment: The project is innovative, but could use some publicity to encourage more use. Has the potential to be a good source for debate on problem facing government. However, need to demonstrate a strong engagement plan on how to get people to participate on this online platform. Could have benefited from a discussion on how many percentage of the people are online and are using the platform. 4.9/5 Judge Name: Virginia Pardo Score: The proposal present a tool for citizen participation to improve the perception of citizens about democracy, and close the gap with the state. It Comment: allows, in an innovative and collaborative way to strengthen the management and generation of ideas for local government Ultrech. Strengthens the pillars of transparency, collaboration and participation of the Open Government through a tool easy to use and accessible to citizens. 3.5/5 Alvaro Ramirez Alujas Judge Name: Score: While it is a digital platform to structure and organize debates to improve local services, it remains unclear results and practical impact. Comment: 3.9 / 5Judge Name: Ben Taylor Score: 3.9 Reasonably compelling use of technology to increase public participation in policy making. Comment: 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 - 11 - 2 2 - 3 3 - 4 4 - 5 Shows little evidence of Shows some signs of achieving Demonstrates achieving one or Uses clear indicators to prove Achieved two or more of the achieving any of the outcomes or outcomes to ultimately expand outcomes but the evidence is more of the outcomes, but it is that one or more of the outcomes unclear whether the quality of were achieved; initiative has access or improve service quality of an improvement in public unconvincing; change in public service is incremental and has the public service or access to services; target population has 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 for the relationship between more than half of the target population population government and citizens 3/5 Judge Name: Justine Dupuys Score: The platform was launched recently so there is few evidence of its success. Comment: 2.5/5 Judge Name: Haidy Ear-Dupuy Score: Comment: The initiative is at an early phase and does not have enough time to show its success. Perhaps in a few years we can see the success. 3.6/5 Judge Name: Virginia Pardo Score: 3.6 Evidence of use by citizens is checked through the ideas incorporated in the website itself. Is not reflected in the proposal that guarantees a Comment: subsequent process management ideas from the government, in this case the local government, as well as implementations of the ideas raised. Judge Name: Alvaro Ramirez Alujas Score: Lack detail and information on metrics and indicators to assess the results and impact of the proposed initiative. Comment: Judge Name: Ben Taylor Score: 3.3 Comment: Still early, but engagement levels so far have been disappointing. 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 - 11 - 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 but presents unrealistic ways of addresses how challenges will be initiative; makes a good case on scaled-up; makes a compelling potential threats or challenges to how potential challenges will be case for how challenges will be managing challenges faced by addressed addressed the initiative the initiative managed 4.4/5 Judge Name: Justine Dupuys Score: Comment: this initiative is implemented at subnational governmental level and can be scaled-up by replicating the model in other local government or at national level. 2.9/5 Judge Name: Haidy Ear-Dupuy Score: 2.9 Did not address sustainability question. Assumption of sustainability and that online users are responsive. Comment: 3/5 Judge Name: Virginia Pardo Score: 3.0 Comment: The proposal is well presented from the technological point of view, as an innovative tool for participation. It is not proven the sustainability of the process and methodology to ensure processing, commitment, and feedback of the organism to carry out the ideas. Judge Name: Alvaro Ramirez Alujas Score: Comment: It seems sustainable, at least locally. The experience could be useful in other contexts and scale be applied to other local governments or public services. 3.1/5Judge Name: Ben Taylor Score: 3.1 Need to address the challenge of increasing participation levels, but has clear potential for scaling up on a big scale. Comment: 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 3 - 44 - 5 2 - 3 Do Not Select Do Not Select Select this range for No Do Not Select Select this range for Yes 0/5 Judge Name: Justine Dupuys Score: 0.0Comment: however the platform tries to focus the debate on social problems, it is not clear that it will improve the service delivery access and outcomes for a vulnerable population. 0/5Haidy Ear-Dupuy Judge Name: Score: Comment: It is a good project from technology perspective however, can easily marginalized those who do not use internet and are not able to access it for one reason or another. 0/5Virginia Pardo Judge Name: Score: Initiative does not apply directly to vulnerable populations or specific sectors of the population that need special attention Comment:

Judge Name:

Judge Name:

Comment:

Score:

Comment:

Score:

0/5

Alvaro Ramirez Alujas

Ben Taylor

The initiative enhances a debate on improving public services and policies, involving citizens through the digital platform.

not applicable - target community is internet-connected people in a wealthy, democratic community.