

Submission

Applicant Name: Hungary Team  
Normalized Scores 58.8

**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>

2.7 / 5

**Judge Name:** Tim Hughes  
**Score:** 2.7  
**Comment:** The application is a joint application with a CSO, but does not describe any consultation on the nomination of the initiative with wider civil society. The initiative was jointly implemented by a CSO and local government.

3.8 / 5

**Judge Name:** Tanvi Nagpal  
**Score:** 3.8  
**Comment:** The initiative was jointly implemented with the local government of Pazmand and the EDemocracy Workshop Association and NGO. It is still a pilot and quite small.

3.2 / 5

**Judge Name:** Marija Novkovic  
**Score:** 3.2  
**Comment:** The initiative is driven by an NGO and later adopted by the local authorities. There is, however, not much evidence of wider consultations on the most prominent open government initiatives.

2.2 / 5

**Judge Name:** Stefano Pizzicannella  
**Score:** 2.2  
**Comment:** The initiative is jointly implemented but showed minimal consultation process for nomination and poor validation of claims.

2.2 / 5

**Judge Name:** Radu Puchiu  
**Score:** 2.2  
**Comment:** The project is a pilot showing a good collaboration at local level between the local authorities and the applicant NGO. Still, one of the support letters is from the same organization as the applicant and both support letters show only that the provided information is correct.

**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

**Judge Name:** Tim Hughes  
**Score:** 3.0  
**Comment:** The application makes a case for the importance of increasing access to information, but does not link this to any impact on the improvement of public services. Beyond increasing the supply of information, the application does not describe how the initiative responded to the needs of citizens.

3.3 / 5

**Judge Name:** Tanvi Nagpal  
**Score:** 3.3  
**Comment:** The pilot has good ambitions but it's really about openness of government rules and procedures and not about improving services.

2.6 / 5

**Judge Name:** Marija Novkovic  
**Score:** 2.6  
**Comment:** A moderate score is given here mostly because the initiative still did not yield concrete results.

3.9 / 5

**Judge Name:** Stefano Pizzicannella  
**Score:** 3.9  
**Comment:** The initiative wants to achieve transparency where most of the citizens get in touch with the public administration, at local level, but it is yet in the pilot phase. It makes a convincing case for the use of OG principles but it is still limited to one municipality. The target population is therefore still limited.

2.5 / 5

**Judge Name:** Radu Puchiu  
**Score:** 2.5  
**Comment:** Although at a small scale, the project uses the open government principles - mostly increasing the access to information in order to increase the public participation.

**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>

2.7 / 5

**Judge Name:** Tim Hughes  
**Score:** 2.7  
**Comment:** Pázmánd should be commended for taking a lead on increasing transparency in local government in Hungary. However, the outcomes listed in the application do not relate to public services, and it's unclear the extent to which they are attributable to the initiative, rather than other societal factors. It is also not clear the extent to which the initiative has been used by citizens and/or civil society.

3.6 / 5

**Judge Name:** Tanvi Nagpal  
**Score:** 3.6  
**Comment:** About 700 people with access to Internet now have the ability to get information about all the services offered by the local government. Not clear if services have improved or if there is much citizen feedback in the process

3.2 / 5

**Judge Name:** Marija Novkovic  
**Score:** 3.2  
**Comment:** The initiative appears to be in the inception stage.

3.6 / 5

**Judge Name:** Stefano Pizzicannella  
**Score:** 3.6  
**Comment:** The initiative reports some indicators that show a positive tendency for the pilot project, but there is not clear evidence of citizen engagement and better quality of the public service. There is no evidence that the increase in local population is due to the Glass Village Project.

2.3 / 5

**Judge Name:** Radu Puchiu  
**Score:** 2.3  
**Comment:** The project shows a strong focus in increasing access to information and a good collaboration between the various stakeholders at local level aimed by the project. The description showed an increase in public participation in relation with the city hall ("Increasing local government population (3,1% within 5 years), growing tax incomes (almost 60% within 5 years), and over-the-average, strong participation in elections (local: 53% in 2014, votes for the mayor: 68,8% in 2014) are promising feedback for openness and sustainability.") but it is unclear to what extent it is a result of the project.

**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>

3.3 / 5

**Judge Name:** Tim Hughes  
**Score:** 3.3  
**Comment:** The application shows a continued commitment to institutionalising transparency through the Pázmánd government. However, it does not list any challenges or how they will be addressed. These could include extending the transparency beyond the areas required by law, or building the demand and capacity for accessing information among citizens.

2.8 / 5

**Judge Name:** Tanvi Nagpal  
**Score:** 2.8  
**Comment:** The goal of the NGO is to take this initiative beyond this village. However it's unclear how it plans to do so.

3 / 5

**Judge Name:** Marija Novkovic  
**Score:** 3.0  
**Comment:** The risk mitigation strategy is not well developed. How the initiative could be replicated in other areas of Hungary remains unclear.

2.8 / 5

**Judge Name:** Stefano Pizzicannella  
**Score:** 2.8  
**Comment:** Even if the initiative can become a model for the other community in the country, is not clear how this process will be endorsed and how it addresses the challenges and the threats. There is no indication that central Government or other municipalities are endorsing or willing to spread the experience. Definitely, for the near future, the project will go on in Pazmand.

2.1 / 5

**Judge Name:** Radu Puchiu  
**Score:** 2.1  
**Comment:** The project was fulfilled to show that a good implementation at a local level can be a model to scale up at the entire country: "When a working technical solution to fulfill the public data publishing obligations for local governments meets the involvement of local and expert civic groups, a new design of legal, community and technical aspects are becoming the ingredients to significantly improve local data transparency, as a public service delivery."

**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:** Tim Hughes  
**Score:** 0.0  
**Comment:** The application does not make any reference to improving services for vulnerable populations.

0 / 5

**Judge Name:** Tanvi Nagpal  
**Score:** 0.0  
**Comment:** There is no evidence of this initiative targeting special populations.

0 / 5

**Judge Name:** Marija Novkovic  
**Score:** 0.0  
**Comment:** The initiative is web-based and could consequently be exclusive by design. The applicant should consider addressing the needs of marginalized groups.

0 / 5

**Judge Name:** Stefano Pizzicannella  
**Score:** 0.0  
**Comment:** The initiative doesn't address any vulnerable population category.

0 / 5

**Judge Name:** Radu Puchiu  
**Score:** 0.0  
**Comment:** The project doesn't show a focus on the vulnerable population.