

Applicant Name: Armenia Team
Normalized Scores 85.7

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>

4.8 / 5

Judge Name: Tim Hughes
Score: 4.8
Comment: The initiative was selected through a crowdsourcing process, is a joint application with a CSO, and has strong letters of recommendation from three diverse organisations. The initiative itself is jointly implemented by a range of partners.

4.1 / 5

Judge Name: Mendi Njonjo
Score: 4.1
Comment: Applicant provided sufficient evidence of partnering with other non-government organizations in either nominating, validating and/or jointly implementing the initiative.

5 / 5

Judge Name: Marija Novkovic
Score: 5.0
Comment: The applicants presented compelling claims on consultations with other stakeholders, in the nomination stage, as well as proof of collaboration with CSOs in the implementation stage.

4.7 / 5

Judge Name: Stefano Pizzicannella
Score: 4.7
Comment: Armenia selected the project with a good involvement of civil society and the project itself is a consortium of actors mixed public - private

4.4 / 5

Judge Name: Radu Puchiu
Score: 4.4
Comment: According to the resources found (http://unpan3.un.org/unpsa/Public_NominationProfile.aspx?id=706), the initiator of the project was the RA Ministry of Territorial Administration in Armenia and the project was fully elaborated and implemented by "Information Systems Development and Training Center" NGO, which Head (Grisha Khachatryan) and staff have extensive and rich experience in creation and introduction of municipal management information systems. This shows not only a strong evidence in the joint implementation but a strong collaboration between Government and NGOs which is also shown in the support letters. Still, the project started in 2006, first phase ending in 2009 by launching of MMIS in 217 communities out of the total of 926 communities in the Republic of Armenia. The present submission shows that "The Municipal Management Information System (MMIS) was created and introduced in communities of Armenia. The MMIS has been installed in over 550 communities (61%) across the country."

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>

4.4 / 5

Judge Name: Tim Hughes
Score: 4.4
Comment: The application makes a compelling case for a joined up digital architecture for citizens to access information and participate in local services. The initiative boasts a wide coverage of the population, with ambitions to increase it further. The application could have been strengthened by greater evidence of the demand from citizens.

3.7 / 5

Judge Name: Mendi Njonjo
Score: 3.7
Comment: Applicant provides sufficient evidence of partnering with other non-government organizations in either nominating, validating and/or jointly implementing the initiative where project targets 61% of the population (550 communities in total). The targeting of Municipalities as the Units responsible to service delivery as the point where citizens interact with public services The idea has built in feedback to citizens where they get information on the state of services they're seeking from their Municipalities through the ticketing system. This allows citizens to track issue resolution through the service delivery process.

4.4 / 5

Judge Name: Marija Novkovic
Score: 4.4
Comment: The initiative clearly relies on the use of new technologies, while also trying to provide offline services to those citizens who are not technologically savvy. The geographical coverage is quite sizeable too, but this is probably due to a long implementation period (since 2008). The applicants should have focused more on elaborating the initiative outcomes.

4.2 / 5

Judge Name: Stefano Pizzicannella
Score: 4.2
Comment: The project makes a large use of technology to introduce the OGP principles and approaches of transparency and access. The Smart Municipality is conceived to have an organizational impact on local government but it is not clear if this has been achieved yet.

4.1 / 5

Judge Name: Radu Puchiu
Score: 4.1
Comment: The project is included in the National Action Plan and gives good evidence on focusing on citizen participation to achieve transparency, trust and improved service provision on the municipal level.

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>

3.6 / 5

Judge Name: Tim Hughes
Score: 3.6
Comment: The initiative relates to all of the outcomes listed, but the application lacks clear evidence of the tangible impact on each. The system sounds as though it has great potential to improve service quality, but it is not clear from the evidence presented the extent to which it is being used and the impact it is having on citizens or services.

4.5 / 5

Judge Name: Mendi Njonjo
Score: 4.5
Comment: Overall, the initiative allows for the targeted municipalities to increase the quality and efficiency of public services. Specifically, citizens have better access to the service entitlements that are due to them; and they also have mechanisms (through the online ticketing) to monitor and oversee public works and services.

4.5 / 5

Judge Name: Marija Novkovic
Score: 4.5
Comment: As mentioned, the applicants should have devoted more attention to communicating the initiative outcomes. Though there is mention of reduction in service provision time, there should have been more practical examples of the impact on the ground.

3.9 / 5

Judge Name: Stefano Pizzicannella
Score: 3.9
Comment: It is not clear how many citizens are actually using the system and how. Reference is made to the number of Systems installed but more evidence on impacts and users satisfaction of the initiative might be sought given the long standing duration of the initiative itself. Moreover, it is not clear if participatory tools are implemented, active and used.

4.3 / 5

Judge Name: Radu Puchiu
Score: 4.3
Comment: The system is designed deliver various services applying the principles of open government of active participation, including mechanisms to monitor the public services. The project was introduced and launched in over 550 communities in all 10 regions (provinces) of Armenia involving according to the applicant, approximately 92% of the population of the regions.

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>

4.4 / 5

Judge Name: Tim Hughes
Score: 4.4
Comment: The application presents a strong case for how its implementation is being scaled across local government. The initiative appears to have strong backing through its partners, and is built into the budgets of local governments. However, it's not clear from the application the current extent of use of the platform by citizens, and how the partners intend to scale this up over time. Experience from previous e-government platforms suggests that this is the more difficult aspect of achieving scale.

3.9 / 5

Judge Name: Mendi Njonjo
Score: 3.9
Comment: Applicant makes a compelling case that the initiative can be scaled up over time with the uptake of the MMIS system high (e.g. the project coverage is over 61%. This is indicative of the high institutionalization potential of the programme.) There exists a clear feedback mechanism for citizens to be able to track the status of their service. This seems to provide a compelling case for citizens to continue participating in the MMIS programme. The creation of "Citizen Offices" in the communities that would (presumably) provide ways in which citizens would gain awareness and information on how to register complaints/ issues through the MMIS. All told, this looks like a project that would be incubated and implemented at the local government level so strong indications for citizen participation in the MMIS. Missing from project description is an analysis of how the Municipalities' capacities to manage the citizens' demands is being met by the Government of Armenia however. Poses significant risk to programme, if the MMIS only highlights the Municipalities' inability to meet citizen needs and demands.

4.8 / 5

Judge Name: Marija Novkovic
Score: 4.8
Comment: It seems like the sustainability mechanisms are in place, particularly regarding the financial aspects. However, it would be good to know how the initiative curators will keep engaging the citizens in public service improvement.

3.8 / 5

Judge Name: Stefano Pizzicannella
Score: 3.8
Comment: It is clear that the consortium has reached a point of non return, but some issues about the use by citizens and the financial effort in the future are unclear. The Consortium appears to be stable. However, for the future there seems to lack a strategy to meet further challenges.

4.2 / 5

Judge Name: Radu Puchiu
Score: 4.2
Comment: The project showed a strong joint collaboration and commitment from both Government and NGOs from the very beginning back in 2006. It's continuing improvement and the focus on public participation shows a durable model which in constantly implemented to a large scale of the population.

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

Judge Name: Tim Hughes
Score: 0.0
Comment: The initiative has taken some account of digitally excluded communities through the establishment of some offline centres. However, there is no evidence presented of the impact of the initiative on service delivery access or outcomes for vulnerable populations.

5 / 5

Judge Name: Mendi Njonjo
Score: 5.0
Comment: Applicant somewhat demonstrates that this can lead to successfully improved service delivery access outcomes for vulnerable population through the "Ease of Access" where offline services can be provided to "net marginalized communities". There is however not enough information available to make a determination on whether the communities who cannot get online corresponds to the offline marginalizations that also occur in the provinces that the MMIS is working in.

0 / 5

Judge Name: Marija Novkovic
Score: 0.0
Comment: More data is provided in capacity building for local civil servants, than on reaching out to poor and excluded groups. Hence the somewhat low rating.

0 / 5

Judge Name: Stefano Pizzicannella
Score: 0.0
Comment: The project doesn't target specific vulnerable groups of population, even if paths to access the system off-line have been implemented

5 / 5

Judge Name: Radu Puchiu
Score: 5.0
Comment: The project was introduced and launched in over 550 communities in all 10 regions (provinces) of Armenia involving according to the applicant, approximately 92% of the population of the regions which gives a strong opportunity to all the vulnerable population.