Submission

Applicant Name: Italy Team
Normalized Scores 76.7

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
Showed no consultation in nominating an initiative; may have been jointly implemented but shows very weak validation of claims	*Some effort in consulting with other partners in nominating an initiative; initiative was not jointly implemented but provided minimal validation of claims*	*Provided sufficient evidence of consulting with other partners to nominate an initiative, was jointly implemented and presented somewhat convincing validation of claims.*	*Demonstrated compelling mechanisms for consulting others in nominating an initiative; was not jointly implemented but shows convincing validation of claims*	*Shows strong evidence of consulting others in nominating an initiative; jointly implemented with a partner agency and strong validation of claims*

2.1 / 5

Judge Name: Milena Nedeva
Score: 2.1
Comment: No information is provided on the consultation process for the nomination of this particular initiative,

2.9 / 5

Judge Name: Mendi Njonjo
Score: 2.9
Comment: Applicant provides sufficient evidence of partnering with other groups (government, non-government organizations, media groups etc.) for jointly implementing the initiative.

2.4 / 5

Judge Name: Marija Novkovic
Score: 2.4
Comment: There is no evidence of consulting other stakeholders in nominating this initiative.

4.4 / 5

Judge Name: Radu Puchiu
Score: 4.4
Comment: There application is part of the country's NAP and shows not only that was jointly developed and implemented but a strong support from civil society and media for the application.

4.9 / 5

Judge Name: Maxine Tanya Hamada
Score: 4.9
Comment: The mutual realization by the state and its partner institutions that the data was not being used is the foundation of this partnership. Both the supply and the demand side for the data agree on a trajectory for meaningful and re-usability of the available open data.

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
Exhibits a centralized, top-down approach to improving public services rather than public-facing approach; Target population largely have a passive role	*Somewhat articulates the importance of using open government approaches but these are sporadic, not well-thought out; Needs of the target population is unclear*	*Makes a convincing case of the need to use open government approaches and addresses a need of the target population for improved public services*	*Establishes strong rationale for using open government approaches which are somewhat innovative; targets a large number of the population and clearly identifies a need*	*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*

3.3 / 5

Judge Name: Milena Nedeva
Score: 3.3
Comment: Clearly identified deficit and evidence-based rationale for opening public data.

4.3 / 5

Judge Name: Mendi Njonjo
Score: 4.3
Comment: By getting more traction and usage for open & public data, the initiative make a compelling case of using open government approaches. Through increased access to information, there is possibility of increased civic (and other stakeholder participation) & public service delivery.

Judge Name: Marija Novkovic
Score: 4.6
Comment: The numbers of searches on the public spending note is quite staggering. The initiative managed to respond to the need for more openness and transparency.

Judge Name: Radu Puchiu
Score: 4.1
Comment: The initiative shows a strong commitment towards using the technology and establishes a good model for open data use and re-use. Targets a large number of population by combining in a innovative way the data visualization for an increased access to information and a better way of understanding data.

Judge Name: Maxine Tanya Hamada
Score: 3.4
Comment: The selection of three focus areas to deepen the use and reuse of available open data shows the target of this initiative. The initiative has the potential to expand to other focus areas and thereby widen the scope and reach.

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
Shows little evidence of achieving any of the outcomes or of an improvement in public services; target population has barely been reached	*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*	*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*	*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*	*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*

Judge Name: Milena Nedeva
Score: 4.2
Comment: Based on the numbers quoted the initiative clearly established a new standard for government-citizen interaction.

Judge Name: Mendi Njonjo
Score: 2.8
Comment: The initiative seeks to get more traction for the data usage (e.g though visualizations more public and researchers etc. are using the information). Validation video provides some information on how this can translate to improvements in public services.

Judge Name: Marija Novkovic
Score: 4.1
Comment: There appears to be a mechanism for monitoring and overseeing the work of public sector bodies. It would be interesting to know which groups engage with open data and reuse it. The assumption is that this attracts NGOs and high profile data driven journalists, as well as developers. Are there any plans for engaging other groups?

Judge Name: Radu Puchiu
Score: 3.8
Comment: More than two outcomes were achieved. The initiative widened the access to information using tools for better understanding of the data. To some extent is sets a new approach towards the relation between government and citizens in the way data is opendata is used.

Judge Name: Maxine Tanya Hamada
Score: 4.0
Comment: The initiative has three of the four outcomes. There is not so much data on whether the initiative has translated into concrete improvements in public spending, community resiliency and delivery of public works. In the future, these may perhaps be more apparent and measured.

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
Demonstrates few plans in moving the initiative beyond the pilot stage; does not address any potential threats or challenges to the initiative	*Shows some commitment to institionalizing the initiative; but presents unrealistic ways of managing challenges faced by the initiative*	*Lists activities to institutionalize the initiative; but only somewhat addresses how challenges will be addressed*	*Outlines a clear path to either institutionalize or scale-up the initiative; makes a good case on how potential challenges will be addressed*	*Presents a durable model that can be institutionalized and/or scaled-up; makes a compelling case for how challenges will be managed*

Judge Name: Milena Nedeva
Score: 4.3
Comment: Detailed and convincing approach to ensuring sustainability through ongoing involvement of a variety of stakeholders and encouragement of active re-use of public data.

Judge Name: Mendi Njonjo
Score: 4.8
Comment: Applicant makes a compelling case on the potential for this being scaled up over time (low cost of use, reusability of data etc.) . However- this claim assumes that making data re-usable= actionable data which cannot be validated.

Judge Name: Marija Novkovic
Score: 4.1
Comment: Please consider other risks associated with this initiative, such as the low adoption rate of new web or mobile tools. This is usually the case when users are not consulted in the design stage. Consider more inclusive forms of innovation as hackathons attract only a small section of the society.

Judge Name: Radu Puchiu
Score: 4.2
Comment: The model is surely one institutionalized and has a strong potential for scaling-up.

Judge Name: Maxine Tanya Hamada
Score: 4.0
Comment: The national open data strategy is positioned as the sustainability driver - done in continuous consultation with civil society and data users. The scale at which this could be expanded will in part depend on the ability to show a demonstrable impact on 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*

Judge Name: Milena Nedeva
Score: 0.0
Comment: The initiative does not specifically target vulnerable groups.

Judge Name: Mendi Njonjo
Score: 5.0
Comment: The applicant doesn't provide sufficient information for classifying this as a project that targets marginalized or vulnerable groups.

Judge Name: Marija Novkovic
Score: 0.0
Comment: It is difficult to assess this as there is no information in the submission on the profile of data4all users.

Judge Name: Radu Puchiu
Score: 5.0
Comment: The initiative makes a strong case in the potential of using data for a better decision making in the cases of flood areas of Italy, offering a number of risk indicators across the national territory (e.g. the government spending in public works for flood prevention, emergencies and damages) in the benefit of vulnerable population exposed to such risks.

Judge Name: Maxine Tanya Hamada
Score: 0.0
Comment: The three selected focus areas of this initiative does not yet allow for strategic intervention for vulnerable populations. If the national open data strategy can identify a particular data set or group of data, it may then utilize this model for vulnerable populations