Submission

Applicant Name: United Kingdom Team
Normalized Scores 90.7

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*

Judge Name: Don Don Parafina
Score: 4.9
Comment: The process of nomination was consultative and the implementation of the initiative was a joint effort.

Judge Name: Haidy Ear-Dupuy
Score: 5.0
Comment: Well documented process of selection and demonstrated supporting evidence of partnering with other organizations.

Judge Name: Siapha Kamara
Score: 4.4
Comment: There is sufficient evidence of consultation and the reference confirm working with other agencies.

Judge Name: Milena Nedeva
Score: 5.0
Comment: Detailed description was provided of the consultation process for the nomination of the initiative. A selection procedure was put in place based on clear rules and criteria.

Judge Name: Maxine Tanya Hamada
Score: 4.6
Comment: The open call for nominations enabled stakeholders to articulate their initiatives. Having a set of criteria to select and shortlist the entries makes it objective - it would be good to know what the criteria was. The partnership extends beyond the implementing institutions and includes the neighborhood groups and citizens who have become part of the emerging practice

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*

Judge Name: Don Don Parafina
Score: 4.6
Comment: Aside from commentaries on draft plans, expert guidance and the referendums, I would have wanted to hear about the type of information that were publicised to enable good planning.

Judge Name: Haidy Ear-Dupuy
Score: 5.0
Comment: Innovative project that brings in civic participation and revitalize the participation of people in a government process. Inclusion of people and empowering them to be the planner, with government workers as advisers in the process is an excellent way to turn the process around. Giving more say to community on how they would like to see their community grow and progress.

Judge Name: Siapha Kamara
Score: 4.2
Comment: This initiative emphasis civil participation and increasing citizen access to information

Judge Name: Milena Nedeva
Score: 4.6
Comment: A new process which significantly changes the way in which neighborhood planning takes place in the UK was instituted practically affecting all citizens and addressing a clearly identified need.

Judge Name: Maxine Tanya Hamada
Score: 4.9
Comment: Bringing back planning to the citizens in their neighborhoods is a good example of open government. Giving these prepared plans a space and influence on government policy is commendable. The percentage of participation is a good indicator. It will be good to know if the development and outcomes will be influenced by the bottom-up approach

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: Don Don Parafina
Score: 4.6
Comment: In general, all indicators were met, but access to more information would be desirable to substantiate planning. This entails need for means to enable understanding of available information.

Judge Name: Haidy Ear-Dupuy
Score: 5.0
Comment: Has demonstrated the improved participation of the people in the process as a result of trust increasing in the government. Clear narrative outlining the evidence of success.

Judge Name: Siapha Kamara
Score: 3.4
Comment: Provides evidence of impacting on two outcomes and is contributing to improved service delivery

Judge Name: Milena Nedeva
Score: 4.5
Comment: Reliable evidence, examples and statistical data, is provided that the initiative achieved its goal of establishing a participatory neighborhood planning process which has become the new standard of government-citizen relations on the issue.

Judge Name: Maxine Tanya Hamada
Score: 4.6
Comment: Access to decision-making is clear and measured by levels of participation. The potential as a feedback mechanism is present. It would be good to see if service delivery of the population's identified priority needs has changed as a result of the neighborhood planning model.

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 institutionalizing 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: Don Don Parafina
Score: 3.6
Comment: Need more information on the source of financing of the initiative and the assurance on capacity development. Grants are not known to be a reliable source of financing and capacity development is a complex intervention.

Judge Name: Haidy Ear-Dupuy
Score: 4.8
Comment: Has potential to be sustain as more people are involved and feeling empowered. Government support and advice coupled with empowered community is a strong combination for success. Has potential to scale up.

Judge Name: Siapha Kamara
Score: 3.4
Comment: There are clear activity plan to institutionalization of the initiative and measures to overcome challenges

Judge Name: Milena Nedeva
Score: 4.7
Comment: Legislative changes were made as a guarantee that the new approach will be sustainable and credible for the participant. The financial mechanism put in place further reinforces the durability of the initiative.

Judge Name: Maxine Tanya Hamada
Score: 4.9
Comment: It would be even better to see how this can be institutionalized with state support or incorporated into the regular planning of the UK system as a whole. As it is, it is a powerful innovation that complements existing state plans.

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: Don Don Parafina
Score: 5.0
Comment: Planning needs to be linked to implementation to show actual improvement in service delivery. No clear linking is demonstrated in the initiative.

Judge Name: Haidy Ear-Dupuy
Score: 0.0
Comment: Demonstrated increased in citizen's participation. More community participation and hence building inclusion via empowering of community members. Addressing affordable housing, benefiting poorer members of community.

Judge Name: Siapha Kamara
Score: 0.0
Comment: Even thought the initiative emphasis community participation but it has no explicit targeting mechanism for the vulnerable groups

Judge Name: Milena Nedeva
Score: 0.0
Comment: There is no special focus on improving service delivery for disadvantaged groups.

Judge Name: Maxine Tanya Hamada
Score: 0.0
Comment: As presently implemented, it is not targeted for vulnerable populations but over time it has the potential especially at the level of inclusivity in neighborhoods