International Observatory on Participatory Democracy

21st AWARD BEST PRACTICE IN CITIZEN PARTICIPATION

Jury 2 — Assessment Criteria — 21st OIDP Award

Jury Guidelines for Evaluation

Jurors are asked to assess each practice using the criteria outlined below and to assign a score for each criterion, up to the maximum indicated, using the provided Excel sheet. Scores should reflect both the **quality and clarity** of the information submitted, and **the strength of the practice within its specific territorial and institutional context**.

As a general guideline:

- **Low scores** indicate that the criterion is poorly addressed, unclear, or largely absent.
- **Mid-range scores** indicate that the criterion is adequately addressed, showing some strengths but also clear limitations or gaps.
- **High scores** indicate that the criterion is addressed in a clear, coherent, well-evidenced, and contextually relevant manner, demonstrating strong performance and good practice.

For criteria with a higher maximum score (15 points), jurors should apply **greater differentiation between practices,** as these represent core components of participatory and deliberative democracy.

In your assessment, please be mindful of the diversity of contexts represented among applications. This includes ensuring a balanced representation across the Global North and Global South, regions, and different city/territory sizes, and between smaller-scale and large-scale initiatives. This consideration should support fair comparisons while respecting the merit-based scoring.

Jurors are encouraged to use the final comment section to provide a **balanced analytical assessment of each practice,** highlighting key strengths, areas for improvement, and its overall contribution and impact.

Consistency across evaluations is essential. Jurors should apply the same standards to all practices, while remaining attentive to differences in context, scale, and resources.

For reference, please consult the Award Terms:
https://www.oidp.net/docs/repo/doc2007.pdf

Assessment Criteria

1) **Objectives, design, and scope:** Are the objectives and sub-objectives clear and relevant? Does the practice adequately address the challenges and needs of its community? Is the design of the practice aligned with these objectives, scope and main target groups/beneficiaries? (**10 max**)
2) **Methodology**: Is the methodology clearly explained and appropriate for achieving the objectives? Is it well-conceived, structured, and executed? (**15 max**)* **One of the two most valued components, as it encompasses the entire system through which the practice of participatory/deliberative democracy is implemented.*
3) **Communication, community outreach, and awareness-raising**: Are the communication and dissemination strategies effective in reaching the maximum number of people, encouraging participation and keeping participants informed during and after the process? Do they engage closely with the community? Do they empower people and foster informed decision-making? (**10 max**)
4) **Innovation**: Does the practice introduce innovative or creative elements? These could be innovations in methodology or new forms of participation within the territory. **(10 max)**
5) Inclusion and equity: Does this practice attempt to achieve inclusion for people in all their diversity? Does it foster social or gender inclusion and contribute to social cohesion? (**10 max**)
6) **Evaluation, accountability, and transparency**: Is there a clear methodology or framework for assessing the impacts of the practice? Is evaluation used to analyze outcomes and improve future iterations? Are there clear accountability and transparency mechanisms in how the practice was funded, managed, or evaluated? (**10 max**)
7) Follow-up, sustainability, and adaptability: Are there clear mechanisms for monitoring the practice after implementation? Is continuity over time ensured, and are challenges addressed effectively? Is feedback or lessons learned integrated to improve the practice and maintain alignment with objectives? Can the practice adapt to changing circumstances or evolving needs? If long-term sustainability or adaptation were not achieved, is this explained and justified? **(10 max)**
8) **Impacts and results**: Does the practice achieve significant transformation within the community or territory where it is implemented? Is the number of beneficiaries clearly defined? Impacts may include institutional changes, public policy shifts, or improvements

in the social and community fabric. The assessment should take the specific territory and context into account. (**15 max**)
9) **Collaboration and articulation**: Does the practice demonstrate effective collaboration and coordination with other existing stakeholders, processes, or instances? (**10 max**)
Comment on the practice: *Please provide an analytical assessment of this practice, highlighting its strengths, areas for improvement, and overall impact.*