

IGF2019 Workshop Session Proposal Form

Workshop Proposal Submission Form Elements	Notes	MAG decision needed
<p>1. Theme [select one]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Security & Safety b. Data Governance c. Inclusion 	<p>After people select the narrative (only one) the narrative text appears. On question #5 they will have to explain how they think their session proposal fits into the narrative.</p>	<p>No objections or comments Some members of the WG supported the inclusion of an “other” option to allow applicants to define their focus. Other members recommended to avoid adding “other” as an option. Up to the MAG to decide</p>
<p>2. [Sub-theme, depending on Theme selected]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. [Sub-theme 1] b. [Sub-theme 2] c. ... 	<p>Limited number of subthemes will be included to bring focus to the program with 2-3 sub-tracks covering all the IGF program session types.</p>	<p>Some members of the WG supported the inclusion of an “other” option to allow applicants to define their focus. Other members recommended to avoid adding “other” as an option. Up to the MAG to decide</p>
<p>3. Workshop Session Title</p>	<p>Clear and strong guidelines for titles will be an important addition, as many previous titles are too generic, not indicative of the discussion. So far there is an automatic 60-character limit here. For titles that still do not make sense or do not adequately reflect the content of the proposal (regardless of length), the MAG could gently guide those proposers to change it.</p>	<p>No objections or comments</p>
<p>4. Policy Question(s)</p>	<p>Applicant will be asked to list the policy question or questions that will be addressed during the workshop.</p>	<p>No objections or comments</p>

<p>5. Relevance to Theme</p>	<p>Applicant will be asked to explain how their proposed session will contribute to the narrative of that theme (free text fields). It is recommended to delete the current text relating to the CSTD working group WG on IGF improvements, and specific paragraphs. This is not evaluation criteria, and we are trying to simplify the application process for proposers.</p>	<p>No objections or comments</p>
<p>6. Relevance to Internet Governance</p>	<p>Applicant will be asked to explain the how their proposed session relates to Internet Governance. Recommended to provide WGIG definition.</p>	<p>No objections or comments</p>
<p>7. Workshop Session Format</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Roundtable (U-shape/ Circle) b. Birds of a Feather (Classroom/Auditorium) c. Debate (Classroom/Auditorium) d. Tutorial (Classroom/Auditorium) e. Breakout session (round tables/flexible seating) f. Panel (Auditorium) g. If none of these formats fit your plans, please indicate the format type and room set up required. 	<p>These formats should also inform the room set-up required, depending on what the host country can confirm as available.</p>	<p>Some members of the WG recommended to eliminate the panel format all together from the form. Some members indicated they will prefer to keep that format on the form.</p> <p>It was suggested to leave Panel as the last option in the selection and ask the applicant to consider all other formats primarily or if selected, request applicant to explain why they have selected that format.</p>

<p>8. Diversity [statement of diversity requirement]</p> <p>a. Is this the first time you are organizing a workshop? Yes/No If no state the number of times you have organized a workshop</p> <p>b. Are you and/or your co-organizers coming from a developing country or under-represented region? Yes/No</p> <p>c. Is the list of people contributing to the session, in terms of organizers and/or speakers, diverse? Workshops should clearly match at least X of the diversity criteria listed below. Please select the ones you will be able to address, explain how, and what you plan to do to remedy the ones you are not able to address at the time the proposal is submitted</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Gender Yes/No ii. Geography Yes/No iii. Stakeholder group Yes/No iv. Policy perspective Yes/No v. Persons with disabilities vi. Youth vii. Local communities 	<p>Options to select Yes/No will allow applicants to clarify in an easier way what aspects of diversity the proposal is addressing.</p> <p>Criteria from a to c are mandatory to respond/address.</p>	<p>The MAG to decide how many to be clearly addressed from I to vii? Some members of the WG suggested to request a minimum of 3 aspects from i to vii to be addressed as it will be very difficult to address them all.</p>
<p>9. Workshop Session Description [current text] Please provide an outline for the session, including a description of the intended agenda for the session, and the issues that will be discussed]</p>	<p>Applicants may also explain how the methodology will support practical outcomes, substantive policy discussions, and how discussion will be facilitated during the session, etc.</p>	<p>No objections or comments</p>
<p>10. Workshop Session Expected (tangible) Outcomes</p>	<p>To be defined scope and expectations</p>	<p>MAG to decide how to address this requirement. Some members of the WG requested not to include the word tangible. All WG agreed that clarification and scope is required.</p>

<p>11. Organizer information</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Family Name b. Given Name c. Gender d. Nationality e. Organization f. Stakeholder group g. Regional group h. E-mail address 		No objections or comments
<p>12. If you organized a session in previous IGF events, please give the name of the session and provide the link to the report</p>	<p>This question will be visible on the form depending if the applicant answered No to question 8) a.</p>	No objections or comments
<p>13. Speakers [check box if contacted/confirmed] [text field below check box will invite proposer to provide any additional explanation on the communication with their speakers, i.e. any necessary clarification on the speakers' availability to participate]</p>	<p>Maximum number of speakers might need to be reviewed depending on the session format shared. It is recommended the maximum of 5.</p> <p>Format: Name, Title, Stakeholder Group, Region. For consistency, same fields as Organizer, Moderators and Rapporteur</p> <p>The secretariat indicated they could do a high-level 'quality control' check of selected workshops closer to the meeting, to see if updated speakers lists more or less match those proposed, especially where diversity is concerned.</p>	No objections or comments
<p>14. Moderators</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. In-person b. Online 	<p>For consistency, same fields as Organizer, Moderators and Rapporteur</p>	No objections or comments
<p>15. Rapporteur</p>	<p>For consistency, same fields as Organizer, Moderators and Rapporteur</p> <p>Can the Secretariat provide access to the moderator for the reporting template (normally is the organizer who has the access</p>	No objections or comments

	and sometimes the delays to submit reports are because the rapporteur does not have the access.	
<p>16. Session interaction and participation</p> <p>a. Explain how the session organizers plan to facilitate and encourage interaction and participation during the session (free text)</p> <p>b. Are you aware that the IGF provides access and support for remote participants through an Official Remote Participation Platform? Yes/No</p> <p>c. Are you planning to use other complementary tools/platforms to increase participation and interaction during the session? Yes/No</p>	<p>The WG highlighted that it is important that online participation is a requirement.</p> <p>If applicants select yes on option b, a text box will show to explain how you are planning to use the official remote participation tool.</p> <p>If applicants select no, link to guidelines for remote participation (independent of the software to be available) and indicate that training will be available so that they can add a later date how they are planning to use it.</p> <p>On c. if yes, show text field about which platforms and how they are planning to use them.</p>	No objections or comments
17. Relation to SDGs	Applicant to choose the SDGs the proposal is related to from a list	

18. Optional: Background materials, framework document, policy documents, recent supporting documentation	<p>Applicant to add links to supporting materials – e.g. white papers, reports. This is not required, but documents may be taken into account by the MAG in the evaluation process</p> <p>From the technical standpoint, both providing links and uploading documents will be possible.</p> <p>Secretariat might put together all supporting documents recommended/suggested by narrative(theme)/subtheme as part of the concrete outcomes (recommended, up to date bibliography)</p>	No objections or comments
--	---	---------------------------

DRAFT