

GENERAL GUIDANCE FOR WS EVALUATION PROCESS IGF 2026

Introduction

This document aims to provide a general and common approach for Workshop Evaluation Process and recommended selection for the **IGF 2026**.

Individual **MAG members will be randomly assigned to evaluate workshop proposals according to the programme's subthemes.**

Once **individual evaluation** is concluded, the IGF Secretariat prepares the final report of calculated scores for every workshop proposal. All MAG members will then be asked **to work in the subtheme groups** where each was assigned, in order to start the final selection of workshop.

Each evaluation group may apply these guidelines and consider particular elements that will be brought together during the **Second Open Consultation and MAG meeting from 7 to 9 September 2026**, providing the recommendation for selected workshop proposals included in a ranking list.

Stages, Dates and milestones

Stage 1: Initial screening by IGF Secretariat – 31 July-4 August 2026

Stage 2: MAG member individual evaluation – 5-19 August 2026

Step 2.1. MAG member evaluation based upon defined criteria

1. MAG members will be randomly assigned into evaluation groups by the Secretariat in which they will cover one or more subthemes, on the basis of the number of proposals received under each one and an equitable division of labor among the groups. These groups will remain the same from the point of individual evaluation throughout the process.

2. Individual MAG members will evaluate proposals based upon the following criteria and weights: i. Proposed topic (20%); ii. Workshop content (30%); iii. Policy Questions (15%); iv. Engagement & Hybrid Strategy (15%); v. Diversity (20%). According to the criteria description outlined in: <https://www.intgovforum.org/en/content/igf-2026-workshop-submission-and-review-process>

3. The total score for each proposal will be the mean average of the grades given by MAG members.

4. During the Stage 2 evaluation process, individual MAG members should also reflect on what topics could be emerging for the themes they are evaluating.

Stage 3: MAG evaluation groups – 20-28 August 2026

Step 3.1. Evaluation Synthesis

1. The Secretariat will provide an analysis of the Stage 2 evaluations.
2. The analysis will include the overall ranking of proposals and a list of each of the WS proposals and the corresponding overall score (average of all scores from MAG members assessing that particular proposal). Each of the Evaluation Groups will receive a second partial ranking list, including only the proposals assigned to each group.

Step 3.2. Evaluation Group discussions on workshop approvals

Once the analysis is received, the evaluation groups will begin a group discussion to develop a recommended list of accepted workshop proposals grouped into topics.

1. The evaluation groups are urged to take into account the following considerations and guidelines when developing their lists:

BACKGROUND INITIAL CONSIDERATIONS

- Total number of proposals received and evaluated.
- Distribution of proposals under each subtheme.
- Approximate number of slots possible for workshops: **TBC**

GUIDELINES

- The final decision for the number of sessions per subtheme will be based on the quality of selected proposals and thematic balance. Thematic balance is roughly determined by the proportion of proposals received under each subtheme, as an indication of the community's interest in that subtheme. The number of accepted sessions under each subtheme should be proportionately equivalent, in an approximate way, to the number of proposals received.
- For this stage, we will use the **“Three Baskets approach”**: **Green, Orange and Red**.
- Once the Evaluation Group has set aside the directly selected top-ranked proposals (**Green Basket**) that they would like to keep.
- The Evaluation Group could group the proposals into topics and identify gaps. This will help to identify elements which might be lacking so that the remaining slots can be used to help redress any lack of balance. Gaps can include under-representation of stakeholder group, geographic region(s), gender, and other diversity criteria, as well as under-representation of sub-themes.
- Other consideration may follow, such as:
 - A. To have an agreement of proposals that were not strong enough and will not be considered for further evaluation, putting them in the **“Red Basket”**. The main criteria to perform this elimination would consider lowest-ranked proposals, with two approaches:
 - a. 1. Worst ranked 30% proposals. Or
 - b. 2. Proposals with a score lower than 2.5 points.

- B. At this point we will have several proposals included in the “Green Basket” and also in the “Red Basket”, the remaining proposals will be included in the “Orange Basket”.
 - C. It will be also important to consider the main topics covered by the workshops as well as diversity in order to bring flow and balance to the programme.
 - D. Evaluation Group members will be moving workshop proposals from the “Orange Basket” to the “Green Basket”, or even all the way around, according to how the group feels about balance within the issue area, e.g. in terms of topics, geographic region or stakeholder group.
 - E. Group members should also look at workshops with a large variance in their scores as this might indicate interesting issues that may benefit from more discussion.
- Proposals which do not seem to fit as a workshop, but which show potential promise as a different type of session, should be set aside in an “Other Session” basket.

Step 3.3 Submit the Evaluation Group’s recommendations of workshops to approve

Groups should have their pre-selection workshops lists ready for final approval at the face-to-face Second Open Consultations & MAG Meeting on 7-9 September in Geneva.

Step 3.4: Final approval

All evaluation group lists will be formally approved at the Second Open Consultations & MAG Meeting. The accepted workshop organizers will be duly informed by the Secretariat immediately thereafter.