

IGF 2021 Workshop Evaluation Form

Deadline is 17 June 23:59 UTC

Select a proposal from the subset of IGF 2021 Workshop Proposals assigned to you to evaluate.

Proposal *

The menu shows the proposals assigned to you and that you have still pending to evaluate

MAG members who are listed as speakers or are directly involved in organizing a proposal should decline to evaluate it. MAG members should also decline to evaluate any proposals that they are aware were submitted by the organization they work for or are affiliated to. If you fall in one of those categories, or you consider there is any other reason why you should decline to evaluate a specific proposal, please let the Secretariat know, by marking the corresponding statement below.

- I don't have any Conflict of Interest and will complete the evaluation of this proposal
- I have a Conflict of Interest and therefore decline to assess this Proposal

IMPORTANT: Early signaling of Conflict(s) of Interest is much appreciated, in order to allow other MAG members to evaluate the affected proposal(s) within the deadline.

Please score the proposal according to the following criteria

C1. Session content and description.* The MAG member will look at the "Description" and "Expected Outcomes" fields in the workshop proposal being assessed and consider how all the information in the whole proposal reads and fits together.

Under this criterion, MAG members will assess the overall quality of the proposal as presented, including whether the description of the session is well-thought through, whether the proposal presents a concrete plan for the session, and whether responses to all the questions in the form are complete.

- Absent - The proposal is not fit for purpose, no plan included
- Poor - The proposal somewhat addresses the purpose and ideas presented, but no plan for how to achieve the objectives of the session from a multistakeholder perspective is included
- Needs improvement - The proposal is fit for purpose but it needs further improvement on how the ideas are presented, its structure and/or plan
- Good - The proposal is fit for purpose, ideas are presented well, follows a clear structure, and includes a plan how to achieve the objectives of the session from a multistakeholder perspective

- o Excellent - The proposal is fit for purpose, ideas are clearly explained, it is well structured, and includes a concrete plan how to achieve the objectives of the session from a multistakeholder perspective.
-

C2. Response to policy question(s).* The **MAG** member will look at the selected, refined or proposed "**Policy Question(s)**" in the workshop proposal and assess **how the proposed session intends to address the question/s.**

- o Absent - There is no clear understanding between the selected/refined/proposed policy question(s) and how it (they) are intended to be addressed.
 - o Poor - Selected/refined/proposed policy question(s) are barely related to the content to be addressed by the session
 - o Needs improvement - Session does not address the policy question(s) selected very clearly, therefore needs further improvement
 - o Good - The content of the workshop is well related to selected/refined/proposed policy question(s) and has the potential to encourage discussion and generate outcomes
 - o Excellent - The content of the workshop is fully related to selected/refined/proposed policy question(s), and has the potential to encourage discussion in order to provide concrete outcomes and/or further impact
-

C3. Relevance.* The **MAG** member will look at the entries in the fields "**How the proposal is going to address the Policy Question(s)**", "**Description**", "**Expected outcomes**" in the workshop proposal being assessed and consider its relevance, in relation to the **Main Focus or Emerging and cross-cutting Issue** selected.

Proposals should be relevant both to Internet governance and one of the main focus or emerging cross-cutting issue areas for IGF2021. The MAG member should assess whether the session's approach to the topic will add value to enhance the discussion on the issue area and/or policy question.

- o Absent - Proposal does not have a clear link with the main focus or cross-cutting issue selected nor provides deeper discussion on the issue area or policy question.
- o Poor - Proposal is somewhat aligned with the main focus or cross-cutting issue selected, but not clearly formulated
- o Needs improvement - Proposal is aligned with the main focus or cross-cutting issue selected, but needs further improvement, particularly regarding indicators that will introduce deeper discussion about the issue area or policy question.
- o Good - Proposal is aligned with the main focus or cross-cutting issue selected and somehow allows further discussion about the issue area or policy question.

- o Excellent - Proposal is clearly aligned with the main focus or cross-cutting issue selected and provides clear explanation about how the proposal will enhance discussion about the issue area or policy question
-

C4. Format * The **MAG** member will look at the **Session Format** selection on the workshop proposal assessed, in combination with the **Description** provided.

This criterion does not favour any one format over another, but considers whether the workshop content, as described in the proposal, is consistent with the format selected. For example, if the format is break-out groups, then does the proposal describe how the groups will be set up and their discussions captured?

- o Absent - The selected format is not referred to in the session description or does not match the session description (for example: format selected is debate, but the description talks of a panel)
 - o Poor - The selected format matches the session description but is not elaborated on
 - o Needs improvement - The description addresses the format, but needs improvement (for example: description talks of the same format as the one selected, but does not address clearly how the selected format will benefit the discussion)
 - o Good - The description matches the format chosen and addresses how this will benefit the discussion
 - o Excellent - The description clearly matches the format chosen, addresses thoroughly how this will benefit the discussion and lead to the desired outcomes
-

C5. Interaction and engagement related to the hybrid nature of the session. The **MAG** member will look at the entries registered on **Description, Interaction, Speakers and Moderators** and **Additional aspects**.

Workshop sessions should be engaging for all participants. The interaction criterion will consider the plans proposed for interaction among speakers as well as between speakers and on-site and online participants. IGF2021 is expected to take place in a hybrid format. This means that the experience of participation should be comparable and engaging for both face to face and online participants. Session proposals are expected to explain how their session caters to all participants, and offer opportunities for input and engagement.

- o Absent - The proposal does not address how interaction among speakers and between speakers and panelists will be managed throughout the session, nor does it elaborate on engagement opportunities by participants, either on-site or online.

- o Poor - The proposal touches upon interaction and engagement, but the explanations provided around online and on-site participation are not fit for purpose.
- o Needs improvement - The proposal somehow demonstrates a plan and effort to make the session engaging and inclusive for both online and face-to-face participants, but lacks concrete and viable solutions.
- o Good - The proposal has a thought-out plan for interaction among speakers and between speakers and the audience as well as concrete plans for genuine inclusion of both online and face-to-face participants.
- o Excellent - The proposal has demonstrated advanced thinking and planning to address how on-site and/or online participation will occur and is promising an original and engaging experience, including use of additional tools supporting further interaction.

C6. Diversity.* The **MAG** member will look at the response on all the **Diversity** options (**age, disability, experience, gender, geographic area, political view or orientation, stakeholder group, and additional comments**) on the workshop proposal assessed.

Diversity at the IGF occurs when a broad spectrum of participants share different viewpoints on the same Internet policy issue. Proposals should demonstrate diversity amongst speakers in perspective, experience, age, stakeholder group, geographic origin, gender and ability and disability. Proposers and speakers from developing countries, and youth participants are particularly encouraged, as well as people who will be new to the IGF, including communities from the host country to foster greater local participation. The approach to the theme and related topics, as well as the proposed outcomes or outputs of the session should also, as far as possible, be multidisciplinary and reflect diversity. To meet the minimum for this criterion, proposals must satisfy up to three diversity elements listed in the workshop proposal submission form

- o Absent - Diversity is not addressed in the proposal even though one element was selected
- o Poor - Diversity is somewhat addressed in one element listed but there is no clear plan to remedy or address the lack of diversity
- o Needs improvement - Diversity is addressed in one or two elements listed and provides some explanation about it, but would benefit from adding at least one more OR providing a basic plan to remedy or address the lack of diversity that could be improved
- o Good - Diversity is well addressed on more than two or three of the elements listed and a basic plan about how this contribute to the discussion is presented
- o Excellent - Diversity is clearly addressed in three of the elements listed, and a detailed plan about how diversity contributes to the discussion is included

