

Working Group on Workshop Review and Evaluation Process – IGF 2019

2nd Virtual meeting, 26 Feb. 2019, 12.00 – 13.00 UTC

Minutes

1. Regarding the agenda for the meeting, it was agreed the first item on a Terms of Reference for the Working Group would be postponed. Susan Chalmers, who had volunteered to draft this, unfortunately could not make the call. Susan has said she will share an initial draft ToR soon on the group's list.
2. An overview was given of the narratives for the three themes submitted within the 22 February deadline. It was said that these were now being worked on by the Secretariat to refine the formatting and make the documents more consistent, and that revised versions would be re-shared with the MAG within the day (as of writing, the new narratives have been sent). The basic structure of the narrative documents would be as follows: Theme title; short thematic narrative/description; a list of the theme's related SDGs; a table with 2-3 subthemes; and illustrative policy questions associated with the subthemes.
3. An updated version of the workshop form was shared with participants on the call, with much of the editing work done by Sylvia Cadena, Susan Chalmers and Jutta Croll. The edits reflect the changes to the thematic structure this year, with three themes, and two to three subthemes from which proposers could select, as well as a write-in field for their policy questions. Other proposed edits do not depart significantly from prior years' forms and are intended to make the fields and information simpler for the proposers. Diversity of speakers and organizers, which has been strongly emphasized in the past, was presented in a more accessible way via a series of yes/no questions which invite the proposers to assert whether or not their organizing team and/or speakers meet the established criteria for gender, stakeholder, region, policy perspective, and inclusion of persons with disabilities; additionally, 'youth' and 'local communities' were placed among the criteria, based on the working group's latest discussions.
4. Regarding the form, it was further noted that the data provided for each of the persons involved in the workshop should be consistent across 'roles', i.e., be the same for organizers, speakers, moderators and rapporteurs. On the rapporteur role specifically, it was said the Secretariat should ensure this person has full access to the future online reporting platform.
5. A question arose over the ability to select a 'panel' format, which the MAG has tried to discourage in past proposal processes. One suggestion was made to eliminate this as an option altogether, while most felt this could be retained and left as the last option to subtly indicate this is not preferred for evaluation purposes, with perhaps the addition of a small note to guide proposers toward the other formats.
6. The question also came up as to whether to continue to make it mandatory for returning proposers to provide evidence that they submitted a report the prior year. Although some felt that this requirement could be too easily circumvented, it was agreed that retaining it made sense to emphasize the importance of fulfilling reporting obligations. As in past years, if applicable, providing a link to a previous report will be required.
7. A couple of technical aspects of the proposal were discussed, namely that proposers will have the ability to both include links to and upload additional background documents. It was further specified that proposers would be asked to describe any possible tools they planned to use to enhance participation in their workshops, but that these would be along the lines of a Twitter wall, or in-room poll mechanism, and not tools that supplant the IGF's main online participation platform. It was agreed that the Secretariat's platform need not be named in the form, although internally it is possible a transition will take place from Webex to Zoom. Regarding the mechanism for confirming speakers, as in the past, listed speakers will receive an automated email informing them of their inclusion in a proposal. In addition, proposers will be asked to tick a check box to assert they have

contacted their speakers and that they are provisionally confirmed; if there is any doubt regarding this or explanation needed, a text field will be provided to them below the check box.

8. There were a handful of questions participants agreed would need to be concluded on by the wider MAG in their virtual meeting the following day. These were, namely: should 'other' be given as a selection option among the themes and/or subthemes?; what is meant more precisely and what is expected when asking proposers for 'tangible outcomes' from their workshops?; as was the case last year, should speakers be limited to 5 per proposal, with an individual speaker allowed in no more than 3 proposals?; and should there be a minimum number of diversity criteria the proposal must meet for consideration?

9. Referring to the next steps (please see below) the meeting was closed without any other business to be discussed.

Next Steps

Wednesday, Feb 27th: Virtual MAG meeting V: sharing the revised workshop proposal form with the MAG ahead of the meeting; presentation of the working group's suggestions for the call for proposal and evaluation process; discussion with the MAG

Thursday, Feb 28th - Monday March 4th: Implementation of the changes to the proposal form; phrasing of the call for proposals

Monday March 4th: Publication of the Call for proposals

Participants

Sylvia Cadena

Concettina Cassa

Lucien Castex

Afi Edoh

Lianna Galstyan

June Parris

Paul Rowney

Timea Suto

Sorina Teleanu

Secretariat

Eleonora Mazzucchi

Luis Bobo

Host

Jutta Croll