

IGF 2019 Workshops Process: Evaluation, Post-Evaluation & Themes

I. Theme Assignment and Workshop Grading

As part of the drive toward a more focused programme, the MAG has agreed to form 'Thematic Evaluation Working Groups' to review Workshop Proposals around the programme's three main themes - (1) Data Governance; (2) Digital Inclusion; and (3) Security, Safety, Stability & Resilience.

MAG members are randomly assigned to the Thematic Evaluation Working Groups by the Secretariat at the start of workshop evaluations and will then only grade the proposals under their assigned theme. Attention was paid to multiple diversity measures in the assignment of MAG members to these thematic working groups.

Assignments to be communicated and evaluations open on Thursday 18 April.

Thematic submissions and groups were more or less evenly distributed as follows:

Data Governance: 17 MAG Members - 97 Proposals

Digital Inclusion: 18 MAG Members - 106 proposals

Security, Safety, Stability and Resilience: 17 MAG Members - 86 Proposals

MAG evaluations close on Wednesday 8 May.

II. Statements of Conflict of Interest

Identification of Conflicts of Interest are to be declared to the Secretariat (Luis Bobo) by Wednesday 24 April. In order to facilitate *correlative thematic reviews* by the Thematic Evaluation Working Groups, reassignments will be undertaken by the Secretariat **ONLY** if necessary to ensure adequate and diverse reviews, and not as an automatic step.

III. Secretariat Supporting Analysis

Once all scores for proposals are received, the Secretariat determines where to cut off the highest scoring proposals based on its assessment of the schedule slots available for each theme and after consultation with the MAG on the overall programme. The secretariat will set the cut-off line at 80% of the expected slots for each theme and leave the rest of the slots for the Thematic Evaluation Working Groups to fill.

Just as in past years, those proposals highest ranked would serve as a "starting point" (a strong starting point but not an automatic acceptance). Each Thematic Evaluation Working Group will

start with the highest ranked WSs (by Theme) and then adjust from there on the basis of other factors (redundancy, diversity, issue coverage, overall thematic programme, etc.). The subsequent reviews by the Secretariat, Thematic Evaluation Working Groups, and finally the MAG will “build on” these earlier steps and ultimately determine the final programme.

To support the Thematic Evaluation Working Group reviews, the Secretariat will conduct an analysis by theme, looking primarily at the proposals above the cut-off line. The extracted information will be sent to the Thematic Evaluation Working Groups and should be as useful as possible to them, and aim to answer the following questions (*among possible others):

- a) What are the main policy questions to have emerged from the pool of submissions in each Theme?
- b) Are the top proposals in each Theme aligned with the main policy questions?
- c) How diverse are the viewpoints in the top proposals under each Theme?
- d) Relative to other criteria, how high is the *Relevance* score for the top proposals under each Theme? Do *Content* and *Policy Questions* rate highly?
- e) How concrete or clear are the Expected Outcomes of the top proposals in each Theme?
- f) Are there instances of duplication/redundancy that need to be flagged among the top proposals in each Theme?
- g) Are any of the top proposals in each Theme very clearly cross-cutting with other Themes, or more suitable for classification under the other Themes?

→ **Responding to question a)**, a policy question synthesis of the overall submissions pool would be prepared.

→ **Responding to question b)**, a policy question synthesis and analysis of tags/subthemes within the top proposals would be prepared.

→ **Responding to question c)**, an analysis of the gender, regions and stakeholder groups of the **speakers** in the top proposals would be prepared.

→ **Responding to question d)**, a comparison of the scores of the top proposals, isolating each of the six criteria, would be prepared. Special attention would be paid to *Relevance*, *Content* and *Policy Questions*.

→ **Responding to question e)**, an analysis of the Expected Outcomes would be prepared.

→ **Responding to question f)**, any top proposals that appear redundant with one another would be flagged.

→ **Responding to question g)**, any top proposals that appear to significantly cut across the Themes or appear more suitable for another Theme, will be flagged.

The Secretariat concludes its analysis and shares results with each MAG Thematic working group on Friday 17 May.

IV. MAG Thematic Working Group Review (Virtual)

The **MAG working groups review the analysis and meet virtually at least once, between 18 and 24 May**. During that time, they should try to resolve any possible issues related to content, duplication, thematic classification, or others, and agree on a preliminary thematic track. The Secretariat will help set up these WG review meetings and ensure they happen.

Working groups should submit their proposed draft Thematic Programme to the MAG no later than 24 May in order to allow time for MAG discussion ahead of the Virtual MAG meeting on 29 May.

V. MAG Virtual meeting - Plenary Review

The entire MAG meets virtually to discuss the working groups' respective draft Thematic Programme on 29 May.

VI. MAG Final Review (Face-to-face)

During the 5-6 June MAG meeting, time will be given to the MAG working groups to meet in breakout groups to address any open questions based on MAG discussions.

One (1) day will be for the Open Consultation Meeting (date TBD – may be the 2nd day)

On 7 June, MAG reviews and finalizes Thematic Programmes including Main Sessions and Thematic Opening and Closing sessions (if any).

Section Above	Activity	Dates
I.	Secretariat groups MAG evaluators, then screens, organizes and sends proposals to MAG for evaluation	18 April
I.	MAG workshop evaluation	18 April-12 May
II.	Statements of Conflicts of Interest Due	24 April
III.	Secretariat supporting analysis	12-17 May
IV.	MAG Thematic working groups virtual review	18 May-24 May
V.	MAG Virtual Meeting - plenary review	29 May
VI.	MAG working groups finalize Thematic Programmes	5-6 June
VI.	MAG plenary finalizes IGF Annual Meeting Programme (incl. Main sessions and any Thematic Opening and Closing Sessions)	6-7 June