

Working Group on Workshop Review and Evaluation Process – IGF 2019

4th Virtual meeting, 12 March 2019, 12.00 – 13.00 UTC

Minutes

1. The meeting focused on reviewing, for possible adoption, a draft Terms of Reference for the Working Group, drafted by Susan Chalmers; reviewing the Call for Workshop Proposals; and the various elements and stages of the proposal evaluation process.
2. Regarding the Call for Workshop Proposals, which had been published in time on Monday 4 March, group members did not have further comment and were satisfied with the public information provided.
3. Luis Bobo from the IGF Secretariat then gave a virtual introduction to the e-evaluation form MAG members will use, demonstrating the look and functionality of last year's form. It was explained that members would be able to select from their assigned proposals at the top of the sheet; score each of the six criteria from 1 to 5, resulting in an instantaneously displayed average or 'overall' score; and write comments into three different fields – to suggest a merger, to provide feedback to the proposers, and/or to make internal notations. This year, evaluators will also be able to change their scores throughout the evaluation period, as needed.
4. The issue was raised that it had been difficult in the past to provide objective scoring on each criterion, as there seemed to be no shared definition of what the numerical assignments meant. It was agreed that the Group could come up with some very succinct definitions for these, applying them to the six criteria - Policy Questions, Relevance, Format, Diversity, Content and Interaction – and then invite the MAG to do a trial evaluation using this detailed scoring scale. This would be suggested by the Working Group in the MAG virtual meeting to take place the following day. The Group members were further reminded of how the numerical scores have been defined as they pertain to the overall score for a proposal:
 - 5: An excellent proposal.
 - 4: A good proposal overall, although could be enhanced.
 - 3: An average proposal.
 - 2: A weak proposal.
 - 1: Does not meet criteria.
5. A discussion followed on whether or not the scores for the criteria should be weighted differently, according to their agreed importance to the overall process (the suggestion had been made, for instance, to prioritize Diversity and Relevance and give them stronger weight). Various options on how or whether to weight the criteria were discussed. Although there was consensus that certain criteria (f.e. Diversity and Relevance) might merit a higher weight than others, it was also cautioned that differentiating criteria by weight would need due consideration of the consequences this might have on the overall ranking of workshop proposals. Therefore, it was decided this question would be posed first to the wider MAG in the call the next day, and should there be agreement on distinctive weighting of criteria, weighting possibilities would be elaborated by the Group.
6. The Group also discussed a suggestion made that workshops be assessed onsite at the IGF as they take place, to gauge differences with how they were proposed and if quality is maintained when they are carried out. It was agreed there was not sufficient capacity to conduct such assessments, but that the workshop reports and videos could provide needed insight, and that organizers could be asked to self-report on certain aspects of holding the workshop.
7. Finally, the Terms of Reference of the Group was reviewed and ultimately adopted (the Group is to be renamed 'WG on Workshops Process – WG-WSP). The members of the Group agreed the Working Group should be open to current and former MAG members as well as to the wider public. Based on

this decision it was suggested to ask former MAG members, such as Rasha Abdulla, and others with valuable insight, to join the Group and be engaged in the deliberations of weighting the criteria in case the MAG agrees to a distinctive weighting of criteria.

8. The meeting was closed without any other business to be discussed.

Next Steps

- Discuss pending questions in next biweekly MAG call, on Wednesday 13 March, including weighting for evaluation criteria.

Participants

Sylvia Cadena

Concettina Cassa

Lucien Castex

Susan Chalmers

Raquel Gatto

June Parris

Timea Suto

Sorina Teleanu

Mary Uduma

Ben Wallis

Secretariat

Chengetai Masango

Eleonora Mazzucchi

Luis Bobo

Host

Jutta Croll