IGF2019 Workshop Session Proposal Form

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Workshop Proposal Submission Form Elements** | **Notes** |
| 1. **Theme [select one]**    1. Security & Safety    2. Data Governance    3. Inclusion | After people select the narrative (only one) the narrative text appears, as well as a question about how they think their session proposal fits into the narrative. |
| 1. **[Sub-theme, depending on Theme selected]**    1. [Sub-theme 1]    2. [Sub-theme 2] | Limited number of subthemes will be included to bring focus to the program with six distinct sub-tracks covering all the IGF program session types. To help focus the program on the three themes, it is recommended to avoid adding “other” as an option. |
| 1. **Workshop Session Title** | Clear and strong guidelines for titles will be an important addition, as many previous titles are too generic, not indicative of the discussion |
| 1. **Policy Question(s)** | Applicant will be asked to list the policy question or questions that will be addressed during the workshop. |
| 1. **Relevance to Theme** | Applicant will be asked to explain how their proposed session will contribute to the narrative of that theme (free text fields). It is recommended to delete the current text relating to the CSTD working group WG on IGF improvements, and specific paragraphs. This is not evaluation criteria, and we are trying to simplify the application process for proposers. |
| 1. **Relevance to Internet Governance** | Applicant will be asked to explain the how their proposed session relates to Internet Governance. Recommended to provide WGIG definition. |
| 1. **Workshop Session Format**    1. Roundtable (U-shape/ Circle)    2. Birds of a Feather (Classroom/Auditorium)    3. Debate (Classroom/Auditorium)    4. Tutorial (Classroom/Auditorium)    5. Panel | These formats should also inform the room set-up required, depending on what the host country can confirm as available. |
| 1. **Diversity [statement of diversity requirement]**    1. Is this the first time you are organizing a workshop? Yes/No    2. Are you and/or your co-organizers coming from a developing country or under-represented region? Yes/No    3. Is the list of people contributing to the session, in terms of organizers and/or speakers, diverse? Workshops should clearly match at least 3 of the diversity criteria listed below. Please select the ones you will be able to address, explain how, and what you plan to do to remedy the ones you are not able to address at the time the proposal is submitted       1. Gender Yes/No       2. Geography Yes/No       3. Stakeholder group Yes/No       4. Policy perspective Yes/No       5. Persons with disabilities       6. Youth       7. Local communities | Options to select Yes/No will allow applicants to clarify in an easier way what aspects of diversity the proposal is addressing. The MAG could consider to request a minimum of 3 aspects to be addressed as it will be very difficult to address them all. |
| 1. **Workshop Session Description [[**current text] Please provide an outline for the session, including a description of the intended agenda for the session, and the issues that will be discussed] | Currently described as “content” – one of the four criterion, alongside relevance, format, and diversity.  Applicants may also explain how the methodology will support practical outcomes, substantive policy discussions, and how discussion will be facilitated during the session, etc |
| 1. **Workshop Session Expected (tangible) Outcomes** | To be defined scope and expectations |
| 1. **Organizer information**    1. Family Name    2. Given Name    3. Gender    4. Nationality    5. Organization    6. Stakeholder group    7. Regional group    8. E-mail address |  |
| 1. **If you organized a session at the IGF2018, please give the name of the session and provide the link to the report** | Depending on answering No about question |
| 1. **Speakers** [check box if contacted/confirmed] [text field below check box will invite proposer to provide any additional explanation on the communication with their speakers, i.e. any necessary clarification on the speakers’ availability to participate] | Format: Name, Title, Stakeholder Group, Region. For consistency, same fields as Organizer, Moderators and Rapporteur |
| 1. **Moderators**    1. In-person    2. Online | For consistency, same fields as Organizer, Moderators and Rapporteur |
| 1. **Rapporteur** | For consistency, same fields as Organizer, Moderators and Rapporteur  Can the Secretariat provide access to the moderator for the reporting template (normally is the organizer who has the access and sometimes the delays to submit reports are because the rapporteur does not have the access. |
| 1. **Online participation**    1. Are you aware of the remote participation platforms offered by the IGF? Yes/No    2. Are you planning to use other platforms? Yes/No | Explain that online participation is a requirement.  If yes, show text box to explain how you are planning to use it.   If no, show/pop-up with description of what platform is and what it offers, link to guideline, and text field on how they are planning to use it  If yes, show text field about how |
| 1. **Discussion facilitation** |  |
| 1. **Optional: Background materials** | Applicant may upload supporting materials – e.g. white papers, reports, though this is not required and not an evaluation criteria. |