

# **GENERAL GUIDANCE FOR WS EVALUATION PROCESS**

Produced by WG of Workshop Evaluation Process

Adopted by MAG on: June 5th

----

## **Introduction**

This document aims to provide a general and common approach for Workshop Evaluation Process and recommended selection for IGF in Katowice to be held in November 2020.

For this year, individual MAG members were randomly assigned to evaluate workshop proposals in each of thematic tracks: Trust, Inclusion, Data and Environment.

Once individual evaluation concluded on April 28th, all members were assigned to four evaluation groups, one per each thematic track, in order to start stage 2.

Each evaluation group may apply these guidelines and consider particular elements in each thematic track that will be brought together during the MAG meeting in June 2020, providing the recommendation for selected workshop proposals included in a ranking list.

This document may be also applied for subsequent years, after an overall process review, and proper adjustments, bases in lessons learned.

## **Stages, Dates and milestones**

**Stage 1: Initial screening by IGF Secretariat - CONCLUDED on April 28<sup>th</sup>**

**Stage 2: MAG member evaluation – IN PROGRESS (to be concluded by May 31<sup>th</sup>)**

**Step 2.1. Conflict of Interest – CONCLUDED on Friday May 8<sup>th</sup>**

MAG members have to screen all their assigned proposals and declare any Conflicts of Interest on the evaluation platform.

## **Step 2.2. MAG member evaluation based upon defined criteria – to be concluded by May 29<sup>th</sup>**

1. Individual MAG members will evaluate proposals based upon the following criteria: 1) Format; 2) Diversity; 3) Content; 4) Policy Question(s); 5) Relevance; and 6) Interaction.

According to the process outlined in:

<https://www.intgovforum.org/multilingual/content/igf-2020-workshop-submission-and-review-process>

2. The total score for each proposal will be the mean average of the grades given by MAG members.

3. During the Stage 2 evaluation process, individual MAG members should also reflect on what sub-themes could be emerging for the thematic track(s) they are evaluating.

## **Stage 3a: MAG Evaluation Group discussion (preparatory work for the [Second Open Consultations and Virtual] MAG meeting)**

### **Step 3.1. Evaluation Synthesis – Delivered by June 5<sup>th</sup>**

1. The Secretariat will provide an analysis of the Stage 2 evaluations by June 5<sup>th</sup>

2. The analysis will include the overall ranking of proposals and a list of each of the WS proposals and the corresponding overall score (average of all scores from MAG members assessing that particular proposal). Each of the four Evaluation Groups (INCLUSION, DATA, ENVIRONMENT, TRUST) will receive a second partial ranking list, including only the proposals assigned to each group.

### **Step 3.2. Evaluation Group discussions on workshop approvals – June 5<sup>th</sup> to June 12<sup>th</sup>**

1. Once the analysis is received, the evaluation groups will begin a group discussion to develop a recommended list of accepted workshop proposals grouped into sub-themes, and proposed mergers (if any), in advance of the second (Virtual) MAG meeting.

2. The evaluation groups are urged to consider the following guidelines in developing their lists:

- The selected proposals will not necessarily be evenly distributed among the four tracks. More likely, proposals will be proportionally distributed according to the number of proposals received for each track as a reflection of where the community's interest lies. The final decision for the number of sessions per track will be based on the quality of

selected proposals, thematic balance, among other aspects the MAG will discuss later on. (You may find an example in Annex No.1).

- For this stage, we will use the “**Three Baskets approach**”: **Green, Yellow and Red**.
- WG members raise any concerns they have that workshop proposals might be inappropriate in some way, e.g. designed largely to promote their own products or services.
- Once the Evaluation Group has set aside the directly selected top-ranked proposals (**Green Basket**), they should structure the track into sub-themes and identify gaps. This will help to identify elements which might be lacking so that the remaining slots can be used to help redress any lack of balance. Gaps can include under-representation of stakeholder group, geographic region(s), gender, and other diversity criteria, as well as under-representation of sub-themes, and these gaps can be identified from the statistical analysis of the ranking provided by the Secretariat (step 3.1.1).
- At this point it would be good to review how many proposals of 90 and 60 minutes were selected. The quantity of 60-minute proposals multiplied by 30 minutes will give extra time to consider more slots to be accepted for each track. As an example, if 6 selected proposals have a duration of 60 minutes, then there could be room for 2 more 90-minute WS or 3 more 60-minute WS.
- As for the remaining slots in each evaluation group some other consideration may follow, such as:
  - A. To have an agreement of proposals that may be eliminated and not to be considered for further evaluation, putting them in the “**Red Basket**”. The main criteria to perform this elimination would consider lowest-ranked proposals, with two approaches: 1. Worst ranked 30% proposals or 2. Proposals with a score lower than 2 points. And continue with the following considerations. [poor ranked proposal]
  - B. Considering that at this point we will have several proposals included in the “**Green Basket**” and also in the “**Red Basket**”, the remaining proposals will be included in the “**Yellow Basket**”.
  - C. It will be also important to consider the main subtheme(s) covered by the workshops as well as diversity in order to bring flow and balance to the thematic program.
  - D. Evaluation WG members will be moving workshops proposals from the “**Yellow Basket**” to the “**Green Basket**”, or even all the way around, according to how the group feels about balance within the thematic track, e.g. in terms of sub-themes, geographic region or stakeholder group.
  - E. WG members should also look at workshops with a large variance in their scores as this might indicate interesting issues that may benefit from more discussion.
  - F. WG members discuss structuring of workshops per subtheme
- Proposals which do not seem to fit as a workshop, but which show potential promise as a different type of session, should be set aside and mentioned alongside the recommendations submitted to the MAG.

**Step 3.3. Evaluation Group discussions to identify any potential merger candidates - June 5<sup>th</sup> to June 12<sup>th</sup>**

1. During the Evaluation Group discussions, members can bring forward suggestions for merging workshop proposals. This should be considered the exception, given the complexity it raises for workshop organisers to be subjected to a merger. It is also strongly recommended to avoid merging more than two proposals, and to avoid asking highly-ranked proposals (e.g. those ranked in the top 10%) to merge.
2. Reasons for suggesting mergers can include bringing together very similar proposals to avoid duplication, or to help address an element that is lacking in an otherwise good proposal by merging with another proposal that covers that element.
3. Once the working group has discussed the merit of any proposed merger(s), this is included as part of its recommendations to the full MAG, detailing which proposals to merge and on what grounds, including the elements that the MAG feels a merger would address.
4. If accepted, at least two MAG members of the thematic WG (with subject matter expertise) will volunteer as mentors to make sure the review of the two proposals and the new merged proposal satisfies the details of the recommendation.
5. Workshop organizers are contacted by the Secretariat and offered the possibility of accepting the merger and to agree to work with the MAG mentors and organizer(s) of the other workshop, or decline the offer and explain why they feel they can address any issues raised by the MAG without being merged with another proposal. They will be informed that if they decline it is possible their proposal is not accepted as its score may be lower. If they decline, it will be advisable that they provide the reasons to decline, as that may also help the MAG to reconsider the request and decide to have one or both proposals included in the program separately.

**Stage 3b: Finalization. By June 12<sup>th</sup>**

Submit the Evaluation Group's recommendations (workshops to approve, structure of track by sub-theme and any merger proposals) to the MAG and the Secretariat.

**Stage 3c: Virtual MAG Meeting discussion of workshop. June 16<sup>th</sup> to June 18<sup>th</sup>**

Before and during the June meeting, MAG members will review the recommendations of each Evaluation Group. This is partly to come to a view on the theme-specific proposals and also to consider the overall balance of the topics within the programme as a whole.

Following the merger process and other necessary arrangements, the list of workshops to be included as part of the IGF programme will then be finalized.

## ANNEX

### Calculation examples to define the number of accepted proposals, valid only for this year.

- The number of slots available will depend on the duration of selected proposals and the capacity of the venue. Another consideration would be the workshop duration. As a reference, in 2019, 64 workshops were accepted with durations ranging from 60 to 90 minutes (most of them).
- Considering 237 proposals, the proportional percentages are:

DATA (Pd): 21.1%

INCLUSION (Pi): 29.5%

TRUST (Pt): 41.4%

ENVIRONMENT (Pe): 8%

So, to calculate the number of accepted slots (AS), we can use:

$$AS_d = P_d \times TS$$

$$AS_i = P_i \times TS$$

$$AS_t = P_t \times TS$$

$$AS_e = P_e \times TS$$

TS is the Number of slots available

- According to those numbers, the initial approach would consider proportional distribution per track. If so, INCLUSION would have 18 out of 70 (18/70), DATA 12/50, ENVIRONMENT 5/19 and TRUST 25/98.
- Since ENVIRONMENT AND DATA COMBINED. Then the evaluation groups may initially consider: INCLUSION 18/70, DATA+ENVIRONMENT 12/50+5/19
- Based on those numbers, and considering the initial proportional allocation (INCLUSION 18, DATA+ENVIRONMENT 12+5, TRUST 26), a cut off line need to be defined, as an absolute value (like 3.6 or 4) or as a percentage of top ranked proposals and SHOULD BE DIRECTLY SELECTED. As an example of percentage approach, if 80% is the cut off line, that would mean: INCLUSION 15, DATA+ENVIRONMENT 10+4, TRUST 22. That would provide a total of 51 directly selected/accepted proposals.