

IGF 2025 Workshop Evaluation Form

Proposal IGF 2022 WS #200 Ecological water transport, medicine and training [online \[Sample proposal\]](#)

MAG members who are listed as speakers or are directly involved in organizing a proposal should decline to evaluate it. MAG members should also decline to evaluate any proposals that they are aware were submitted by the organization they work for or are affiliated to. If you fall in one of those categories, or you consider there is any other reason why you should decline to evaluate a specific proposal, please let the Secretariat know, by marking the corresponding statement below.

- I don't have any Conflict of Interest and will complete the evaluation of this proposal
- I have a Conflict of Interest and therefore decline to assess this Proposal

IMPORTANT: Early signaling of Conflict(s) of Interest is much appreciated, in order to allow other MAG members to evaluate the affected proposal(s) within the deadline.

Please Score the Proposal according to the Following Criteria

Proposed Topic - 20% (*Relevance to Internet Governance and proper alignment with one of the subthemes*). The MAG member will look at the selected "Subtheme" and "Title (Topic)" of the proposal and assess whether the topic is: relevant to Internet governance, in alignment with the selected subtheme, a constructive contribution to the programme.

- Not relevant - The topic has no relation whatsoever to Internet governance, nor the selected subtheme nor broader themes of the meeting.
- Poor - The topic is only minimally related to Internet governance with weak correspondence to the selected subtheme.
- Needs improvement - The topic is relevant and has potential to be a good contribution to the programme but could use refinement, either in how well it adheres to the subtheme, its specificity or originality.
- Good - The proposer has put forward a relevant topic under the subtheme and that coheres with the meeting's broader themes and aims.
- Excellent - The proposer has put forward a fully relevant, original and interesting topic that would be an asset to the programme.

Workshop Content - 30% (*Substantive quality, including focus on the selected subtheme*). The MAG member will look at the "Description" and "Expected Outcomes" and consider how all the information in the proposal reads and fits together. Is it well-thought through and presents a concrete plan?

- Not appropriate - The proposal is not fit for purpose; no plan is included and the content bears little to no relation to themes and aims of the programme.

- Poor - The proposal somewhat addresses the purpose and ideas presented, but no plan on how to achieve the objectives of the session from a multistakeholder perspective is included. The correspondence with or focus on the selected subtheme is weak.
- Needs improvement - The proposal is fit for purpose but needs further improvement on how its ideas are presented, its structure and/or plan.
- Good - The proposal is fit for purpose, ideas are presented well, it follows structure, and includes a plan on how to achieve the objectives of the session from a multistakeholder perspective. The content is focused and thematically relevant.
- Excellent - The proposal is fit for purpose, ideas are explained, it follows a well laid-out structure, and includes a concrete plan on how to achieve the objectives of the session from a multistakeholder perspective. The content is fully focused and thematically relevant.

Policy Questions - 15% (*Up to three requested; whether these are timely, interesting and relevant to the subtheme, and whether they tie in with expected outcomes of the session*). The MAG member will look at the “Policy Questions” and “Expected Outcomes”.

- Not pertinent - Though the field was complete, no policy questions were formulated.
- Poor - Policy question(s) are not clearly formulated.
- Needs improvement - Policy question(s) do not fully address the topic at hand, have a weak connection to expected outcomes and are lacking in interest.
- Good - Policy question(s) effectively address the topic at hand, connect with the session’s expected outcomes and have the potential to generate good discussion.
- Excellent - Policy question(s) fully address the topic at hand in an interesting way and have the potential to generate vibrant discussion. In addition, they connect well to the stated expected outcomes for the session.

Engagement and Hybrid Strategy - 15% (*Whether the proposal lays out an effective, creative strategy for interactive engagement of participants and takes the hybrid nature of the meeting into account*). The MAG member will look at “Ensuring Implementation of an Engaging Hybrid Session” and “Training”.

- Not engaging - The proposal does not address the questions in this section. If the proposer has not made themselves available for training without proper explanation, this should be taken into account negatively.
- Poor - The proposal only minimally addresses the questions in this section and does not provide good evidence of a well thought-out plan. If the proposer has not made themselves available for training without proper explanation, this should be taken into

Needs improvement - The questions are addressed but need improvement as the answers are superficial or not fully convincing. Whether the proposer has made themselves available for training should be taken into account.

Good - The questions are addressed and provide evidence of a strategy or thoughtful approach to this aspect during planning, including thought as to additional tools. The proposer has made themselves available for training, or provided a good explanation

Excellent - The questions are well addressed and formulate a thoughtful engagement strategy, including creative thought as to additional tools. The proposer has made themselves available for training, or provided a good explanation as to why not and indicated

Diversity - 20% *(Along different vectors: diversity of perspective, supported by experience; gender; region; stakeholder group; and inclusion of youth, persons with disabilities and persons from other under-represented or marginalised groups).* The MAG member will look at “Speakers”, “Organisers” and references to diversity, especially of perspectives, that may be present in “Description”. This should take into account that diversity of “Speakers” is a priority.

Not diverse - Diversity is not addressed in the proposal at all, as evidenced by choice of speakers and/or organisers, and/or references in the proposal’s descriptive fields.

Poor - Diversity is somewhat addressed in choice of speakers and/or organisers and/or in the descriptive fields of the proposal, but there is no plan to remedy or address the lack of diversity.

Needs improvement - Diversity is addressed in choice of speakers and/or organisers and in the proposal’s descriptive fields, but would benefit from more, OR there is a basic plan to remedy or address the lack of diversity that could be improved.

Good - Diversity is well addressed in choice of speakers and/or organisers and a basic plan about how they contribute to the discussion is presented.

Excellent - Diversity is clearly addressed in choice of speakers and/or organisers and a detailed plan about how diversity contributes to the discussion is included.

Resulting Score *[Automatically generated by system]*

Supporting Comments:

Please provide comments in the text box that support the score you have provided for this proposal. This information will be visible for MAG members and the IGF Secretariat.

Feedback for Proposal Organizer:

The feedback above will be shared with the proposers when the workshop selection process is concluded. Please take special attention when writing these comments to help organizers improve

their submissions in the future. Limit your comments to the application of the criteria for the 2025 Call.

Internal Comments:

Use this to write your private comments for this proposal. These comments will only be available for you to guide your deliberations during the next steps of the selection process.

SUBMIT