

Working Group on Workshop Review and Evaluation Process – IGF 2019

1. Virtual meeting, Feb. 20th, 2019, 12.00 – 13.00 UTC

Minutes

Participants to the meeting were welcomed and the agenda sent out on Feb. 19th was agreed on.

In the previous years the working group had not had Terms of Reference. This was explained by the Secretariat as a result of the working group being one of the first working groups, when ToR were not considered necessary. Members of the working group felt that a framing of their work would be beneficial and Susan Chalmers volunteered for setting-up a first draft of ToR.

Since there was no input in regard of the methodology for the evaluation process, the methodology used in 2018 shall be reviewed on a later stage of work.

The group discussed the criteria from the 2018 evaluation of workshop proposals, these were: Diversity, Content, Format, Relevance. Since the workshop proposers were asked for more information in the form, f. e. “Interventions”, “Online Participation” and “Discussion Facilitation” it was considered to use the information given in these fields also in this year’s evaluation process. Luis Bobo confirmed that it is technically possible to have additional fields in the form and more criteria included in the assessment. Additional fields in the form were suggested: “Expected tangible outcomes”, “Continuity of the theme in Internet Governance over the last years” (which is already partly reflected under question VII in the workshop form) and “Relation to the SDGs” (which is also reflected in the current form but could be made a mandatory rather than voluntary field). It was noted that “tangible outcomes” would need some clarification for workshop proposers to understand what they shall fill in: Tangible outcomes should be more than the obligatory report after the session. It could be a research question, a policy recommendation or a plan for a BPF or DC. It was also recommended adding an assessment of whether the workshop is ‘fit for purpose’, based on the information provided by the proposers, f.e. if the proposal centres around an issue relevant to developing countries, does it include developing country speakers? In regard to “Diversity” it was suggested to add “Youths” and “Local communities” as sub-criteria to diversity. In terms of mechanisms for supporting diversity in the proposals, various options were discussed. One option would be to signal technically (provided this is feasible) to proposers who miss some diversity criteria, f. e. when they have named speakers from only one stakeholder group or region; otherwise proposers could be asked to provide a plausible explanation for why they have chosen not to meet all diversity aspects, f. e. because a certain topic is not relevant in all regions. While some suggested to add bonus points to proposals that have given special regard to engaging youths and/or local communities others suggested to make youth participation obligatory and treat the issue with the same relevance as gender balance. It was also said that youth participation could only work as a criterion if we were able to define what age group youths does refer to and it was cautioned to be discriminative towards other age groups. On local communities specifically, to the extent that they refer to local national communities, the suggestion was made to offer those proposers a separate track in the programme to facilitate their participation, or find other means of inclusion, rather than adding this as an element or criterion in the workshops process.

The decision on how the grading would work in regard to diversity was postponed till the MAG have agreed on the various elements of diversity as a criterion in their next virtual meeting.

Deliberations on the weighting of the scores per criterion were postponed till the decision on the criteria is finalised, taking into account recommendations from the final report of the WG WSEVAL 2018.

Amendments to the workshop proposal submission form including narratives and sub themes shall be developed once the narratives are finalised, probably by Friday, Feb. 22nd.

In regard to the methodology for the evaluation process it was suggested to give the proposers provisional approval for the workshops the MAG agrees on in the 3rd f2f meeting, then conducting a

short final check at a later stage closer to the meeting, to ensure confirmed speakers lists are as proposed, and ensure the MAG's suggestions for improvement have been implemented. This was referred to the Secretariat to consider if time and staff resources would allow to do so.

Referring to the next steps (s. below) the meeting was closed without any other business to be discussed.

Next Steps

Feb 20th, 12.00 UTC on WebEx: Deliberations on the evaluation process and methodology

Friday, Feb 22nd - 25th: Review of the 3 narratives for the main themes in regard of readiness for purpose in the call for proposal and evaluation process

Either Tuesday 26th 12.00 UTC or Wednesday 27th 18.00 UTC (just before the 5. Virtual MAG Meeting): Next meeting of WGWSEVAL

Wednesday, Feb 27th: 5 Virtual MAG meeting: presentation of the working group's suggestions for the call for proposal and evaluation process, discussion with the MAG

Thursday, Feb 28th - Monday March 4th: Adaptation of the workshop proposal form, phrasing of the call for proposals

Monday March 4th: Publication of the Call for proposals

Participants

Sylvia Cadena

Concettina Cassa

Lucien Castex

Susan Chalmers

Afi Edoh

Raquel Gatto

June Parris

Paul Rowney

Timea Suto

Sorina Teleanu

Secretariat

Chengetai Massango

Eleonora Mazzucchi

Luis Bobo

Host

Jutta Croll