

ANNEX 2:
**THE EVALUATION PROCESS AND FRAMEWORK FOR IAME ANNUAL
CONFERENCE BIDS**

A) *Working Group for the Evaluation of Bidding Documents (WG)*

- The WG should consist of 4 members from the IAME Council, presided by (one of) the IAME vice-president(s), and preferably includes previously successful conference organizers.
- The composition of the WG is determined for a period of 2 years at the start of the term of a newly elected IAME Council, during its first meeting.
- The composition of the WG is communicated on the IAME website, so potential future bidders/organizers may express interest or ask questions to the WG members at any point.
- The IAME Council reserves the right to appoint further (Council or non-Council) member(s) to the WG, if this seems fit.
- No members of the WG should be involved in any of the bids in any capacity, for instance (but not limited to), organizing committee member, advisor, etc. Failure to timely inform the IAME Council of potential conflicts of interest may lead to disqualification of the bid involved.
- The WG only acts in an advisory role. Final discussion and decisions are the exclusive responsibility of the full IAME Council.

B) *Evaluation Process*

The WG should evaluate the bidding documents based on the following criteria:

- Compliance with IAME Bid Guidelines, i.e. sufficient development of the compulsory contents as defined by the template and guidelines.
- Organizational, Financial and Scientific Capability of the organizers:
 - o To what extent the bids provide sensible judgments on different aspects related to hosting an international conference in terms of, for instance (but not limited to), conference theme, scientific process, financial budget, conference fees, conference dates, proceedings, special issues in scholarly journals, communication, conference logistics and administration.
 - o Quality and references of the organizing team and the core members of the Scientific Committee.
 - o General attractiveness of the bid for the association's development (e.g. in terms of membership, outreach, image and reputation) and networking possibilities.

- The evaluation of each bid will be summarized by the WG in a SWOT-analysis, addressing the major strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats (SWOT) for all compliant bids.
- Any *ad hoc* issues that need special attention will be identified.

C) Reporting and Aftermaths

- At least 1 week before the IAME Council Meeting (or the first Council Meeting for an election year), on behalf of the WG, the chairperson of the WG should prepare a final report to the IAME Secretariat and Council.
- The WG report should summarize the evaluation process, and offer insight on the quality of all compliant bids based on the guided questions in Section B. The WG may provide a preliminary ranking of the bids, as well as a list of questions for clarifications to be used during the oral presentation of the bids.
- To ensure transparency and accountability, the WG report should provide sound reasons justifying why a particular preliminary ranking is put forward.
- To ensure impartiality and free expression of opinions from WG members, as much as possible, the contents of the report should reflect the unified opinion from the WG. In any circumstances, the identity of individual members should not appear anywhere in the WG report. If there remain issues of division in the WG, these may be separately listed in the report.
- The chairperson of the WG may assist in advisory capacity at the IAME Council meeting discussions on the conference awarding, should he/she not be an elected Council member moving forward.
