



United Nations
Educational, Scientific and
Cultural Organization

Internal Oversight Service

IOS/EVS/PI/167



Evaluation of the International Programme for the Development of Communication (IPDC)

IOS Evaluation Office

March 2018

ABSTRACT

The International Programme for Development Communication (IPDC) was created by the UNESCO General Conference in 1980. Its aim is "... to contribute to sustainable development, democracy and good governance by fostering universal access to and distribution of information and knowledge by strengthening the capacities of the developing countries and countries in transition in the field of electronic media and the printed press." It is an intergovernmental body under the General Conference comprised of a 39 member Council and an eight member Bureau. The main purpose of the evaluation was to assess the relevance, efficiency, governance structure and results of the IPDC and to generate recommendations for the future.

The evaluation found that IPDC interventions have achieved important outcomes in several key areas. Furthermore, some of the results achieved are directly associated with features that are specific to IPDC and derive from its unique governance structures and instruments. In terms of key challenges, the evaluation recommends the development of an IPDC Strategic Framework to clarify and strengthen its overall strategic positioning.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Internal Oversight Service (IOS) would like to acknowledge all who participated in and contributed to the evaluation. The evaluation was managed by Mr. Geoffrey Geurts, Principal Evaluation Specialist, IOS Evaluation Office, and was conducted by Mr. Sean O'Siochru, an independent external evaluation consultant.

The IOS Evaluation Office would especially like to thank the members of the Evaluation Reference Group, in particular Ms. Albana Shala, IPDC Chairperson, Mr. Guy Berger, Director of the Division of Freedom of Expression and IPDC Secretary and Ms. Rosa Gonzalez, IPDC Deputy Secretary. IOS would also like to recognize the Communication and Information Sector staff in the UNESCO Bangkok and Nairobi Offices who helped to organize field visits by the evaluator.

Susanne Frueh
Director, IOS

Cover photo: UNESCO

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables	5
Acronyms and Abbreviations	6
Executive Summary.....	8
1. Background and purpose	8
2. Findings.....	8
3. Recommendations.....	11
MANAGEMENT RESPONSE.....	13
PART I: IPDC PROGRAMME DESCRIPTION	16
1. Background, Purpose and Contents.....	16
1.1. IPDC Background and Mandate	16
1.2. Purpose and Scope of the Evaluation	17
1.3. Contents of this Report	17
2. IPDC Priorities and Main Interventions.....	19
2.1. IPDC Priorities	19
2.2. Types of Intervention.....	20
2.3. IPDC Projects.....	22
2.4. Special Initiatives.....	27
2.5. Funds-in-Trust	38
3. IPDC Governance, Costs and Income.....	39
3.1. Governance	39
3.2. IPDC Costs	40
3.3. IPDC Income.....	42
3.4. Fundraising Strategy	43
3.5. Trends in Media and Donor Funding	45
PART II: FINDINGS & ANALYSIS.....	49
4. Evidence of Outcomes	49
4.1. Approach to Grouping Outcome Analysis.....	49
4.2. Outcome 1: Safety of Journalists	50
4.3. Outcome 2: Media Sector Reform and Development	55
4.4. Outcome 3: Knowledge-Driven Media Development and the SDGs	60
4.5. Outcome 4: Journalism Education	61
4.6. Outcome 5: Other IPDC Projects and Actions.....	63

4.7.	External Evidence on Small Project Outcomes	65
5.	Outcome Analysis	66
5.1.	IPDC’s Defining Features	67
5.2.	What the Evidence Says	68
5.3.	Areas Drawing on IPDC Strengths	74
6.	IPDC Processes and Management	76
6.1.	IPDC Mandate and Priorities	76
6.2.	Project & Intervention Selection Processes	77
6.3.	IPDC Positioning in CI/FEM Division	80
6.4.	Costs and Benefits of Governance Structure	85
6.5.	Monitoring and Evaluation Framework	88
6.6.	Gender Equality	90
PART III: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....		92
7.	Summary Conclusions	92
7.1.	IPDC Outcomes	92
7.2.	IPDC Strategic Mandate and Priorities.....	94
7.3.	Project and Intervention Selection Processes	96
7.4.	Funding and Donor Support.....	97
8.	Recommendations	100
ANNEXES.....		109
Annex 1: IPDC Projects in Numbers		109
Annex 2: Evaluation TERMS OF REFERENCE.....		112
Annex 3: List of Interviewees		118
Annex 4: Governance Working Group Recommendations		121

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Types of Intervention by Year and Amount Approved 2011 to 2017 (US\$ '000)	22
Table 2: Number of IPDC Projects by Region, 2011-2017.....	22
Table 3: Projects by IPDC Priority 2016 – 2017	23
Table 4: Special Initiatives and other funding from Special Allocations 2013 to 2017(US\$).....	27
Table 5: Annual Project Grants for Safety of Journalists Projects 2011 – 2017 (US\$).....	30
Table 6: Funds-in-Trust Contributions 2011 – 2017 (All include overhead 13%)	38
Table 7: Biennial Staff time and costs, IPDC governance and IPDC other 2016-2017 (US\$)	41
Table 8: Donor Contributions and Funding Modalities to IPDC 2011-2017 (US\$ '000s)	43
Table 9: IPDC Special Account Contributions channelled via Field Offices (US\$) 2012-2017.....	43
Table 10: Total Donor Contributions: 2011 - 2017 (US\$ '000).....	44
Table 11: IPDC Interventions grouped into Outcome Types	49
Table 12: Areas that draw on IPDC's Strengths	75
Table 13: IPDC Projects approved by Region and Year.....	109
Table 14: Number of Projects, total grant, average grant, 2011-2017.....	110
Table 15: Number of IPDC Projects by Geographical Scope and Year 2011-2016.....	110
Table 16: Total Project Budget, Funding Requested, & Amount Granted by Region 2016 (US\$)	110
Table 17: Projects by IPDC Priority 2011 – 2015.....	110
Table 18: Donor List and Contributions 2011 - 2017	111

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

AMI:	African Media Initiative
AUB:	African Union of Broadcasting
CI Sector:	Communication and Information Sector
BSP:	Bureau of Strategic Planning
DG's Report:	Director-General's <i>Report on the Safety of Journalists and the Danger of Impunity</i>
ER:	Expected Result (in the context of UNESCO's Programme and Budget C/5 Document)
FEM:	Division of Freedom of Expression and Media Development (within CI)
FIT:	Funds-in-Trust
FOE:	Section for Freedom of Expression (within FEM Division)
GIEJE:	Global Initiative for Excellence in Journalism Education
GMFD:	Global Forum for Media Development
GSIM:	Gender-Sensitive Indicators for the Media
IADG:	Inter-Agency Expert Group (on SDGs)
IFAP:	Information for All Programme
ILO:	International Labour Organisation
IPDC:	International Programme for the Development of Communication
IUIs:	Internet Universality Indicators
JSI:	Journalism Safety Indicators
KDMD:	Knowledge-Driven Media Development
KSD:	Knowledge Society Division (within CI Sector)
MAS:	Section for Media Development and Society (within FEM Division)
MDIs:	Media Development Indicators
MLA:	Major Lines of Action (in the context of UNESCO's C/5 Document)
MVIs:	Media Viability Indicators
ORBICOM:	International Network of UNESCO Chairs in Communications
SDGs:	Sustainable Development Goals
SIDS:	Small Island Developing States
UNCEB:	United Nations Chief Executive Board for Coordination
UNDAF:	United Nations Development Assistant Framework

UNDP: United Nations Development Programme

UNGA: United Nations General Assembly

UNHCR: United Nations Human Rights Council

UNESCO: United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation

UNSC: United Nations Statistical Commission

World Trends: *World Trends in Freedom of Expression and Media Development* report

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE

1. The International Programme for Development Communication (IPDC) was created by the UNESCO General Conference in 1980 as an intergovernmental body. It has an elected Council of 39 Member State delegates which elects an eight Member Bureau, and a Secretariat located within UNESCO's CI Sector. Its mandate since 2003 is "... to contribute to sustainable development, democracy and good governance by fostering universal access to and distribution of information and knowledge by strengthening the capacities of the developing countries and countries in transition in the field of electronic media and the printed press."

2. IPDC annually supports an open call for Projects in Member States, based on a set of evolving Priorities and funded from donor contributions to a Special Account. Almost 2,000 projects have been supported since its foundation, 482 of them between 2011 and 2017 with an average value of US\$19,000 accounting for almost 70% of IPDC funds. A small number of larger Projects are implemented through Funds-in-Trust, accounting for 22% of funds; and IPDC also supports Special Initiatives in key areas that, though modestly funded, comprise a central part of its work. Prominent Special Initiatives include one on the safety of journalists and the issue of impunity; and another to develop and implement media-related indicators and reports at national sectoral level.

3. The purpose of the evaluation is to assess the relevance, efficiency and results of the IPDC over the period 2011 to 2017 and to generate recommendations for the future. The primary users of the evaluation include the IPDC Council, Bureau and Secretariat, the CI Sector including Field Staff and, more widely, UNESCO Member States, donor organisations and the international media development sector.

4. The evaluation methodology includes interviews with UNESCO staff, IPDC Council and Bureau members, UNESCO Permanent Delegation representatives, donors and select experts; field visits to Bangkok, Hanoi and Nairobi; online surveys of UNESCO Field Office staff and IPDC Council members; and an extensive review of documentation and the IPDC Projects database.

2. FINDINGS

5. The evaluation identified the following main achievements:

- (a) The conclusion of this evaluation is that the unique benefits and outcomes visible in recent years (see below) justify the specific governance costs incurred over those years.** However, since the governance costs are fixed, a decline in IPDC extrabudgetary resources would weigh the scales more heavily against the costs of these structures. On the other hand, if extrabudgetary funds rise as they have in the last two years, then the cost relative to benefits of the governance structures falls.

- (b) The unique potential of IPDC is its ability to combine several distinct features in a manner that generates a higher level of outcomes, and sometimes different types of outcomes, than would otherwise be possible.** Endorsement by the IPDC Council of normative content, tools and instruments appreciably heightens their value to Member States, offering neutrality and impartiality; and also allows civil society actors, when supported by IPDC, to become active in more sensitive areas of media and communication and to collaborate more easily with governmental institutions. The specialist expertise of Council and Bureau members enhances the quality of work and reinforces the prospects of reaching meaningful consensus on important issues; and its positioning as a body within wider UNESCO facilitates intergovernmental approval on media development issues. IPDC also offers Member States a platform to influence intergovernmental agendas and support national trends and dynamics around communications development. UNESCO Field Offices are able to deploy IPDC interventions to support civil society initiatives in media and communication, addressing emerging and neglected issues and reinforcing reform in an efficient and targeted way.
- (c) The evidence available shows convincingly that IPDC interventions have achieved significant outcomes in several key focus areas.** Furthermore much of the impact, in several areas, is directly associated with features that are specific to IPDC and derive from its governance structures and instruments. Some of the most significant outcomes could not have been achieved by any other means. Notable outcomes include:
- Sustained work on the **safety of journalists and the issue of impunity** at UN and INGO level has given rise to the UN Plan of Action on the Safety of Journalists and the Issue of Impunity; the Director General’s Monitoring and Reporting Mechanism on the Safety of Journalists and the Issue of Impunity; and enhanced debate internationally. Impetus continues to grow. Nationally, IPDC Projects and actions involving civil society, media and government, are reinforcing government responsiveness and pointing to significant future impact for journalists’ safety.
 - Positive outcomes are evident in **media sector reform and development**, through the Media Development Indicators (MDI) Framework and other tools and numerous Projects. These are influencing media policies and laws, offering donors an evidence-based menu of actions, enhancing a space for stakeholder dialogue, empowering NGOs to contribute and building UNESCO’s relationships. The endorsement by UNESCO of the MDI Framework and the application of this as a credible research instrument is an example of an effective outcome of IPDC governance and its value at the point of implementation.
 - Work on **SDG Indicators** under the heading of knowledge-driven media development is too recent to show outcomes but has potential as an opportunity for civil society and other stakeholders to engage with media and communication and to sensitise IPDC Council Members and governments as well as to reinforce SDG implementation through knowledge dissemination.
- (d) Recently improved project and intervention selection processes are relatively robust and efficient**, needing only modest adjustment. Overall, the processes of choosing and

administering the Annual Project cycle and of identifying and managing Special Initiatives and Funds-in-Trust Projects are efficient and effective, and the division of responsibilities between them is appropriate.

6. The evaluation identified the following main challenges:

- (a) Lack of clarity on IPDC's strategic focus and priorities.** Donors and other external actors expressed some concern about the clarity of IPDC's own strategic focus and priorities. There is a perception amongst donors and others that the unique focus of IPDC interventions is becoming blurred with newly introduced Project Priorities. A degree of inconsistency is evident between and among IPDC Priorities and Special Initiatives, some being presented as *outcomes*, such as media pluralism or safety of journalism, and others as *instruments or intervention types* such as media assessments, indicator development and capacity building.
- (b) The IPDC Secretariat is not optimally positioned which has affected internal management communication, cooperation and programme complementarities in the CI sector.** The overall positioning of the IPDC Secretariat, given the IPDC's broad mandate and unique dynamic, alongside the two Sections of the CI/FEM Division has problematic aspects. While their mandates are overwhelmingly complementary, and mutually beneficial collaboration and synergies is substantial, the position of the IPDC Secretariat manager below Section Chief level can inhibit effective communication and the high level of close collaboration needed to maximise complementarities.
- (c) There remains a pressing need to increase the overall volume of donor contributions to IPDC, to improve the regularity and consistency of what can be described as core funding, and to attract a wider set of donors with a sustained interest in the issue and in IPDC as a useful means to address it.** Funding has been falling since 2011 and despite a recent improvement through higher FIT contributions and a new 'earmarked' modality for the Special Account, the 2013 Fundraising Strategy is still behind target and the Secretariat has insufficient human resources to fully follow through. Bringing clarity to IPDC's unique contribution, in the wider context of the global media and communication development needs and derived from its mandate and strengths, would improve prospects for support from traditional donors. The donor base also needs to be extended.
- (d) The IPDC experienced a decline in extrabudgetary funding but has shown improvements recently.** Contributions to the Special Account for Projects declined from approximately \$US2.5 million in 2011 to \$US 600,000 in 2017. However, earmarked contributions to the Special Account were significant in 2017 (circa \$US 800,000) and FIT contributions were significantly higher in 2016-17 (circa \$US 1.7 million).

(e) **The ratio of costs to extrabudgetary contributions is high**, reflecting in part the staff time absorbed in serving grant-making for a large number of small Projects and the steep fall in donor funds between 2011 and 2016. There is also a fixed overhead to pay for governance structures. The cost of selecting and administering many small Projects in many countries is higher than that of a few large ones in fewer countries. Furthermore, no staff cost recovery is applied to the IPDC Special Account. As a result, the IPDC has fewer resources available to assist in covering the workload of the Programme. At the same time, these governance structures and the annual Project cycles can in turn attract an amount of donor funding for projects, which, although not precisely quantifiable, would certainly represent a significant proportion of the total that would not otherwise be available to complement other work in the CI Sector.

3. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. **IPDC should develop an IPDC Strategic Framework**, to clarify and strengthen the strategic positioning of IPDC within UNESCO and outside, and the selection and implementation of interventions. It should explicitly capture the linkages and complementarities with CI and with the C/5 and the outcomes that the IPDC is seeking to achieve, and should be debated and approved by IPDC Council.
2. **IPDC should develop strategically-focused packages of interventions**, grouping countries regionally on an annual basis and rotating between regions. To this effect, Regional Working Groups would engage selected stakeholders over a two-year period, introducing a new strategic component into the IPDC Project and support cycle, and operating in parallel to the existing one and combining different IPDC intervention types. IPDC's rapid and unique response mechanism for emergency situations should be actively promoted as an intervention type.
3. **The CI Assistant Director General (ADG) should consider strengthening the IPDC's overall positioning to improve management communication, cooperation and complementarities within the CI/FEM Division.** A desk audit could explore the creation of a new Section for Media Development, on a par with other Sections in the Division, within which the IPDC Secretariat should be based with the Section Head as the manager of the IPDC Secretariat.
4. **An online IPDC Communication Platform** could be developed that would, in a secure but informal section, enhance timely exchange of information and communication between and within the governance bodies of IPDC. An open section moderated by the Secretariat could explore media development trends relevant to IPDC and how IPDC might respond to them in innovative and experimental ways. The identification of appropriate issues might result in the organisation of open seminars, information sessions at Council meetings, and debates.
5. **Fundraising efforts should be reinforced** through facilitating greater Member State participation and in the context of wider CI Sector resource mobilisation.

6. **The focus on gender transformative action should be reinforced**, in line with UNESCO priorities and policy, through additional practical supportive actions.
7. **The Project selection process should be reviewed and refined** to enhance efficiency and transparency.
8. **An IPDC monitoring and evaluation framework should be designed** in line with the 2015 UNESCO Evaluation Policy and tailored to the Programme's specific needs and circumstances, enabling more systematic assessment of outcomes and the identification of lessons to feed into programming.

MANAGEMENT RESPONSE

Overall Management Response	
<p>The CI Sector welcomes this evaluation which provides detailed evidence of the outcomes achieved by the Programme, as well as important recommendations for the future strategy of the Programme and its capacity to attract extra-budgetary funding.</p> <p>The initial findings of this evaluation were presented by the External Evaluator to IPDC Council members and other interested Member States at an informal information meeting organized by the IPDC Chair in September 2017. Furthermore, the evaluation report, together with a roadmap for the implementation of its recommendations, will be formally submitted to the 62nd meeting of the IPDC Bureau (Accra, Ghana, 30 April-1 May 201) with a view to recommend to the IPDC Council the endorsement and implementation of the recommendations.</p>	
Recommendations	Management response
1. Develop, debate and approve an IPDC Strategic Framework	<p>The CI Sector welcomes the recommendation and will work in close cooperation with the IPDC Bureau and Council to implement it.</p> <p>With the support of the IPDC Bureau, the Secretariat will formulate a draft strategic framework, in collaboration with the Chair and External Evaluator, to be submitted to the IPDC Council to debate, amend as needed, and approve.</p>
2. Introduce strategically-focused Package of Interventions within each annual cycle	<p>The CI Sector welcomes the recommendation and will work in close cooperation with the IPDC Bureau and Council to implement it.</p> <p>After brainstorming options at the 62nd meeting of the IPDC Bureau, the IPDC Secretariat will formulate a draft plan to be debated, amended as needed, and approved by the IPDC Council in November 2018.</p>
3. Consider strengthening the IPDC's overall positioning to improve management communication, cooperation and complementarities within the CI/FEM Division	<p>This recommendation will be reviewed in line with the forthcoming Director General's organizational-wide reform.</p>
4. Create a Communication Platform for IPDC Innovation and Interaction	<p>The CI Sector welcomes the recommendation and will work in close cooperation with the IPDC Bureau and Council to implement it.</p> <p>After brainstorming options at the 62nd meeting of the IPDC Bureau, the IPDC</p>

	<p>Secretariat will further formulate the needs for a communication platform, with KMI's support, which will be debated, amended as needed, and approved by the IPDC Council in November 2018.</p> <p>Success of the communication platform will however be also dependent on the active participation of Bureau and Council members.</p>
<p>5. Reinforce fundraising with more IPDC Member State effort</p>	<p>The CI Sector welcomes the recommendation and will work in close cooperation with the IPDC Bureau and Council to implement it.</p> <p>After brainstorming options at the 62nd meeting of the IPDC Bureau, the CI Sector will ensure further integration of IPDC propositions into wider CI Sector resource mobilization efforts.</p> <p>The success of this recommendation will also depend on Council members' capacity to further mobilize national contributions to IPDC. For this, Council members will be requested to consider reporting on their efforts and good practices as a standing Agenda item in statutory meetings.</p> <p>Current donors will be encouraged to increase their allocations to IPDC as a concrete follow-up to this recommendation.</p>
<p>6. Reinforce gender transformation across IPDC activities</p>	<p>The CI Sector welcomes the recommendation and will work in close cooperation with the IPDC Bureau and Council to implement it.</p> <p>After brainstorming options at the 62nd meeting of the IPDC Bureau, the IPDC Secretariat will formulate a draft plan to be debated, amended as needed, and approved by the IPDC Council in November 2018.</p>
<p>7. Review and refinement of the Project selection process</p>	<p>The CI Sector welcomes the recommendation and will work in close cooperation with the IPDC Bureau and Council to implement it.</p> <p>After brainstorming options at the 62nd meeting of the IPDC Bureau, the IPDC Secretariat will develop more detailed guidelines for Bureau members with a clearer set of criteria and a short tutorial. The</p>

	<p>Secretariat will also improve communication of Bureau decisions to submitters. With the support of KMI, the current on-line system has been recently strengthened with new functions, such as the introduction of budget ceilings to facilitate budget allocations by Bureau members. Other functions will be explored and introduced as needs arise and funds permitting.</p>
<p>8. Strengthen the monitoring and evaluation Framework</p>	<p>The CI Sector welcomes the recommendation and will work in close cooperation with the IPDC Bureau and Council to implement it.</p> <p>After brainstorming options at the 62nd meeting of the IPDC Bureau, the CI Sector will set aside funds for the programme evaluation every four years.</p> <p>The IPDC Secretariat, with the assistance of IOS, will design a monitoring and evaluation framework tailored to the specific IPDC needs.</p>

PART I: IPDC PROGRAMME DESCRIPTION

1. BACKGROUND, PURPOSE AND CONTENTS

1.1. IPDC BACKGROUND AND MANDATE

1. The International Programme for Development Communication (IPDC) was created by the UNESCO General Conference in 1980. It came as a response to ongoing debates in UNESCO and more widely concerning the development of media infrastructure and media organisations in developing countries at that time. It is an intergovernmental body under the General Conference comprising a Council of Member State delegates – originally 34 now 39 - elected every two years by the General Conference, which in turn elects seven Members to the Bureau. The elected Chair serves both the Council and Bureau. The IPDC Secretariat is located within the CI Sector in UNESCO, and comprises three staff positions one of whom is IPDC Deputy Secretary, and in addition the position of IPDC Secretary occupied by the CI/FEM Division Director.

2. Its founding objective in 1980 was to “increase cooperation and assistance for the development of communication infrastructures and to reduce the gap between various countries in the communication field.” The wording reflects its origins in the New World Information and Communication Order (NWICO) debate in which the rising importance of media and communication was seen as reinforcing their role in development amid concerns that they were dominated by western powers.

3. In 2003, its aim was redefined by the UNESCO General Conference, in line with the evolving priorities of UNESCO, as:¹

“... to contribute to sustainable development, democracy and good governance by fostering universal access to and distribution of information and knowledge by strengthening the capacities of the developing countries and countries in transition in the field of electronic media and the printed press.” (Article 1)

4. The highest priority is to be given to:

- promotion of freedom of expression and media pluralism;
- development of community media;
- human resource development;
- promotion of international partnership.

5. Later decisions of the IPDC Council specifically endorsed the implementation of media development indicators (in 2008); and agreed on principles and actions around the safety of journalists and the issue of impunity (in 2006). To the extent that IPDC has a distinct mandate, it is constituted by the above.

¹ *Amendments to the Statutes of the International Programme for The Development of Communication (IPDC) Resolution 43/32, adopted on the Report of Commission V at the 18th Plenary Meeting, on 15 October 2003.*

1.2. PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

6. The main purpose of the evaluation is to assess the relevance, efficiency and results of the IPDC, and to generate recommendations for the future.² The scope of the current document covers the years 2011 to 2017³, noting any significant developments since the previous evaluation in 2006.

7. The IPDC Council's 29th Session in November 2014 decided to commission an evaluation⁴ postponing the decision until the External Auditor Report was produced in September 2016⁵ which made reference to the Programme.

8. The core evaluation questions and methodology, as agreed in the Inception Report, are presented in Annex 2. In summary, the main data gathering activities comprised: two rounds of interviews in Paris; three field visits, to Bangkok, Hanoi and Nairobi; two online surveys of key Field Staff and IPDC Council members; interviews with almost all Bureau members, several Council members and representatives of Permanent Delegations to UNESCO, UNESCO staff, CI Field Staff, donors, and selected experts; and examination of very extensive documentation and the IPDC Projects data base.

1.3. CONTENTS OF THIS REPORT

9. This report divides into three parts: Part I is primarily descriptive, Part II presents findings and analysis, and Part III draws conclusions and offers recommendations. The Annexes contain additional material, including further statistical tables on the IPDC Programme (Annex 1).

10. Part I, Section 2, in successive subsections, presents the IPDC priorities (2.1); briefly outlines the different types of interventions (2.2); before considering in some depth the specific activities and outputs of each of these (2.3 to 2.5). The selection mechanism for IPDC Projects is described in detail (2.3). Section 3 follows with a description of the main IPDC governance structures (3.1); the costs associated with IPDC, both operational and staff related (3.2); an account of extrabudgetary funding secured by IPDC (3.3); the fundraising strategy (3.4); and trends in media development generally and in donor funding.

11. Part II begins in Section 4 with an extensive exploration of IPDC outcomes, drawing on a wide range of sources. The approach adopted (4.1) groups together different types of interventions under five headings based on the outcomes they aim to achieve rather than on output types (4.2 to 4.6). Evidence from a comparable global media programme supporting small projects is also outlined (3.7). Section 5 analyses these outcomes through the lens of features unique to IPDC that give it a specific advantage (5.1). In the light of these, the evidence of outcomes is then summarised (5.2). A summary table of outcome areas that draw on IPDC strengths is presented. (5.3) Section 6 turns to the question of processes and management associated with IPDC. It begins with an analysis of its mandate and priorities (6.1), and continues with the selection process for IPDC interventions (6.2). How IPDC is positioned within the CI/FEM Division, including how it relates to the two Sections, is examined in some depth (6.3). Costs and benefits of the governance structure are then explored (6.4) followed by consideration of a monitoring and evaluation framework (6.5). The final subsection looks at progress in relation to gender equality (6.6).

² *Request for Proposals: Evaluation of UNESCO's IPDC.*

³ The Terms of Reference specifies 2011 to 2016 but 2017 is covered where possible.

⁴ For decisions taken by the IPDC 30th Session of the Council. See http://www.unesco.org/new/fileadmin/MULTIMEDIA/HQ/CI/CI/pdf/IPDC/ipdc_30_council_decisions_en.pdf

⁵ *New Audits by the External Auditor: Audit Report of the Communication and Information Sector (CI).* 200 EX/20.INF.3 Paris 1 September 2016. Presented to the UNESCO Executive Board, 200th Session.

12. Part III begins in Section 7 by summarising conclusions drawing on all previous sections. It reviews the IPDC outcomes (7.1), its strategic mandate and priorities (7.2), issues relating to the intervention selection processes (7.3), and finally funding and donor trends (7.4). The final section, Section 8, offers recommendations based on the findings.

2. IPDC PRIORITIES AND MAIN INTERVENTIONS

2.1. IPDC PRIORITIES

13. All IPDC priorities and activities are aligned with the UNESCO Programme and Budget (C/5), endorsed by the UNESCO Executive Board and approved by the General Conference, and within that context have evolved - overseen by the IPDC Council - with shifting emphases and targets over the years. Specific priorities are discussed by the Bureau and suggested revisions submitted to the Council. The Council debates them within a wider context, highlights additional areas of particular interest and concern, and takes a final decision.

14. There is some ambiguity as to whether Priorities⁶ should apply to all IPDC activities or solely to the annual call for Project⁷ proposals. The practice is that they are associated exclusively with Projects and specifically with the annual selection criteria, and data is gathered on them only in that context. Activities funded by other modalities, however, often refer to the Priorities.

15. Priorities changed a couple of times during the period under consideration here, though they had been stable before that going back to at least 2005. In 2001, the four priorities approved by the IPDC Council for Projects were:

- Promotion of freedom of expression and media pluralism;
- Development of Community Media;
- Human Resource Development;
- Promotion of International Partnership.

16. In 2013, the IPDC Bureau proposed to replace these with the following:

- Promotion of freedom of expression, and press freedom (including the safety of journalists), pluralism (particularly community media, youth and gender dimensions), and independence (self-regulation and professional standards);
- Capacity development for journalists and media managers;
- Innovation in convergence and integration of legacy (traditional) news media and new communications.

17. An emphasis on journalism safety was proposed by the Council in 2014 by inviting the Bureau to “continue to give priority to projects that further the objectives of the UN Plan of Action on the Safety of Journalists and the Issue of Impunity”.⁸

18. The Bureau proposed in 2015 to drop the third priority above because of the absence of Project proposals received in this field. Based on the Council recommendation it also agreed to promote Projects that focus on:

⁶ When capitalised, the term ‘Priorities’ always refers here to those formally approved and applied to the annual IPDC call for Projects.

⁷ When capitalised, the term ‘Project’ refers here to those the Bureau selects in the annual call for proposals.

⁸ Intergovernmental Council of the IPDC, Draft Final Report, 29th Session 22-122 November 2014 http://www.unesco.org/new/fileadmin/MULTIMEDIA/HQ/CI/CI/pdf/IPDC/ipdc_29Final_Report_Council_Session_EN_with_RAPP_edits.pdf

“...journalism safety, or law reform fostering media independence, which also seek the active involvement and commitment of the State in the realization of the aims of the project”;

and to encourage Projects:

“...that apply Media Development Indicators (MDIs), Gender Sensitive Indicators for Media (GSIM) and/or the Journalists’ Safety Indicators” and

“...in areas of the Special Initiatives of excellence in journalism education and knowledge-driven media development.” (59th Bureau minutes)

19. In 2016, the 60th Bureau meeting discussed ‘hate speech’ as a growing area of concern and, combined with the decisions from 2015, six priority areas, still current, were consolidated by IPDC Council as follows:

- Supporting media pluralism (particularly community media) and independence (improving self-regulation and professional standards);
- Promoting the safety of journalists;
- Countering hate speech in media and social media, promoting conflict-sensitive journalism practice and/or promoting cross-cultural/cross-religious dialogue among journalists;
- Supporting law reform fostering media independence;
- Conducting media assessments and research based on UNESCO’s Media Development Indicators (MDIs), the Gender Sensitive Indicators for the Media (GSIM) or the Journalists’ Safety Indicators (JSIs); and Media Sustainability Indicators (MSIs);
- Capacity building for journalists and media managers, including improving journalism education (using UNESCO’s Model Curricula for Journalism Education).

2.2. TYPES OF INTERVENTION

20. Since its foundation, a central IPDC activity has been to fund small Projects conceived and executed largely independently of UNESCO. Alongside these is a second set of actions implemented through the IPDC Secretariat and CI/UNESCO staff. The former are largely funded through a Special Account established to pool donations to achieve IPDC goals; and the latter can also be supported through other modalities, such as Funds-in-Trust. Funding from UNESCO’s Regular Programme was and remains restricted primarily to supporting the Secretariat staff and associated costs, and the IPDC governance structure (mainly statutory meetings). Thus from the very beginning the IPDC was to seek extrabudgetary funds to achieve its goals. At times, the amount in Funds-in-Trust exceeded that in the Special Account, but until very recently, the Special Account was the favoured option for donor contributions.

21. In line with IPDC’s goals, the vast bulk of IPDC Project funding is directed towards activities in less and least developed countries in the four UNESCO regions in which they are to be found: i.e. Africa; Arab States; Asia and the Pacific; and Latin America and the Caribbean. The few activities in North America and Europe tend to be focused on global or regional issues that affect these countries.

22. It is difficult to fully differentiate intervention types from their associated financing modalities, but the current situation is as follows:⁹

- **IPDC Projects submitted from external partners:** These are small scale, limited-duration Projects submitted for funding annually to IPDC by external organisations, normally through UNESCO Field Offices, decided upon by the IPDC Bureau and funded from the IPDC Special Account.¹⁰
- **IPDC Special Initiatives:** These interventions can originate with the Secretariat, the IPDC Chair or indeed others interested such as donors, and are presented to Bureau meetings for consideration. They may be of fixed or varying duration, and can draw funding from different modalities including the Special Account (as a Special Allocation) or Funds-in-Trust. They are individually approved by the Bureau, sometimes after online discussion between annual Bureau meetings.
- **Other Relevant Actions:** The Bureau can also approve, as **Special Allocations** from the Special Account, other activities in line with IPDC objectives. These usually comprise support for conferences and events, or advocacy and participation within the UN system and more widely in the international media institutions and networks.
- **Projects through Funds-in-Trust (FIT):** These are individual contributions from donors, endorsed by the Bureau, and accounted for separately from the Special Account. There is no upper limit on the size or duration of these, and a recommended lower limit of US\$250,000. In practice, they differ from Special Initiatives in that they correspond to donors' specific interests and the donor receives individual reporting on them. A larger overhead of 13% also goes to the general UNESCO budget to allow for the additional monitoring and reporting, compared to 10% for Projects funded under the Special Account. FIT Projects are used across the CI Sector, but those channelled through IPDC are closely linked to the mandate of the programme (or more recently to ER3) and/or are generated by IPDC Projects or the IPDC Secretariat.
- **Earmarked Special Account Projects:** This category of IPDC Projects, approved by the Council in 2016, was introduced for the first time at the 2017 Bureau meeting. It is still evolving but appears to operate in two ways. First, it allows a donor to contribute to the Special Account while indicating their 'preference' for a specific eligible Project, or set of Projects, emerging from the annual call for Proposals. Donors can also express a preference for a specific country, region or theme. Second, such Projects can be proposed to the Bureau directly by the Secretariat on behalf of a donor, and can include components significantly higher than the usual Project ceiling. It is important to note that some or all of such funding is additional i.e. it would not have gone to the Special Account were the earmarking facility not available. The Netherlands made a significant earmarked contribution in 2017 across several activities. In the future, it will be interesting to assess the impact of earmarked contributions on the type of project and priorities supported by the IPDC. In practice, earmarked Projects thus lie somewhere between annually submitted Projects funded by the Special Account, un-earmarked funds and Funds-in-Trust. The earmarked modality permits the donor a narrow degree of targeting of issues and geography though with no special reporting or monitoring, and can involve relatively modest investments. The FIT modality enables much greater

⁹ Another activity had been supported for many years: the *UNESCO-IPDC Prize for Rural Communications*. The Council decided in 2014 to discontinue it due to what was perceived as limited visibility, the existence of other prizes, and the human resource and financial cost, and it is not considered here.

¹⁰ There is nothing in principle preventing Regular Programme funding to support Projects or indeed Special Initiatives, and it has occurred. In recent years, decreases in the Regular Programme have prevented that. In practice the Regular Programme funding (apart from staff costs) now covers only the cost of governance structures.

control over targeting issues and geographic scope, but at the cost of a higher overhead of 13% and with a recommended minimum funding threshold of US\$250,000.

23. Each intervention type is not always directly associated with a specific funding modality. Thus, a choice may be available to a donor and to the IPDC. Overall, the suite of arrangements allow a greater degree of flexibility to the IPDC and the Secretariat in negotiations with donors.

24. An indication of their relative size and trends is suggested by the amount approved each year for each intervention type. The top three rows of figures refer to the Special Account.

Table 1: Types of Intervention by Year and Amount Approved 2011 to 2017 (US\$ '000)

Intervention Type	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	Total	%
Annual Projects	2,497	1,361	803	966	779	467	592	7,464	68%
'Earmarked' Projects							808	808	7%
Special Initiatives			35	35	60	133	49	312	3%
Funds-in-Trust	143	276	162		126	1,030	676	2,413	22%
Total	2,640	1,637	1,000	1,001	965	1,629	2,125	10,997	100%

Source: IPDC Secretariat

25. Until 2016, the largest proportion of donor funding was devoted to the annual call for Projects. FIT contributions, a major feature of IPDC funding during its early decades, can vary but were significantly higher in the last two years. Each of these intervention types is described below.

2.3. IPDC PROJECTS

26. IPDC Projects, i.e. those resulting from submissions to the annual call for proposals, comprise the largest group - numerically by far, but also in terms of donor funding – of IPDC interventions. They are also the activity for which IPDC is probably best known among international stakeholders in media and communication development.

27. The total number of Projects supported by IPDC since 1980 comes close to 2,000, including 482 during the period reviewed by this evaluation. Distinguishing features are their small budget - the average from 2011 to 2017 was US\$19,200 - and short duration, up to a maximum of two years.

Table 2: Number of IPDC Projects by Region, 2011-2017

Region \ Year	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017 ¹¹	Total	%
Africa	39	31	24	35	32	17	12	190	39%
Asia & Pacific	22	21	14	16	11	17	15	116	24%

¹¹ 2017 figures from the 39 C/REP/24: Report by the Intergovernmental Council of the International Programme for the Development Of Communication (IPDC) On Its Activities in 2016-2017.

Latin America & Caribbean	18	19	15	19	16	11	14	112	23%
Arab States	11	12	6	9	3	5	5	51	11%
Other	2	1	-	1	6	1	2	13	3%
Total	92	84	59	80	68	51	46	482	100%

Source: IPDC Secretariat

28. The number of Projects submitted under each Priority in 2016 and 2017 is shown in Table 3. Priority 6 on capacity building is the most frequently addressed, followed by Priority 1 on media pluralism.

Table 3: Projects by IPDC Priority 2016 – 2017*

Priorities	2016 Projects	2017 Projects	Total	% of total
1. Supporting media pluralism (especially community media) & independence (improving self-regulation & professional standards)	22	14	36	26%
2. Promoting the safety of journalists	13	13	26	19%
3. Countering hate speech in media and social media, promoting conflict-sensitive journalism practice and/or promoting cross-cultural/cross-religious dialogue among journalists	2	3	5	3%
4. Conducting media assessments and research based on UNESCO's MDIs, GSIM or JSI	7	10	17	12%
5. Supporting law reform fostering media independence	5	5	10	7%
6. Capacity building for journalists and media managers including improving journalism education (using UNESCO's Model Curricula).	24	22	46	33%
Total	73	67	140	100%

Source: IPDC Secretariat

*Some Projects address more than one Priority. Direct comparison with Priorities between 2011 and 2015 is not possible across all areas since the Priorities changed.

29. Annex 1 contains further data tables on various aspects of IPDC Projects. A few key features are:

- 2011-2017: Africa received 40% of all Projects; and in 2016, 38% of all Project grant funding;
- 2011-2017: 84% of Projects were national in scope; others mostly regional and a few global;
- 2017: The average grant size had fallen to \$12,560 with no major regional variations;
- 2011-2015: Capacity development was a priority in 39% of Projects; compared to 31% for Promoting Freedom of Expression & Media Pluralism; 24% for Community Media.

30. Their method of design and approval, as an annual call for proposals, distinguishes Projects from other interventions. Since this significantly shapes the content and outcomes and accounts for a large proportion of IPDC staff time, the selection and approval process is presented in some depth below.

PROJECT SELECTION CRITERIA

31. IPDC Priorities, outlined above, are basic criteria for eligibility, and proposals are submitted often under several of these. Individual Project funding ceiling and floor levels changed during the period, the ceiling rising from US\$20,000 in 2013 to US\$35,000 in 2015, when a minimum threshold of US\$10,000 was also agreed, though exceptions are permitted at either end.

32. Significant detail is provided to potential applicants in the project preparation guidelines¹² on how to enhance their chances, reflecting previous Bureau decisions. They include a list of desirable features, though these are not weighted in terms of their importance. A list of what is not supported such as stand-alone seminars, campaigns, websites or media productions, institutional or maintenance costs is also given. Applications must also exhibit gender-sensitivity with regard to the ultimate beneficiaries. The guidelines also note that just one proposal per country is allowed except for LDCs which can submit two and one regional project per cluster Field Office. Of these, one public sector media project is permitted for each country, though applicants must have editorial independence from government.

THE CYCLE OF PROJECT SELECTION

33. The process, from encouraging Project submissions through to the final selection by the Bureau, involves several steps. The role of CI staff in Field Offices is critical in the early stages, up to the point at which the list of eligible Projects is compiled by the Secretariat and submitted to the Bureau.

a) Pre application identification and submission

34. The application date and description of the process and criteria of eligibility is published on the IPDC website¹³ in May or June each year. Applications open in late June with final submissions by the end of September. Since 2015, the process is facilitated online.

¹² "General Information For Project Submitters."
http://www.unesco.org/new/fileadmin/MULTIMEDIA/HQ/CI/CI/pdf/IPDC/ipdc_guidelines_for_project_submitters_updated_sept15.pdf

¹³ <http://en.unesco.org/programme/ipdc/projects>

35. CI programme specialists explore Project ideas with civil society and institutional partners on an ongoing basis, and informally consider submissions. All formal applicants must approach a CI specialist at one of 27 Field Offices identified in the call.¹⁴ The specialist usually requests a potential applicant to develop a brief expression of interest¹⁵ and if it seems appropriate, will then encourage them to develop a full application. The specialist interacts with a partner until the former is satisfied that the proposal conforms to the eligibility criteria and can be submitted. Once the CI programme specialist is satisfied, Projects are submitted by the deadline (in 2017 by September 30th). Some CI programme specialists have chosen in the past to submit more Projects than can be approved. These are bounced back to the Field Offices for prioritisation on the basis that the responsibility of selecting the best proposals should remain with the Field Office.

b) Initial Consideration by the Secretariat

36. The IPDC Secretariat first assesses whether proposals satisfy basic criteria, checks whether there are too many in terms of the rules per type of country, and if necessary communicates with the CI programme specialists to finalise the list of eligible applications. Only proposals that are still clearly ineligible for technical reasons, for instance that are on the list of specific exclusions such as conferences or radio stations lacking licenses, are omitted at that point.

37. The IPDC Secretariat then examines each proposal in depth and makes a recommendation regarding whether it should be prioritised and if the budget requested should be adjusted, and a comment is added as appropriate. All of this is done electronically.

38. An important aspect of the process is that most proposals are circulated to relevant HQ CI Sector staff outside the IPDC Secretariat who act as 'Theme Trackers'. For instance, a proposal with a strong gender component may be sent to a gender expert for comment, and the comments then consolidated with those of the Secretariat in the database.¹⁶ In addition to contributing to the assessment process, this also enables, according to a note from the CI/FEM Director, "HQ colleagues (where relevant) to be au fait with the IPDC project proposals relevant to [their] work area, and to stimulate possible synergies between the IPDC projects that gain approval of the Bureau with other FEM activities."¹⁷

39. With this initial consideration completed, the full set of eligible Projects is sent for translation (English and French) usually by the end of the year. These eligible proposals are then opened up to Bureau members for their consideration.

c) Initial Consideration by Bureau Members

40. With translation completed, Bureau members are given access to the Projects database about four to six weeks before their meeting. A deadline is agreed by which Bureau members can add their own comments and recommendations, in a dedicated comment section. For each Project, Bureau

¹⁴ International projects can be submitted directly to the HQ Secretariat and would usually be the result of ongoing interactions and discussions.

¹⁵ In its first year of online operation in 2015, a two stage process was operated in which applicants first submitted an Expression of Interest (called a Project Summary) and the Secretariat invited to proceed to the next stage (full project development) only those that were eligible according to the criteria mentioned in the guidelines. The two-step process has since been discontinued.

¹⁶ Internal CI guidelines: *New arrangements to replace IPDC backstopping*.

¹⁷ Note accompanying above guidelines. 26th January 2017

members can individually indicate if they regard it as a priority, the recommended budget amount and any further comments.

d) Screening of Projects for Bureau Meeting

41. With the deadline passed, the Secretariat examines Bureau Members' comments. Those with sufficient consensus are deemed approved and require no more discussion. The formula for *insufficient consensus* in relation to a given proposal is that:

- more than one disagrees on the priority; and/or
- more than two disagree on the budget.

42. All such cases must go forward to the Bureau meeting in March for discussion.

e) Final Bureau Deliberations

43. Thus, the Bureau is presented for final consideration only those Projects on which sufficient consensus has not been reached, and is required to distribute only the budget remaining after the recommended amounts are allocated to those Projects already approved. Invariably, the remaining budget is lower than the amount sought and significant cuts are required.

44. At this point, a more 'political' selection process begins, in line broadly with the IPDC Priorities. The meeting may decide to consider blocks of Projects first, and then come back finally to individual proposals; for instance, agreeing first to consider all Projects from the Least Developed Countries and SIDS; then to proceed to regional proposals; and finally to choose from among those remaining if funds permit. Another approach is to reduce the approved budget of all Projects by an agreed percentage.

f) Project Approval and Launch

45. An implementation period of 24 months (up to 2015) and of 18 months (more recently) then begins. Contracts are prepared between March and June for Project partners and administered by the Field Offices. Upon signing of the contract, an initial payment of up to 80% of the grant can be made - though, depending on the capacities of the implementing partners and the nature of the Project, the contract may also stipulate two or more payments. A specific type of contract (Intergovernmental Body Allocation Contract) is used.

g) Project Monitoring and Evaluation

46. An Interim Project Report is submitted by December and a Final Report upon completion. The final grant payment is disbursed once the deliverables are submitted by the beneficiary, as defined in the contract.

47. Until 2011 when it was discontinued, a number of Projects were also independently evaluated.¹⁸ Now, based on Implementation Reports submitted by UNESCO Field Offices, the Secretariat prepares an 'Analytical Summary' annually for the Bureau meeting, outlining key developments and lessons emerging. At this point, there is no systematic follow through from this report, for instance in terms of pursuing the implications of lessons. At Field Office level, the relevant

¹⁸ Evaluation reports to four Council meetings up until 2012 can be viewed here: <http://www.unesco.org/new/en/communication-and-information/intergovernmental-programmes/ipdc/projects/project-evaluations/>

CI programme specialist in most cases would remain in communication with partners and be aware of ongoing developments and outcomes.

2.4. SPECIAL INITIATIVES

48. IPDC Special Initiatives are designed and approved separately from the annual call for Projects and were first developed by the Council in 2006. They may or may not have a specific duration and can continue indefinitely though they are reviewed at each Bureau and Council meeting. When they receive a Special Allocation from the Special Account for a related activity, that activity is to be implemented within the same time period as Projects (currently 18 months).

49. Table 4 shows the amount of funding for various Special Initiatives and other activities coming from Special Allocations.

Table 4: Special Initiatives and other funding from Special Allocations 2013 to 2017(US\$)*

Special Initiative \ Year	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	Total	%
1. Safety of Journalists	35,000	20,000		110,000		165,000	53%
2. Media-Related Indicators			40,000			40,000	13%
3. Global initiative for Excellence in Journalism Education (GIEJE)		15,000			16,500	31,500	10%
4. Knowledge Driven Media Development & SDGs			10,000		16,500	26,500	9%
Emerging Issues			10,000	22,000		32,000	10%
Other: IPDC's Knowledge Management System					16,500	16,500	5%
Total	35,000	35,000	60,000	132,000	49,500	311,500	100%

Source: IPDC Secretariat. *No Special Allocations are noted in reports from Council and Bureau meetings 2011-2012.

50. Special Initiatives can have a significance beyond what these small budgets suggest. The IPDC Project Priorities have been modified to focus on issues that were first addressed as a Special Initiative, and for certain periods a very significant proportion of Projects have been devoted to explicitly reinforcing them. For instance, two of the media-related indicators frameworks, the Media Development Indicators (MDIs) and the Journalism Safety Indicators (JSIs), were originally developed as Special Initiatives and these have since received Project funding in numerous countries worldwide. The GIEJE is intended to build upon a major IPDC initiative of previous years. Their level of importance is also indicated by the detailed progress reports provided by the Secretariat to Bureau and Council meetings.

51. IPDC Bureau meetings also discussed issues emerging and approved Special Allocations for:

- International Conference on *Youth and the internet: Fighting radicalization and extremism*, jointly with IFAP in 2015;

- Follow-up activities in 2016 to the above;
- Follow-up to a Thematic Debate in March 2016, at the Bureau Meeting, on *Media and Migration*.

52. A notable additional recent activity is the *IPDC Talks* series, an initiative of the current IPDC Chair. These mark the General Conference approved *International Day for Universal Access to Information (IDUAI)* on 28 September, and they are organised by the IPDC Secretariat. The first was held in Paris on 26 September 2016¹⁹, the second on 28 September 2017²⁰, with complementary IPDC Talks held in 10 Field Offices on the day. Both are themed around access to information and the SDGs, and constitute the primary activity of UNESCO for the IDUAI.

53. IPDC governing body members, on an *ad hoc* basis, also cooperate with other entities or organisations, through conferences and other events relevant to its mandate, usually with no budget implications to UNESCO other than staff time.

SPECIAL INITIATIVE 1: MONITORING & REPORTING ON SAFETY OF JOURNALISTS & DANGER OF IMPUNITY

OBJECTIVES, ORIGINS AND DEVELOPMENT

54. The safety of journalists Special Initiative has grown in significance and scope since its origins two decades ago and in recent years has extended significantly into the UN system, with Member States and other stakeholders. The topic has become a major focus in the FEM division as well as being an IPDC Special Initiative and Project-funding Priority.

55. Its origins date to 1997 when the UNESCO General Conference invited the Director-General (DG) to condemn instances of assassination and physical violence against journalists, and urged relevant authorities to do something about it. The key milestones for IPDC, CI and UNESCO are as follows:

- 2008: First requested by the IPDC Council in 2006, the UNESCO DG presents the first *Report on the Safety of Journalists and the Danger of Impunity* (DG's Report), and is requested to produce a further report in 2010.
- 2010: IPDC Council asks the DG to convene an interagency meeting of UN Agencies on the issue, the first move toward a UN-wide approach to the question.
- 2011 UNESCO General Conference requests the DG to monitor the status of press freedom and the safety of journalists, including monitoring and political follow-up through IPDC, and report back to the General Conference. This gives rise to the World Trends in Freedom of Expression and Media Development (World Trends) report, produced by CI every two years, and which includes a dedicated chapter on safety and impunity. As the IPDC Council meets in alternate years to the General Conference, this means an annual cycle for monitoring and reporting with the DG's report to IPDC one year and the World Trends the following one.

¹⁹ See <http://en.unesco.org/ipdctalks-2016>

²⁰ See <http://en.unesco.org/events/2017-ipdc-talks-powering-sustainable-development-access-information>

- 2012 The DG's report to IPDC Council is requested to be officially biennial and includes a list of state responses; the UN Plan of Action is endorsed by the UN Chief Executives Board (UNCEB).
- 2013 The UNGA declares 2 November as the International Day to End Impunity; UNESCO Executive Board endorses the *Work Plan on the Safety of Journalists and the Issue of Impunity* which includes IPDC's role.
- 2014: IPDC Council urges the inclusion of the killing of journalists as an indicator in SDG 16 which became a reality at the UN General Assembly in 2017.
- 2016: IPDC data contributes to the UN Secretary General's Report on SDGs.

56. Data on killings is gathered and verified for the DG's report and World Trends from multiple sources, including NGOs, UNESCO Field Offices and UNESCO Permanent Delegations. The DG further requests a report from States on the status of investigations into these killings. State responses are categorised as: i) no information received from the relevant State on the judicial enquiry's status; ii) the case, subject to specific official information being provided, is ongoing or unresolved; or iii) the case is resolved through conviction, the death of a suspect, or a judicial decision that the death was not related to journalistic practice. The response rate of states has risen from 30% in 2013 to 74.5% in 2017.

57. In addition to feeding into the DG's Report biennially, the data, thus gathered is used in several ways.

- It contributes to the *World Trends* report;
- It feeds into UNESCO's contribution to the global monitoring of SDG indicator 16.10.1, concerning the number of verified cases of violations against journalists;
- It is used as an input for UNESCO's submissions to the *Universal Periodic Report* of the UN Human Rights Council.

58. Although IPDC Council initiated the DG's Report process and the Plan of Action, much of CI staff time devoted to this issue comes not from the IPDC Secretariat but from the FEM/FOE Section. Led by the Division Director, the FEM/FOE Section pursues the issue within the UN System. It supports the DG's Report and produces the World Trends report, and reinforces the implementation of the Plan of Action by a regular newsletter,²¹ while IPDC's Secretariat engages in support actions at the request of the Council, including through Projects at national level and publications.²²

59. The IPDC also developed the Journalists Safety Indicators (JSI) framework²³ in 2013 / 2014 in the context of the UN Plan of Action with a Special Allocation of \$35,000. It enables an evaluation of the environment for, and actions to support, journalists' safety in a given country. Based on the MDIs framework, it includes indicators that can in effect measure the implementation of the UN Plan of Action and thus serve as a baseline for future actions in that direction.

²¹ See <http://www.unesco.org/new/en/communication-and-information/freedom-of-expression/safety-of-journalists/un-plan-of-action/newsletter/>

²² The most recent is: *An Attack on One is an Attack on All: Successful Initiatives to protect Journalists and Combat Impunity*. 2017. <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0025/002504/250430e.pdf>

²³ <http://www.unesco.org/new/en/communication-and-information/freedom-of-expression/safety-of-journalists/journalists-safety-indicators/>

60. The first pilots in Pakistan, Guatemala and Honduras were implemented by UNESCO HQ and Field Offices. Further reports have since been produced in Kenya,²⁴ Nepal and Iraq. As with the MDIs, a collaborative multi-stakeholder approach is critical, and the inclusion of the relevant authorities is vital. Three of the countries, Pakistan, Nepal and Iraq were also pilots for the UN Plan of Action, underlining the link between the two initiatives.

61. In terms of IPDC financial support for safety of Journalists via Special Allocations from the Special Account, the total came to almost US\$450,000 between 2012 and 2015.²⁵

62. A further Special Allocation of US\$20,000 in 2016 was for piloting mechanisms to support states to improve national monitoring systems relating to the Plan of Action. In Pakistan in October 2016 a meeting of 20 experts from Government, civil society and media explored ways to improve information sharing on safety of journalists; and in November 2016 in Iraq, a similar meeting was held between senior officials, the Council of Representatives and the media sector to discuss practical measures to improve information sharing and reporting on safety. The 2016 IPDC Council also approved the production of a best practice compilation and multi-language booklet on the monitoring process, both now published.

63. Finally, it is worth noting that the IPDC supports numerous relevant initiatives through the annual Project grants, giving a total of almost US\$1.2 million to 67 Projects between 2011 and 2017 directly addressing safety of journalists.²⁶

Table 5: Annual Project Grants for Safety of Journalists Projects 2011 – 2017 (US\$)

Scope \ Year	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	Total
Number of Projects	10	6	13	16	6	9	7	67
Total Grants	232,300	157,500	192,400	247,000	101,850	118,000	134,200	1,183,250

Source: IPDC Secretariat

64. Most grants involved capacity building relating to security and safety; some developed safety mechanisms for journalists. At least one involved a regional implementation of the JSI not in the usual fashion overseen by UNESCO but by Article 19 for South Sudan, Rwanda and Kenya.

SPECIAL INITIATIVE 2: MEDIA-RELATED INDICATORS: MDIs, GSIM, MVIs and IUIs

65. This Special Initiative groups together CI activities in the area of indicators, the most prominent and developed being the Media Development Indicators (MDIs). The Journalism Safety Indicators framework, by dint of also being a set of indicators, is also usually included under this

²⁴ <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0024/002449/244914e.pdf>

²⁵ Marcesse, Silvia Chocarro (2016) *IPDC's Role in the Promotion of the Safety of Journalists: A Way Forward*. (Table 1 p.9)

²⁶ Compiled from 2016/2017 Bureau Minutes and Annex II of Marcesse, Silvia Chocarro (2016) *IPDC's Role in the Promotion of the Safety of Journalists: A Way Forward*. (Table 1 p.9). The more recent report – *In Preparation of the Multi-Stakeholder Consultation on Strengthening the Implementation of the UN Plan of Action: Draft Report 21 June 2017* puts the number at 81 projects between 2011 and 2017.

heading. In practice, however, it is an integral part of the set of interventions associated with the safety of journalists and hence has been covered above.

66. Excluding the JSIs, there are three indicator frameworks; while another is currently being developed: an Internet Universality Indicators research and consultation process supported by a US\$331,000 FIT project from SIDA.

MEDIA DEVELOPMENT INDICATORS

67. This was the first of the IPDC Special Initiatives, initiated by the Council in 2006 and launched in 2008 after a period of research, drafting and consultation. The Council endorsed the indicators as an “important diagnostic tool for all stakeholders to assess media development in a given country and to thereby determine the areas in which assistance is most needed”.

68. The framework is built on UNESCO’s Constitutional mandate to foster “the unrestricted pursuit of objective truth”, “the free exchange of ideas and knowledge” and “the free flow of ideas by word and image”. It has been applied in over 20 countries²⁷ and assessments are ongoing in 18 more.²⁸

69. The indicators cover the media sector as a whole, under five categories:

- Legal and regulatory framework governing media;
- Degree of plurality and diversity of the media;
- Capacity of media to function as a platform for democratic discourse;
- Professional capacities;
- Technical capacities.

70. Within UNESCO, IPDC is the primary source of financing for MDIs. Three IPDC Special Allocations (from the Special Account), in 2009, 2011, and 2015, totalling €240,000 were devoted to producing MDIs in 15 countries²⁹ and supporting follow-up in many of them. The Special Allocation modality is used since it allows UNESCO Field Offices to directly maintain responsibility, working with local partners, for implementation and for the product, and to respond quickly to emerging circumstances. However, Projects have also been approved for UNESCO partners to implement an MDI assessment in 2013 (Dominican Republic and Liberia), 2014 (Swaziland), 2015 (Bolivia, Haiti), 2016 (Ghana); and gathering pace in 2017 (Guyana, Jamaica, Malawi, Moldova and Uzbekistan). Others, apart from UNESCO and its funded partners, have also implemented the framework, include in Benin (implemented by the *Media Foundation for West Africa* and DANIDA) and Sri Lanka (implemented by *International Media Support*). A practical guidebook has been produced to support the process.³⁰

²⁷ Reports can be downloaded from: <http://en.unesco.org/programme/ipdc/initiatives/mdis>

²⁸ http://www.unesco.org/new/fileadmin/MULTIMEDIA/HQ/CI/CI/pdf/IPDC/ipdc59_MDI.pdf

²⁹ There were 16 grants: Myanmar received two, in 2013 and 2016. The most recent complete report to the Bureau is here (CI-16/BUR.60/5.1 Information Note): http://www.unesco.org/new/fileadmin/MULTIMEDIA/HQ/CI/CI/pdf/IPDC/ipdc60bur_information_note_in_dicators.pdf

³⁰ See https://en.unesco.org/sites/default/files/guidelines_mdi_final_en.pdf

71. The method of implementation of an MDI process can vary greatly from one place to another, depending on the environment. A Report is the immediate output and acts as a benchmark for future action, but the outcome is always focused on other areas. These can include:

- Capacity building of a wide range of stakeholders that become involved in the process, in terms of gaining an understanding of the dynamics of the media sector;
- Knowledge sharing and consensus building among the stakeholders, through developing discussion and interactions;
- Specific recommendations for action in relation to media development interventions and legal and policy reform, based on needs identified by the stakeholders and following international standards and good practice.

72. The follow-up to the MDI report is critical to achieving positive outcomes. Much of the focus of the research and consultation process is directed towards ensuring the widest possible ownership of the results, and putting in place networks and commitment towards implementation.

GENDER SENSITIVE INDICATORS FOR MEDIA

73. The goal of the Gender Sensitive Indicators for Media framework (GSIM)³¹ is to contribute to gender equality and women's empowerment in and through media of all kinds. It was developed by the CI Sector separately from the IPDC in what is now the FEM/MAS section and works on gender equality in and through media. It was endorsed by IPDC Council³² and added as an IPDC Project Priority under 5: *Conducting Media Assessments*, while work continues in FEM/MAS.

74. The framework was first proposed in 2010 on the UNESCO Women Make the News platform.³³ A draft was produced in collaboration with the *International Federation of Journalists* and others and submitted to two rounds of consultation, before being finalised in 2012. It includes a number of case studies from different regions and is translated into seven languages.³⁴

75. The framework covers two dimensions: gender equality within media organisations; and gender portrayal in media content. It is designed for use by all media organisations, though publicly funded and community media organisations are seen as the early adopters.³⁵

76. While it can be regarded as an extension of the MDIs in the direction of gender, the GSIM differs in that the framework is applied at the organisational or institutional, not sectoral, level. Given the need for access to data internal to the organisations, much of it operational, the GSIM is best implemented by an organisation itself or with its support. But its potential for wider impact at the policy or regulatory level will benefit from direct or indirect involvement, or access, to relevant government institutions.

77. The GSIM has been applied under IPDC on a number of occasions and in different contexts, including the following:

³¹ <http://www.unesco.org/new/en/communication-and-information/crosscutting-priorities/gender-and-media/gender-sensitive-indicators-for-media/>

³² See page 28 <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0021/002199/219910E.pdf>

³³ <http://en.unesco.org/women-make-the-news-2017>

³⁴ The full published version is available here: <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0021/002178/217831e.pdf>

³⁵ GSIM Framework p.17)

- In 2014, Gender and Media in Southern Africa (GEMSAT) applied it (after refinement for use locally) in Tanzania to seven community radio stations enhancing understanding of the issues and encouraging change.³⁶
- In 2015, it was implemented in Paraguay by an NGO, Global News Agency, focusing primarily on content in two each of print and digital media and of television channels, and analysing over 1,100 articles and 400 advertisements.³⁷
- Thai Public Service Broadcasting (TPSB) was established in 2008 partly to become a best practice leader in media. The GSIM fitted well with its goal, and TPSB's training institute implemented it in 2014 - 2015 across six prominent broadcasting outlets both public and commercial. The goal was also to raise awareness among these media organisations, the media regulator and the public.³⁸
- In the Dominican Republic in 2014, a Project implemented both the MDI and GSIM by the Dominican College of Journalists, in a wide consultation process.³⁹
- A similar Project of the Haiti State University' Communications Department began in 2016 implementing the GSIM and MDI together, with the goal of producing a set of recommendations to strengthen the development of the media sector and guide future policy.⁴⁰
- In Mongolia, Globe International Centre from 2015 to 2016 took the GSIM and translated it into Mongolian, and piloted it in the public service broadcaster MNB, the private TV station UBS, and the Confederation of Mongolian Journalists. Additional funding was received and it was duly completed and published.

78. Further Projects have been approved in 2016 and are underway. One in Namibia will be implemented across all community radio stations to develop a Model Gender Policy and a gender-neutral local language guide, by Chirundu Community Radio using its volunteer network.⁴¹ In Mexico, UNAM is developing a handbook for the application of gender indicators in media of indicators, including training journalists in the application of the GSIM Framework.⁴²

³⁶ See Project database: <http://www.unesco-ci.org/ipdcprojects/content/application-unesco-gender-sensitive-media-indicators-means-promoting-gender-equality>

³⁷ See Project database: <http://www.unesco-ci.org/ipdcprojects/content/promotion-gender-equality-through-use-unesco-gender-sensitive-indicators-media-policies> -and

³⁸ See Project database: <http://www.unesco-ci.org/ipdcprojects/content/assessing-gender-sensitivity-thai-public-media>

³⁹ See Project database: <http://www.unesco-ci.org/ipdcprojects/content/media-assessment-dominican-republic-using-media-development-indicators>

⁴⁰ See Project database: <http://www.unesco-ci.org/ipdcprojects/content/media-assessment-haiti-using-media-development-indicators>

⁴¹ See Project database: [https://teamsnet.unesco.org/en-us/Lists/IPDC Submissions Final/DispForm.aspx?ID=15&Source=https%3A%2F%2Fteamsnet.unesco.org%2Fen-us%2FLists%2FIPDC%2520Submissions%2520%2520Final%2FAllItems.aspx&ContentTypeId=0x01000285F9A7BD5BEF45BE6AF85B0410FF03](https://teamsnet.unesco.org/en-us/Lists/IPDC%20Submissions/Final/DispForm.aspx?ID=15&Source=https%3A%2F%2Fteamsnet.unesco.org%2Fen-us%2FLists%2FIPDC%2520Submissions%2520%2520Final%2FAllItems.aspx&ContentTypeId=0x01000285F9A7BD5BEF45BE6AF85B0410FF03)

⁴² See Project database [https://teamsnet.unesco.org/en-us/Lists/IPDC Submissions Final/DispForm.aspx?ID=3&Source=https%3A%2F%2Fteamsnet.unesco.org%2Fen-us%2FLists%2FIPDC%2520Submissions%2520%2520Final%2FAllItems.aspx&ContentTypeId=0x01000285F9A7BD5BEF45BE6AF85B0410FF03](https://teamsnet.unesco.org/en-us/Lists/IPDC%20Submissions/Final/DispForm.aspx?ID=3&Source=https%3A%2F%2Fteamsnet.unesco.org%2Fen-us%2FLists%2FIPDC%2520Submissions%2520%2520Final%2FAllItems.aspx&ContentTypeId=0x01000285F9A7BD5BEF45BE6AF85B0410FF03)

79. CI's FEM/MAS Section also engages in activities working directly with the GSIM. For instance in 2016, 25 African francophone national broadcasters under the AUB participated in a three-day workshop on implementing the framework, developing action plans for their respective organisations.

MEDIA VIABILITY INDICATORS

80. The Media Viability Indicators⁴³ were developed by IPDC in partnership with, and FIT funding from, the Deutsche Welle Akedemie during 2014 and 2015. Due to lack of funding for piloting them, they are the least elaborated of the indicators. A draft was presented to the Bureau in 2015.

81. They are intended as an extension of the MDIs in the direction of looking at viability across all news media, traditional and online. Like the MDIs, their concern is with the media sector as a whole and whether it offers an environment in which media can both sustain economic viability and produce high quality content. They cover:

- Presence of a supportive economic and business environment
- Structure and scope of the media economy
- The media labour market
- The financial health of media operations, including advertising
- Capital environment for media operations
- Organisational structures and resources which support financial and market sustainability
- Contribution to national economy

82. The framework design process involved online consultation with 58 media experts, and discussions at various national, regional and global media development conferences during 2015. Funding has been sought unsuccessfully by the IPDC Secretariat to implement the framework.

SPECIAL INITIATIVE 3: GLOBAL INITIATIVE FOR EXCELLENCE IN JOURNALISM EDUCATION (GIEJE)

83. The forerunner to GIEJE dates to 2007, with the IPDC's Special Initiative on *Building Centres of Excellence in Africa* to enhance the quality of journalism in the continent. This built on work relating to the *Model Curriculum for Journalism Education* and established *Criteria and Indicators for Quality Journalism Training Institutions*. However, following an internal review in 2013,⁴⁴ it was decided to discontinue the Special Initiative in its current form and "...to rethink the initiative in terms that allow for a more inclusive, global and less UNESCO-reliant network of journalism schools aspiring for excellence in journalism education." (p.34)

84. Thus what was described as a "new global phase of the initiative", that moved away from the idea of "centres of excellence" towards "poles (or 'pillars') of excellence", would see: "...schools of

⁴³ See:

http://www.unesco.org/new/fileadmin/MULTIMEDIA/HQ/CI/CI/pdf/IPDC/ipdc59_Media_viability_indicators.pdf

⁴⁴ Internal Review of the Potential Centres of Excellence and Reference in Journalism Education in Africa Initiative. May 2013

http://www.unesco.org/new/fileadmin/MULTIMEDIA/HQ/CI/CI/pdf/review_centres_excellence_rev.pdf

journalism actively cooperating to innovate in teaching, research, media production and professional outreach – nationally, regionally and internationally. A core philosophical component of the “Global Initiative” will be collegial exchange and mentoring among the members, using the technologies available to them and drawing on their comparative advantages and knowledge bases.”

85. The initiative was envisaged to run initially from 2014 to 2018. A partnership with ORBICOM (the network of UNESCO Chairs in communication) was agreed. A proposal was put to the IPDC Bureau in 2014, seeking endorsement and US\$15,000 seed funding, but the Bureau decided to offer ‘encouragement’ and to put the proposal to the IPDC Council at its next session.

86. After this shaky start the broad goals were presented to the IPDC Council as:

- a) To reinforce the existing – often bilateral – education relationships globally;
- b) To provide a platform for globally shared excellence among existing international networks of journalism educators;
- c) To provide pedagogical and material support to educators, especially in developing countries, who may not have adequate capacity to enjoy collaborative opportunities.

87. The Council endorsed it as an IPDC Special Initiative and “encourage[d] Member States to share their best practices in journalism education”.⁴⁵ It is supported by the UNESCO Regular Programme with IPDC Secretariat staff time and received a US\$15,000 Special Allocation at its launch.

88. The potential of the initiative is seen to be in creating a platform that can offer more value to UNESCO publications and activities in journalism education. These include the core *Model Curricula for Journalism Education: A Compendium of New Syllabi*,⁴⁶ revised and relaunched in 2013. The original had by 2012 been adapted for use in at least 70 journalism schools and is available in nine languages,⁴⁷ and the revised version has already been translated into Mandarin and Tamil. The 2016 and 2017⁴⁸ Reports to the IPDC Bureau note the use in various contexts of the IPDC publications *Climate Change in Africa: A Guidebook for Journalists* (including outside of Africa and its translation into Tamil and Mandarin) and the revised *Model Curriculum* above. In 2017, the Bureau agreed a Special Allocation to develop a further specialised syllabus.

89. The publications themselves began as part of the UNESCO *Series on Journalism Education* and were not branded as IPDC outputs. However, their usage is now encouraged and promoted within IPDC’s normative work. Although their precise relationship to the GIEJE is not fully articulated, they have been launched within the context of this initiative at several meetings of journalism educators. The publications are overseen and edited by the Programme Specialists within the IPDC Secretariat.

SPECIAL INITIATIVE 4: KNOWLEDGE-DRIVEN MEDIA DEVELOPMENT (KDMD) & MONITORING SDG 16.10

90. The IPDC’s KDMD Special Initiative and the work in SDG indicators have become intertwined over the last few years, but have different origins. The title of this Special Initiative points to the value

⁴⁵ Decisions Taken by the 29th IPDC Council Session. 2014.

⁴⁶ <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0022/002211/221199E.pdf>

⁴⁷ Model Curriculum for Journalism Education: A Compendium of New Syllabi’ (2013) p.9 <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0022/002211/221199E.pdf#page=8>

⁴⁸ CI-17/BUT.61/4

of knowledge generation and knowledge sharing in driving media development and strengthening journalism education. A desire to share information between media development actors was the initial motivation for IPDC to bring together UNESCO, the World Bank Institute, the World Association of Newspapers and New Publishers (WAN-IFRA) and other media development actors and foundations. The idea was to build a platform to exchange information and learning, prevent duplication of effort and to mutually enrich media development projects and programmes across the globe.

91. The IPDC Bureau approved the Initiative in 2013. The first step was to draft a protocol for exchanges, and later in 2013 seven broad principles were agreed in *Media Development Data Sharing Principles*⁴⁹ by the three main actors, UNESCO, WBI and WAN-IFRA, to share information online between each other and the wider media development community. IPDC was aware of its own large and still growing database of Projects dating back several decades and, although the project-related documentation was available online, lessons and learning emerging were not compiled or immediately accessible. (Indeed, since the decision had been taken in 2011 to discontinue evaluations of Projects, even less was emerging of use outside.) Thus, the IPDC Secretariat decided to distil from IPDC Projects' final implementation reports an annual Analytical Report that would help to share lessons and achieve a better use of the database. The first Analytical Report was produced later in 2013 and since then these have been presented annually to Bureau meetings.

92. However, the agreement of the data sharing principles did not mark the beginning of an ongoing or wider process of sharing as it was not taken up by the partners involved. That aspect of the Initiative has in effect come to a halt.

93. In 2015, the Bureau approved its first Special Allocation of \$10,000 to the KDMD.⁵⁰ It sought two outputs: to establish a UNESCO Chair (or expand an existing Chair) on Knowledge-Driven Media Development that would promote scholarly and policy research on the notion of knowledge-driven media development⁵¹; and to develop and launch the post-2015 development agenda publication, entitled "Teaching Journalism for Sustainable Development: New Syllabi". The CI Sector work on the Post-Development Agenda began as early as 2013. The first interest was expressed by the Bureau in March 2014 and strongly endorsed by Council Members in 2014 who pursued it with the UNESCO General Conference.

94. In 2014, the SDGs began to be associated with the KDMD. The IPDC Secretariat updated the IPDC Bureau on the KDMD (still hoping to extend the sharing activity) and loosely incorporated work that had begun in the context of the SDGs. The rationale for extending KDMD into this area was that:⁵²

"...the IPDC will seek to use its *knowledge* about media development, derived from analytical reports on its support for media projects globally, to continue to make the case for the correlation between free, independent and pluralistic media and sustainable development... The IPDC, by contributing evidence-based insights to the ongoing consultation on sustainable development beyond 2015, has an opportunity to demonstrate global intellectual leadership on the role of free, independent and pluralistic media as a catalyst for human development." (italics in original).

⁴⁹ http://en.unesco.org/sites/default/files/media_development_data_sharing_principles_final.pdf

⁵⁰ CI-15/CONF.201/9 5 March 2015

⁵¹ This culminated in the launch of a UNESCO chair on Communication and Sustainable Development at Indonesia's Pancasila University in May 2017.

⁵² *Status Report on the Knowledge-Driven Media Development (KDMD) Initiative*. 57th IPDC Bureau meeting.

95. In its effort to take forward IPDC's interest in shaping the SDGs, the IPDC Secretariat would also further strengthen its relations with other organisations such as *Global Forum for Media Development* (GFMD), OECD and *African Media Initiative* (AMI).

96. The IPDC's work relating to SDGs and to the KDMD were reported separately to the IPDC Council later in 2014, which debated and strongly endorsed the idea that media and freedom of expression should be explicitly included in the SDGs. It approved continuation of the effort by the Secretariat.⁵³ In 2015, the two were reported on together to the Bureau meeting; and again in March 2016. Similarly the follow-up on the SDGs was reported to the 2016 IPDC Council as the sole activity under the KDMD, having by then been fully folded in under that umbrella.

97. There was significant progress to report over that period, in particular the adoption in September 2015 by the UNGA of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainability Development of 17 goals (SDGs) and 169 associated targets.

98. The IPDC Bureau had in March 2014 already reaffirmed its commitment to the SDG process. In November 2014, the IPDC Council noted "with regret" that the (then draft) SDGs "contained no reference to the right to freedom of expression and information and its corollary, media freedom" and specifically urged all Member States to encourage the inclusion "in particular the safety of journalists and the issue of impunity as a key gateway to achieving Goal 16."⁵⁴

99. A key requirement for each target is to have indicators. Indeed, the precise definition of the indicators – as the only means to assess process - influences in practice the meaning of the targets. The task of defining the indicators and developing a global framework fell to the Inter-Agency Expert Group on SDGs (IAEG-SDGs)⁵⁵ created by the United Nations Statistical Commission (UNSC),⁵⁶ and this became the target of intense lobbying as various organisations and interests contributed in their own areas. The IPDC Secretariat, armed with its strong mandate, engaged very actively with the process, building partnerships with relevant UN agencies such as OHCHR, ILO and the World Bank, and working intensely with civil society through the GMFD and securing the support of the UNESCO Institute of Statistics.

100. The result of these combined efforts was the inclusion of two indicators under SDG Goal 16. SDG 16 *Peace Justice and Strong Institutions* aims to "Promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions". More specifically, SDG 16.10 is to: "Ensure public access to information and protect fundamental freedoms, in accordance with national legislation and international agreements". The two indicators are:

- SDG 16.10.1: Number of verified cases of killing, kidnapping, enforced disappearance, arbitrary detention and torture of journalists, associated media personnel, trade unionists and human rights advocates in the previous 12 months;
- SDG 16.10.2: Number of countries that adopt and implement constitutional, statutory and/or policy guarantees for public access to information.

101. According to the CI Director for Freedom of Expression and Media Development, who also serves as IPDC Secretary "it was the IPDC Council Members States'... mandate and prestige that gave

⁵³ *Status Report on IPDC's Contributions to the Post-2015 Development Agenda Process*. CI/14/CONF.202/5; *Status Report on IPDC's KDMD Initiative*. CI-14/CONF.202/6

⁵⁴ Decisions Taken by the 29th IPDC Council Session, 20-21 November 2014, Room X, UNESCO Headquarters, Paris.

⁵⁵ <https://unstats.un.org/sdgs/iaeg%2Dsdgs/>

⁵⁶ It comprises 27 regionally distributed UN Member States, and the UNSC Chair ex officio.

impetus to the partnerships that led to the indicators being developed and accepted, and to the IPDC Secretariat doing the job of convening agency for UNESCO as the UN Mandate holder to report on SDG 16.10.2".⁵⁷ Both indicators have been endorsed by the UNSC, and were formally approved by the UNGA later in 2017.

102. UNESCO's role in relation to each indicator is different. UNSC has nominated UNESCO as a 'contributor' UN agency for indicator 16.10.1 with OHCHR as the lead. For 16.10.2 UNESCO has been designated as the 'custodian' which mandates it to gather data from national statistics and other sources and to further refine the indicator, coordinating with other interested parties; to build capacities around the indicator; and to contribute the narrative to the SDG progress report. This is a notable achievement for UNESCO, facilitated by the UNESCO Institute of Statistics and partnerships with civil society and Member State actors. The CI/FEM/FOE Section and the IPDC Secretariat co-operate closely in regard to compiling and submitting reports on both of the indicators.

2.5. FUNDS-IN-TRUST

103. Formally, Funds-in-Trust are bilateral donations subject to review by the donor and requiring monitoring, evaluation and reporting as per donor and UNESCO requirements. In addition to formal individual reporting to the donor, the IPDC Bureau is also kept informed about their development, through IPDC general reports and oral presentations during Bureau meetings.

104. A note of clarification may be useful here. The Bureau decides whether to approve each FIT project to be channelled (or administered) through IPDC, but does not approve the project itself. The IPDC Secretariat administers its implementation: it is linked in the system to IPDC'S ER3 and reports are provided to the Bureau for information. Presentations of results achieved are made during IPDC statutory meetings and these inform further action by the programme.

105. These FIT projects are few in number and negotiated individually by the IPDC Secretariat. Their size varies significantly, though all are much larger than allocations from the Special Account for Projects. As noted, they are dedicated to specific activities of mutual interest to IPDC and the donor and involve significant reporting.⁵⁸

Table 6: Funds-in-Trust Contributions 2011 – 2017 (All include overhead 13%)

Year	Country	Title	Amount (US\$)
2011	Belgium	Assessing Media landscapes in the MENA Region using MDIs.	142,653
2012	Norway	(Phase I) Fostering media freedom in Tunisia through the creation of a desk officer temporary position in Tunisia	276,420
2013/4	Norway	(Phase II). Develop and design communication and information strategies for the recovery, reconstruction and democratisation of Tunisian Society.	161,816
2014	Germany	Support Media Sustainability: Developing Media Viability Indicators	126,112

⁵⁷ Written communication with the evaluator.

⁵⁸ As indicated elsewhere, all extrabudgetary projects must at the same time align with the priorities of the C/5, understood as contributing to one or more approved Expected Results of the C5.

2016	European Union	Journalists and Media Component: Governance in Gambia	767,574
	Norway	Project appointment to Promote Safety of Journalists	263,078
	Spain	Preventing Violence & Promoting Gender Equality through Media In Morocco & Senegal	200,000
2017	Sweden	Defining Internet Universality Indicators	330,979
	Malaysia	Post COP 21: Strengthening media capacity to monitor and report on climate change in Asia Pacific	145,500
2011-17	Total		2,414,133

Source: IPDC Secretariat

106. Several of these relate directly to Special Initiatives:

- The Belgian FIT in the MENA Region in 2011 was specifically dedicated to implementing MDIs; an MDI was undertaken in Tunisia as part of a much larger set of communication and media related activities in 2012 to 2013, under the Norwegian funded FIT project; and the 2016 Norwegian FIT directly supports the safety of journalists.
- The Swedish FIT is a research and consultation grant to develop a set of Internet Universality Indicators, the future application of which will be decided when it is completed in 2018. The remaining two are in line with IPDC objectives, one specifically addressing gender and the other climate change.

107. No individual evaluations have been undertaken of these initiatives.

3. IPDC GOVERNANCE, COSTS AND INCOME

108. The formal governance structures are first described in brief, followed by summary cost figures and trends in IPDC income and expenditure.

3.1. GOVERNANCE

109. The IPDC Council comprises 39 Member State delegates elected every two years from the UNESCO General Conference, and submits to it a report on its activities. The Council elects a Chair, who is also Chair of the Bureau, and further Bureau members comprise three Vice-Chairpersons, a Rapporteur and three other members, giving a total of eight who remain in office until a new Bureau is elected.

110. The 2003 amendment to the IPDC Statutes specified that both Council and Bureau members should “preferably be specialists”⁵⁹ while also representing their countries as delegates. The Bureau in particular tends to have a large majority of specialists (currently it is seven of the eight members),

⁵⁹ Amendments to the Statutes of the International Programme for the Development of Communication (IPDC) Resolution 43/32 Adopted on the Report of Commission V at the 18th Plenary Meeting, on 15 October 2003. (Article 2.6 and Article 6.1)

though career diplomats do also attend from Member State countries as observers. A review of the 30th IPDC Council Session attendance in 2016 suggests that about 60% of delegates are experts, many accompanied by Permanent Delegation members as observers. A total of 37 observers also attended the Session: six expert panellists, about 25 UNESCO Permanent Delegation members, and the rest being experts in media development.

111. The Council, according to the Statutes as amended in 2003, is responsible for:

- Policy-making, guiding the planning and the implementation of the Programme;
- Approving priorities;
- Reviewing and assessing achievements on the basis of implementation and evaluation reports on projects and defining basic areas requiring increased international cooperation;
- Reviewing ways and means whereby Member States might participate more effectively;
- Approving an appropriate system of IPDC financing to secure the resources needed.⁶⁰

112. The Council normally meets in plenary session in November every two years, and the Bureau annually in March.

113. The Bureau discharges duties decided by the Council and has full responsibility for Project selection, approval and allocation of funds from the Special Account and for planning the organisation of work of the Council sessions.

3.2. IPDC COSTS

114. IPDC income comes from two sources: UNESCO's Regular Programme, divided between staff and operational costs; and extrabudgetary sources, almost entirely government donations to the IPDC Special Account or Funds-in-Trust. The Regular Programme comes from the regular contributions of UNESCO Member States. Several countries have suspended or delayed payments to UNESCO, for different reasons, putting the Regular Programme under severe pressure. Regular Programme operational contributions to IPDC are now limited to the cost of running the Council and Bureau meetings, and essential associated travel and subsistence.

115. **Table 7** shows an estimate of staff time spent by the Secretariat on IPDC activities. It is divided into two blocks:

- One is directly related to the governance structures, specifically Bureau and Council meetings, communications with Bureau and Council members, information meetings, and IPDC Chair visits to the Secretariat. Specifically excluded is time devoted by Field Office and HQ staff to the annual mobilisation of Project proposals and oversight of implementation, since these are not associated with the IPDC governance structures *per se* but rather with administering these specific extrabudgetary funds. Much of this work would most likely be required if the same funding were to be channelled to UNESCO outside of IPDC governance.
- The second block on the table comprises other IPDC work, including IPDC Special Initiatives, Project preparation, Project assessment and approval, IPDC Secretariat internal planning and meetings, IPDC Talks, implementation follow-up and fundraising work.

116. It may be noted that although all contributions to IPDC include 10% for Programme Support Costs (PSC), there is no direct return of PSC to the IPDC Programme. Furthermore, no staff cost

⁶⁰ Omitted here is the awarding of the IPDC-UNESCO Prize for Rural Communication which has been discontinued.

recovery is applied to the IPDC Special Account. As a result, the IPDC has fewer resources available to assist in covering the workload of the Programme.

Table 7: Biennial Staff time and costs, IPDC governance and IPDC other 2016-2017 (US\$)

Secretariat Staff Members	Governance (in months)	Staff Cost	Other IPDC work (months)	Staff Cost	Total Months	Total Cost
IPDC Secretary (D-2)	2	40,000	2	40,000	4	80,000
IPDC Deputy Secretary (P-4)	6	84,800	14	197,800	20	282,600
Programme Specialist (P-3)	3	36,200	14	168,600	17	204,800
Assistant Programme Specialist (P-2)	4	39,600	14	138,200	18	177,800
Programme Assistant (G-6)	6	45,200	2	15,000	8	60,200
Total	21	245,800	46	559,600⁶¹	67.0	805,400

Source: IPDC Secretariat

117. The time of the above staff not accounted for by IPDC (and hence not included above) is devoted to other CI/FEM activities undertaken by IPDC Secretariat staff members.

118. The Operational budget in support of IPDC from the 2016–2017 Regular Programme comes to US\$ 179,967⁶². The travel, subsistence, translation and other cost of the *biennial* Council meeting is approximately **US\$60,000** and for the *annual* Bureau meetings **US\$30,000⁶³**, giving a total operational cost for governance structures only for the biennium of about **US\$120,000**.

119. The total staff cost associated with governance structures only for the biennium comes to **US\$245,800** (US\$122,900 annually). Therefore, the total biennial cost of supporting the governance structures of IPDC (i.e. the relevant Operational costs plus the actual staff costs) comes to approximately **US\$365,800** or US\$182,900 annually.

120. In addition to the above, 13 UNESCO International Professional Field Staff and 17 National Professional Field Staff also work for the CI Sector and are occasionally mobilised around IPDC activities. Their job description includes the following references to IPDC:⁶⁴

⁶¹ This figure is derived from direct estimates of IPDC Secretariat staff time. The discrepancy with the staff budget figure given in the 38C/5 for ER3 - which is lower at US\$452,600 – is due primarily to proportionally more staff time from the Secretariat (P3, P2, G6) being used in practice than was originally anticipated in the 38C/5 when the figure there was calculated. The estimates provided in this evaluation are considered to be a more accurate representation of the Secretariat staff time.

⁶²This figure is actual expenditure. The planned allocation in the 38 C/5 Approved, CI Expected Result 3, Expenditure Plan (\$518 million), is \$209,500.

⁶³ Figures supplied by IPDC Secretariat.

⁶⁴ UNESCO Job Description, Form HR 3-1 (September 2010). Job descriptions do vary but as far as can be determined, something similar would be in those of all CI advisers.

“... develops new project options and proposals to be funded by contributions received for the [IPDC]... in line with priorities and project quality criteria, and implements approved projects.

“Coordinates the preparation of, or prepares, reports on the implementation of programmes and projects (funded within C/5s and by extrabudgetary funds, including contributions received for IPDC...)

121. It is not possible to calculate the total staff time they devote to IPDC activities and it varies greatly between Field Offices. Estimates provided by three Regional Offices varied from 3.6 person months annually devoted to IPDC initiatives, to six person months, to less than one month. National Field Staff would in some cases account for additional time, though this would usually be very modest.

122. A point returned to later is that all Field Office Staff interviewed believe that the time devoted to IPDC is worth the effort, and for most IPDC Project funding represents a significant proportion of operational funds, sometimes exceeding that from the Regular Programme (see **Table 9: IPDC Special Account Contributions channelled via Field Offices (US\$) 2012-2017** below).

3.3. IPDC INCOME

123. As noted, IPDC income comprises two components: Regular Programme income to cover staff and operational costs, and extrabudgetary funds. Regular Programme income for the 2016 to 2017 biennium is described above, contributing under US\$1 million over the period. Extrabudgetary funds account for a much larger proportion of IPDC's income, and come in the form of contributions to the Special Account and Funds-in-Trust.

124. The IPDC Special Account is as old as the IPDC itself. Donations are pooled: funds are not associated with any specific IPDC activities though the recent practice of 'earmarking' is changing this. The bulk of Special Account proceeds are devoted to Projects resulting from the annual call for proposals, and the remainder to Special Allocations.

125. Funds-in-Trust (FIT) offer donors control over investments, issues or target group to be addressed, the type of interventions and/or the country or region. They attract a slightly higher overhead of 13%, compared to 10% for the Special Account, warranted by the fact that donors receive separate itemized reports of expenditure and specific narrative. FIT projects are relatively large, and can also be of longer duration.

126. Over its 37 years, extrabudgetary funds attracted to the IPDC Special Account averaged about US\$1.7 million annually.⁶⁵ During that period contributions from FIT averaged just over half that contributed to the Special Account.

127. Table 8, showing donor contributions received annually from 2011 to 2017 indicates a significant decline during the period. The annual yield from FIT, being fewer and larger grants in size, tends to fluctuate more widely and rose significantly since 2016.

⁶⁵ Updated from *Audit Report of the Communication and Information Sector*.200 EX/20.INF.3. 2016.

Table 8: Donor Contributions and Funding Modalities to IPDC 2011-2017 (US\$ '000s)*

Year	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	Total	%
Special Account	2,497	1,361	838	1,001	839	600	1,448	8,584	78%
Funds-in-Trust	143	276	162		126	1,030	676	2,413	22%
Total IPDC	2,640	1,637	1,000	1,001	965	1,629	2,125	10,997	100%
Number of Donors	12	9	6	7	6	9	10	22	

* Special Account figures are inclusive of 10% UNESCO overhead and FIT figures of 13%. Source: IPDC Secretariat

128. FIT contributions have partly compensated for the general fall in Special Account contributions, but with corresponding shifts between different funding modalities. The number of donors has also fluctuated though regular funding is underpinned by just a few. During the entire period, a total of 22 different donors contributed, eleven with just a single contribution. (See Annex 1.)

129. Almost all Project funding is distributed via Field Offices. Although IPDC Projects are each modest in size, the aggregated proportion of funding via Field Offices can be very significant as compared to the very limited Regular Programme funding available to them. The table below illustrates this point for the 2012 to 2017 period.

Table 9: IPDC Special Account Contributions channelled via Field Offices (US\$) 2012-2017

Region	Regular Programme	IPDC Special Account	Total Funding	IPDC funding as % of total	% IPDC to each region
Africa	2,666,044	2,589,867	5,255,911	49%	54%
Asia & Pacific	2,005,758	1,930,288	3,936,046	49%	40%
Latin America & Caribbean	1,099,559	1,506,640	2,606,199	58%	22%
Arab States	1,019,431	669,082	1,688,513	40%	21%
Total / Average	4,970,746	6,695,877	11,666,623	57%	100%

Source: IPDC Secretariat

3.4. FUNDRAISING STRATEGY

130. Given the sharp decline in extrabudgetary funding from 2011 onwards, the Secretariat prepared a fundraising strategy for consideration by the Bureau in March 2013.⁶⁶ The IPDC Chair is seen as leading the process, and Bureau and Council Member States should also “play an important in securing funds”. The IPDC Secretariat, in addition to fundraising, has a role in profile-building

⁶⁶ Agenda Item: Discussion: IPDC Fundraising. CI-13/CONF.201/7

(including within UNESCO), as do UNESCO Field Office staff. It also recommends that an Associate Expert “should be found from a supportive Member State to assist in this area”. Concrete targets were to increase annual funds to at least US\$1.5 by 2015, and donor numbers to 15 by 2014 and in addition to traditional bilateral donors, it targeted national development agencies, commercial organisations and foundations. The FIT modality was explicitly targeted as the “most promising modality for a substantial increase in the financing of IPDC projects.” Accompanying this was a communication strategy to raise the profile of IPDC and the international community and key audiences. Bureau members committed themselves to supporting the effort.

131. Though a ‘concrete work programme’ identified in the strategy as needed was not subsequently put in place, a progress report was delivered in March 2015.⁶⁷ It noted that the IPDC Chair had been highly active in canvassing UNESCO Permanent Delegations and visible at most CI events, and that further promotional activities were undertaken. The loss of the post of a dedicated IPDC Assistant Programme Specialist at the end of 2013 was acknowledged as limiting the capacity to follow through, however, and it was not possible to secure the Associate Expert sought in the strategy. By 2015, not only had targets not been met but total extrabudgetary funds had in fact fallen slightly. Bureau members were further urged to lobby their respective governments – if only for symbolic amounts in some cases.

132. Efforts continued, especially by the IPDC Chair, since re-elected, by meeting UNESCO Permanent Delegations, attending events and other promotional activities, and a brochure has been published funded with a Special Allocation. More recent figures show that these efforts are beginning to pay off in terms of total funds attracted: by 2016, the 2015 target had been reached and exceeded and the overall figures rose again slightly in 2017.

Table 10: Total Donor Contributions: 2011 - 2017 (US\$ ‘000)

Year	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	Total
Total	2,640	1,638	1,000	1,001	965	1,630	2,124	10,998

Source: IPDC Secretariat

133. Donor numbers rose from a low of six in 2013 to ten by 2017, well below the target of 15 that had been set for 2014. Furthermore, the rise in figures is reliant on a few small donations, continuing support from a small number of core donors, and a few large and possibly one-off Funds-in-Trust donations. The last includes a FIT of US\$ 768,000 from the European Union in 2016 which had previously been approved and was channelled through IPDC since it focused directly on its areas of activities, including media development, journalism education and MDIs. In 2017, several contributions from the Netherlands came to a total of US\$ 803,000. A complete table of all donors and contributions is contained in Annex 1: Table 18: Donor List and Contributions 2011 - 2017.

134. The need to diversify efforts remains continues to be discussed at Bureau meetings and brought to the attention of the Council. To what extent might wider trends in media and donor funding influence this? This is explored in the next section.

⁶⁷ *Setting targets for fundraising and communication*. CI-15/CONF.201/12.

3.5. TRENDS IN MEDIA AND DONOR FUNDING

135. The IPDC's objective is to contribute to sustainable development, democracy and good governance through enhancing the capacities of media and communication in developing countries. This is intended to foster universal access to and distribution of information and knowledge. What trends are evident today that might cast light on the current and future relevance of this mission, and on IPDC capacity to attract support?

TRENDS IN MEDIA

136. In the decades since the foundation of the IPDC, a number of trends have influenced the capacity of media to facilitate and enable freedom of expression, resulting today in a complex mixture of dynamics and a somewhat uncertain future.

137. During the 1980s, concern shifted from direct state control over media to corporate control by multinationals often in collusion with the state. Public service media came under sustained attack from private and sometimes government interests. More recently, the mainstream media advertising base – itself often a distorting factor – is being undermined by internet advertising to a point where viability is threatened. Meanwhile the extensive use, especially by younger people, of social media platforms as an instant source of news and information, has created opportunities for new actors with new motivations to spread their views. Some such content is refreshing and liberating; much of it is unverified, with little pretence of impartiality and often narrow agendas. Social media platforms, lauded for a time during the Arab Spring as tools for democracy and democratisation of media itself, have been reined in by various regimes and distorted by the drive for profit maximisation, with little democratic governance oversight nationally or internationally to ensure the public interest is served. Misinformation moves to disinformation. Mainstream media are losing not just audiences but their control over the definition of what constitutes news. Digital communications enrich the research and reach of journalism, but also open a new front for attacks – not least on women journalists.

138. The era of the algorithm, 'fake news' and the 'click economy', according to some, has arrived while many perennial problems such as gender and safety have barely shifted. Yet at the same time, the opportunities to promote freedom of expression, pluralism and media democratisation in this combination of disruptive and constructive forces are clearly evident.⁶⁸

139. These dynamics are being played out most forcefully in the wealthier countries, and most of the analysis is focused there.⁶⁹ Yet the media and communication environment in developing countries is also changing at least as rapidly and as radically, responding to a different mixture of forces. In some places, public service media – dedicated solely to pursuing the public interest – is being reconsidered in the light of obvious failings of alternatives including government-controlled media, and the general fall in the perceived credibility of media sources.⁷⁰ Community media has come to play an important role in many developed countries – indeed encountering 'second-generation'

⁶⁸ Several of these topics were discussed at the Colloquium entitled *Journalists Under Fire* in March 2017, to which IPDC contributed. See <http://en.unesco.org/journalism-under-fire>

⁶⁹ The Biennial UNESCO/CI Publication *World Trends in Freedom of Expression and Media Development* raises issues relevant to both developed and developing countries, including its *Special Digital Focus 2015*. <http://www.unesco.org/new/en/world-media-trends>

⁷⁰See for instance Phil Harding. *Public service media in divided societies: Relic or renaissance?* <http://www.bbc.co.uk/mediaaction/publications-and-resources/policy/briefings/public-service-broadcasting-21C>

problems in some – and the sector’s adaptation to the internet and its models of sustainability are of key importance.

140. The potential for IPDC to retain and expand its relevance is to be seen in this context. Media sector evolution and reform, and indeed the meaning of freedom of expression, is going through a highly dynamic and unstable phase, with many risks but equally many opportunities for developing countries. IPDC’s mandate – to contribute to sustainable development, democracy and good governance through enhancing the capacities of media and communication in developing countries – is in principle highly relevant. The ongoing challenge for IPDC is how to translate that mandate into areas where it can have meaningful influence and positive outcomes. Attracting and sustaining donor interest is an intrinsic part of that.

TRENDS IN DONOR FUNDING

141. A question posed for this evaluation is whether the recent decline in IPDC donor support, in particular in relation to the Special Account, is part of a wider trend or due to localised and specific factors.

142. Conceptualising and monitoring trends in donor funding for media and communication is complicated by a number of sector characteristics. Many donors’ interest in media is focused on delivering their own messages, in some cases directly, for instance to promote their wider development activities or deliver public interest messages; for others, subjecting sector capacity-building of national media organisations to editorial controls or content restrictions is a condition of support. Drawing the line between promoting an independent media sector and promoting specific messages and ideologies can be difficult. Even developing countries genuinely seeking to build and sustain an independent media sector do not necessarily welcome such external donor investment.

143. The Centre for International Media Assistance (CIMA) tracks donor priorities in media development, and admits to the challenges.⁷¹ It calculates that about 2 percent of funding for good governance by OECD members is devoted to building independent media, representing less than half a percent of official aid overall.⁷² In terms of priorities, it notes “some indication that within development organisations, media development has emerged as a field as distinct from a one-size-fits-all ‘any funding that involved media’ approach”⁷³ citing BMZ and JICA as examples.⁷⁴ It also notes that:

“...as media development has evolved as a field critics have questioned the heavy focus on basic journalism training, arguing that a truly independent media sector needs an entire ecosystem to function effectively, one that requires support for business development training, a legal enabling environment, basic access to information, and so on.”

144. Many governments are suspicious of donor support in the wider media sector, fearing it is a pretext for asserting an agenda for a specific vision of democracy or approach to economic development, a trend especially prevalent in the United States and elsewhere in the 1990s and

⁷¹ See <http://www.cima.ned.org/what-is-media-development/funding/>

⁷² Eduardo González Cauhapé-Cazaux and Shanthi Kalathil. *Official Development Assistance for Media: Figures and Findings*. CIMA and OECD. 2015 <http://www.cima.ned.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/03/CIMA-Official-Development-Assistance.pdf>

⁷³ Kalathil, Shanthi. *A Slowly Shifting Field: Understanding Donor Priorities in Media Development* CIMA Digital Report <http://www.cima.ned.org/publication/slowly-shifting-field/>

⁷⁴ <http://www.cima.ned.org/donor-profiles/>

2000s.⁷⁵ Some donors simply take it for granted that supporting a media sector that is independent from government contributes to democracy and good governance - ignoring the many examples of media captured by political parties or corporate interests that are incompatible with the public interest. Other donors do not see the link between safety of journalists, the rule of law and good governance as per SDG 16 on peace, justice and strong institutions.

145. Complicating matters further is the fact that quantifiable results, increasingly demanded by donors, are difficult to provide by those investing in media:

“Unlike other national institutions designed to provide a check on power, like the judiciary or the parliament, the media is neither unitary nor formal in status, but, rather, an intensely complex, competitive, adaptive and rapidly changing institutional ecosystem.”⁷⁶

146. Gathering convincing evidence for the effectiveness of investing in media structures and organisations can also be difficult. Media tend to be at one remove from the ‘coalface’ of development in the sense that benefits tend to emerge in the long term, mediated by many factors. It is thus difficult to ascribe specific development outcomes to specific media investments.⁷⁷

147. These factors provide a useful backdrop to consideration of variations in IPDC’s donations, but specific causal links are difficult to determine. Some (such as a distrust of bilateral support) could act in IPDC’s favour while others (such as a growing demand for evidence of specific donor impact) might militate against it. Several experts and donors interviewed for this evaluation note the following trends as potentially among the most relevant:

- Growing distrust of media generally, partly inspired by more authoritarian governments elected in many parts of the world;
- A government donor preference towards more visible – and voter friendly – target groups and impacts for their development investment;
- Donor funding becoming more target-specific in relation to media, for instance focusing on gender, health or environmental aspects, as distinct from targeting wider sector development;
- Growing distrust of the whole UN system, by some donor countries, leading to a general shift towards bilateral aid and funding national-based INGOs to work in developing countries.

148. The most commonly expressed view among those interviewed was that the last three are most likely relevant to IPDC, and specifically to the Special Account as a pooled donor mechanism. Special Account funding implies a high degree of trust in the ability of IPDC mechanisms to target and manage effective investments; and donors need to accept that they cannot identify the impact of their particular investment on specific target groups.

149. Recent variations in contributions from key IPDC donors were for the most part attributed to localised factors at national level or to generalised responses to global factors, rather than to issues

⁷⁵ Deane, James (2015) ‘Media and communication in governance: It’s time for a rethink.’ in *A Governance Practitioner’s Notebook: Alternative Ideas and Approach*. OECD. Paris. p. 273.

⁷⁶ Deane, James (2015) ‘Media and communication in governance: It’s time for a rethink.’ in *A Governance Practitioner’s Notebook: Alternative Ideas and Approach*. OECD. Paris.p. 274

⁷⁷ BBC Media Action has put major efforts into building evidence for the impact of media programmes on development, and has made that evidence public in a new data Portal: <http://dataportal.bbcmmediaaction.org/site/>

arising in relation to the IPDC's mandate or basic structures. However, certain features of IPDC did raise concerns.

150. Several donors expressed the view that ongoing revisions in Project Priorities and the addition of Special Initiatives affects the clarity and focus of IPDC targets and its unique features. The Priorities do not always target specific issues and are imprecise in their goals. Donors seek a clear message from IPDC in terms of what it does and how it can be supported, that differentiates it from other parts of CI. There is also an impression among donors that Sections of CI compete for funding sometimes in similar areas, as distinct from each seeking support for activities that are complementary to those of the others, and this can act as a disincentive.⁷⁸ The creation of new donor investment modalities, such as the Multi-Donor Special Account for Journalism Safety, further blurs the lines, adding a new avenue for investment without clarity on the specific advantages and goals of each.

151. At the same time, all delegates from donor countries who were interviewed strongly recognise the value of IPDC work in general, and how critically important it is to invest in media sector development, freedom of expression and media pluralism and diversity. All agree that the specific structure and mandate of IPDC is, and will remain, a valuable conduit for funding in some circumstances. The capacity of IPDC to develop and endorse norms that can be applied often with major non-government input is considered very valuable, as well as its ability to respond quickly and flexibly to needs and opportunities arising at national and regional levels. In some instances, these features have facilitated specific IPDC investments that are unlikely otherwise to have been forthcoming to the CI Sector.

152. This unanimity concerning the importance of investment in media sector development stems in part from the self-selection of these donors – those involved in IPDC are anyhow interested in the sector. But their level of interest in the sector is if anything rising, and driving their interest in a desire to maximise the effectiveness of IPDC and of the CI Sector as a whole as vehicles for investment.

⁷⁸ The New Audit Report (2016) notes "... there is real competition between the activities of IPDC and the other activities of the FEM Division of the CI Sector, and even with those of the KSD Division. That competition concerns resource mobilisation and the management of activities." (para. 199)

PART II: FINDINGS & ANALYSIS

4. EVIDENCE OF OUTCOMES

4.1. APPROACH TO GROUPING OUTCOME ANALYSIS

153. Above, IPDC activities were described by intervention type. When considering outcomes, a more appropriate grouping is by the *type of outcome* to which they contribute, each of which may involve several intervention types. This reorganisation of headings facilitates the exploration of evidence from combined IPDC Projects, Regular Programme funds, Special Initiatives and FIT projects.

154. There is a further reason for reviewing the existing sets of headings. A key challenge for this evaluation has been to make sense of the many categories under which IPDC initiatives are currently presented. The six Project Priorities, four Special Initiatives and other *ad hoc* activities are *qualitatively* different – some comprising tools, others target groups, and others still, objectives. The line between some Priorities is also unclear: for instance, law reform that fosters independence (Priority 4) can at the same time support media pluralism (Priority 1); or conducting MDIs (Priority 5) can be a key first step in supporting law reform (Priority 4). This lack of coherence and consistency raises questions regarding clarity of objectives and focus of IPDC, a topic addressed later on.

155. Table 11 proposes four main outcome groups and a fifth more or less residual group, and distributes Project Priorities and Special Initiatives between them, dividing several Priorities into two.

Table 11: IPDC Interventions grouped into Outcome Types

Outcome Groupings	IPDC Project Priorities and Special Initiatives
Outcomes for Safety of Journalists that improve the policy and institutional environment for journalists to work in safety, take practical measures to enhance safety, and address the issue of impunity.	<i>Special Initiative 1:</i> Safety of Journalists <i>Priority 2 (all):</i> Promoting Safety of Journalists <i>Priority 5 (part):</i> JSIs but excluding MDIs and GSIM
Outcomes in Media Sector Reform and Development that enhance laws, policy and regulation for freedom of expression, increase sectoral ownership & content pluralism, and improve participation of marginalised groups and women.	<i>Special Initiative 2:</i> Media Related Indicators <i>Priority 1 (part):</i> Supporting media pluralism & independence, but excluding (non-sector level) Projects for individual community media bodies <i>Priority 4:</i> Supporting Law reform & media independence <i>Priority 5 (Part):</i> MDI and GISM, excluding JSIs
Outcomes from Knowledge-Driven Media Development & SDGs resulting in media creating and disseminating knowledge, and knowledge exchange with media development.	<i>Special Initiative 4:</i> KDMD and SDGs <i>IPDC Talks</i>

<p>Outcomes in Journalism Education that build the capacities of the educational institutions for existing and new journalists.</p>	<p><i>Special Initiative 3: GIEJE</i></p> <p><i>Priority 6 (part):</i> Improving journalism education (using UNESCO Model Curricula), excluding capacity building/training journalists.</p>
<p>Outcomes from IPDC initiatives not covered in the above that strengthen individual or groups of media practitioners and entities.</p>	<p><i>Priority 3 (all):</i> Countering hate speech in media, promoting conflict-sensitive journalism, cross-cultural/religious dialogue among journalists;</p> <p><i>Priority 1 (part):</i> Support to individual community media</p> <p><i>Priority 6 (part):</i> Capacity building for journalists & media managers excluding media education</p>

156. These outcome groupings are, of course, not mutually exclusive since many interventions aim at several outcomes. Furthermore, individual components of the media and communication development environment and dynamics as a whole are closely interdependent and mutually interact in many ways. Each is considered in turn below, and the sources are detailed in the methodological annex.

4.2. OUTCOME 1: SAFETY OF JOURNALISTS

157. While complementary to that of other UN agencies, UNESCO’s mandate in the area of safety of journalists is clear. Its constitution states that it will “promote the free flow of ideas by word and image.” In this light, UNESCO’s General Conference has reaffirmed its commitment to safety of journalists several times, and in 2015 the Executive Board (Decision 196 EXB/31) requested the DG to reinforce UNESCO’s responsibility in coordinating the implementation of the UN Plan of Action.

158. The scope and influence specifically of the IPDC’s initiatives on the safety of journalists, working with the CI FOE Section and guided by the Director of the Division, has broadened and deepened over the years, moving into new funding modalities and activities, and building networks with stakeholders. The issue is strongly supported by the IPDC Council and Field Offices. In the survey conducted for this evaluation, it emerged as the highest priority for the latter; and for the former just marginally behind ‘capacity building’.

159. IPDC interventions on the issue include the following:

- The IPDC Council provides the mandate and destination for DG’s *Report on the Safety of Journalists and the Issue of Impunity*, and its monitoring of judicial follow-up feeds into the World Trends report;
- The IPDC Special Initiative, funded by the Special Account and by FITs, makes a number of specific contributions including the development, implementation and support of the JSI framework;
- A total of 81 IPDC Projects between 2011 and 2017 mobilised numerous actors on the issue in 30 countries in a range of actions to support journalists' safety;
- The IPDC is active on two SDG Indicators, one relating specifically to safety of journalists.

160. Outcomes can be seen at intergovernmental and at national levels.

161. There is broad agreement among experts and officials interviewed for this evaluation that UNESCO's profile and credibility with human rights agencies in the UN system has been enhanced through its active pursuit and leadership on this issue. Other mandated UN entities such as the OHCHR and UNDP acknowledge the value of the work. Its central role in increasing the profile and deepening understanding of the issue in the UN system is widely recognised.

162. This is evident in the recent report prepared for the *Multi-Stakeholder Consultation on Strengthening the Implementation of the UN Plan of Action* organised by the CI Sector in Geneva in June 2017.⁷⁹ The scope of the report is broad, covering the full range of processes engaging in issues of safety of journalists. UNESCO, and sometimes specifically IPDC, is credited with much of the leadership and support activities; while the activities of the OHCHR are also highlighted⁸⁰.

163. The report notes progress in several areas. At the level of the UN system the work has resulted in the creation of a "common platform for dialogue between different agencies dealing with the issue" (p.8) leading to enhanced coordination between for instance OHCHR, UNESCO and the Inter-American system of human rights and resulting in new inter-agency partnerships. The level of dialogue at the international level on the issue has increased dramatically.

The JSI in Kenya, Rwanda and Somalia*

According to the Kenyan Union of Journalists (KUJ) and Article 19 East Africa, the situation of media freedom in general, though traditionally pluralistic and independent, has been deteriorating for a number of years. Although the Government responds to impunity requests for the DG's report, investigations of some cases are ongoing for eight years and many doubt the commitment to resolve them. The African Media Initiative, working with the UNESCO Multi-Sectoral Regional Office for Eastern Africa office and funded by an IPDC Special Allocation, implemented the JSI framework from 2015 to 2016. The Report⁸¹ concludes that "the number of threats, incidents of harassment and intimidation as well as legal and personal attacks, has grown within the period under study" (p11). The process involved media stakeholder consultations in May 2015 and February 2016, the latter to review the draft.

Unusually, a second JSI assessment has also covered Kenya, along with Rwanda and Somalia, proposed by Article 19 and approved for IPDC funding in 2015. This was more modest in scope and the goal is partly to explore its implementation in different contexts. It was completed in early 2017 and in Kenya it mobilised further actors around the issue.

Although neither Kenyan JSI had direct government input (officials were invited to consultations but did not take part), they had the advantage of a structure to take the issue forward. The Kenya Media Working Group (KMWG) formed in 2012 brings together media NGOs including Article 19, Media Council of Kenya (a statutory body), the AMI and others for media related actions. A Journalists' Safety and Protection Working Group has been formed on the basis of the JSIs, in which UNESCO is also involved. It is still at an early stage, but it is seen as possibly the entry point for the development of a Kenyan National Plan of Action on the Safety of Journalists. A key point about the JSI, according to the CI programme specialist, is that "it just draws conclusions about the issues, not recommendations. This makes it easier for a government to sign up to it and be involved." KUJ also reports using the JSI

⁷⁹ <https://en.unesco.org/news/global-call-improve-safety-journalists-ground>

⁸⁰The report was prepared by the UNESCO CI Sector, based on extensive consultation including submissions from numerous named stakeholders groups, and it does not appear to overstate the role of UNESCO or IPDC.

⁸¹ To download the report see: <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0024/002449/244914E.pdf>

report to “develop our strategy; we use the data when applying for funding; and we use it for advocacy in relation to legal issues”.

UNESCO has supported a follow-up project to provide training on protection of journalists, implemented by Article 19, and they work together to highlight *International Day to End Impunity for Crimes Against Journalists* on November 2nd. The KUJ also intends to apply to IPDC to develop a mechanism to monitor attacks on journalists, as they see an ongoing rise in such assaults.

The three country comparative JSI study undertaken by Article 19 drew conclusions relevant to JSI implementation. In Somalia, it was not possible to deploy the JSI framework fully as “journalists were not ready to discuss their safety challenges for fear of exposing themselves to other attacks and reprisals from the perpetrators...”; and the researcher team did not succeed in interviewing the Somali Federal Government officials. In Rwanda, though attacks on journalists are few, there is a fear of discussing the issue among journalists. Furthermore, “...where data exists restrictive approval measures by the government do not permit officials to speak to the researcher” and little information could be gathered. Neither report could be published.

*Based on interviews with Jaco du Toit, CI programme specialist, Erick Oduor, KUJ; Victor Bwire, MCK; Henry Maina, Article 19 East Africa, and documentation.

164. Positive reference in the consultation report is made to:

- DG’s Report and *World Trends* report in monitoring and highlighting the killing of journalists;
- UNESCO’s role in relation to the SDG 16.10.1 indicator in terms of its future potential;
- the JSIs applied or in progress in 10 countries and their contribution to the Plan of Action;
- IPDC Project-level support in capacity building and training and syllabus development.

165. Weaknesses are also identified. It notes that the comprehensiveness of responses to the DG’s requests for information on judicial follow-up of killings could be improved: between 2006 and 2015 over 50% of all cases referred to Member States received either no response or just an acknowledgment of receipt. Responses have, however, been rising rapidly from 30% in 2013 to 74.5% in 2017.

166. The report says that the JSIs “... have long turn-around times and the impact has not been maximised. The indicators are not clear enough in terms of which actors bear what responsibility and role as regards safety and impunity.” (p.9)

167. Specific evidence of IPDC’s contribution to the safety of journalists was generated by an assessment in 2016.⁸² Drawing on interviews and written contributions from UNESCO staff, experts and Project beneficiaries, it came to the following main conclusions:

- The IPDC’s efforts pushed the issue high on the UN agenda, resulting in unprecedented normative work in the UN system around the UN Plan of Action;
- In countries where the Plan has been applied it provoked new multi-stakeholder dialogue, awareness raising and better coordination;

⁸² Marcesse, Silvia Chocarro (2016) *IPDC’s Role in the Promotion of the Safety of Journalists: A Way Forward*.

- The DG’s Reports and World Trends Reports on the killings of journalists and the issue of impunity have raised awareness among governments on the issue and been used by civil society groups to lobby;
- The JSI process offers a baseline on the safety of journalists, promotes cooperation through the participatory methodology, and supports the design of strategic solutions.

168. The assessment calculated that the IPDC Projects and Special Initiatives devoted \$1,664,186 to the safety of journalists at national level between 2009 and 2015, at its height in 2013 accounting for 25% of all Special Account expenditure. Africa and Asia each received about 31% of the Project funding, Latin America and the Caribbean and 23%, the Arab Region 11%, with the remainder for international Projects. Journalists were the main target beneficiaries, mostly for training in relation to safety; but there was significant awareness-raising and advocacy, and investment in JSIs and monitoring mechanisms. About 12% of projects worked with public institutions as the beneficiaries, including judiciary and law enforcement.

169. In addition to implementing the JSIs across many countries, the role of IPDC actions, bearing in mind the recommendations above, is illustrated by a few examples from the assessment report:

- An IPDC Special Allocation funded by Norway, aiming to improve the relationship between journalists and police forces, trained 300 officers with, according to the report, “significant results” that opened a dialogue in a matter of hours. It included training of trainers, and the resulting training manual has been used in follow-on courses in many countries, including Cote d’Ivoire, Iraq, Somalia, South Sudan and Tanzania.
- In Pakistan an IPDC Project was used to enhance mechanisms to monitor attacks on journalists by the Rural Media Network Programme, and to provide training on safety awareness especially for women journalists;
- In Colombia in 2014, an IPDC Project implemented by Fundación para la libertad de Prensa, developed and implemented for four major media outlets a digital safety strategy, including a safety guide and building in the use of a safety app for journalists.
- In Palestine, IPDC supported risk assessment and safety training among independent Gazan journalists, undertaken by the Ma’an Network.

170. The IPDC’s role in relation to the SDG target indicator 16.10.1 holds significant future potential for UNESCO to build further the networks of monitoring to support the wider issue of safety of journalists, and the implementation of the Plan of Action at national level. This issue is returned to later below in the context of the SDGs.

Complementary IPDC Interventions in South Sudan*

UNESCO in South Sudan – a dangerous country in which to practice journalism – took a lead role in the Media Sector Thematic Working Group (SSMSWG) in developing a National Plan to implement the *UN Plan of Action on the Safety of Journalists*. The SSMSWG brings together government, UN agencies, educational institutions, NGOs and donors, and South Sudan was one of first countries to begin implementing the plan. IPDC Projects first supported the Union of Journalists of South Sudan (UJOSS) to develop three Media Observatory Committees to monitor and report incidents of violence against journalists and impunity, now covering all ten states. With training workshops and equipment, they began reporting incidents and protecting journalists who have been attacked, detained or harassed; and were then further consolidated with a SIDA grant for additional training, ICT and Web facilities,

and the development of a training module at the Media Development Institute. This national network is now a core instrument of the Action Plan.

A further IPDC Project trained UJOSS members on safety and security and on codes of conduct and media ethics. UJOSS built on this by partnering with USAID, INTERNEWS and IREX for training in human rights and conflict-sensitive journalism. IPDC also supported a JSI assessment in 2016 and the report is due soon.

Apart from journalists' safety, IPDC, along with SIDA and IMS, funded an MDI assessment carried out and published in 2015.⁸³ Although carried out in a highly volatile environment, it "still serves as a baseline for media development initiatives in the country by the national and international media development partners" according to the regional CI Programme Specialist.

An audio studio for journalism training, the first in the country, was the recipient of a further IPDC grant triggering support from Internews and USAID; and in 2015 IPDC supported the first community radio station to promote peaceful coexistence between warring parties in a region of South Sudan, as well to provide education, entertainment and information.

The CI programme specialist believes that IPDC support "has contributed greatly to media development initiatives that are hardly prioritised by other media development partners especially in countries in conflict and post conflict. For example, the importance of supporting community based communication platforms as a vehicle for peacebuilding, promotion of women in media and through media, safety of journalists, strengthening of journalism institutions etc. has been spearheaded by UNESCO IPDC funded initiatives."

She further notes that it acts as "seed money where other partners find the necessary ground for support to many other activities", for instance in SSMSWG where "many partners built on the IPDC funded initiatives."

IPDC funding creates for UNESCO "a unique niche as the UN lead agency for promotion of Freedom of Expression, Access to Information and Safety of Journalists", pointing to the UNESCO's role as the lead in the *South Sudan Media Donor Group* and the *Safety of Journalists National Plan* as well as the SSMSWG.

*From an interview and written communication with Lydia Gachungi, Regional Communication Expert, UNESCO Multi-Sectoral Regional Office in Nairobi, on secondment from the Norwegian Refugee Council.

171. Interviews and certain comments point to a further issue for IPDC. From a global systemic perspective on the UNESCO approach, a degree of unease was evident among a few experts and Field Office staff interviewed in relation to UNESCO's work on the DG's Report. UNESCO traditionally is not perceived to be active in the 'harder' side of human rights enforcement – it is more closely associated across all its activities with the 'carrot' than the 'stick', encouraging and resourcing Member States to move in certain directions. Thus, it was felt that UNESCO should try to ensure that support is readily available as per Member States requests for assistance in developing their systems for their voluntary responses to the DG's annual request for information on judicial follow-up to killings.

172. Related to this, several commented that UNESCO's traditional partners in government – Ministries of Education, Culture or Communications etc. – do not extend to authorities most relevant

⁸³ <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0023/002327/232709E.pdf>

to tackling impunity: the Ministry of Justice or Interior, the Office of the Public Prosecutor, the police authorities and so forth. This, it was felt, might in some cases hinder a response from governments, and UNESCO must thus ensure that the appropriate channels of communication are open to them and being utilised. Several of those interviewed, as well as a few comments in the Council survey, argued that IPDC should go further in stimulating and enabling Member States to respond fully in relation to the DG's Report. IPDC Council Member States might be in a position to play an active role here in relevant countries, though it was not possible to determine whether this was happening.

173. If an element of peer pressure is an effect of the DG's Report at the intergovernmental level, IPDC tries to offer more 'carrot' at national level through the numerous actions, noted above, focusing on improving the safety of journalists and implementing the Plan of Action.⁸⁴

4.3. OUTCOME 2: MEDIA SECTOR REFORM AND DEVELOPMENT

174. Media sector reform and media development are combined here to address several aspects of building up and reforming the legal, institutional and policy aspects of the sector. It embraces *Priority 4* on fostering law reform and *Priority 5* on media assessments since both attempt to influence sector reform and change. Aspects of *Priority 1* are included for the same reason, but only where they reinforce sector pluralism through legal and policy reform and enhancing of self-regulation (but not with regard to direct support for community channels and training actions).

175. The term 'Media Development Indicators' is sometimes used generically to cover the MDIs, GSIM and JSIs as well as the emerging Media Viability Indicators, understandably so since they are all concerned with indicators of the development of the media sector. Here (as earlier) we omit the JSIs since they are addressed above as an integral part of the larger issue of safety of journalists. Since the Media Viability Indicators framework has yet to be implemented, no outcomes can be associated with it and so it is not considered here. The GSIM is included here since its aspiration is to have sector-wide impacts (see box below), though it is applied in the first place only to individual media organisations.

176. The **MDI framework** has now been applied in over 20 countries,⁸⁵ and assessments are ongoing in 18 more.⁸⁶ Most were supported as Special Allocations as distinct from Projects, allowing UNESCO to take a lead role and to publish (or co-publish) the report. Between 2011 and 2015, MDIs were not specifically mentioned in IPDC Project Priorities but a review of Projects shows that six directly supported MDI framework implementation, all but one completed. Since then a further six were approved under *Priority 5: Conducting Media Assessments* in 2016 and 2017 and are underway.

177. In a 2013 assessment⁸⁷ of the impact of the MDIs, outcomes were identified under four headings based on interviews with UNESCO HQ and Field Staff and over a dozen media development experts.

178. The first refers to MDI assessments' *contributions to governmental media policies and laws*. It analysed evidence for specific MDI impact, and among its conclusions were the following:

⁸⁴ A good practice report has just been published by IPDC: "Successful Initiatives to Protect Journalists and Combat Impunity." 2017.

⁸⁵ Reports can be downloaded from: <http://en.unesco.org/programme/ipdc/initiatives/mdis>

⁸⁶ http://www.unesco.org/new/fileadmin/MULTIMEDIA/HQ/CI/CI/pdf/IPDC/ipdc59_MDI.pdf

⁸⁷ Mariona Sanz Cortell (2013) *Report on the impact of the UNESCO Media Development Indicators assessments*. UNESCO.

- In Bhutan, the MDI completed in 2010 contributed to amending a media law to create an Independent Press Council; and an IPDC Project,⁸⁸ run by the World Association of Community Radio Broadcasters (AMARC) in 2012, instigated a process introducing community radio as a third tier of broadcasting. The first two stations were opened in 2016.
- The MDI in Tunisia in 2012, part of a wider IPDC Special Initiative after the Arab Spring, combined with other social forces and “fed into a process of effective media reform in line with international standards” (p.6). Here, the role of the MDI as an advocacy tool was underlined.
- In Gabon, where MDI recommendations are on the webpage of the Ministry of Digital Economy, the government has “[a]s a result of the report... started to fund community media”. According to one MDI researcher, it also directly influenced the transformation of the public GABON TV into an autonomous company. UNESCO deliberately deployed the process to influence policy.
- In the Maldives, the decriminalisation of defamation in 2011 can “in part be attributed [to] one of the MDI report’s recommendations.” (p.6).

179. A second avenue of influence of MDIs aims at purposes other than enhancing government policy. The assessment points to the use of MDIs by the Council of Europe and bilateral development agencies as a map for where to invest. Specific examples are given in Tunisia, East Timor and Mozambique (p.11). Media professionals have also used the MDIs in relation to the recommendations on self-regulatory mechanisms, in Jordan, Gabon, Tunisia, Ecuador, Uruguay and Egypt (p.11-12).

180. The third type of outcome noted by the report is the enhancement of dialogue, empowerment and capacity building. In Cote d’Ivoire, the process of consultations initiated by the MDIs resulted in the creation by the government of a Media Development Committee comprising both government and non-governmental organisations. In Ecuador, the non-partisan credentials of the MDI process managed to create, in a highly polarised environment, common ground for stakeholders to debate a new media law; it managed “to provide space for a new dialogue in a saturated debate” according to the UNESCO Field Officer (p.14); and a similar process was supported in Bolivia. The empowerment and capacity building aspect comes from the research and often extensive debate between stakeholders. This builds the capacities of the research organisations (usually academic institutions) often working with international experts; but also of civil society organisations and government officials who become familiar with the issues and comfortable in debating them (p.15).

The MDI in Madagascar*

Following the political crisis of 2009 to 2013 and in the run up to the 2015 elections, UNDP and the EU supported major programmes in peace building. A new media law was under development and UNESCO, supported from the UNESCO Multi-Sectoral Regional Office for Eastern Africa, approached key stakeholders including the government. They argued that they had the *instrument* i.e. the MDI Framework; a tried and tested *process* to implement it supported by a handbook; that would produce an *outcome* to feed into the development of the law. With support from an IPDC Special Allocation, they even brought the funding. In cooperation with UNDP and working closely with the Ministry for Communication, the *Centre for Communication Research* in the *University of Antananarivo* led the research during 2014, working with a national team of experts from government, intergovernmental

⁸⁸ The Project documentation can be seen here: <http://www.unesco-ci.org/ipdcprojects/content/development-third-tier-broadcasting-community-radio-bhutan>

and non-government organisations and covering the full range of issues.⁸⁹ A forum on the state of media in Madagascar in November 2014 brought all the actors together, with international representation from several UN organisations, and endorsed the recommendations.

The Regional CI Programme Specialist notes that “it influenced the Law as they could base it on real and current information”, and “offered a framework and guide used by all organisations working on media there”. The benefits were that “it helped to implement a holistic process with stakeholders, broad in scope, that was brought to future actions; it enabled evidence-based progress using the data; and it enhanced the profile of UNESCO as it had the instrument and process ready in such a timely manner.” Key to its success was that: “several rounds of in-depth consultations enhanced ownership; the editorial board comprised all media stakeholders including government; and the University led the research, depoliticising the process.”

*Based on interview with Jaco du Toit, CI programme specialist, UNESCO Multi-Sectoral Regional Office in Nairobi and documentation.

181. Finally, outcomes are also recorded for UNESCO. The MDI has enhanced UNESCO’s credibility as a neutral actor in media development. One Field Officer contrasts UNESCO’s Culture Sector’s binding Conventions with the CI Sector’s lack of anything similar, noting that the MDI framework, though non-binding, nevertheless can have a somewhat similar value in terms of mobilising actors. The endorsement by the IPDC’s Council is critical to its neutrality and credibility and CI’s reputational enhancement extends to its other actions and actors.

182. The use by other organisations of the MDIs, independently of UNESCO, underlines the perceived value of the tool, for instance in Benin funded by DANIDA, and in Qatar funded by the Doha Centre for Media Freedom. The MDI Report can be helpful to UNESCO in developing its national sector strategy, through the overview and insights it provides, the relationships developed with key actors, and especially through the recommendations as a coherent and integrated menu of future actions for UNESCO. The report cites examples of where UNESCO used the MDIs to develop convincing and successful submissions to other funders, including to the European Commission for a major project on *Enhancing Media Coverage of Elections*.

183. The assessment underlined the fact, affirmed by the present evaluation, that follow-up activities to the MDI process are critical to maximising its potential. Many IPDC Projects have magnified and sustained the impact of the MDI process, but other donors and actors, including government, are also central to this. In some countries, national validation conferences are an immediate follow-up; press conferences and ongoing meetings with decision-makers are held; as well as presentations to UNCT and discussions about integration into the UNDAF. Periodic revision is also an option.

184. Between 2011 and 2015, at least seven Projects directly supported post-MDI strengthening. In most cases, these involved taking a specific sub-sector and/or set of recommendations, such as in Bhutan the community radio sector (2012), in Ecuador media self-regulation (2012), or in Timor-Leste the creation of a Press-Council (2012).

⁸⁹ The Report can be downloaded here: <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0024/002477/247735E.pdf>

The MDI in Myanmar*

Myanmar is a recent example, having completed an MDI study between May 2014 and April 2016 following several UNESCO supported conferences on media development. It was completed as a UNESCO/International Media Support (IMS) collaboration, with IPDC covering a small proportion of the cost. The process was lengthy because of a major capacity-building component. The Regional CI Programme Specialist reports that the process involved “members of the government, media sector, academia, civil society and international experts, provided a common road map to all stakeholders for the development of a free, independent and pluralistic media landscape in Myanmar. The road map included among others the reform of the colonial-era Penal Code that restricts freedom of expression, the strengthening of the Myanmar News Media Council, the strengthening of professional journalism among the private media as well as journalism education, and improvements in the distribution channels of newspapers in rural areas.”

She stresses the importance of the fact that it was a consensus document. “The publication of a common road map was an important achievement in a country divided by ethnic conflicts, where private media and civil society were emerging and the new government was facing the challenges of rapid transition to democracy with direct impacts on the country’s communication and information landscape.” The fact that the local research team, the Journalism Department of the National Management Degree College, took ownership was important. The role of UNESCO was in “catalyzing cooperation between national stakeholders, as well as the UN system and development partners”. It remains, she says, the reference document for much of ongoing media reform and investment.

*Based on interviews with Misako Ito, CI programme specialist, UNESCO Regional Office, Bangkok, and documentation.

- Since 2016, several Projects under other priorities, including *Priority 4: Supporting Law Reform* and *Priority 1: Supporting Media Pluralism*, have built directly on MDIs or engage in activities that are complementary to one or more of the five MDI categories. For instance the following were approved in 2016;⁹⁰ In the Dominican Republican intervention to support law reform takes as its starting point the MDI assessment there, and establishes Working Groups to update MDI recommendations with a view to moving towards implementation;
- In Palestine, a community media Project explicitly addresses two recommendations of the 2014 UNESCO Palestine MDI;
- In Timor Leste, another is focused on enhancing capacity in self-regulation among media managers as recommended in the MDIs;
- In Nepal, a Project is reviewing media policies and making recommendations to ensure the inclusion of marginalised communities in both content and participation;

185. The MDI process and report is an instrument for change rather than an outcome in itself. The foregoing supports an argument that the MDI process is just one step in wider processes of ongoing media sector reform that embrace policy, law and governmental and non-governmental institutions. It has a specific potential in helping to ‘kick start’ change and catalyse stakeholders at certain moments. The MDI process is far from reaching saturation in LDCs, SIDS and developing countries let alone in developed countries. A couple of interviewees argued that it was achieving an impetus of its own, beginning to attract other sources of funding; even that a degree of peer competition was

⁹⁰ From the IPDC Project Database: https://teamsnet.unesco.org/en-us/Lists/IPDC_Submissions_Final/AllItems.aspx

emerging between countries regarding its implementation. A case was argued that IPDC should work towards its support for MDI becoming redundant i.e. encouraging and enabling others to implement it to a point where no funding from IPDC is needed. On the other hand, the MDI process can be most effective at particular political and social conjunctions and IPDC is well placed to identify these and secure appropriate partners in a timely manner.

186. Sector reform is approached from other directions by IPDC interventions. Many of the **community media** Projects under Priority 1 also aim at strengthening the sectoral level. The following, for instance, were approved in 2016:

- In Morocco, a Project is creating a national advocacy coalition for the legal recognition of community radios for the purpose of lobbying public authorities and heightening public awareness through the media.
- In Argentina, a Project is investigating and systematising information about sustainable models of community radio stations, and public policies in this area.
- In India, the decade old community radio policy is being critically reviewed to explore a policy framework for more inclusive and liberal radio, and promotes a more autonomous community radio sector.

187. IPDC support is widely acknowledged as having over the years had sector-transformative impact in some places. CI Field Office staff and experts interviewed report that in South Sudan, Bangladesh, Bolivia, Ecuador and Nepal, IPDC has been critical to founding and building the community radio sector; and in SIDS some Projects are also regarded as a critically valuable contribution to a small and vulnerable, though important, media sector.

GSIM Implementation in Thailand and Mongolia*

Outcomes from the GSIM framework implementation have not yet been systematically evaluated. The evaluator, however, had an opportunity to follow up on two of them.

In Thailand, the public service broadcaster implemented the GSIM Framework in-house and in a set of prominent commercial broadcasters, finishing in 2015, and produced a report that included recommendations. The goal was to itself become a focus of best practice and in the long term to influence the approach of the National Broadcasting and Telecommunication Commission. In an interview significant progress was reported. A recent draft Code of Conduct for Work and Dignity includes key recommendations, in part because the Consultant involved had earlier led the GSIM work. The Consultant also felt that GSIM indicators focus too strongly, in management, on gender *equality* as distinct from putting in place measures to ensure that gender would not limit choice; and that the framework could be expanded to include sexual orientation including LGBT.

In Mongolia, the GSIM report, finalised in 2016 by Globe International Centre (GIC), has become “the main reference document to ensure the gender equality in media sector. GIC has contributed to the new Government Action Plan on Gender Equality and it is based on results of the project” according to the Mongolian IPDC Bureau delegate, who is also a member of the implementing NGO, the GIC.

Both examples point to the potential for wider impact on regulation and policy.

*Based on interviews and interactions with Naranjargal Hashhuu, GIC, IPDC Bureau Member; Anothai Udomsilp, Thai Public Service Broadcasting, and Dr. Chanettee Tinnam, Consultant.

4.4. OUTCOME 3: KNOWLEDGE-DRIVEN MEDIA DEVELOPMENT AND THE SDGS

188. The initial impetus for the KDMD Special Initiative, according to experts and UNESCO staff interviewed, was responding to a need expressed within the international media development community. Sharing information and knowledge is recognised as enhancing the quality of media development interventions, reducing duplication and improving cooperation between organisations.

189. A 2013 Bureau information document, building on the KDMD idea, proposed the following as one of three strategic IPDC outcomes for the period 2014 to 2021.⁹¹

“...to be recognised as a global leader in knowledge about media development, playing a prominent intellectual role in the wider community of practice of media development actors internationally, including donors, implementers and actors.”

190. The theme is picked up in another Information Note to the Bureau in 2015 that explores the IPDC niche in the wider field of media development.⁹² UNESCO’s 70 years of experience and IPDC 30 years of lessons learnt are seen as translating into “an informed, strategic and learning practice of support for particular dimensions in media development”. The knowledge sources include project experience, the annual Implementation Reports and the in-depth evaluations, as well as MDIs, JSI and other indicators. The KDMD should be seen in this context.

191. Achieving such an aspiration would require IPDC capacity and action at several points, including knowledge generation for instance from Projects; knowledge processing and value-adding for usability, a goal of the annual Analytic Overviews; enabling knowledge use by stakeholders and partners at different levels⁹³; and knowledge dissemination, through publications, databases, events etc. The IPDC does not have sufficient resources to undertake this, and the discontinuation of the evaluation of selected Projects in 2012 due to lack of funding is indicative of this. Outcomes from this phase of the KDMD are very limited, and the absence of major contributions from the original KDMD collaborators casts doubt on its original rationale and/or approach.

192. CI’s work under the SDG Indicators was subsequently folded in under this Special Initiative, the rationale being that the work of defining indicators and collecting data may be regarded as knowledge development and sharing in a general sense.

193. The SDG Indicators 16.10.1 and 16.10.2 outcomes, which gained UN approval in 2017, do not yet extend beyond the UN system. Significant work is underway in terms of exploring the most effective and appropriate ways in which the data can be gathered and outcomes optimised from these responsibilities.

194. A recent initiative, the *IPDC Talks*, in its second year in September 2017 can also be included here, as the theme of both is the role of media and communication in generating and disseminating knowledge around the SDGs.

⁹¹ *Agenda Item: Discussion: Strengthening IPDC for the period 2014-2021.* CI-13/CONF:201/6

⁹² *IPDC’s niche in the wider field of media development* CI-15/CONF,201/7

⁹³ “IPDC’s intergovernmental Council enables the Programme to have an impact at policy-levels”, national and inter-governmental. It draws on its “practical experience on the ground to develop normative work” such as the UN Plan of Action and MDIs. Thus, “grassroots initiatives around the world can inform both governmental decision-making and international thinking on media development, and vice versa.” (CI-15/CONF.201/7)

195. At this point, it is noted that the SDG Indicators have become central to the potential of the KDMD Special Initiative, being both more specific and broader. Yet knowledge driven media development remains a relevant concept for IPDC.

4.5. OUTCOME 4: JOURNALISM EDUCATION

196. Journalism education features both in Priority 6, as a sub-section, and as a dedicated Special Initiative: the *Global Initiative for Excellence in Journalism Education* (GIEJE).

197. In Priority 6, journalism education is a subsection of capacity building for journalists and media education managers. In practice, short-term media sector and journalism training (not included under this heading) and higher-level journalism education are very different. While the ultimate outcomes sought are similar, intermediate outcomes diverge. Most training activities have short-term goals while the enhancement of journalism education must look to the medium and long-term with a focus on sustainability.

198. The GIEJE is a legacy of the earlier IPDC initiative *African Centres of Excellence* and continues mainly because the IPDC Council regards journalism education as a priority in many countries. The IPDC Council survey found that Member States rate it as important as the other Special Initiatives. But there have been few developments so far. Two relatively small Special Allocations were devoted to it since its launch in 2014, and no assessment has been undertaken of outcomes.

199. While the GIEJE aspires to becoming a global sharing platform, so far its outputs – it is too early for outcomes – appear to be the promotion of publications under UNESCO *Series on Journalism Education*, and a partnership with ORBICOM. It is not clear how the promotion of model curriculum work gains specifically from its location under IPDC. Model curricula and syllabi development and promotion have long been fundamental features of UNESCO activity in education as well as media.

200. Enhancing national journalism education systems (as distinct from providing training) has been the target also of many IPDC Projects. There appears to be no explicit link between these and the GIEJE, for instance by promoting such Projects broadly under its umbrella, though some Projects have been awarded to institutions formerly recognised by the Centres of Excellence programme.

201. Among Projects those completed or underway are the following:

- In Swaziland, a Project was approved in 2016 to enable the *University of Swaziland's Department of Journalism and Mass Communication* to introduce a distance-learning programme for working media practitioners, adapted from the UNESCO model curricula for Journalism Education.
- In Surinam, almost all media are private and commercially driven and few staff have a journalism qualification. This 2015 Project enabled the *Journalism Department* of the *Academy of Higher Arts & Cultural Education* to develop and implement a one-year course for practicing journalists.
- In a 2014 Project, the *University of Antananarivo* in Madagascar developed and ran a 'refresher' course, the first of its kind, for 25 academic and professional instructors from six Malagasy journalism training institutions, providing theoretical and technological tools to upgrade courses.
- Also in 2014, a Project in Algeria trained 12 lecturers from the *Ecole Nationale et Supérieure de Journalisme et des Sciences de l'Information* in journalism techniques sensitive to gender-equality issues, and international instruments for the protection of human rights.

- In 2011, *Daystar University* in Kenya and the *University of Makerere* in Uganda agreed to jointly review and revise their media curricula, upgrade teaching capacities and undertake lecturer exchanges to improve their course content and skills.

202. All focus on improving the quality and delivery of professional journalism education courses, of at least medium duration at third level, with many building on UNESCO's Model Curricula and Syllabi. But none have been the subject of an evaluation.

Journalism Curriculum Development in Bangkok and Nairobi*

The Project concept of the Institute of Asian Studies in **Chulalongkorn University** in Bangkok was to introduce an Asian approach and philosophy to the Journalism Curriculum, as a balance to the euro- and US- centric tendency in existing curricula. The Project began in 2014 with a view to adapting the UNESCO Model Curriculum, based around the idea of 'mindfulness' as a core Asian philosophy. Six undergraduate modules on a range of topics, from climate change and sustainable development, to media and society, were selected. Over the course of two seminars in December 2014 and July 2016, experts from all over Asia first drafted the curricula modules and then tested them. So far individual modules have been implemented, but a systematic dissemination and deployment plan was not part of the Project and its sustained impact is uncertain. However, a book will be published by Sage in early 2018 entitled "Mindful Communication for Sustainable Development - Perspectives from Asia" and the majority of its contributors participated in the Project.

In 2013 the School of Journalism & Mass Communication, **University of Nairobi** developed a curriculum on conflict reporting, bringing together experts who had developed the training material and providing training at a regional conference on the topic. With follow up support from UNESCO Field Office, a module was specifically tailored for South Sudan. Beyond this, it has not been further implemented, according to those involved because they lack the resources to do so, for instance through producing a replicable package.

*Based on interviews with Dr Ndeti Ndati, Dr Wambui Kiai, University of Nairobi, and Dr. Jirayudh Sinthuphan, South Asian Studies Centre, Institute of Asian Studies, Chulalongkorn University.

203. Evidence gathered during this evaluation suggests that for a sustained impact, such Projects must be part of a more sustained effort, and/or part of a larger target-institutional effort with strong management support (see Box above).

204. However, the available evidence base is limited. Of the 45 independent IPDC Project evaluation reports produced between 2006 and 2012,⁹⁴ only one aimed to strengthen journalism education institutions (although a larger number address journalism capacity building and training).

205. In 2008 to 2009, support was provided to enable the Hargeisa University School of Journalism in Somalia to integrate a radio station and media resources into the relevant courses (Project 354SOM5071). However, a change of government led to a change of university management, and the university contribution was not forthcoming. Only the equipment component covered by IPDC went ahead and, though useful, the outcome was more limited than intended. While the situation in Somalia is not typical, it nevertheless underlines the need for sustained institutional support.

⁹⁴ The following links leads to four volumes of independent evaluations. The later three were used in this exercise.: <http://www.unesco.org/new/en/communication-and-information/intergovernmental-programmes/ipdc/projects/project-evaluations/>

206. A recently approved IPDC project, part of the integrated set of actions in Gambia funded by an EU FIT contribution, includes a more significant component for the institutional strengthening of journalism schools may provide further useful evidence of factors that lead to success and failure.

4.6. OUTCOME 5: OTHER IPDC PROJECTS AND ACTIONS

207. A significant proportion of all Projects have already been considered under the above headings. Between 2011 and 2017 the safety of journalist issue, including the JSIs, accounted for over 80 Projects; media sector development, including MDI and GSIM assessments but also those supporting law reform and media pluralism, account for approximately 150 more; and Projects aimed at enhancing the institutions of journalism education come to about 30.

208. Several overlapping categories account for the remaining IPDC Projects comprising:

- Priority 1 in so far as it offers training and various supports for individual or groups of community media entities but not sectoral-level change;
- Aspects of Priority 6 that cover short training programmes for journalists and media managers (but excluding the journalism education component);
- Priority 3 that supports Projects to counter hate speech in media and social media, and promote conflict-sensitive journalism and cross-cultural dialogue.

209. Priority 3 has so far had few if any Projects completed (just five were approved since the priority was introduced in 2016) and no information on outcomes is yet available. However, the small number of Projects approved in two years does suggest a limited demand.

210. The largest category remaining is Projects that support individual or groups of community media organisations – those that aim to have sector wide influence are covered above in Outcome 2. A significant number have also supported the training of journalists.

211. Many of the Projects fund ongoing training or equipment provision in countries with relatively stable community media sectors. The IPDC contribution to community radio in developing countries as a whole is estimated to be in the region of 3% to 5% of total donor funding⁹⁵ and in countries with relatively stable sectors and donor support, IPDC support is not a major factor.

212. Overall, despite immediately accruing benefits, a review of 45 independent evaluations,⁹⁶ about 30 of them relevant to this section, suggest that for a large majority of Projects that target individual organisations, sustainability is very much an open question, whether for the immediate outputs of the Project or for the beneficiary entity itself.

213. The following examples illustrate the point (The evaluations tended to cover groups of two or more projects. Official Project numbers are given in brackets):

- A capacity building project (354BGD5071) for young journalists in Bangladesh in 2010 developed a useful model for training, but the evaluation concludes: “to cover 60 districts the funds required would be about 20 times more than the present one... To make it

⁹⁵ Interview with the AMARC Secretary General, Francesco Diasio. The figure is approximate and no substantial research has been done in this area.

⁹⁶ The following links leads to four volumes of independent evaluations. The later three were used in this exercise.: <http://www.unesco.org/new/en/communication-and-information/intergovernmental-programmes/ipdc/projects/project-evaluations/>

sustainable, funds for the effort have to be raised from within the country – at least to some extent.” A second community radio project (354BGD5082) trained 25 people but the evaluator expressed strong reservations about the sustainability of the station, which could broadcast only within a one kilometre radius.

- A project in Lebanon (354LEB5081) was to set up a journalists’ training facility for the National News Agency in 2010. Yet once the first three funded training activities were completed, the evaluation concluded that “NNA will need additional funding to hold similar training in the future to achieve its own sustainability...” and “...translate learning into long term positive outcomes in the workplace.” A second training Project (354LEB5082) in Lebanon for young journalists covering conflict concludes: “Sustainability would be better achieved by more systematic engagement with more young Lebanese journalists. Maharat will probably need additional funding to hold similar training courses in the future.”
- In 2008 to 2009, a Project (354KEN5071) provided training and equipment to a local language community radio station in a poor district in Kenya. The evaluation concludes: “Sustainability remains a major challenge for the station... Because donor funding was not enough to meet the operational costs and because contributions from the community were not forthcoming, the station has had to commercialise some services.” A second Project (PDC/49 URT/01) evaluated there also had sustainability issues, and it was concluded that further support, in three areas, would be needed to address them.
- In 2010 (354RAB5081) an IPDC Project was launched to establish a self-sustaining training institute for the Arab region by eighteen members of the Federation of Arab News Agencies (FANA). The evaluation noted, in terms of sustainability, that “there is a big challenge to raise substantial funding from Arab News Agencies members of FANA to sustain this institute and conduct further training workshops”. Although training was successfully undertaken during the Project an institute did not emerge from the Project.
- An already existing IPDC-supported Community Media Centre in Jamaica received Project (PDC/51/Jam/01) funding to build a “a multimedia lab in a wheeled bin “to enable it to travel into target communities. Sustainability was found to be: “...easily the most challenging aspect of the project. The physical container needs to be further retrofitted to facilitate maximum training sessions. The need for funding beyond the existing model is also urgent to sustain the interest of the volunteers and the management team.” A second project (PDC/51 JAM/02) in Jamaica to set up a radio station in a Prison by the Department of Correction Services seemed to have somewhat better prospects of sustainability in part because the benefits have been seen and there is some institutional commitment to it.

214. What most of these Projects have in common is that they work at the level of individual organisations as distinct from the sector; that they have limited institutional capacity or support from their parent institution to sustain outcomes; and that they are not part of a wider set of strategically oriented actions. In many cases, the level of support that IPDC can offer is very small compared to the overall requirement of the sector, and/or provided to it by other donors and actors. The limited evaluation evidence suggests that even where short-term benefits are achieved, long-term outcomes of many of these Projects are often in doubt.

215. Yet, general conclusions from this evidence concerning the efficacy and sustainability of small grants to individual organisations must be qualified in important ways. Several Field Offices interviewed mentioned examples of IPDC Project grants to individual organisations that have led to sustained benefits, and whose outcomes have grown over time.

- Some resulted from an innovation that was supported and subsequently expanded, usually with strong organisational backing and a strategic commitment to the process.
- Others, despite the small grant size, successfully leveraged the IPDC grant and ‘brand’ to demonstrate the organisation’s credibility and attract other funders.
- Several examples were noted in SIDS where, because of the countries small scale, an organisation-level grant continued on to achieve a sector-level impact due to a favourable set of circumstances and a strategic approach adopted by implementing organisations and their partners.
- South Sudan (see earlier box) is a country where there appears to be considerable impact as a result of several small Projects leverage greater change through collaboration with additional partners.

216. Below evidence concerning whether the small size of Projects may have specific implications is examined in the context of another global media development programme.

4.7. EXTERNAL EVIDENCE ON SMALL PROJECT OUTCOMES

217. There exist a few other examples of relatively large programmes funding small media development projects on a global scale, the evaluation of which might offer some insights here. Somewhat comparable is the *World Association for Christian Communication (WACC)’s Development Initiative Programme (DIP)*. This provides grants to independent projects that promote the right to communicate with an average grant size of about US\$12,000 and the largest of about US\$20,000. It funded 86 projects in its triennial round to 2014 with a total of US\$1.4 million.

218. DIP was evaluated in 2015, led by the present consultant.⁹⁷ While the research faced similar methodological constraints regarding the prohibitive cost of extensive in-situ project-level evaluations, a survey, documentary and data analysis, and nine in-depth post-completion field visits, were undertaken. Some conclusions are relevant here.

219. It found that the modest size of the grant did not prevent, in certain circumstances, the achievement of very significant and potentially far-reach impacts.

“[S]omewhat to the surprise of the evaluators, the modest funding and short time scale were sufficient in the case at least of most of the Case Studies to gain some momentum and achieve a sustained impact. This was as a result of partners scaling the size and timing of projects accordingly, and ensuring that they fell within their strategic goals. While some would have liked more funding and more time, none made a convincing case that larger and longer projects would have had disproportionately larger impacts i.e. that the additional investment would yield a higher return when combined with, and as compared to, the original one.” (p.iv)

220. The key lesson emerging was as follows:

“Projects that achieved the greatest impact, and that were most likely to be sustained and grow after funding ends, were those *that were already embedded in, or represented the implementation of, a key component of a partner’s existing core strategy*. These Projects were

⁹⁷ Seán Ó Siochrú and Bruce Girard. *Development Initiative Programme 2012 – 2014: Final Evaluation Report*. October. 2015. World Association for Christian Communication (unpublished)

designed in the first place not as stand-alone actions *per se*, but as moving the strategy a single, definable, step forward. Partners were often in a position to, and had a strong incentive to, pursue it still further once DIP funding ended. And indeed the DIP Projects on several occasions facilitated the partners to secure additional funding to continue their strategies.” (p.42)

221. These conclusions would fit with much of the evidence presented here about IPDC. Small additional ‘add-on’ projects can yield immediate benefits, but having a sustainable impact will depend on their strategic positioning within the organisation but also in relation to the sector or wider goals.

222. In addition to the challenge in outcome evaluation, global programmes that support numerous small projects face a further challenge: how to cost-effectively manage the selection process. There is justified concern, also expressed in relation to the IPDC, that the overhead cost of identifying, assessing and administering numerous small projects is, relative to that of a small number of large projects, excessive, and hard to justify in terms of the benefits achieved (although this calculation does not consider political benefits to UNESCO and Member States). There is also a concern that Projects of lower quality may be approved within a field seeking to cover as many individual states as possible.

223. This question is addressed below in conclusions. At this point an estimate of the time required is offered, to be used later for comparative purposes. The WACC manager has estimated that the full administration of the DIP, from initial identification through to contract approval and payment, requires between 72 and 90 professional staff days annually⁹⁸, including project officers and financial controller but excluding the time regional and national WACC members spend in encouraging and enabling applications. This is to cover just under 30 projects each year, with funding of less than US\$500,000 annually.

224. A brief mention of other small projects outcomes should be added i.e. those accruing to Field Offices. What was referenced above as a feature of IPDC is a positive outcome of small projects in general – the call for proposals enables UNESCO Field Offices to interact with community-based organisations and NGOs outside their usual networks and to gain insights into issues emerging there.

5. OUTCOME ANALYSIS

225. The approach adopted in Section 4 was to explore the combined outcomes of the Special Initiatives, FITs and Projects. The evidence was presented under five outcome-oriented headings. This section analyses and distils the significance of the outcomes documented in the previous section. The salient findings supported by diverse sources of evidence are summarised here and their implications highlighted. **Key findings are presented at the end of each section.**

226. However, another question must first be addressed in order to enhance what can be extracted from this evidence: To what extent does achieving these outcomes *draw on the particular strengths and/or relate to the historical role of IPDC?* This is relevant since the rationale for IPDC engagement in certain types of interventions and issues is reinforced *if it can be shown that it draws on IPDC’s specific strengths and mandate*; and conversely is weakened if other types of interventions *could equally be*

⁹⁸ Personal Communication with Philip Lee, WACC. August 25th 2017

implemented by others yielding similar outcomes. Thus before considering the implications of the evidence, IPDC's defining features are summarised.

5.1. IPDC'S DEFINING FEATURES

227. IPDC's particular strengths in terms of outputs and operations stem from a combination of governance and operational features that, according to many interviewed and in line with the evidence, make it a particularly useful instrument in certain circumstances. These are the following:

a) IPDC can act as an intergovernmental 'Think-Tank' and normative 'standard-setter'. IPDC's capacity as a 'Think-Tank' – enabling innovative and expert thinking and proposals to emerge to address current issues – has been demonstrated in relation to the safety of journalists; in developing knowledge-based tools for sectoral development (such as the MDI), and more recently, in its pursuit of the link between SDGs and media and in its national and regional support of initiatives to train judges. Its role in setting normative standards, non-mandatory but authoritative, in potentially sensitive areas derives directly from its intergovernmental status. Both think-tank and standard-setter roles are underpinned by the combination of media expertise and political sensitivity among its delegates in a forum dedicated to the development of media and communication with a strategic long-term horizon. While disagreements emerge within the forum, these reflect its status as a microcosm of the larger political engagement and consensus-building within UNESCO and it is uniquely equipped to find solutions and ways forward.

b) IPDC endorsement is valued as neutral. Tools, instruments and documents endorsed by the IPDC Intergovernmental Council, often with significant normative content, are regarded by governments and other stakeholders as authoritative, while being neutral, impartial and of high quality. Hence, they are more likely to be approved for implementation, or at least to face fewer grounds on which they are challenged as compared to, for instance, international NGO or bilateral equivalents. This can be a critical advantage for independent non-governmental actors in some countries; and it can enable multi-stakeholder cooperation, including government, in media sector reform and developing communication.

c) IPDC approval of normative guidelines and actions is procedurally efficient and produces quality outputs. Endorsement by the UNESCO Executive Board or General Conference (or indeed other UN agencies) is equally if not more highly valued. However, the IPDC Council and Bureau membership includes a high level of domain expertise in media, enabling delegates to directly develop and endorse relatively detailed normative frameworks with a high level of authority, and achieve a deeper consensus than might a purely diplomatic approach. IPDC procedures also allow it to progress from initiation to endorsement within a short period of time. Several experts and UNESCO staff maintain that proceeding through the IPDC route has resulted in more timely and substantive outputs than had approval by Executive Board or General Conference been sought directly, instead of first being processed and resolved by the IPDC governing bodies and then entering these structures at a more general level.

d) IPDC Project roll-out is streamlined nationally. Projects funded by IPDC enable UNESCO Field Offices to work at national level with partners and on issues that might otherwise require lengthy (and uncertain) approval processes from local authorities. As a long-standing and recognised mechanism, IPDC Projects, once approved by the Bureau, require no further national approval. This can be an effective contribution in countries where media development may be perceived a sensitive issue. IPDC's status enables the empowerment of local civil society actors with multi-laterally endorsed instruments that could be difficult even through Regular Programme support.

e) IPDC offers UNESCO Field Offices a regular, flexible and timely means to indirectly address emerging or neglected topics. Projects often provide assistance to countries on issues that, at a particular moment, are not prioritised by other donors but yet are important. Post-conflict support, and support for small countries and SIDS, are examples. Despite the small scale of IPDC Projects, the total often exceeds Regular Programme contributions, and in the absence of other extrabudgetary sources, is critical to sustaining Field Offices' meaningful engagement on media development and with related partners.

f) IPDC also offers a rapid and flexible response mechanism. In the past, the IPDC Bureau has been quickly mobilized to respond to urgent communication needs in countries affected by a particular crisis or emergency. This was the case for example in early 2015, when the Bureau earmarked a sum to support projects from Ebola-affected countries, or in 2017 when a sum was quickly identified by the IPDC Chair and offered to support hurricane-affected islands.

g) IPDC enables Field Offices to engage with wider civil society. The annual IPDC call for proposals allows UNESCO staff to engage with civil society actors and institutions beyond their usual partners. It offers a concrete prospect for cooperation, and an overall impression of issues for developing communication. Several Field Offices continue to work even with organisations whose proposals merited funding but were not approved, assisting them in sourcing funding elsewhere.

h) IPDC Council and Bureau activity engages and raises awareness of Member States. Through direct engagement and discussion on the issue, UNESCO Permanent Delegations (experts and diplomatic) are more aware of and informed about the issues, and debate between them can enhance the potential for developing consensus. A potential benefit is that IPDC Council members may also, based on IPDC engagement, advocate on relevant issues at national level.

i) IPDC Special Account incurs low administration charges. For donors, the lower UNESCO overhead charged by the Special Account, at 10% as compared to 13% for Funds-in-Trust, ensures that a larger proportion of donations reach the target (though at the expense of donors having less influence on the precise beneficiary targeted). Apart from the 10% overhead, the amounts approved by the Bureau go fully to project submitters.

Findings

- The unique potential of IPDC that can set it apart from other Special Accounts, Funds-in-Trust and Regular Programme funding is its ability to combine several of these features in a manner that generates a higher level of outcomes, and sometimes different types of outcomes, than would otherwise be possible.

5.2. WHAT THE EVIDENCE SAYS

228. **Outcome Area 1:** The strongest evidence for outcomes is in the area of **safety of journalists**, though these outcomes are as yet intermediate in nature i.e. it is still early to seek extensive evidence that the working environment for journalists as a whole has become perceptibly safer and that impunity is less prevalent, though a direct causal chain of evidence would always be difficult to identify.

229. The evidence examined during this evaluation in general supports conclusions reached in the 2016 assessment of IPDC's role as regards safety and impunity.⁹⁹ The safety of journalists' initiative has raised the level of debate, concern and understanding at intergovernmental level and it is reasonable to conclude that this has led to some sensitisation of governments to address the question. Measures have been initiated at national level around the Action Plan, sometimes reinforced by JSIs and IPDC Projects, especially by countries ready to acknowledge the issue and expressing a willingness to act. There is some evidence that interventions and practical measures, especially joint civil society and governmental institutional actions, are making a difference. There is also evidence of growing impetus at both levels.

230. IPDC has played a key role in this, from the outset, and continues to through the DG's Report, the Special Initiative interventions including publications, and Projects. Other parts of CI, specifically FEM/FOE, also play a critically important role though the impact of each cannot (and need not) always be distinguished. FOE undertakes the supporting work for the IPDC Council in producing the DG's Report on safety and impunity, as well as the World Trends Report (for which data is gathered through the IPDC's mechanism via the DG). Led by the FEM Director, FOE supports the UN/INGO level in further developing the Plan of Action, and also supports implementation at national level.

231. This is the area in which the IPDC most closely integrates with other CI/FEM activities, and effective collaboration within the Division is critical to its success. As National Plans for Safety of Journalists become more widespread, new opportunities to develop synergies at national level working with Field Offices will open up.

232. This issue has been played directly from IPDC's strengths and leverage its normative authority and impartiality. The initial and ongoing request from the IPDC's Council to the UNESCO Director-General is an example. Actions supported by the IPDC Special Initiative are directed at the request of the Council to reinforce the area, and donors are responding to that request. The related IPDC Projects, over 80 of them, enable multiple actors often in combination (for instance with the JSIs), to work effectively in a sensitive area under the IPDC 'brand', and significantly enhance the profile of UNESCO at national level by lending it more authority to convene and influence actors.

Findings

- UNESCO CI/FEM Division has shown strong leadership in raising awareness and stimulating debate on the importance of safety of journalists and the issue of impunity at international level. IPDC has been a central initiator, and its DG's Report a catalyst in the process.
- At national level, IPDC Projects – totalling 25% of all IPDC Special Account expenditure at its height - and publications are generating positive outcomes for the safety of journalists in some countries and, as the process gains impetus at the international level, these are likely to expand.
- IPDC leverages its normative authority in the highly relevant area of safety of journalists to good effect. The potential for positive long-term outcomes is significant.

233. **Outcome Area 2: In media sector reform and development**, the evidence is also significant but less consistent.

⁹⁹ Marcesse, Silvia Chocarro (2016) *IPDC's Role in the Promotion of the Safety of Journalists: A Way Forward*.

234. For the MDIs, evidence of outcomes is strong thanks largely to the analysis of impacts by the 2013 assessment at four levels. There is no reason to believe that MDIs completed subsequently have had any less of an impact. These four levels are: (i) It influences media policies and laws through providing a roadmap, directly to government and institutions or via advocacy; (ii) for other actors such as donors, it offers a menu for interventions and investment; (iii) it enhances dialogue between stakeholders and empowers and builds capacities of NGOs and of research organisations, in an interactive space; and (iv) it helps UNESCO build relationships, develop its strategies, and even attract additional partner funding.

235. Interviews and analysis undertaken by this evaluation in Kenya and Myanmar lend support to conclusions about these four outcome areas. There is some evidence that different IPDC interventions reinforce each other in terms of sectoral level influence, and UNESCO Field Offices combine these with other initiatives at national and sometimes regional level.

236. It is clear that a key asset of the MDI process is IPDC Council endorsement of the framework, one that would, according to several UNESCO staff interviewed, have been difficult to develop in the less specialised bodies of the UNESCO Executive Board or General Conference. Reinforcing this is the direct participation of, and publication of reports by, UNESCO nationally, enabling partners to come together, including government, and interact constructively. This interaction builds the trust and relationships that enable further progress. Other actors, such as bilateral agencies or international NGOs, are less likely to be in a position to convene and support such a process in this area and at opportune times.

237. IPDC Projects enable other actors, including civil society actors and coalitions of stakeholders, to follow through on and reinforce an MDI, and to build strategically on the networks and relationships created by the MDI. This can reasonably be assumed to enhance prospects for successful outcomes.

238. Conclusions regarding outcomes of other IPDC actions that target the media sector, with for instance law and policy reform, separately from MDI-related activities are on less firm ground since less evidence is available. However, evaluations prior to 2012, Project documentation and interviews point to a few cases of strong and significant outcomes. Examples were noted of where IPDC has been a factor in the creation, early growth and recognition of the community media sector, including Nepal, Bangladesh and South Sudan, Bolivia and Ecuador. The support of the Norwegian FIT investment to post-Arab Spring Tunisia in the light of the MDI there has, according to documentation and interviews, positively impacted the sector and the legal environment for media development such as right to information legislation and independent broadcast regulation.

239. The GSIM is being successfully implemented and reports produced. Two cases reviewed during this evaluation, in Thailand and Mongolia, suggest that following implementation, positive outcomes within the participating organisations depend on the extent to which management is committed to the principles involved. Influencing wider policy and regulation is largely a function of networking and positioning of the partners. In both cases, access to policy makers has been achieved, though it is too early to say whether this will translate into sustainable positive outcomes.

240. Being applied at organisation rather than sectoral level, and therefore having limited direct engagement with government policy, the GSIM Framework benefits less from specific IPDC endorsement as compared to the MDI framework. The IPDC was also less involved in its development. IPDC endorsement does not appear on the published version of the guidelines – though it may be useful to introducing it into the policy context. IPDC Project funding has enabled its implementation in several contexts, but GSIM is mainly promoted from the FEM/MAS Section which has a specific brief around media and gender.

Findings

- The implementation of the MDI framework has yielded positive outcomes in several identifiable cases, and for a variety of stakeholders, through influencing law, policy and regulation; improving dialogue between stakeholders; contributing to donor priorities; and enhancing UNESCO's profile.
- The UNESCO stamp on the MDI framework and the production of a credible instrument is an example of the effective use of IPDC governance and deliberation processes, and of its value at the point of implementation.
- There exists scope for the expansion of the MDI process into other countries where the circumstances indicate a strong possibility for positive outcomes. The added potential for IPDC Project follow-up to enhance outcomes can also be more systematically exploited.
- IPDC Projects aiming at a sector-level influence or transformation, in community media or other relevant areas, have seen successful outcomes, when implemented as part of a wider strategy and in the appropriate circumstances.

241. **Outcome Area 3: Knowledge-driven media development** is considered, for reasons given earlier, jointly with the work on **SDG Indicators**. The Special Initiative dedicated to the former has not achieved significant outcomes, despite efforts by the Secretariat – and this is not to suggest that knowledge sharing between international media development organisations is not needed.

242. However, it created the knowledge-driven space within which the IPDC role in relation to the SDG target indicators could be introduced. As regards the outcomes so far from the SDG Indicators 16.10.1 and 16.10.2, longer-term potential for positive outcomes is significant. The IPDC Talks initiative, led by the IPDC Chair, is an instrument to explore possible future avenues.

243. Effective data gathering and dissemination of the two Indicators, encompassing violence against journalists, trade unionists and human rights advocates, and public access to information, can in themselves play an important role in reinforcing government action to achieve the SDG targets. A significant number of those interviewed, including Field Office staff, argued that the SDGs should become a major focus for IPDC in the future.

244. One argument was that this could offer an entry point for expanding media sector development in UNDAF processes, since the SDGs will increasingly form the backdrop to these. The two 16.10 Indicators might offer an opportunity to cooperate with a wider set of supporting actors relevant to media development, creating more space for action in UNESCO country strategies and UNDAF. This in turn might leverage additional government, UN and donor support for actions in the sector. Regional inter-governmental bodies might also be influenced in a similar way as they increasingly focus on the SDGs.

245. The case has been articulated for the key role that media has in promoting awareness and disseminating knowledge about SDGs. The CI Programme Specialist in the UNESCO Multi-Sectoral Regional Office for Southern Africa drafted a major proposal to promote media advocacy of the SDGs as a means to disseminate wider knowledge and encourage civic participation around the SDGs.¹⁰⁰

¹⁰⁰ The draft proposal is entitled “*Empowering media to support SDG awareness and Implementation in the SADC Region*” and would cover the entire region. At present, the Office is seeking donors.

UNESCO's role in the indicators, the UN Plan of Action on the Safety of Journalists, and in CI's activities in sectoral reform and community media, are central to the rationale for UNESCO leading this.

246. The rationale for IPDC participation in data gathering and associated activities for SDG indicators, as UN wide initiatives, is not as immediately apparent as it is for MDIs and Safety of journalists, but it does exist. A distinction can be drawn between the identification and collection of data, which can be undertaken by various sectors within UNESCO and by external partners, and the coordination, processing and channelling of this information into the UN and SDG system. A strong case can be made for the IPDC Secretariat to continue to undertake the latter role based on several factors. One is the early initiative taken by, and ongoing commitment shown by, IPDC governing bodies in relation to channelling information, obtained from several sources, regarding safety of journalists and impunity into the UN system. IPDC Council Member States may also through their participation in IPDC discussions become more knowledgeable about, and more committed to, gathering data for and implementing these indicators at national level. The IPDC 'branding' of the data gathering and support activity, as distinct from that of the CI Sector or UNESCO more widely, may also encourage some governments to get more involved both nationally and globally. A further strong argument is the potential for IPDC Projects and other actions to provide civil society organisations, institutions and others with the resources and legitimacy needed to become partners not just in data gathering, but in implementing actions to help countries achieve the targets and, more specifically, to ensure that media can help generate and communicate the knowledge to support it. In this light, IPDC could support efforts by Member States to implement the SDG 16.10 indicators nationally.

Findings

- The KDMD Special Initiative, though launched for justifiable reasons, has not moved forward significantly and its original impetus appears to have dissipated.
- The IPDC role in the SDG Indicators has major potential for relevant interventions at national and possibly regional levels, in terms of engaging on media development with many stakeholders and contexts. It is, however, too early to fully articulate the direction and it will require careful management.
- IPDC's experience equips it to undertake a coordination, processing and channelling role in relation to the SDG 16.10 target indicators; its governance may enable it to reinforce government commitment; and its Project and actions can engage with civil society on achieving SDG targets.

247. **Outcome Area 4:** IPDC has a strong history of support for **institutions for journalism education**. The widespread weakness of these institutions was from the time of its foundation recognised as a barrier to the development of a strong and effective media sector, capable of producing quality reporting both nationally and internationally and of serving the public interest.

248. The GIEJE Special Initiative seeks to support journalism education. Positioned under IPDC as a legacy of the African Centres of Excellence and the IPDC history of support, it is underpinned by IPDC Council members' commitment as evidenced, for instance, in the survey. Outcomes from its promotion of the model curricula are not sufficiently documented. Some evidence points to the use of the initiative to support journalism professors from developing countries, especially in Africa, to participate in key meetings of journalism educators (e.g. ORBICOM) and UNESCO conferences (e.g. World Press Freedom Day). There is also some evidence indicating that the initiative has been used to

enlist support from experts who have contributed syllabi towards some of the IPDC/UNESCO publications in the Journalism Education Series. Other outcomes are not at this point visible.

249. There is some evidence that IPDC Projects can, and some do, enhance the capacity of journalism institutions. The UNESCO endorsement and reputation in these areas is important, and ongoing IPDC participation is related in some cases to the absence of interest among other donors. Furthermore, in a few countries, supporting journalism education might be one of very few types of interventions that UNESCO can propose, offering an entry point into the media sector. However, evidence also points to the need to ensure that investments in journalism education are strategically supported by the institutions themselves and that follow-through and sustained impact is planned from the start. The small size of Projects may be an issue here.

Findings

- Outcomes from the GEIJE Special Initiative are very modest (and very modestly funded) so far, and there is little indication that it will significantly advance on its goal of becoming an active and supportive global platform for journalism education institutions.
- Individual Projects to reinforce journalism education institutions may in some cases be effective, with strong institutional support and further follow-through; but in other cases such Projects generate, at most, short term benefits.
- Although this area has a strong IPDC mandate and is an ongoing concern of UNESCO, the specific IPDC leverage is not clear, and resources are too limited. Building such institutions demands long-term sustained commitment.

250. **Outcome Area 5:** A final category of IPDC activities comprises **Projects that provide training and other support directly to media organisations and journalists**, to build skills and capacities in community media and journalism, though without a sector-level focus. It includes a small number of Projects addressing emerging issues identified by IPDC such as hate speech in media and conflict-sensitive journalism.

251. Previous evaluations, Project documentation and interviews affirm that many such Projects can have immediate positive outcomes for the partners. However, the benefits often tend to be short-term and not sustained. Media training initiatives are also funded and implemented by many other development organisations and in some countries the IPDC contribution, though positive for the organisations, is miniscule in relation to sector needs.

252. However, several Field Offices highly value the opportunity to respond positively in a timely manner to Project ideas they believe can make a sustained difference and which have few or no prospects for other support and in environments such as those that characterise SIDS. When carefully targeted at innovative opportunities where there is potential to leverage the IPDC brand and when built into wider strategic frameworks of Projects and partnerships, small Projects have been shown to have sector-transformative potential. Furthermore, the small size of a Project does not in itself impose a definitive limit on the extent of outcomes it might generate. Projects targeting individual organisations can, in the right strategic circumstances, generate significant outcomes.

253. Projects aiming to support an individual organisation do not in themselves draw strongly on the core strengths of IPDC, except in those few cases where an IPDC grant can lead to further donor

funding. Yet when included in a wider strategic context aimed at sector-level outcomes, or in SIDS, investing in them can yield positive results.

Findings

- Short-term isolated Projects aimed at individual organisations often have limited outcomes that are not sustained, especially where the grant is small as compared to the sectoral level of need and where many others donors are active.
- The design, strategic orientation, level of institutional support and wider environment are all factors that determine whether IPDC Projects supporting individual organisations are likely to yield sustained positive outcomes, requiring due attention to these in the design and selection stages.
- Projects to support individual media organisations are justified where they contribute to a larger strategic goal that can leverage IPDC strengths, and IPDC would benefit from a means to identify these cases.

5.3. AREAS DRAWING ON IPDC STRENGTHS

254. The extent to which the outcomes presented above have been enabled or enhanced as a result of leveraging specific IPDC characteristics and features, it has been argued, should be seen as a critical factor in deciding whether IPDC is the appropriate vehicle for addressing them.

255. The Section above *IPDC's Defining Features* outlined these features, derived from its governance structure and mandate. In each outcome area above, attention is drawn to this question, noting that some types of interventions could and were benefiting from one or more of these features thus reinforcing the rationale for IPDC's role.

256. Table 122 summarises the comparative level and nature of relevance of IPDC's unique features in terms of achieving the outcomes sought. A gender sensitive approach and a focus on Africa are seen as horizontal priorities here and apply to all.

257. Those classified as having a moderate to weak rationale for being provided with IPDC support have not necessarily shown fewer positive outcomes; nor is it claimed that they do not merit support. Rather they do not draw on IPDC's *specific strengths* and could therefore be addressed equally, or even to greater effect, by other modalities. Nevertheless, where these issues are neglected by other media development organisations; if IPDC can make a timely contribution; and if the context is strategic, then interventions might be justified.

Table 12: Areas that draw on IPDC's strengths

1. Unique Rationale: IPDC endorsement is critical to successful outcomes

DG's Report: IPDC initiated the mandate and the target (Member States) of UNESCO DG's Report on the judicial follow-up to the killing of journalists.

JSI Implementation: The implementation of the Journalist's Safety indicators framework is optimised with government participation which is encouraged through IPDC endorsement.

Projects and actions on journalists' safety: IPDC Projects that address judiciary and enforcement agencies are enabled by high-level intergovernmental IPDC endorsement; and IPDC Projects implemented by NGOs that address sensitive aspects of journalists' safety are empowered and protected by the IPDC 'brand' and also sometimes facilitated in collaborating with authorities.

MDI Framework implementation: Central to the successful implementation and follow-up framework is participation of, or recognition by, government institutions, which IPDC enables.

Projects and actions to reform the media sector: Some national-level actions, that build capacity of non-governmental actors to contribute to sector reform and to collaborate effectively with government institutions, rely heavily on IPDC endorsement for legitimacy (funding from e.g. INGO might undermine their neutrality); and sometimes for timeliness (a rapid response is needed).

Data gathering & knowledge dissemination on SDG communication-related indicators: IPDC's current role in SDG indicators could combine with leverage it can obtain through its governance structures, Projects and other actions to expand media development within national and regional arenas, enable civil society actors to partner in data-gathering and achieving target indicators, and knowledge generation and media dissemination to support the SDGs more widely.

2. High to Moderate Rationale: IPDC brand an asset; strong mandate and history in the area

Enhancing Journalism Education: IPDC has a strong mandate and history in journalism education; has the endorsement of IPDC Council in the area, and can draw on UNESCO resources including curricula and syllabi. It lacks a meaningful mechanism and resources to implement significant improvement in the sector.

3. Moderate to Weak Rationale: A strong IPDC mandate; a neglected area for funding

Projects to support individual community media: Community media add to plurality and amplify the media voice of civil society. Community media training programmes, per se, gain no special advantage from being funded by IPDC and are widely supported by INGOs. However, these Projects can have important outcomes in certain countries including SIDS and as part of a wider strategic approach.

Projects on journalism training: Short-term training projects for journalists on issues such as hate-speech, conflict or gender -sensitive reporting, may have immediate outcomes, but they do not need IPDC linkage. Nevertheless, they can be a priority in some countries, and when neglected by other donors.

Promoting/implementing the GSIM: The Gender Sensitive Indicators for the Media framework is implemented at organisational level, rather than sectoral, which reduces (but not eliminates) the value of and need for IPDC endorsement; but IPDC Projects can be a useful way to support wider implementation.

Knowledge sharing platform among international media development organisations: Although the KDMD as originally conceived addresses a real need, IPDC does not generate or add sufficient value to a knowledge base, nor does it leverage IPDC's core strengths.

6. IPDC PROCESSES AND MANAGEMENT

6.1. IPDC MANDATE AND PRIORITIES

258. The core mandate of IPDC has remained unchanged since the 2003 UNESCO General Conference:

“... to contribute to sustainable development, democracy and good governance by fostering universal access to and distribution of information and knowledge by strengthening the capacities of the developing countries and countries in transition in the field of electronic media and the printed press.”

259. The wording is open and has been interpreted flexibly to adapt to changes over the intervening 14 years, reflected in the evolving Priorities. In practice, the Priorities' main use recently is as criteria for the selection of Projects submitted in response to the annual call rather than as guidance to wider IPDC actions. Priorities have been added where the Bureau or Council felt a topic was of growing interest in Member States, or dropped where relevance was waning. Issues were discussed by the Bureau and Council, but the fit with other IPDC activities and with its general mandate and strengths were not fully explored. Rather, they were introduced in a more or less iterative manner responding to trends and Member State concerns rather than as a strategic interpretation and realignment of IPDC's mandate.

260. The evaluation survey included a number of questions about the role and Priorities and elicited responses from 54% of Council Members and from 88% of CI Advisors. Council Members and CI Advisors responding are virtually unanimous¹⁰¹ on the statement that IPDC has “a clear and relevant role in communications and development today”, more so than for any other put to either group.

261. The Survey also indicates reasonable levels of support for all Priority areas among Council members responding, with the lowest score for Priority 5 on MDIs and research (3.11 out of 5), and the highest for Priority 1 on capacity building, marginally above Priority 2 on safety of Journalists. However, when the Council was asked how to improve IPDC's relevance, the most popular choice was “could be improved through more thematically-focused interventions”. (Interestingly, the CI Advisors choice by a large margin was “could be improved through more funding”.)

262. None of the Priorities was considered unimportant. But many survey responses and many of those interviewed commented that recent additions to Priorities risk blurring the focus of IPDC. The enlarged set of Special Initiatives, lacking explicit articulation with Priorities and some with unclear outcomes, adds to the lack of clarity. Overall, there is some concern that what differentiates IPDC from other parts of CI and indeed from other media development actors, is getting lost. As one Council member put it in the Survey: “Now too much new and interesting work seems ad hoc, and different functions seem disconnected (project funding, Special Initiatives, normative work).” And another: “IPDC should focus on its priority areas in which it has a unique mandate...” A number of existing donors were also strongly of this view. Among other Sections of the CI Sector, there is also concern that IPDC is moving from its core mandate into certain areas with no clear benefit or rationale.

¹⁰¹One in each group 'disagrees' with the statement, neither 'strongly'.

263. A degree of inconsistency is also evident between and among IPDC Priorities and Special Initiatives in the wording used to describe them. For instance, some are described as *outcomes*, such as media pluralism or safety of journalism, and others as instruments or interventions such as media assessments, indicator development and capacity building. This hampered somewhat the efforts of this evaluation to assess the extent to which outcomes are achieved (as indicated in the need in the previous section to reorganise the various IPDC interventions under four outcome-oriented headings). More important, it led to a lack of coherence and full alignment between IPDC Priorities and the overall programmatic focus of IPDC in the wider CI context and the Expected Results in the C5. Unless IPDC Priorities are clearly articulated in terms of the outcomes sought, there will always be a difficulty in precisely aligning these Priorities with the relevant (outcome-oriented) Expected Results.

264. Finally, IPDC Priorities should also take into account whether the resources available are sufficient to address the range of Priorities offered. There is some evidence that consideration is already given to this. For instance, the GIEJE was approved in 2014 to run until just 2018 in part to assess whether funding might be attracted to it. Thus the likelihood that funds can be attracted is also a relevant factor.

Findings

- Overall, there is a case for refocusing the IPDC Priorities in the context of its mandate, strengths, available resources and current needs, and of clarifying and simplifying the relationship between the various types of activities and funding mechanisms within a strategic framework.

6.2. PROJECT & INTERVENTION SELECTION PROCESSES

265. Under IPDC's Statutes, the Bureau has the responsibility, supported by the Secretariat, to identify Projects to be funded by the Special Account.

266. Implementing the annual call for Project proposals is a complex task. It must ensure that the more than a hundred applications submitted to dozens of Field Offices satisfy the criteria, cover the six Priorities, and are geographically distributed with a definite but indeterminate preference for African, gender-sensitive and SIDS Projects; and facilitate a final selection and approval procedure by eight people, and with a budget that is invariably insufficient to support all eligible applicants.

267. As a whole, CI Programme Specialists interviewed feel that the online system introduced in 2015 is a significant improvement on what preceded it but that it can still be improved further. But the survey shows that 30% of Council members responding and almost the same proportion of CI Advisers believe the system to be less than fully efficient. Among CI Programme Specialists 71% believe that IPDC Projects are "firmly focused on areas that can have most impact", and 62% of the Council members who responded agree.

268. Additional observations about the process emerged from interviews:

- Though all highly value IPDC Projects, the approach of Field Offices to selection varies significantly. Some CI Programme Specialists publicise the call for proposals and go to considerable lengths to assist those making submissions. Others focus mainly on one or few selected applicants that they may have been encouraged to submit. Time devoted to the selection and approval process can vary from a week annually to several months; and

the attention given to IPDC Projects will depend on how busy the office is, especially with other extrabudgetary funded actions.

- The online system is regarded as a great improvement, though it has some relatively minor technical problems. The system was designed so that CI Advisers can provide suitable applicants with a unique log-in link for the latter to complete their submission and the former to then review them online. However, because of delays in system response when accessing outside UNESCO's own network, the practice of several CI Advisers is to interact with proposers directly until completion, and the Adviser then enters the proposal into the system.
- Although the criteria for Project selection are described in the Project preparation guidelines, they are not set out in a hierarchical and systematic manner, with weighted criteria, that would allow an applicant to assess the importance of each factor and enable an optimised response.
- The funding specificities of IPDC, including a rapid response mechanism which allows the IPDC Bureau to approve projects in between sessions, are what enable the unique flexibility in UNESCO for a swift response to urgent communication needs arising as a result of a crisis or emergency, as noted earlier in this report in regard to the Ebola crisis.

269. Additional specific concerns were expressed by a few Bureau members:

- The system is not fully transparent since applications deemed ineligible by the Secretariat are not forwarded to the Bureau explaining the reasons for rejection;
- Bureau discussions do not always take serious account of the criteria, and the process for the final stages of selection (when the priority list is agreed but insufficient funding is available for all) is unclear and often driven by inappropriate or arbitrary factors;
- The occasional practice, when faced with too little funding for too many proposals, of reducing all budgets pro-rata may significantly affect the ability of some approved Projects to deliver.

270. It was also suggested that the Council should be more involved in decisions around Project selection.¹⁰² This has a certain merit in that it would allow the Council to engage more closely with, and become more familiar with, the IPDC activities. However, by far the majority view among those interviewed is that this would be highly inefficient. Several on the Bureau, reflecting on the amount of time it currently takes to reach agreement, believe the involvement of a 39 member Council would consume too much Council meeting time with little prospect of an improved outcome. Indeed several argued that the opposite might be the case. There was some concern that the selection process might be skewed due to the active participation of just a few Council members, given the complexity and time-consuming nature of the process.

271. Nonetheless, most conceded that further ways for IPDC Council members to engage with IPDC would be desirable. A few Council and Bureau members expressed frustration with the limited interaction between the Secretariat and Bureau and the Council. Council members' only participation is at biennial meetings with minimal interaction in between. A couple of delegates expressed disappointment that the 2016 Council meeting was characterised by lengthy interventions and

¹⁰² The Governance Review includes: "Examine roles of Bureau and Council in selection of projects."

interactions on a single topic, having waited two years for an opportunity to engage in dialogue on other agenda issues.

272. The case has also been put that the Bureau as a whole has insufficient experience in diplomatic procedures and ways of working and should include more with a diplomatic background¹⁰³. Seven of the eight Bureau members are communication specialists with different levels of diplomatic experience, with just one permanent diplomatic representative. As noted earlier, the IPDC Statutes specify that both Council and Bureau representatives appointed by Member States shall “preferably be specialists in the fields covered by the IPDC”. Some Bureau specialists are accompanied by a permanent delegate to offer diplomatic expertise. Others regularly brief the Permanent Delegation, and receive specific guidance and instructions concerning national and regional positions. Similarly in the IPDC Council, a review of those attending the November 2016 meeting shows that many of the 60% or so of Member State specialist representatives were accompanied by Permanent Delegation members as observers. The total number of Council participants came to 76, almost double the number of Council members.

273. Concern was also expressed that the recently introduced ‘earmarking’ mechanism of IPDC Projects may, over time, undermine the goal of the Special Account i.e. that funds should be distributed according to agreed strategic priorities and not individual donor preferences. A counter argument is that it attracts additional donor funding that would not otherwise be in the Special Account, though this only partly addresses the issue since the allocation to Priorities may be distorted overall.

274. Leaving aside the annual call for Projects, the identification, negotiation and approval of Special Initiatives (funded from the Special Account) and of Funds-in-Trust projects is considered satisfactory overall by Bureau members and the efforts and energy devoted by the Secretariat and Chair to it is widely appreciated. A general concern was voiced by a few: Exploring, designing and seeking funding for these takes into consideration the Priorities and the wider mandate of the IPDC. However, discussions in the Bureau are often limited and not undertaken within, as noted earlier, an explicit and consistent strategic framework for the direction that IPDC is taking. This issue re-emerges in relation to donor funding.

¹⁰³ The Governance Review includes: “Enhance intergovernmental nature, especially of the Bureau, while retaining expert engagement.”

Findings

- Overall, the annual Project selection cycle is implemented in an efficient and effective manner, given the complex tasks involved. Certain of the practices, including the guidelines for selection, should be reviewed and refined to adhere to professional standards and be transparent to applicants, and some Bureau Members need further support in implementing the system.
- The arguments against greater Council participation in Project selection outweigh those in favour, though there is a strong case for more and better communication between Council, Bureau and Secretariat.
- The combination of specialist and diplomatic expertise of the IPDC is a key IPDC strength, and the diplomatic component can be reinforced through further support and commitment from the Permanent Delegations.
- On balance, the 'earmarking' modality appears to be working as intended to attract additional funding, but its long-term effects on the Special Account needs to be monitored.
- An IPDC Strategic Framework approved by the Council, more comprehensive than the Project Priorities, would enable more focused discussions within the Bureau concerning Special Initiatives and FIT Projects.

6.3. IPDC POSITIONING IN CI/FEM DIVISION

275. The IPDC Secretariat is located within the CI Sector. Its positioning internally is highly relevant to whether it can extract full advantage from IPDC's specific features, facilitate effective cooperation and complementarity with other parts of the CI Sector, and maximise the overall value added to CI activities and expected results.

MANAGING MLAs, ERs AND RESOURCES

276. UNESCO activities are governed by the C/5 Programme and Budget which translates strategic objectives and policy directions in the Medium-Term Strategy 2014-2021 (C/4), endorsed by Member States, into concrete actions. The C/5 covers a four-year period (two 'bienniums') and is reviewed half way through. Budgets are allocated to *Main Lines of Action* (MLAs), each of which has associated with it *Expected Results* (ERs) which in turn have associated *Performance Indicators*. Budgets are assigned down to the ER level, the rationale being to link expenditure to results. The CI Sector drafts MLAs and ERs are developed in discussions between the Section Chiefs, Directors, the ADG and the Bureau of Strategic Planning (BSP) and then submitted for consideration by the Member States.

277. Formally, IPDC is a separate inter-governmental body under the UNESCO General Conference. Its Secretariat is part of the wider *Freedom of Expression and Media Development* (FEM) Division of the CI Sector, sitting alongside two Sections, *Freedom of Expression* (FOE) and *Media Development and Society* (MAS). The Director of CI/FEM is the IPDC Secretary, and the Secretariat (although not formally a unit in the UNESCO structure) is headed by the IPDC Deputy Secretary who – as per job description – serves as programme manager.

278. Distributing responsibilities and facilitating active cooperation and complementarity between its constituent parts to achieve objectives is a management task facing all UNESCO Divisions and, on a larger scale, Sectors.

279. The Division has the following Main Line of Action (MLA) and Expected Results in the 2018-2021 (39 C/5) period:

- MLA1: Fostering freedom of expression online and offline, promoting the safety of journalists, advancing diversity and participation in the media, and supporting independent media.
- ER1: Member States are enhancing norms and policies related to freedom of expression, including press freedom and the right to access information, online and offline, and are reinforcing the safety of journalists by implementing the UN Plan of Action on the Safety of Journalists and the Issue of Impunity;
- ER2: Member States have benefited from enhanced media contributions to diversity, gender-equality and youth empowerment in and through media; and societies are empowered through media and information literacy programmes and effective media response to emergency and disaster;
- ER3: Media development is strengthened, and Member States have improved monitoring and reporting systems, and these results are reinforced by external grassroots projects supported by the IPDC.

280. A number of important points arise here. These ERs express the ultimate outcomes sought from CI/FEM and (as can be seen above) the General Conference updates and amends these, thus reflecting shifts in circumstances and priorities. The internal structure of a Division is influenced, in addition to these, by other dynamics such as the skills available, its history and previous and ongoing activities, and the degree of complementarity between these ERs. ERs do not always correspond precisely to Sections or units from a resource management perspective, and nor are they intended to create a rigid correspondence, even though there is a broad match between the three CI/FEM ERs and the two Sections and IPDC Secretariat.¹⁰⁴

SPECIFIC CHALLENGES

281. This distinction between ERs and Secretariat structures applies especially in relation to IPDC since the determination of the latter's priorities is the responsibility of the IPDC Council which, while fully aligned with the C5 broadly, is not entirely encapsulated within the process of determining those of CI/FEM.

282. In practice, not all IPDC programme activities are focused on achieving ER3. For instance, some of its activities in relation to the safety of journalists fall under ER1, and others support media pluralism which falls under ER2. Conversely, staff in the two Sections also engage in actions that directly contribute to IPDC and ER3. It follows that the budget, operational and staff, allocated to each of the ERs does not fully correspond with the activities of each of the three CI/FEM units (i.e. the two Sections and the Secretariat).¹⁰⁵

283. If anything the partial correspondence between the three CI/FEM units and the ERs is a further complicating factor in what is already a difficult task facing the CI/FEM Director in managing the Division's resources to achieve these goals. However, it is clear that the core task is to manage the entire Division's resources as effectively as possible to achieve the three ERs; and not as 'silos' where each unit part of the whole devotes itself exclusively to a specific ER and ignores complementarities between them. How to achieve effective collaboration within the whole team is the key management challenge.

¹⁰⁴ Illustrating this, the MLA1 2014-2015 plan originally submitted by CI Sector/BSP sought just two ERs, but Member States reinstated three to have clearer visibility for IPDC, and similarly for IFAP under MLA2.

¹⁰⁵ Nevertheless, a high degree of correspondence between ERs and institutional units does simplify management and reporting lines and reduces bureaucracy for example in preparing performance reports.

284. Two factors complicate the task. First the core mission of CI/FEM (or indeed ultimately of the CI Sector as a whole) cannot easily be divided into discrete objectives, between which all the inter-linkages can readily be identified and operationalised. Promoting media and communication sector development resists dissection into sub-objectives that can be pursued in relative isolation from each other. The media sector as a whole has a greater degree of interdependence and intertwining of dynamics than has, for instance, the education sector that can be divided broadly into different sub-sectors.

285. This applies even more clearly to the CI/FEM MLA for 2018-2021: “Fostering freedom of expression online and offline, promoting the safety of journalists, advancing diversity and participation in media, and supporting independent media”. All four embedded sub-objectives are closely interdependent and hence interventions to bring them about, in most cases, will necessarily be addressing more than one.

286. The second reason for complexity rests in the fact that being a Secretariat of an intergovernmental body, the IPDC Secretariat is qualitatively different from the two CI/FEM Sections. In addition, as argued in Section *IPDC’s Defining Features*, the bulk of the Secretariat’s work under IPDC auspices is inherently *qualitatively distinct* and, in certain circumstances, it deploys specific features and strengths that other CI interventions cannot.

287. Because of this, the key question here is not how to differentiate the *issues* to be addressed by IPDC from those of the two FEM Sections (in fact IPDC’s mandate would cover most or all of CI’s issues), but rather how to articulate *these strengths of IPDC* with those of these Sections, bearing in mind IPDC’s broad mandate, in the light of the skills and resources available to each and in the context of achieving the overall CI/FEM (and broader CI) MLA and objectives.

288. Thus, the mandate of IPDC cuts across all areas, most clearly illustrated by the fact that the annual Projects approved contribute to many if not most of the issues and target groups addressed by the other two Sections (and even some by the KSD Division).

289. These factors explain the comment in the 2016 Audit Report¹⁰⁶ that “a comparison of development of the activities of IPDC and the CI Sector in the area of freedom of expression and media pluralism does not reveal a clear distinction between each vector.” (para 202) The distinction is to be found in the fact that the unique IPDC governance and mandate mean that there are different strengths in terms of how their respective interventions can achieve outcomes. The core challenge is thus how to locate the IPDC within the CI Sector to maximise the strengths of each and their complementarities.

290. All this also explains why there is necessarily a significant synergy between the three CI/FEM ERs, their activities and performance indicators. Among them are the following:

- Safety of journalists and the issue of impunity (ER1, *World Trends* and ER3 *DG’s Report*)
- Plan of Action on Safety of Journalists (ER1 and ER3)
- Media and gender (ER2 and ER3);
- Community media (ER2 and ER3);

¹⁰⁶ *New Audits by the External Auditor: Audit Report of the Communication and Information Sector (CI)*. 200 EX/20.INF.3. Paris, 1 September 2016.

- Contributing to *International Day for Universal Access to Information* (ER1 and ER3 through IPDC Talks);
- Media policy formulation (ER1 and ER3);
- Journalist capacity building (ER1 and ER3).

291. As noted already, the mandates of IPDC and of the Division are independently determined by the UNESCO General Conference. Many other inter-reinforcing dimensions are evident from the C/5.

292. The CI/FEM Director manages this by allocating tasks in a manner that optimises the use of staff resources between and within the different sections, a degree of flexibility as to which ER is associated with which part of the division. The safety of journalists (see Box), with its multiple actions, offers an example of the allocation of labour guided by the Division structure, the location of appropriate skills and resources, and the type of intervention. The main point of reference is not, in this case, the individual units or even ERs, but rather the overall Division MLA and objective that calls for promoting the safety of journalists and is achieved through mobilising at multiple points across all sub-components of the Division.

Who does what in the Safety of Journalist initiative? An example of collaboration at work.

At a practical level the data collection and write up of the DG's Report was first undertaken by the IPDC Secretariat. At a later stage, due to internal staff movements and budget constraints, it was undertaken by FOE Section staff (with the Director's involvement and oversight), as also occurs in alternate years with the World Trends report – which, by dint of the General Conference resolution on which World Trends is mandated, relies on the IPDC mechanism. The mechanics of format, translation and presentation are done by IPDC Secretariat.

For support to journalist safety activities, the division of labour again is based on where internal expertise lies. Hence a key training of judges activity is undertaken by the FOE section (again with the Director's oversight), originating in an initiative that commenced in an IPDC Project in Mexico, then grew and attracted further funding, from SIDA outside of IPDC, and from Denmark inside IPDC (for African judges courses). Recently a curriculum on journalism safety was also developed for journalism schools in the Arab region, led by the FOE Section but with IPDC Secretariat support.

Dutch support via IPDC contributed to the Geneva Conference on the UN Plan of Action, which was organised by the FOE section and with IPDC Secretariat input. The SDG 16.10.1 indicator on safety of journalists is serviced through the IPDC Secretariat working with the FOE section (including on the technical workshop in Geneva ahead of the recent UN Plan workshop). The recent IPDC publication of examples of enhancing journalists' safety in practice was delivered through the work of the IPDC Secretariat and Director which complements and supports the wider Division effort. Most grants to journalism safety Projects, including earmarked projects supporting national reporting mechanisms, are overseen by the IPDC Secretariat in consultation with FOE and by field colleagues.

Finally, the International Day to End Impunity for Crimes against Journalists, on November 2nd, is a common enterprise by staff from across the Division, with the FOE Section being the primary actor.

ISSUES ARISING

293. Addressing the added complexity of containing the Secretariat of an external intergovernmental entity within a Division can give rise to some complications from a couple of directions.

294. One is around communication and cooperation. The evaluator came across several cases where communication and cooperation between the parts of CI/FEM Division was less than optimal. Some instances concerned a lack of information, or incorrect information, concerning actions and responsibilities. In others, a lack of willingness to reach out and maximise opportunities for cooperation was evident. Though the specific cases were relatively minor, they point to underlying structural issues and misunderstandings. Some of the issues raised above may partly account for this, including the necessarily transversal nature of IPDC's mandate within CI. But the fact that IPDC's current Priorities are not fully and clearly articulated with the ER3 and the ER structure in general may also be a cause of some confusion. What are in fact complementarities may be misunderstood as overlaps or competing actions, or as disconnected activities. For instance, where a Priority is represented as focusing on *implementing media indicators* as distinct from contributing to the *outcome to which such an assessment using the indicators can contribute*, then problems may arise in coordinating with complementary activities between CI.

295. A structural fact may also partly account for this. The FOE and MAS Sections each has a P-5 Section Chief, while the IPDC Secretariat has a P-4 Programme Specialist as the IPDC Deputy Secretary managing other members of the Secretariat and its work, and reporting directly to the Director (also the IPDC Secretary). The IPDC Secretariat is thus positioned below the level of a Section though it reports directly to the Director. This has practical implications. The CI Senior Management Team meets monthly, and comprises the ADG, two Directors and Section Chiefs but excludes the manager of the IPDC Secretariat (i.e. the Deputy Secretary of the IPDC).¹⁰⁷ The FEM Director represents both the Division and IPDC (as Secretary).

296. As a consequence, the Secretariat's manager is outside the Divisional management decision-making and communication circuit, and relies on briefings from the Director.¹⁰⁸ Furthermore, the dual role of the Director also appears to be a source of communication shortcomings and misunderstanding between the IPDC Secretariat and the two Sections.

297. A second consequence relates to external relations with donors. Each of the parts of the overall FEM Division can and does approach donors separately, though there is progress in channelling all of this through the Director. However, Section Chiefs participate in management meetings where funding opportunities and fundraising strategies are discussed and decided, leaving the IPDC Secretariat to be represented by the Director (as IPDC Secretary) who also has to represent the whole Division. This has in the past led to constraints on opportunities for successful fundraising for IPDC and been the source of misunderstandings. Given the necessarily complex overlapping areas of responsibility, and the additional funding mechanisms associated with different intervention types, this can heighten the sense of confusion among donors mentioned above and engender a logic of

¹⁰⁷ By contrast, although (like IPDC) the position of IFAP Secretary is held by the Director of CI/KSD, the IFAP Assistant Secretary is Section Chief of the Universal Access and Preservation Section and is a member of the CI Senior Management Team.

¹⁰⁸ The IPDC Deputy Secretary also has a lower level of access to financial and administrative applications (SISTER, Tulip, Contracts), and cannot authorise certain expenditures (including IPDC contracts handled by other Sections) or approve staff related issues, sometimes resulting in administrative problems and delays.

competition within the Sector.¹⁰⁹ The latter can in turn lessen the enthusiasm for sharing and cooperation.

298. Such obstacles are best addressed through ensuring that avenues of communication are horizontal, open and operating smoothly and that planning is undertaken in a participatory and transparent manner.

Findings

- The central management task facing the CI/FEM Director is to maximise complementarity and effective use of resources between the three CI/FEM units in terms of achieving the common MLA and three inter-related ERs.
- Taking full advantage of IPDC's potential means it necessarily has a transversal or horizontal position in CI in relation to the themes, issues, outcomes and targets it addresses, which are in turn determined by those most suited to leveraging IPDC's strengths.
- The integration of the IPDC Secretariat into a new Section for Media Development with an upgrading of the position of IPDC Deputy Secretary to Section Chief and the corresponding inclusion of the IPDC Deputy Secretary as a full member of the CI Management Team, would enable improved communication internally in CI and externally with donors, and enhance coordination and implementation of complementarity between the various CI/FEM component parts.

6.4. COSTS AND BENEFITS OF GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE

299. The 2016 Audit Report on the Communication and Information Sector¹¹⁰ recommended a study of "the costs and benefits of maintaining specific governance for the [IPDC]." (para.205) The cost specifically of supporting IPDC governance structures were presented earlier. The annual staff and operational cost of the Council and Bureau comes to approximately US\$183,000, of which about US\$60,000 is the annual average cost of travel, subsistence, translation and materials of the Bureau and (biennial) Council meetings. The remaining US\$123,000 covers the staff of the Secretariat Unit.

300. Benefits deriving from the IPDC governance can be approached in a few different ways. First, the value added by IPDC specific characteristics can be described in qualitative terms, as a counterfactual assessment of what would have occurred in its absence. Drawing on the *section IPDC's Defining Features* above, a key strength of IPDC is the timely and efficient endorsement of normative instruments and activities by specialist IPDC Council delegates. These might not otherwise gain UNESCO General Conference approval in a timely and efficient manner. Two such initiatives stand out:

- UNESCO's mandate that led to the DG's Report derives from an IPDC Council decision that effectively initiated the wider process that is now the UN Plan of Action. Without the IPDC

¹⁰⁹ The Audit Report on CI (200 EX/20.INF.3 2016) notes: "... there is real competition between the activities of IPDC and the other activities of the FEM Division and the CI Sector... That competition concerns resource mobilisation and the management of activities." (para 199)

¹¹⁰ *New Audits by the External Auditor: Audit Report of the Communication and Information Sector (CI)*. 200 EX/20.INF.3. Paris, 1 September 2016.

Council having emphasized this as a key issue and using its unique mandate in media to act on it, it is highly unlikely that the wider process would have got underway. The supporting IPDC Projects and the endorsement of the JSI framework are, it seems likely, far more effective as a result of the IPDC endorsement, empowering civil society actors to work on their own and with government and others to address journalists' safety in practical ways.

- The design of the MDI framework began by reviewing other media assessment tools, several of which had already been developed by INGOs.¹¹¹ The IPDC Council endorsement helped to overcome barriers that had hindered previous frameworks: the acceptance, in a highly charged international media environment, of the framework's impartiality and hence a willingness of government institutions to engage on it with other sectoral stakeholders. This has enabled civil society in some countries to strengthen media law and policy in ways that would otherwise have been difficult or impossible. There is strong evidence that the MDIs and supporting activities are having an impact in at least some of the countries where they are implemented.

301. Second, IPDC endorsement of the annual Projects and FIT projects, quite apart from the specific normative work above, is regarded by some donors as an effective means to invest in relatively sensitive areas especially where it involves non-governmental actors or collaborations. The direct approval of the IPDC intergovernmental mechanism with its immediate proximity to Member States confers a higher degree of legitimacy and neutrality to donor-funded projects than if they were routed through the CI Sector in general. The Special Account, as a pooled mechanism to support small projects across many countries, though recently less attractive to donors, nevertheless continues to attract funds because of its direct and flexible support to media, civil society and community based organisations. Although contributions fell very significantly between 2012 and 2015, the introduction of the 'earmarked' fund mechanisms appears to be counteracting this.

302. Third, for Field Offices, funding by means of IPDC Projects has features that differentiate it from Regular Programme funds. Forming partnerships and launching Projects is simple and direct. It means IPDC Projects can reach partners and address themes in a timely manner that might otherwise be difficult.

303. At a higher level, the IPDC Council offers the elected Member States a unique entry into both the wider intergovernmental space and national level dynamics in media and communication. The IPDC as a platform can offer significant agenda-setting influence in the wider UN system, as is evident from the safety of journalists issues, and through building momentum for change across many countries and regions, for instance through the MDIs. Strong attendance levels, including non-sitting UNESCO Member State observers, at Council meetings adds credence to there being a high level of interest. This it can do thanks to a governance structure that allows it to steer highly complex and sometimes contentious issues and proposals through to ultimate acceptance by the General Conference - items that might be too complex to navigate through already over-loaded mainstream UNESCO processes such as the Executive Board.

304. Stepping back from IPDC governance structures to look at the overall cost and benefits of IPDC, some figures can be considered.

¹¹¹ Andrew Puddephatt. 2007. *Defining Indicators for media Development, a background paper*. Paris: UNESCO. <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0016/001600/160017eb.pdf>

305. The average extrabudgetary funds received by IPDC over the last seven years amounted to about US\$1.57 million annually (Table 18). The approximate cost of managing these, both staff and operational (including governance related), is US\$400,000 (Table 7), excluding the Regular Budget operational support, equivalent to about 25% of the funds. The two other CI/FEM Sections attract significantly more extrabudgetary funds. In the 2016-2017 expenditure plan, the ratio of funds to costs was expected to be just 6% for FEM/FOE and 10% for FEM/MAS.¹¹²

306. The IPDC in its current form unavoidably incurs an additional fixed overhead to pay for its governance structures, and the cost of selecting and administering many small Projects is higher than a few large ones. Large projects can also include an amount to engage management externally. But these governance structures and the annual Project cycles can in turn attract an amount of donor funding for projects, not precisely quantifiable but certainly a significant proportion of the total that would not otherwise be available to the CI Sector. The IPDC's special features, which are inherently linked to those governance structures, also offer unique opportunities to influence and generate outcomes to CI and UNESCO that would not otherwise be available. These too resist precise quantification in terms of benefits, but the evidence in this report shows that they are tangible.

307. At the same time, it is clear that the IPDC mechanism, and in particular the annual round of Project approval, with its current staff levels could, as it has in the past, handle a significantly higher throughput of funds in the Special Account. As the IPDC attracts additional extrabudgetary funds, therefore, the ratio of funds to costs would decline dramatically.

308. As regards efficiency, users generally believe the move to an online system has led to a great improvement of the Project selection procedure, and reduced the overall administration time at Field and Headquarters. It has also enhanced mechanisms available to the Secretariat and Bureau members to comment in a transparent and efficient manner. Further improvements, of a relatively minor nature, have been suggested and it is an opportune time now to review its operation, gather systematic feedback and implement changes as appropriate.

309. The procedures deployed compare favourably against those of another programme that administers small-scale projects at a global level, i.e. WACC's DIP programme. The stages of the process and practices are comparable, allowing for different circumstances of the two programmes, each having arrived at ways to identify, select, assess and rank programmes following relatively complex but flexible criteria. The DIP programme requires 3.5 to 4.5 staff months to administer annually, with less than 30 projects per year. The IPDC estimate is 7.5 months for an average of 69 Projects annually between 2011 and 2017.¹¹³ Both sets of figures exclude the time of those spent encouraging or supporting projects outside the headquarters level.

¹¹² This is not a direct comparison. These figures, taken from 37 C/5, equate ER1 and ER2 to FEM/FOE and FEM/MAS respectively, while the IPDC figures are based on averages calculated for this evaluation.

¹¹³ Estimate provided by IPDC Secretariat.

Findings

- A key benefit of the IPDC governance structure is its capacity to secure timely and efficient UNESCO endorsement of normative instruments, conceived and launched jointly by specialist and diplomatic Council delegates.
- It is likely that a significant proportion of funding that goes to the IPDC Special Account and FIT would not be available to the CI Sector – and to Field Offices – were the structures and mechanisms not available in their current form.
- The IPDC governance structure enables Field Offices to engage on issues and with partners that they otherwise could not.
- IPDC governance can enable Member States to gain access, thanks to the governance structures, to intergovernmental arenas (such as input into the formulation of SDGs) and national dynamics (such as support for Projects originating in and for less-developed countries where media development assistance is valued).
- The ratio of costs to extrabudgetary contributions, at about 25%, is very high compared to FOE and MAS, reflecting the staff time absorbed in serving grant-making for a large number of small Projects involved and the steep fall in donor funds between 2011 and 2016. This needs to be set against the specific output benefits of funds channelled through the IPDC.
- The IPDC saw a serious decline in extrabudgetary funding between 2011 and 2015 but recovered somewhat since. Its governance structures and funding modalities contribute to its capacity to attract funds, and other factors (e.g. see Section 3.5) account for this decline.
- The revised Project selection process could handle considerably higher volume of funds, and attracting such funds will be critical to an improved cost-to-contribution ratio.
- The IPDC Project selection and administration process, even at its current volume levels,

6.5. MONITORING AND EVALUATION FRAMEWORK

310. Monitoring and evaluating outcomes is a major challenge for a programme that funds multiple small projects, since the cost of undertaking comprehensive ongoing monitoring and review of each and every intervention is prohibitive. Less resource-intensive approaches must be devised.

311. At present the IPDC lacks a formal monitoring and evaluation framework *per se*, but has a set of actions and practices that have evolved over time. In addition to the initial Project Description, each Project (working with or through the Field Office) produces an Interim Report at the end of the calendar year in which the grant is approved, and then a Final Report (or ‘Implementation Report’) on completion. These reports are not uniformly available online¹¹⁴, and it has not been possible to

¹¹⁴ Descriptions of Projects submitted annually, a list of those approved, compilations of interim and final reports (as submitted to the Bureau) and evaluations undertaken up to 2012 (when they ceased) are downloadable in separate part of the following webpage: <https://en.unesco.org/programme/ipdc/documents> The description of Projects approved are available in the Project Database Website https://teamsnet.unesco.org/en-us/Lists/IPDC_Submissions

establish exactly for instance how many Projects actually deliver both Reports (partly because of discontinuation of, or delays in, some Projects). The reports tend to be schematic, referring to outputs specified in the Project Description, and each has a section on *Challenges and Key Lessons* and sometimes on *Analytical Reflections*.

312. While Field Offices play an important role in ensuring accountability, in the sense that they can verify that the work was undertaken and in which areas and Priorities, their contribution to providing ongoing feedback on each Project's outcomes, or on the wider Programme in relation to a set of indicators, is limited. Since independent Project-level evaluations were discontinued in 2012 (see next paragraph) an annual summary Analytical Report has been produced for Bureau meetings, compiled from Interim and Final Reports. While it draws general lessons, the exercise is insufficiently resourced to draw conclusions that can enhance programme design or implementation.

313. Until 2012, the IPDC set aside funding from the Special Account to evaluate annually, using local experts, a selection of less than 5% of all Projects; but when donor funding fell this was discontinued.¹¹⁵ A compilation of such reports was presented to Council meetings, the last in 2012, but no mechanisms were in place to ensure that lessons emerging were fed back to improve targeting or Project effectiveness. It was more a reporting exercise than a learning one, though in the absence of much else they did prove useful in the context of this evaluation.

314. The central concern here is not necessarily that existing Project monitoring and evaluation activities are not more elaborate. This would inevitably be more resource and time consuming, raising another set of questions. Rather it is that no coherent IPDC Programme framework is in place for monitoring and evaluation. Instead, a number of practices are pursued to ensure a minimal level of accountability, but little else. This has consequences in terms of learning for the Programme itself, but also for external evaluations including this one.

315. While this conclusion is drawn mainly from the analysis of IPDC Projects, it applies also to the wider IPDC interventions including Special Initiatives and FITs. While some of these have been subject to evaluation, these do not comprise part of a wider reference framework for IPDC as a whole. Such a framework would involve the development of a coherent set of output and outcome indicators, set against baselines and linked to Priorities, and aligned with CI ERs and coherent with their related performance indicators.

316. The nature of the IPDC Programme certainly presents specific challenges to effective evaluation. However, innovative solutions can be found. For instance, selective Project analysis could extract strategic lessons for the *Project identification and selection phase*, with the emphasis more on selecting Projects more likely to succeed than on identifying specific outcomes. Insights would be gathered into the types of characteristics, dynamics and environments that enable small Projects to succeed, and others to failure.

[Final/AllItems.aspx](#) in a searchable form but in two separate and different databases, one for 1980 to 2015 and the other since then (though the latter are not in downloadable form – they can just be searched and viewed online).

¹¹⁵ In fact, the amount set aside had just been increased. The 2011 IPDC Bureau minutes note: "The IPDC Bureau approved a Decision increasing the funds allocated from the IPDC Special Account for evaluation activities in order to enable the IPDC Secretariat to reinforce the evaluation of IPDC projects and ensure adequate follow-up. The biennial allocation will thus increase from US\$25,000 (53rd IPDC Bureau meeting, March 2009) to US\$40,000 in view of financing the missions of independent evaluators to complete at least 12 evaluation reports on terminated projects per biennium."

317. In devising an approach to evaluation the IPDC should also bear in mind that following the UNESCO Evaluation Policy approved in 2015¹¹⁶ extrabudgetary programmes will be subject to external evaluation, though the timetable is yet to be determined. Resources will have to be set aside (the Policy sets 3% as the target) to ensure the regular evaluation of IPDC.

Findings

- The monitoring and evaluation activities currently in place are insufficient in two areas. First, they provide only very limited learning to IPDC Programme stakeholders that might enable them to monitor and improve the Programme and the Projects supported under it. Second, a robust system to monitor performance against IPDC outcome indicators, with clear baselines and targets, is lacking.
- The frequency of external evaluations of IPDC (previous ones were in 2002 and 2006) is insufficient to enable the assessment of outcomes and the identification of lessons learned, and to inform programme design, delivery and strategic decision-making.

6.6. GENDER EQUALITY

318. Gender Equality is one of UNESCO's two global priorities, committing the organisation to support it across the organisation. The issue of gender equality has recently been raised in the IPDC and discussion is ongoing.

319. The UNESCO approach to promoting gender equality deploys a three part concept: On a rising scale, workplans can be classified as 'gender sensitive' (gender differences are identified and acknowledged); 'gender responsive' (in addition, factors that address the different needs are identified) and/or 'gender transformative' (actions are proposed that brings about changes in gender equality).¹¹⁷

320. The GSIM is a specific tool designed to address gender issues. However, all IPDC Project applications must apply a gender-sensitivity criterion. The application conditions note, in a negative formulation, that IPDC will not normally support: "Projects which do not demonstrate gender-sensitivity as regards the ultimate beneficiaries (for instance, which fail to disaggregate how many men and how many women will benefit)." In addition, applications are provided with guidelines that explicitly include reference to gender in four sections, including project justification (Section 1); target groups (Section 2) and project outputs and activities (Sections 5 and 6).

321. An Information Note to the March 2015 IPDC Bureau set out the situation at that time, based on research undertaken into 80 Project proposals. With basic fulfilment at a low threshold, the research also found a poor level of compliance in specific sections of the application form. For instance, less than half of the proposals included gender disaggregated information for target groups (Section 2) and just over one-third in relation to outputs (Section 5).

322. The Bureau recommendations were: i) to alert Field Office and HQ staff on the need to improve gender mainstreaming in the context of the three part definition above; ii) to underline the

¹¹⁶ UNESCO Evaluation Policy 196 EX/24.INF. See http://www.unesco.org/new/fileadmin/MULTIMEDIA/HQ/IOS/images/UNESCO_Evaluation_Policy_EN.pdf

¹¹⁷ See *Guidelines for the formulation of 38 C/5 Regular Programme Workplans* at http://www.unesco.org/new/fileadmin/MULTIMEDIA/HQ/BSP/GENDER/GEMinSISTERODGGE_01.pdf

role of the former in ensuring that Projects proposals adequately address the issue; iii) to develop and promote a Quality Checklist to enable Field Offices to improve compliance (implemented for 2016 Projects onwards); and iv) for the Secretariat to develop an alternative and improved Proposal format in the medium term.

323. On the positive side, the research noted a “continued rise” in the number of gender specific Projects, which came to 14% in 2014. By 2015, this had risen to 21% according to a further Information Note to the Bureau in 2016 which also outlined some examples of gender-transformative IPDC Projects.¹¹⁸ However, an upward trend is difficult to confirm since the figures in 2016 and 2017 were 12% and 19% respectively. By 2016, the majority of IPDC Projects had gender-sensitive components, partly as a response to the Checklist that had been implemented as part of the application process, and it is now mandatory for all future IPDC Projects. The IPDC Chair has been proactively seeking funding, a direct result being a multi-country Project recently supported by the Netherlands to promote gender equality in media.

324. The 2016 Bureau meeting “agreed to consider increasing the priority given to gender-transformative project proposals”.¹¹⁹ The Secretariat, at the request of the Bureau, organised a Thematic Debate on gender transformative projects¹²⁰ at the 30th Council Session in November 2016, and the issue was debated although no decision was taken on whether a greater emphasis should be put on the concept.

325. In terms of monitoring the gender emphasis of Projects, and the outcomes, the current *Template for Interim and Final IPDC Implementation Reports* provided to Projects requires no specific requirement to report on any level of gender outputs or outcomes. Many do report on whether their specific gender targets (for instance in relation to number of people of each gender trained) were met. Wider outcomes from a gender perspective are referred to by those Projects that have specifically gender-related goals, but otherwise they tend to receive little attention.

326. It has thus been difficult for this evaluation to assess the nature or depth of outcomes in relation to gender equality.

Findings

- The IPDC from a relatively low threshold has improved the priority given to gender related issues in recent years. Given the major UNESCO emphasis on gender equality as expressed in its Global Priority, and a willingness among IPDC Council, Bureau and Secretariat, it is reasonable to encourage and expect further strengthening here in the future. However, there is a weakness in terms of monitoring gender specific outcomes.

¹¹⁸ Gender-Transformative Projects within the IPDC. 1 February 2016 CI-16/BUR.60/4.2

¹¹⁹ Decisions taken at the 60th IPDC Bureau meeting 17-18 March 2016.

¹²⁰ Noted in: *Concept Note: the power of gender-transformative media development projects*. CI-16 Council -30B.

PART III: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

7. SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS

327. What differentiates IPDC is its mandate as an intergovernmental structure and its specific forms of intervention with their potential for unique outcomes. As an intergovernmental body, IPDC bears organisational expenses; its traditional support to multiple projects of modest size through the pooled Special Account demands certain staff overheads to administer and presents challenges in terms of the evaluation of outcomes; and its extrabudgetary resources have seen a decline in recent years, especially to its Special Account.

328. A key question for this evaluation, the first since 2006, is whether, after 37 years, IPDC has outlived its usefulness and cannot be reformed; or whether it has evolved, and can continue to evolve, to respond to new and emerging challenges for the development of communication.

7.1. IPDC OUTCOMES

329. The evidence available to this evaluation regarding IPDC outcomes draws on a variety of sources, none of which in itself offers definitive answers. However, in combination, some credible overall conclusions can be drawn. Each outcome area in practice combines different types of IPDC intervention, often in close cooperation with other CI Sector activities, and the following conclusions summarise the analysis above:

- a) Based on recent analysis and an external assessment, outcomes are evident in the area of **safety of journalists and the issue of impunity** internationally at UN and INGO level, giving rise to the UN Plan of Action, enhancing the level of debate, understanding and interaction, and impetus is growing. It can be concluded that there is greater responsiveness by governments to address the question through these processes and the DG's Report.

National measures have been initiated around the Action Plan, sometimes reinforced by JSIs and IPDC Projects. There is some evidence that interventions and practical measures, especially joint civil society, media and governmental institutional actions, are making a difference. Evidence of growing impetus means that these intermediate outcomes have the potential to translate in future into significant final outcomes for the journalist target group. This is an area that capitalizes strongly on IPDC core features, through initiating the DG's Report process, endorsing the JSIs and empowering civil society actors.

- b) The MDI Framework is an instrument to facilitate analysis and change and must be considered in the wider context of **media sector reform and development** which embraces numerous IPDC Projects and other actions. This evaluation tends to confirm that benefits are emerging through influencing media policies and laws, offering donors a menu of actions, enhancing a space for stakeholder dialogue and empowers NGOs to contribute, and build UNESCO's relationships. IPDC Project actions can be vital to reinforcing their impact and bringing about sustainable change with civil society involvement.

Other Projects and activities that target media law and policy reform, aside from those associated with MDIs, can – based on more limited evidence – have an impact though this may not be sustained as the challenge originally addressed reasserts itself. These include community media sectoral support. A couple of examples of GSIM implementation examined

suggest that institutional, and sometimes policy or regulatory, change is possible depending on commitment and positioning of those involved.

IPDC Council endorsement is important in most sector level actions here too. The GSIM, however, is implemented at media organisation, not sector, level. That IPDC has endorsed the instrument does not specifically help to open doors (or impact widely) across the industry, except amongst publicly-owned media.

- c) The area of **knowledge-driven media development** was expanded from its origins in the KDMD Special Initiative to include the SDG indicators work. The former has not achieved significant outcomes, whilst the latter has major potential for outcomes both directly gathering and disseminating data, but even more so as an opportunity for civil society and other stakeholders to engage with media and communication and reinforce SDG implementation through knowledge dissemination. The link to SDGs might offer a route to greater recognition of the role of the media and communication sector for instance through UNDAF and regional organisations. The IPDC Talks is currently a useful initiative to explore the options and potential.

IPDC 'branding' may sensitise some governments, predisposing them to support data gathering and achieving the goals; IPDC Council Member States might also recognise the value of the media sector in relation to knowledge dissemination concerning SDGs. IPDC's capacity to enable civil society participation, including in wider stakeholder coalitions with governments, is the area where its unique features can contribute to SDGs.

- d) **The journalism education sector and institutions**, with a strong history in IPDC, is now addressed by the GIEJE Special Initiative. The GIEJE has had very limited outcomes so far, but there is some evidence that IPDC Projects can, and do, enhance the capacity of journalism institutions. Limited evidence from field visits suggests that investment in journalism education, to be sustainable, requires strong institutional management commitment and more sustained, and larger, investment.

This area has been a core concern of IPDC and its mandate from the earliest days and for most Council Member States and at least some Field Offices, it remains a priority. UNESCO curricula and syllabi are important assets to build institutional change. However, the current mechanisms and resources available to IPDC need to be reassessed in terms of whether they can significantly influence the sector. Notwithstanding this, in some countries supporting journalism education is the only means available to IPDC to support media, and it can help to build or maintain bridges into the sector.

- e) IPDC funds **other Projects** not encompassed in the above. In general, these focus at the level of individual media entities and institutions and support training, capacity building and resources, in community media and to journalists directly; and, more recently, emerging issues identified by the IPDC including hate speech in media and conflict-sensitive journalism. The evidence was sufficient to identify two types of such Projects, though not to quantify each.

Many training and support Projects can generate significant benefits for their implementing organisation, but these tend not to be sustained. IPDC outcomes are often miniscule compared to national sector needs and few such Projects draw on the core strengths of IPDC.

Other Projects aimed directly at individual organisations have yielded strong and sustained benefits, often at sector level. Several Field Offices and HQ staff highly value being able to

respond in a timely manner to innovative ideas, and report sustained outcomes from Projects with few prospects of securing support elsewhere. IPDC has been able to respond quickly to some emergencies (Ebola in particular), and this outcome has potential. Factors that influence success include their strategic orientation, the level of institutional support and wider environment, and due attention must be given to these in the design and selection stages. Drawing firm and comprehensive conclusions across all areas would require more evidence.

Conclusion:

The evidence available shows convincingly that IPDC interventions have achieved significant outcomes in several key focus areas. Furthermore, much of the impact, in several areas, is directly associated with features that are specific to IPDC and derive from its governance structures and instruments. Some of the most significant outcomes could not have been achieved by any other means.

7.2. IPDC STRATEGIC MANDATE AND PRIORITIES

330. The IPDC is an intergovernmental entity under the UNESCO General Conference with governance structures and financing modalities, and a history, that give to it a unique set of features. These features can be, and are, used to bring about change that in some cases could not happen by any other means.

331. Among media and communication bodies internationally, IPDC occupies a unique position in relation to developing ideas and mechanisms informed both by specialist expertise and diplomatic possibilities. The normative content of these is a core feature of IPDC, and its structure means it commands respect among Member States as impartial, independent and technically proficient and reliable. For IPDC Council members, it offers a platform of learning and influence at intergovernmental and national levels, to influence intergovernmental agendas and support national trends and dynamics.

332. Other features are more practical and operational, especially for UNESCO Field Offices. The CI Sector's ability to draw on a network of 30 Programme Specialists and project officers, international and national, means that IPDC Projects can be rolled out nationally with minimal demands for approval and bureaucracy. This can address emerging and emergency issues and support, if modestly, issues neglected by other actors and agencies. The annual IPDC proposal development process, though time consuming for some, is considered worthwhile in terms of extending networks and obtaining bottom-up feedback.

333. The capacity of IPDC to provide a rapid response mechanism to respond to urgent communication needs in countries hit by crisis, disaster or other emergencies, needs also to be highlighted.

334. These defining features are what IPDC brings to the table and must leverage effectively to maintain and build its relevance.

335. Although it has a unique mandate and dynamic, the IPDC is anchored in CI through the Secretariat, positioned alongside the two Sections in the CI/FEM Division. The IPDC mandate and priorities and those of CI, also as expressed in the C/5, are overwhelmingly complementary and the potential for mutually beneficial collaboration and synergies is substantial. Media sectoral development overall, unavoidably involves a high degree of integration of actions across its various

vectors. It is not amenable to being divided into relatively discrete sub-sectors. There is thus a significant mutuality of issues and target groups and interweaving of means and ends, and this is reflected in the allocations of tasks and responsibilities across especially CI/FEM.

336. Nevertheless, the IPDC and its Secretariat is differentiated from the two Sections by its distinctively broad mandate, cutting across all areas of media development, and by its unique governance features and the means it has at its disposal to exert influence. In practice, this means that IPDC, working optimally, can and does initiate ideas and processes that enable it to then direct work to other parts of CI; and that other parts of CI can use IPDC to reinforce their own areas of activity.

337. Thus the articulation of IPDC and CI in a manner that maximises the potential of each and of their collaboration is highly complex. Management of the CI/FEM Division requires the encouragement and introduction of a highly collaborative culture and approach, allocating responsibilities and tasks according to the skills and strengths of each component of the whole and staff members.

338. Dealing with this complexity and achieving complementarity can encounter obstacles, from a couple of directions. Specifically, unlike in IFAP, the manager of the IPDC Secretariat (i.e. the Deputy Secretary) is currently below a Section Chief level position and therefore does not attend and participate in Sector management meetings and communicate at the same level, and the Director then re-briefs this incumbent which duplicates work. More significantly, while the Director is required to fundraise on behalf of IPDC and for the Division as a whole, this can heighten the sense of confusion among donors and perceptions of competition between the sub-components of the Division.

339. Donors and other external actors also expressed some concern about the clarity of IPDC's own strategic focus and priorities.

340. IPDC does not have a strategic plan *per se* and its mandate is broad. Its six Priorities are associated solely with the Projects annually approved; and they sit alongside Special Initiatives, Funds-in-Trust projects and other occasional interventions approved by the Bureau. Although there are interactions between them - for instance many Projects reinforce Special Initiatives - their relationship, strategically or operationally, is not explicit or planned in any depth. Funding modalities evolve responding to opportunities rather than a plan for a specific suite of options.

341. This has positive aspects, such as the flexibility to respond to a changing media environment, Council and Bureau concerns, emergency situations, and donor trends. Furthermore, in specific targeted areas IPDC has greatly strengthened its profile and is an acknowledged leader, specifically in the safety of journalists and in media indicators.

342. However, flexibility also comes at a price. IPDC's overall focus has become somewhat blurred in recent years, and it is difficult to describe precisely its objectives, unique strengths and the instruments it uses to achieve them. For many, IPDC is known for supporting a large number of small Projects, but not for what these actually achieve, and not for its achievements in other areas. The evolution of the current six Priorities has been iterative and responsive to issues at the time, meaning that it is now appropriate to reconfigure these in terms of a strategic framework that will enable prioritisation amongst them and clearer relations to the Special Initiatives (see Recommendation 1 in the next chapter).

343. Clarifying the ambiguous positioning would support IPDC in moving forward. A starting point for a review of its objectives and priorities would be to consider, as outlined here, which of the many

IPDC interventions draw most strongly on its unique features and leverage its strengths. The importance of developing a strategic framework to simplify, harmonise and maximise focus, cannot be under-rated.

Conclusions:

- It is important that IPDC clearly identify and document its key unique features derived from its mandate, articulate how they add value and deliver benefits for certain types of interventions, and thus prioritize the maintenance and strengthening of these features in the future.
- The core challenge for the CI/FEM Division is how to combine the IPDC unique mandate and governance structures and its Secretariat with other parts of the CI Sector, taking full advantage of the strengths of each to maximise complementarities. Good communication channels between all component parts is an essential part of this, and the current management and staff configuration is not conducive to this.
- IPDC is currently characterised by a recognised profile and success in specific areas and activities, combined with overall lack of clarity, especially but not exclusively externally, concerning its core mission, what differentiates it from others, and its specific strengths.

7.3. PROJECT AND INTERVENTION SELECTION PROCESSES

344. The implementation and administration of the annual IPDC Project cycle tackles a complex set of challenges and does so, overall, efficiently and effectively. It compares well against a somewhat similar global programme (WACC's DIP), and the online system developed in recent years is a significant improvement. The division of responsibilities between Field Offices (who broadly value the process IPDC Project selection), Secretariat and Bureau is appropriate and no additional role is envisaged for the IPDC Council in this.

345. Several concerns were voiced and the process can be improved through relatively minor adjustments at most of its stages, from the initial call for proposals through to support and submission by Field Offices, Secretariat processes and pre-selection, commenting and final Bureau selection.

346. The design and processing of individual Special Initiatives and Funds-in-Trust projects also works effectively, led sometimes by the Bureau, especially the Chair, and by the Secretariat and approved by the Bureau and ultimately the Council.

347. Regular monitoring and evaluation by the Secretariat of IPDC intervention outcomes is currently very limited, and insufficient to enable ongoing judgement of outcomes and the application of learning.

348. Cost effectiveness and value for money are complex questions. First, the Bureau and Council governance structures incur an estimated average annual US\$183,000 support and administration costs. This can be set against the unique benefits associated with these structures, most notably those deriving from the work on safety of journalists at both international and national levels; and the MDIs and, more widely, media sector reform actions in so far as they draw on IPDC's unique features. Other areas, especially where they support and create space for civil society and media to input into policy, are also relevant.

349. A second way of considering the issue is whether the IPDC structures are seen as valuable from the donor perspective, and whether they attract extrabudgetary funds that might not otherwise be available. The answer to the first part is positive: some current donors highly value what the IPDC governance delivers. A definitive answer is more difficult on the second part but it seems likely that a significant proportion of funding that goes to the IPDC Special Account does so because of its specific features and would not otherwise be available to the CI Sector.

350. A further benefit of IPDC funds derived from its governance is at field level, where IPDC Project legitimacy enables CI Programme Specialists to form partnerships and coalitions, such as by bringing together government, media and civil society actors.

351. Seen in this light the cost of governance delivers tangible and sometimes unique benefits.

352. Since the governance costs are fixed, a decline in IPDC extrabudgetary resources would weigh the scales more heavily against the continuation of these structures (or indeed the continuation of IPDC activities in any form). On the other hand, if extrabudgetary funds rise as they have been in the last two years, then the cost relative to benefits of the governance structures falls.

353. In terms of value for money more broadly, the IPDC Secretariat has attracted and managed per staff member far more modest amounts of extrabudgetary funds than either of the two CI/FOE Sections. However, the majority of the extrabudgetary funding in these two Sections are Funds-in-Trust, and consultants are hired in Headquarters and in the Field to coordinate these, thereby reducing greatly the workload on the permanent staff. This is not usually possible for IPDC Projects, and even IPDC FIT projects are fully decentralised with no Headquarters staff.

Conclusions:

- Overall, the processes of choosing and administering the Annual Project cycle and of identifying and managing Special Initiatives and FITs are efficient and effective, and the division of responsibilities between them is appropriate. Monitoring and evaluation is identified as a weakness.
- As far as can be judged from the evidence, and despite the fact that no quantitative figure can be offered, the conclusion of this evaluation is that the unique benefits and outcomes visible in recent years justify the specific governance costs incurred over those years.

7.4. FUNDING AND DONOR SUPPORT

354. The Fundraising Strategy outlined above shows some progress in relation to fundraising. Table 18 in Annex I illustrates that the efforts, especially of the IPDC Chair but also of the Secretariat and some Bureau and Council members, have resulted in a rise overall in extrabudgetary contributions. There is no information on whether UNESCO Field Office staff also contributed to this. The 2013 strategy did not offer full clarity on responsibilities and roles in relation to fundraising and the anticipated action plan was never developed. Thus key challenges remain and the strategy has not been fully effective in addressing the situation.

355. Two donors, Norway and Finland, have been consistent in their support, though levels vary, with the Netherlands and Sweden also providing regular though less consistent contributions (but being the largest in 2017). Spain has recently recommenced contributing and Malaysia, Latvia and Lithuania are relatively new, the latter two with small amounts. Thus, the donor base is still very small.

356. Secondly, the proportion of total extrabudgetary funding accounted for by a small number of FIT contributions fluctuated between 10% and 17% from 2011 to 2015, and then jumped to 63% and 32% in 2016 and 2017 respectively, with amounts to the Special Account falling. In the longer history of IPDC such fluctuations are not unusual and FIT contributions have accounted for a large proportion for long periods.

357. The Bureau has identified an insufficiency of human resources in the Secretariat to follow through on aspects of the funding strategy as a significant constraint, and continued efforts are being made to encourage Bureau and Council members to promote the IPDC where and when they can. The IPDC Chair and the Secretariat believe that a key issue is to communicate the message regarding the positive achievements in recent years, and the specific benefits of using the IPDC as an instrument for change.

358. Interviews with the traditional IPDC donors confirm their ongoing and firm support for media and communication sector investment. They believe that the need to promote freedom of expression and to build sustainable media sectors capable of promoting the public interest is possibly greater than ever. The IPDC Special Account, and especially its ability to channel funding to media and civil society in a structured manner, through Field Offices that are well informed on local needs and dynamics, is regarded as a valuable and unique asset. However, additional insight into the specific outcomes and benefits it generates, as a whole rather than for individual actions, would be welcome.

359. The newly introduced 'earmarked funds' mechanism is a useful addition. It facilitates giving higher visibility to the contribution to governments (and the public), and potentially enables a deeper understanding of its value than is possible with an 'anonymised' Project. This is especially useful for delegations contributing for the first time and seeking to demonstrate the specific value of the IPDC mechanism to the relevant Ministry and governments; and the specific interventions funded can be selected to resonate nationally.

360. Earmarked projects for medium-sized donations, and Funds-in-Trust for larger amounts, also enable donor organisations to direct support to issues in specific countries that fall outside existing bilateral agreements. Channelled through IPDC and with the approval by the Bureau, the support is regarded as impartial and independent.

361. These factors allow more flexibility and they generate more options for the Bureau and Secretariat in making the case to potential donors.

362. Efforts in recent years to raise the profile of IPDC, and specifically of its singular achievements and unique potential, are to some extent paying off. However, the challenge demands at least a medium-term horizon. Some efforts will fail and others succeed. For instance, the potential of the IPDC Talks, that serve several purposes, may take several years to be realised and require refinements and reorientations. Perseverance is essential not just to raise the IPDC profile and communicate the message, but to discover which elements of the profile are best suited to IPDC strengths and which messages resonate most with potential supporters.

363. Taking into account somewhat diverse views of donors, Council and Bureau members and staff and experts interviewed, it may reasonably be concluded that the prospects of securing more funding for IPDC from both existing and new donors would be enhanced with:

- A strategic framework for greater clarity on the specific *objectives* and *targets* of IPDC and *evidence of outcomes* in these;

- A *distinctive set of intervention* types and funding instruments that builds on its specific strengths;
- A more explicit articulation and understanding of the IPDC's *complementarities with the CI Sector* as a whole and how the Sector and IPDC work together to achieve both the CI objectives and the IPDC's mandate and priorities, through a coherent set of options for contributing to this shared endeavour.

364. The wider CI Sector context is also relevant. The External Audit of September 2016¹²¹ recommends the drawing up of “a more ambitious CI Sector resource mobilization plan, based on a thorough analysis of the Sector’s products, their fields of implementation and potential donor profile.” It makes sense that an IPDC fundraising strategy should to be developed within the wider framework of CI Sector resource mobilisation. This is especially relevant given the observations earlier concerning responsibilities for fundraising being a source of misunderstanding within the CI Sector in relation to the IPDC, and the External Auditors references to internal competition for fundraising.

Conclusions:

- There remains a pressing need to increase the overall volume of IPDC contributions, to improve the regularity and consistency of what can be described as core funding, and to attract a wider set of donors with a sustained interest in the issues and in IPDC as a useful means to address them. Additional human resources such as through secondments by Member States and a clearer message regarding achievements would enhance the prospects for this.
- Key donors firmly believe in the need for continued investment in media and communication sectors, and that the IPDC offers unique and appropriate opportunities and funding modalities, including the Special Account and ‘earmarked funds’. Prospects for further funding would be enhanced with greater clarity on IPDC objectives, targets and evidence of outcomes, on the funding instruments available and on its complementarities within the CI Sector. An IPDC fundraising strategy should be viewed within the wider CI resource mobilisation.

¹²¹ *New Audits by the External Auditor: Audit Report of the Communication and Information Sector (CI)*. 200 EX/20.INF.3 page 40.

8. RECOMMENDATIONS

365. Before presenting recommendations, a few of areas are noted where the absence of a recommendation indicates that continuation of the current situation is appropriate:

- a) The cost of supporting the IPDC governance structures is justified in the light of the specific benefits and outcomes associated with these structures. Since these governance costs are fixed, a significant fall in extrabudgetary funds could call that into question – although this would then put IPDC on a par with other intergovernmental committees of UNESCO whose *raison d'être* does not include fundraising and grant-making. Conversely, a rise in funding would further justify the fixed costs expenditure. The recommendations below are intended to further align IPDC actions with areas in which it has specific strengths that derive in large part from its governance structures, and their implementation – if effective – would thus further justify this expenditure.
- b) A larger representation from Permanent Delegations as IPDC Bureau and Council members, and fewer media specialist delegates, would not, on balance, improve IPDC outcomes. A significant number of Permanent Delegates already accompany specialist Members to meetings and this should be further encouraged. It is also up to each Permanent Delegation to ensure that the member representing the country and region elected to IPDC governance bodies is fully briefed and supported.
- c) The case for the Council to become more involved in the selection of Projects is not convincing, and such a move would be unlikely to improve the efficiency or effectiveness of the process. The Council debates and intervenes in Priorities as it sees fit and is hard pressed already to fulfil its mandate in the time available to it. A Council meeting annually would leave less funding available for the wider programme covered by the Regular Programme budget.

Recommendation 1: Develop, debate and approve an IPDC strategic framework

To: IPDC Council, IPDC Bureau and IPDC Secretariat

To clarify and strengthen the strategic positioning of IPDC, and the selection and implementation of interventions, by debating, developing and approving a Strategy Framework that will guide the work.

A Strategic Framework would incorporate reformulated IPDC priorities as strategic drivers applied consistently across all IPDC activities, including Projects, Special Initiatives and Funds-in-Trust. The Framework should also explicitly capture the linkages and complementarities with CI and with the C/5 and the outcomes that the IPDC is seeking to achieve, and have a time horizon of at least four years, possibly longer.

A detailed proposal for an IPDC Strategic Framework should be developed by the Bureau, with technical assistance from the Secretariat, for presentation to the Council. A strategy development tool such as Theory of Change could be utilised to support this. A Working Group that includes the IPDC Chair, the Secretariat and other members of the Bureau, could initiate and lead the process.

IPDC medium term objectives draw on its core mandate¹²² and the UNESCO C/5. Its Priorities should be refocused and revised in the light of, and as a balance between, its specific strengths as outlined in

¹²² As stated in Resolution 43/32 of Commission V of the 18th Plenary Meeting, October 2003.

this report to deliver outcomes; the areas in which it is achieving demonstrable success; and the historical and current areas of IPDC activity. A suggested starting point for these priorities, based on these criteria, is proposed as follows:

- a) **Development of national media and communication sectors in developing countries:** To *strengthen media and communication sectors* in developing countries, through the design and deployment of normative tools and instruments, such as the MDIs, and by implementing other actions to support them to achieve sectoral, policy and legal reform, including specifically enhancing media plurality through promoting community media sectoral growth and sustainability.
- b) **Safety of Journalists:** To *promote the safety of journalists through IPDC's specific strengths* of the DG's Report and Projects and initiatives to support the participation of civil society in designing and implementing the UN Plan on the Safety of Journalists at national level.
- c) **Media & Communication Supporting SDGs:** To increase *understanding of and support for implementation of SDGs* by means of developing the media and communication sectors in developing countries, through the generation and dissemination of knowledge, including in relation to SDG 16.10.1 and SDG 16.10.2 indicators. This will enhance the prospects of Member States achieving targets, and the strengthening of media sectoral goals in UNDAF and regional priorities.
- d) **An Experimental Platform:** To enable IPDC to explore emerging trends in media and communications, and assess the potential for IPDC's particular strengths to contribute in innovative ways in that area, working in partnership with others involved in the issue. Thus the potential of an issue or area would be explored through the lens of what the specific IPDC strengths and modalities can bring to it, and not just in the context of the need or trends. This might in turn result in experimental or trial applications that may emerge, after appropriate evaluation, discussion and debate, as a Priority over time. (See Recommendation 4.)

Rationale:

Overall, this will help to achieve clarity and prioritisation of objectives for IPDC; develop a framework that will ensure coherence and complementarity among the various intervention types and funding modalities; enhance complementarity within the FEM Division; and build a consistent and clear profile within UNESCO and in the international community. This will assist in attracting extrabudgetary contributions and also over time in positioning more clearly the IPDC among international institutions in media and communication leading to stronger outcomes.

The Bureau with Secretariat support is the appropriate body to submit proposals for a strategic framework to the Council for consideration. The proposed Strategic Priorities are consistent with the IPDC mandate, and based on IPDC strengths, evidence of successful outcomes, and IPDC areas of activity.

These four suggested Priorities above are proposed in the knowledge that certain traditional areas, notably journalism education institutional capacity and non-sector transformative support for community media organisations, are not included at this point. This evaluation could not establish the case for a priority on these areas since there is only limited evidence that existing activities yield sustainable outcomes or that the mechanisms being deployed are effective. However, this may result partly from the unavoidable limitations of this evaluation, and it is recognised that journalism education remains a key area for work in developing countries even if IPDC has been unable to

continue to maintain significant momentum in the field. As noted earlier, in certain countries supporting journalism education might also be one of very few options available to UNESCO to intervene in the media sector, and a case could be made to launch targeted Projects in these specific countries with a view to building bridges to the sector. The possibility of designing appropriate modalities to support such important but non-priority issues, that build on IPDC's specific strengths, could be reviewed in the structure proposed below.

Recommendation 2: Introduce strategically-focused package of interventions within each annual cycle

To: IPDC Council

To introduce strategic planning and coherence into the IPDC Project design and implementation cycle, enhancing coordinating between Projects and with other IPDC interventions and CI in order to maximise complementarities and outcomes.

The region-wide planning process would be designed and implemented over a period of two years, and introduced as a new component of the IPDC Project and support cycle, operating in parallel to the existing one, so that each year there is at least one regional focus as part of the wider grant-making.

This new component of the IPDC Project cycle would enable it to integrate, as appropriate, all funding modalities; and would be implemented in parallel with the existing annual Project cycle in each region every two years. A (rotating) region-wide biennial strategic package would draw down approximately 50% on the Special Account and combine it with additional extrabudgetary resources, and would be subjected to a longer, more participative, planning process. The package of interventions would include predominantly country level actions (as is currently the case), but with sub-region and region level activities; and the activities would include a combination of smaller and larger projects.

It is envisaged as a follow-through on Recommendation 1 which includes the idea that Priorities should embrace all funding modalities.

The following clarifies what this would mean in practice.

- a) Each year, two of the four UNESCO Regions would have an annual call for Project proposals *continuing the current practice*, and on average half the Special Account would be allocated to that (the precise proportion might vary annually depending on which regions are addressed).
- b) That same year, the other two UNESCO Regions would submit a *Region-Wide Biennial Strategic Package* of interventions, under preparation for two years. This would include the remainder of the Special Account for a focused call for Projects, and a set of other interventions funded by Special Initiatives, Earmarked Projects or Funds-in-Trust projects.

Thus, each year just two regions would be selected for the Region-Wide Packages, for instance Africa and South America & Caribbean one year; and Asia & the Pacific and Arab states the next, enabling a longer planning and preparation period; but the other two regions in each year would continue with the normal call for Proposals.

- c) *Region Working Groups* would be formed for the purpose of developing these strategic packages, drafting and designing a coherent regional, sub-regional and national set of actions, based on IPDC priorities. This would maximise complementarities between IPDC objectives and support modalities, combine funding sources and instruments for greater impact, identify relevant partners outside of UNESCO, and ensure greater coherence with other CI Sector actions.

- d) Each *Region Working Group* would comprise the CI Senior Advisers in the Regional hubs, the IPDC Bureau, the IPDC Secretariat and the two CI Sections, and others selected from relevant areas of civil society with a high-level view of priorities and potential.

The background cycle of this component would enable the (mainly virtual) *Region Working Group* to first develop an outline plan, in consultation with potential donors and partners, over the first year; leaving a year to develop the ideas, open a focused call for proposals, assess responses and finalise a package. IPDC Priorities could thus be tailored to each region, sub-region or country. The packages would be presented to the Bureau for discussion, amendment and approval – alongside the proposals for other regions not covered in that year’s regional approach.

- e) The upper Project budget limit and implementation duration would be relaxed for the targeted regions.
- f) Due attention would be taken to maintain the geographical priority for Africa, and SIDS.
- g) The potential of IPDC to act as a rapid response mechanisms for emergencies should be promoted within the above arrangements.

The goal is to anticipate and enable better complementarities and synergies between different actions where they are operating in the same territories (mainly countries) and on the same or complementary issues.

IPDC would continue to fund other interventions through Funds-in-Trust, Earmarked Projects or Special Allocations, as it does at present, retaining its full flexibility to respond at different levels, and to evolving challenges.

Rationale:

The rationale for this Recommendation is to strengthen strategic coordination of IPDC resources, in the wider context of CI, and the concentration of investment on key areas, leading to greater complementarities and achieving a threshold for system-level outcomes.

The benefits of developing a strategic investment framework are:

- Expanded and concentrated resources for greater impact within a given time period;
- A strategic approach leading to greater complementary between Projects, between them and UNESCO regional/national programmes, and with wider CI activities;
- Potential to attract donors to areas of strategic interest;
- More coordinated effort facilitates outcome evaluation.

There are potential disadvantages:

- An increased HQ and Field staff and Bureau Member time commitment, devoted to developing plans at region-wide level;
- The possibility of a reduced number of Project in some countries, as some Projects increase in size and others may be concentrated into fewer countries for strategic impact;
- Potential challenges to introducing a region-wide level of planning, when the main focus is still to coordinate activities at national level.

Recommendation 3: Consider strengthening the IPDC's overall positioning to improve management communication, cooperation and complementarities within the CI/FEM Division

To: Assistant Director-General of CI

To enhance horizontal communication and cooperation within the CI Sector with a view to maximising complementarities and related funding opportunities across all CI/FEM structures.

Consider a desk audit to explore the creation of a new Section for Media Development, on a par with other Sections in the Division, within which the IPDC Secretariat should be based, and where the Section Head would be the manager of the IPDC Secretariat.

Encourage regular communication and information sharing activities, at group level, in CI including face-to-face interactions and team building exercises.

Rationale: There is evidence that the status of the IPDC Secretariat, including the lower grade level of the IPDC Deputy Secretary who serves as the Secretariat's manager, combined with the dual role required of Division Director/ IPDC Secretary, are affecting communication, synergies and decision-making processes of CI/FEM especially as they relate to IPDC. Linked to this structural issue, there is evidence of a lack of understanding between the parts of FEM in terms of resource allocations and responsibilities, and the need to collaborate to achieve their common goals. This recommendation is intended to resolve these issues and to strengthen the management of the whole entity.

Recommendation 4: Create a communication platform for IPDC innovation and interaction

To: IPDC Secretariat

To create a communication platform within IPDC that would encourage an innovative approach and support experimentation, as well as improve interaction between its various elements.

As a communication mechanism for an IPDC Experimental Platform, a facility could be designed and moderated/facilitated by the Secretariat, that would enable ongoing information sharing and communication between Council members, the Secretariat, wider CI staff, Field Offices, and external experts. This would have two functions

First, to explore potential trends on media development of relevance to IPDC, and how IPDC might be in a position to respond to them in innovative and experimental ways. Ongoing dialogue moderated by the Secretariat would be a feature, and the identification of appropriate issues might result in the organisation of open Seminars, information sessions at Council meetings, and debates. It could have a synergistic relationship with the UNESCO biannual World Trends in Freedom of Expression and Media Development (although this is produced outside of IPDC) and with the IPDC Talks initiative.

Second, it is proposed that such a Platform incorporate a secure but informal area for Council, Bureau and Secretariat discussions. This would enhance ongoing timely exchange of information and communication between and within the governance components of IPDC.

Rationale: The rationale for this platform is also twofold.

Currently emerging trends for communication development are discussed in various fora (Bureau and Council expert sessions, IPDC Talks) and dealt with in different ways including supporting impromptu events, and recently approving a new Priority. A systematic, participative and reflective means to identify emerging trends in media and communication, and to relate them to IPDC strengths and capacities, shared among all IPDC actors and more widely as appropriate, would enable the early identification of emerging issues, an informed reflection on their potential importance, a broad

assessment of their relevance and interest among different Member States, and their suitability for further consideration by IPDC in some form. Examples of the types of issues emerging might include the power of social media platforms, fake news, media sustainability models and other factors shaping media and freedom of expression in developing countries.

A second rationale addresses the current absence of regular and ongoing informal communication channels between IPDC Council, the Bureau and Secretariat. The Council in particular currently has few opportunities for ongoing interaction with Bureau deliberations and Secretariat support activities. In a secure area, the Platform could improve timely and informal information exchange between Council, Bureau and Secretariat. Overall it would enhance opportunities for participation especially amongst Council members between meetings.

Recommendation 5: Reinforce fundraising with more IPDC Member State effort

To: Bureau, Secretariat and Council

To maximise the benefits from changes above, and leverage UNESCO Member States, in terms of additional IPDC extrabudgetary funding.

The current funding strategy is achieving some success, but further effort, and new approaches, will be essential if IPDC is to achieve a sustained level of extrabudgetary funding from a more diverse set of donors.

The Strategic Framework above is intended to clarify the priorities of IPDC and its relationship to other areas; and the strategically-focused package of interventions to attract donors based on identified areas of potential and interest, and these should be configured to extract the maximum benefits in this regard. It seems likely that IPDC Council Member State delegations, and UNESCO Member States more widely, could also do more.

Member State delegations have already expressed their interest and commitment to the ideals of IPDC by seeking and securing a seat on the Council. It is not unreasonable to expect them to take the lead among UNESCO Member States by directly approaching their respective national authorities for, initially, at least a small amount of funding. Working in collaboration with the Secretariat, Projects could be identified, possibly using the Earmarked modalities, that resonate with these specific countries, and care could be taken to ensure that the specific achievement of these are documented. Thus a small initial contribution might encourage larger amounts later, moving from a symbolic contribution towards more substantial support.

Opportunities should be taken to coordinate with a wider CI Sector resource mobilisation strategy that was recommended by the External Audit.

Rationale: Reversing the decline in Special Account funding and expanding other avenues of extrabudgetary funding is critical to the future of IPDC and to improving its cost benefit ratio. Given that Council Member States have already demonstrated an interest, even a small contribution from each of them makes a larger point nationally and to others to consider contributing. It could also raise the profile of the IPDC beyond the immediate Delegations who are members of the IPDC Council.

Recommendation 6: Reinforce gender transformation across IPDC activities

To: Bureau and Secretariat.

To position IPDC at the forefront of gender-responsive and gender-transformative change in communication development.

The Bureau should explicitly increase the priority of gender-responsive and gender-transformative Projects and actions, including incorporating individual elements where the primary focus of a Project is elsewhere. The Secretariat should also ensure that partners are aware of and understand the implications and advantages of the three-level gender approach taken by UNESCO and are encouraged to incorporate it into Project proposals, including by merging the Quality Checklist with the project preparation guidelines. Specific action should also be taken to incorporate into the Project reporting template requirements regarding gender outputs and outcomes.

Rationale: In relation to gender, UNESCO ranks project workplans on a three-step scale. A majority of IPDC Projects had by 2016 reached the lowest rank on that scale i.e. they included ‘gender-sensitive’ components. There is also some evidence, but not conclusive, of a rise in gender-specific Projects some of which would propose ‘gender-transformative’ changes, the highest rank.

Some gender-transformative Projects are already being proposed and approved by IPDC and its partners, suggesting that a demand is there already. More could come forward given further encouragement. Given that gender equality is one of two UNESCO Global Priorities, further encouragement to identify and support ‘gender-responsive’ (the middle rank), and gender-transformative, Projects is justified. Related to this, IPDC at present has no means to evaluate the extent of contribution to gender-related issues, and this is addressed under another Recommendation below.

Recommendation 7: Review and refinement of the project selection process

To: Bureau and Secretariat

To enhance the Project and intervention selection process with best practice in procedures and transparency.

The implementation of Recommendation 2 above would imply changes in how Field Offices, Secretariat and Bureau deal with the Project selection and approval process. In any case, the following are specific recommendations concerning this process.

- To assist the Bureau in considering Project proposals, more detailed guidelines should be provided in line with tender assessment good practice. For instance, this would include a clear set of weighted criteria by which each proposal submitted would be assessed.
- Especially for newly appointed members, a short ‘tutorial’ on the selection guidelines could be provided to ensure greater uniformity in the rationale for decisions and that the quality of proposals is factored in appropriately. (This would correspond to one of the recommendations in the Governance Review process conducted during 2017).
- The Secretariat should ensure that Bureau members are advised of the details of all applications rejected for technical reasons, and the reasons for their rejection.
- The Secretariat should ensure that all unsuccessful Project applicants receive a response to their proposals indicating why they have been unsuccessful, incorporating as appropriate their scores on the weighted criteria;
- A review of the online proposal development facility should be undertaken, through a survey and discussions with CI advisers, to identify and implement areas for improvement, including software and procedural matters.

Rationale: Although the current online-supported Project selection system is an improvement, and overall the system is functioning quite well, it can be improved. The weaknesses identified include a lack of thoroughness in the guidelines and weighting of criteria; transparency for applicants in relation

to reasons for rejection; some perceived inconsistency in the early stages of how Field Offices handle applications and in the final stages of Bureau selection; and some minor software issues.

Recommendation 8: Strengthen the monitoring and evaluation framework

To: Secretariat

To ensure more systematic assessment of outcomes and identification of lessons learned that will feed into programming.

Under the UNESCO Evaluation Policy, it is a requirement that the IPDC is subject to evaluation each four year programme cycles. The Programme will need to set resources aside to support this. The dual purpose is to identify outcomes achieved across all intervention types and areas and to extract the relevant ongoing and future learning for internal IPDC and wider use. It is important that a monitoring and evaluation framework is designed and tailored to the specific IPDC needs and circumstances, and it should be given early consideration by the Secretariat.

The integrated region-wide packages described above would facilitate such an evaluation, and the rest of the annual Projects could also be included as well as other interventions. The approach would relate to the Strategic Framework, concentrating on the areas contained there; and include performance indicators, baselines and targets articulated there.

It is recognised that the evaluation of numerous small Projects presents specific challenges. In contrast to earlier evaluation efforts, greater emphasis could be placed on engaging the local knowledge of Field Offices and past partners regarding medium-term outcomes from previous activities, and on improving Project development and selection criteria. Workshops, targeted evaluation of specific Projects – for instance those considered highly successful - and other means, could be used to identify practical lessons in targeting and selecting ideas and partners more likely to succeed. IPDC should also ensure that FIT project evaluations are funded, in line with the Framework, from within their own budgets; and that Special Initiatives are also routinely included.

Rationale:

Apart from the obligation to undertake regular evaluations, IPDC requires clearer and more comprehensive insights into its specific achievements and shortcoming, if it is to attract additional donor support, especially around activities funded by the Special Account.

The discontinuation in 2012 of the evaluation of individual Projects, and the absence of systematic evaluation of larger initiatives, suggests that this has recently been an issue of low priority. Micro-evaluations of Projects (of the kind undertaken until 2012) serve primarily reporting purposes and tend not to yield lessons that can improve future outcomes. A revised approach might lead to improvements in Project and intervention selection that would in turn lead to better outcomes. The adoption of a Monitoring and Evaluation Framework, as outlined above, would also facilitate more systematic evaluation activities.

Given the UNESCO emphasis on gender and the current discussion within IPDC, greater effort is also needed to assess whether the IPDC interventions are actually achieving gender outcomes in line with expectations and requirements.

Implementation of Recommendations:

Given the urgency of the challenges facing IPDC, the consideration and, if appropriate, approval of these recommendations is, if based on the current schedule of meetings, likely to be too lengthy to

optimise the benefits. It is therefore recommended that additional informal or Special Bureau or Council meetings, or other working groups, be organised to allow timely consideration and interim work to proceed.

ANNEX 1: IPDC PROJECTS IN NUMBERS

Table 13: IPDC Projects approved by Region and Year

Region/Year	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	Total	% all projects
Africa									
Submitted	48	39	49	49	39	22	42	288	41%
Approved	39	31	24	35	32	17	13	191	40%
% approved	81%	79%	49%	71%	82%	77%	31%	66%	
Asia Pacific									
Submitted	31	25	26	21	21	19	32	175	25%
Approved	22	21	14	16	11	17	15	116	24%
% approved	71%	84%	54%	76%	52%	89%	47%	66%	
LA & Carib.									
Submitted	26	21	25	26	22	11	20	151	21%
Approved	18	19	15	19	16	11	14	112	23%
% approved	69%	90%	60%	73%	73%	100%	70%	74%	
Arab States									
Submitted	13	12	8	9	8	6	14	70	10%
Approved	11	12	6	9	3	5	5	51	11%
% approved	85%	100%	75%	100%	38%	83%	27%	87%	
Europe									
Submitted	2	3	2	2	2	-	3	14	2%
Approved	2	-	-	1	2	-	1	6	1%
% approved	100%	0%	0%	50%	100%		33%	43%	
Other									
Submitted	-	1	-	-	5	1	-	7	1%
Approved	-	1	-	-	4	1	-	6	1%
% approved		100%			80%	100%		93%	
TOTALS:									
Submitted	120	101	110	107	97	58	111	704	100%
Approved	92	84	59	80	68	51	48	482	100%
% approved	77%	83%	54%	75%	70%	88%	43%	68%	

Table 14: Number of Projects, total grant, average grant, 2011-2017

Scope \ Year	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	Total
Number of Projects	92	84	59	80	68	51	48	482
Grant (US\$ '000)	2,596	1,890	890	1,397	1,198	628	592	9,191
Average grant (US\$)	28.2	22.5	15.1	17.5	17.6	12.3	12.3	19.1

Table 15: Number of IPDC Projects by Geographical Scope and Year 2011-2016

Scope \ Year	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	Total	%
National	74	72	50	67	60	41	364	84%
Regional	18	11	9	13	4	9	64	15%
Interregional/global	-	1	-	-	4	1	6	1%
Total	92	84	59	80	68	51	434	100%

Table 16: Total Project Budget, Funding Requested, & Amount Granted by Region 2016 (US\$)

Region	Total budget (all sources)	Request to IPDC	Granted by IPDC	% granted of total budget	% granted of IPDC request	% per region of total grant	Average grant amount
Africa	523,867	371,511	238,181	45%	64%	38%	14,000
Asia & Pacific	523,921	355,851	205,455	39%	58%	33%	12,100
Latin America & Carib.	359,045	228,250	117,727	33%	52%	19%	10,700
Arab States	148,950	111,940	66,818	45%	60%	11%	13,360
Total / Average	1,555,783	1,067,552	628,181	40%	60%	100%	12,560

To avoid distorting the figures a global project with a total budget of US\$300,000, of which US\$34,820 was sought from IPDC and US\$27,272 was granted, is excluded in this table.

Table 17: Projects by IPDC Priority 2011 – 2015*

Scope \ Year	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	Total	%
Human Resource Development	50	35	20	76	22	203	39%
Promote Freedom of Expression & Media Pluralism	21	20	26	66	24	157	31%
Community Media Development	21	29	12	27	34	123	24%
Other	-	-	1	7	23	31	6%
Total	92	84	59	176	103	514	100%

*Some Projects have more than one.

Table 18: Donor List and Contributions 2011 - 2017

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	Total
Norway	166,945	451,129	357,916	324,480	467,006	539,823	223,214	2,530,513
Finland	267,738	266,666	259,740	530,472	271,740	221,238	266,360	2,083,954
Netherlands		66,666	64,767	65,189	65,876	52,910	803,158	1,118,566
Denmark	275,000	275,000	275,000	50,206			99,616	974,822
Spain	443,787	130,000					200,000	773,787
Euro. Union						767,574		767,574
Sweden	36,737	103,656	30,000	15,585		25,571	330,979	542,528
India	530,000							530,000
Switzerland	482,456							482,456
USA	200,000	264,143						464,143
Andorra	52,344	42,368	12,870	13,587	12,706	8,417	8,743	151,035
Malaysia							145,500	145,500
Belgium	142,653							142,653
Germany					126,112			126,112
France	27,127	38,000						65,127
Lithuania							36,766	36,766
IMS					21,648			21,648
Latvia						10,989	10,616	21,605
Israel	15,052							15,052
Ghana						2,500		2,500
Bangladesh						1,000		1,000
Thailand				1,000				1,000
Total	2,639,839	1,637,628	1,000,293	1,000,519	965,088	1,630,022	2,124,952	10,998,341
Of which FIT	142,653	276,420	161,816		126,112	1,030,231	676,479	2,547,478
% FIT	10%	17%	16%	0%	13%	63%	32%	22%
Number of Donors	12	9	6	7	6	9	10	

This Annex comprises the approved Terms of Reference of the evaluation.

The May 2017 Inception Report of this evaluation, including a complete methodology statement, can be accessed here: http://en.unesco.org/sites/default/files/ipdc_inception_report_final_0.pdf

1. Background

Brief description of the programme

Since 1980, the international community has worked to support media development through the International Programme for the Development of Communication (IPDC), the only intergovernmental programme in the UN system which aims to strengthen media capacity in developing countries, as a contribution to sustainable development, democracy and good governance.

Since its creation, IPDC has secured and dispersed US\$ 105 million in extra-budgetary funds, with results in over 1,700 media development projects in 140 countries. IPDC's **unique role** has been continuously reaffirmed, including in *Resolution A/RES/70/93 A-B "Information in the service of humanity"*, adopted on 15 December 2015 at the 70th session of the General Assembly.

Governing Bodies

The overall responsibility for the Programme lies with the **Intergovernmental Council (IGC) of the IPDC**, which meets every two years to assess the work carried out by the Programme. It consists of representatives from 39 countries elected by the General Conference of UNESCO. The **IPDC Bureau (IGB)** of eight Member States meets once a year and carefully identifies projects worth supporting out of some 100-200 competitive project submissions received every year. Project proposals originate from all over the world, and beneficiaries are selected for their significant contribution to *free, independent and pluralistic* media. Current IPDC priority areas are listed below:

1. Capacity building for journalists and media managers including improving journalism education (using UNESCO's Model Curricula for Journalism Education)
2. Promoting the safety of journalists
3. Supporting media pluralism (particularly community media) and independence (improving self-regulation and professional standards)
4. Supporting law reform that fosters media independence
5. Conducting media assessments and research
6. Countering hate speech in media and social media promoting conflict-sensitive journalism practice and/or promoting cross-cultural/cross-religious dialogue among journalists

Human and financial resources

The Intergovernmental Council and its Bureau are technically assisted by a Secretariat based within the Division of Freedom of Expression and Media Development of UNESCO's Communication and Information Sector (CI). The staff costs associated with the specific governance of the Programme as borne by the Sector's Regular Programme budget came to approximately \$295,000 in the biennium of 2014-2015, as estimated by the External Audit report presented to the 200th UNESCO Executive Board.

The IPDC projects, and dedicated allocations to Special Initiatives and emerging issues, have been operating with a budget based upon extra-budgetary contributions, and has approximated 1 million US\$ over the past few years.

Rationale for the evaluation

Within the context of the new 2030 Development Agenda, and taking into consideration the social, economic, political and cultural changes of societies worldwide since the creation of the IPDC in 1980, and since its latest evaluation in 2006, the IPDC Council decided, at its 30th session, to proceed with the initiative to commission a new evaluation of the Programme. The evaluation shall take into account the changes over the last decade in terms of how globalization and digitization have changed the communication systems, their functions as well as management practices and markets. Such changes have affected the activities of the IPDC as well as UNESCO's general work regarding media and communication.

Taking note of the External Audit of the governance of UNESCO and dependent funds, programmes and entities and its open-ended Working Group on governance, procedures and working methods of the governing bodies of UNESCO ([38 C/23](#)), as well as the recommendations of the External Audit of the CI Sector ([200 EX/20 Part III](#)), the IPDC Council decided, at its 30th session, to proceed with the initiative to commission a new IPDC evaluation, depending upon the necessary extra-budgetary funding being raised, and mandated the Secretariat to proceed with its implementation, according to the current Terms of Reference and estimated budget. Further rationale for an evaluation is provided in the Recommendations of the External Audit report as agreed by the 200th Executive Board in October 2016. Recommendation number 14 reads: "Without calling into question the actions undertaken, the External Auditor recommends submitting to the Executive Board a study of the costs and benefits of maintaining specific governance for the International Programme for the Development of Communication (IPDC)".

2. Purpose and Scope

Purpose

The main purpose of the evaluation is to assess defined aspects of the International Programme for the Development of Communication (IPDC) and to generate recommendations for the future. These aspects concern the relevance, efficiency and results of the Programme. The evaluation findings and recommendations will be useful inputs to the CI sector management, the IPDC Intergovernmental Bureau and Council, as well as to the *Working Group on governance, procedures and working methods of the governing bodies of UNESCO*¹²³ with regard to governance-related issues.

Scope

The evaluation will examine the role of the International Programme for the Development of Communication and its governing bodies between 2011 – 2016, although also noting any significant developments since the previous evaluation in 2006 that were taken into account by the IPDC Council. The primary criteria will be the stated objectives of the Programme, and their specific relevance, as well as optimum efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability, and the results of activities related to achieving these objectives.

¹²³ At its 38th session, the General Conference decided to establish an open-ended working group on governance, procedures and working methods of the governing bodies of UNESCO ([38 C/Resolution 101](#)), building on the recommendations of the Executive Board ([197 EX/Decision 28 and 44](#)).

The evaluation will primarily use qualitative research methods, but should nevertheless seek to make evidence-based recommendations focused on the aspects listed below:

- the niche of IPDC's normative, standard-setting, research and monitoring functions, including through the implementation of the IPDC Special Initiatives in grant-making and by its Special Allocations of funds for particular purposes;
- the results of the IPDC's operational capacity building initiatives as reflected in its programme in the last six years (2011-2016) by assessing how the IPDC Programme has responded to media development needs at national and regional levels;
- IPDC's complementarity with and contribution to UNESCO's overall CI programme, particularly the actions implemented by its Division of Freedom of Expression and Media Development through its field offices' staff, and its niche vis-à-vis overall UNESCO action in the CI field;
- the levels and modalities of funding received by the Programme and provide an overall description of patterns and an assessment of the Programme's financial situation;
- the effectiveness of the IPDC-funded projects in terms of outcomes achieved;
- the efficiency of the project funding modality and its fit for purpose;
- the costs and benefits of maintaining specific governance for the Programme;
- the working methods of the Programme, including the structure and functioning of its Secretariat, its Bureau and its Council, the Programme's leadership and administration, cost-efficiency and transparency, taking account of any relevant information arising from the Working Group on Governance¹²⁴ (see footnote 1);
- the quality of the Programme's delivery, including project planning and formulation, selection processes, implementation follow-up, monitoring and evaluation;
- the promotion and legitimating of IPDC's existence to donors;
- the nature of IPDC's work within a contemporary conceptualisation of media development, in a new societal and media/communication context.

The evaluation should provide recommendations to UNESCO and to IPDC constituencies on all of the above issues for a short-term (2017-2019) and middle-term action plan (2018-2021), including budgetary implications if necessary. These recommendations shall be followed for the planning, implementation and evaluation of IPDC action in the future.

Evaluation questions

The main questions of the evaluation will be further refined in the evaluation's inception report. Indicative questions are provided below.

1. In what manner is the IPDC a valuable programme to its main constituencies of Member States, UNESCO programme officers in Field Offices, implementing partners, and donors?
2. To what extent has the IPDC's operational capacity building programme achieved its goals in regard to its six priority areas?
3. How has IPDC's normative and standard-setting function contributed to advancements in the media development field?
4. How has IPDC-supported research helped to guide media development efforts in countries where it has been conducted?

¹²⁴ The IGC's contribution to the Working Group on Governance will be shared with the evaluation team.

5. How has IPDC's mandated monitoring and reporting mechanism on the safety of journalists contributed to sensitizing Member States about the safety of journalists and the issue of impunity?
6. How have IPDC Special Initiatives been effective in mobilizing international attention and support for the role of free, pluralistic and independent media in development?
7. What are the fundraising patterns of the Programme in the last few years? What explains these trends?
8. What are the costs and benefits of IPDC's specific governance?
9. To what extent have IPDC activities been efficient in terms of a) the use of financial and human resource, b) the number and range of projects supported, and c) the quality of monitoring and evaluation mechanisms?
10. To what extent has the Programme and its activities been designed and implemented in a gender sensitive manner? How has it contributed to increased gender equality in its areas of scope? To what extent does the Programme deliver results that are gender-sensitive, replicable and sustainable?
11. What has been the role and value added of the IPDC as an intergovernmental programme within the United Nations and within the framework of other actors working in the international community who support media development?
12. How are the activities of the IPDC complementary to the work of the other UNESCO entities e.g. the CI sector at Headquarters, UNESCO Field Offices, Institutes and Centers, networks and partners?

3. Methodology

The evaluator(s) will elaborate a detailed evaluation approach and methodology in the inception report. The methodology may include the following elements:

- Desk study of all key relevant documentation
- Questionnaires and / or surveys to various stakeholders, including Member States, field office staff, field office directors and key partners and beneficiaries in the field (scale to be scoped on the basis of budget raised for the evaluation).
- Structured and semi-structured interviews (face-to-face and via Skype)
- Case studies
- Field visits (to be decided)

4. Roles and Responsibilities

An independent, external evaluation team will conduct the evaluation. The evaluator(s) will contribute specific subject matter expertise and knowledge. The evaluator(s) will prepare three main deliverables, an inception report, draft and final report. The evaluator(s) will comply with United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Norms and Standards for Evaluation and UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation.

The IOS Evaluation Office is responsible for the overall management of the evaluation and quality assurance of the deliverables. The Evaluation Office will also act as the primary liaison between the external evaluation team and UNESCO stakeholders.

The CI sector will provide the evaluator(s) with all relevant documentation including project documents, monitoring and progress reports, final narrative and evaluation reports, and all relevant documentation presented at meetings of the IPDC's IGB and IGC.

An Evaluation Reference Group will be set up to accompany the evaluation process by providing feedback on the draft Terms of Reference, inception report, draft and final report. The Reference Group will comprise members from the IOS Evaluation Office, representatives from the CI sector and the Chairperson of IPDC. The IPDC Bureau will be consulted during the evaluation process and requested to provide feedback on the aforementioned deliverables. The Reference Group shall meet periodically during the evaluation, as necessary.

5. Evaluator Qualifications

The external evaluator(s) should possess the following **mandatory** qualifications and experience:

- At least 10 years of professional experience in an evaluation, research and/or policy-related position in the field of international development
- At least 10 years of professional experience designing and leading programme and policy evaluations
- At least 10 years of experience in international media development, human rights and freedom of expression issues
- An advanced university degree in the field of media development, communications, social sciences, public policy or related field
- Excellent language skills in English (oral communication and report writing)
- Knowledge of the UN system and other international organizations

Verification of these qualifications will be based on the provided curriculum vitae. Moreover, references, web links or electronic copies of two recently completed evaluation reports should be provided (preferably evaluations of media development programmes).

The recommended composition of the evaluation team is one senior evaluator, although other proposals will be considered. The evaluation assignment is expected to require approximately 40 – 50 professional working days, including 1-2 visits to UNESCO Headquarters in Paris. Additional travel for fieldwork is not expected.

6. Deliverables and Schedule

The evaluation will take place between April 2017 - July 2017. The evaluation will consist of three main deliverables: inception report, draft report and final report. The timetable includes a workshop to present and discuss draft findings.

Activity/Deliverable	Timeline (2017)
Formal launch of the evaluation	15 April
Inception report (to be shared with IGC)	30 April
Data collection and analysis phase	April – June
Workshop with Evaluation Reference Group	End June (to be confirmed)
Draft Evaluation Report	1 July
Final Evaluation report	15 July

The Draft and Final Evaluation reports should be written in English and structured as follows:

- Executive Summary

- Programme description
- Evaluation purpose
- Evaluation methodology
- Findings and conclusions
- Recommendations
- Annexes including the Terms of Reference, interview list, data collection instruments, key documents consulted

7. References – previous audits and evaluations of the programme

New audits by the External Auditor: audit report on the Communication and Information Sector (2016)

An evaluation of the reforms (2006)

Media in development: an evaluation of UNESCO's International Programme for the Development of Communication (IPDC) (2002)

ANNEX 3: LIST OF INTERVIEWEES

The following were interviewed during the course of this evaluation, most in person and individually.

UNESCO

Andrea Cairola, FU/RAB

Axel Plathe, FSC

Boyan Radoykov, CI/KSD/UAP

Cedric Wachholz, CI/EO

Dulat Kasymov, BSP/PMR

Erika Walker, FU/KNG

Fackson Banda, CI/KSD/UAP

Franck Odinot, CI/AO

Frank La Rue, CI/ADG

Geoffrey Geurts, IOS/EVS

Guy Berger, CI/FEM

Hezekiel Dlamini, FU/HAR

John Otieno Okande, FU/NAI

Lydia Gachungi, FU/NAI

Maria Rosa Gonzalez, CI/FEM/IPDC

Mirta Lourenco, CI/FEM/MAS

Ranwa Safadi, BSP/PMR

Ricardo Grassi, FU/KAB

Saorla McCabe, CI/FEM/FOE

Sylvie Coudray, CI/FEM/FOE

Wijayananda Jayaweera, (Retired UNESCO staff member)

IPDC Bureau and Council (country)

Albana Shala (The Netherlands)

Chafica Haddad (Grenada)

Gilbert John Bull Maimbo (Zambia)

Ivor Gaber (UK)

Krzysztof Wojciechowski (Poland)

María Elena Velasquez (Ecuador)

Mogens Bjerregård (Denmark)

Naranjargal Hashhuu, (Mongolia)

Suad Al Ishaqi (Oman)

Permanent Delegations to UNESCO (country)

Dominique Levasseur (Canada)

Dorthe Wendt (Denmark)

Élaine Ayotte (Ambassador, Permanent Delegate, Canada)

Evelina Melbarzde (Latvia)

Francisco Lopez Crespo (Spain)

Frida Gustafsson (Sweden)

Grethe Sofie Bratlie (Norway)

Kristin Karlsen (Norway)

Kristina Tamosaityte (Lithuania)

Lionel Veer (Ambassador, Permanent Delegate, The Netherlands)

Margot Llompart (The Netherlands)

Mascha Wismans (The Netherlands)

Piia Immonen-Seuguenot (Finland)

Zabrina Holmstrom (Finland)

IPDC Project beneficiaries in Thailand and Vietnam

Anothai Udomsilp

Chanattee Tinnam

Jirayudh Sinthuphan

Tran Khanh How

Tran Nhat Minh

Experts

Erick Oduor, ARTICLE 19

Francesco Diasio, AMARC, World Association Community Radio Broadcasters

Henry Maina, ARTICLE 19 Eastern Africa

Kenneth Okwurow,

Leon Willems, Director of Free Press Unlimited

Ndeti Ndati, Director at the School of Journalism and Mass Communication, University of Nairobi

Stephen King, Omidyar Foundation

Tim Curtis, UNESCO, Chief of Section, Intangible Heritage, CLT/CRE/ITH

Ulla Carrlson, Former Director of Nordicom and frequent expert from Sweden at UNESCO governing body meetings

Victor Bwire, Media Council of Kenya

Wambui Kiai, School of Journalism and Mass Communication at the University of Nairobi

ANNEX 4: GOVERNANCE WORKING GROUP RECOMMENDATIONS

The 38th Session of the UNESCO General Conference established a Working Group to review the governance, processes and working methods of the governing bodies of UNESCO. Its report, *Report to the Executive Board: Governance, Procedures and Working Methods of the Governing Bodies of UNESCO. 202 EX/21*, was published on the 22nd of September 2017 and proposes four specific recommendations regarding the IPDC.

Each of these, contained in Paragraph 88 of the Report, is addressed below in the light of the findings of this evaluation.

The Report recommended that the IPDC:

a. Reaffirm the intergovernmental nature, especially of the Bureau, while retaining expert engagement.

This evaluation affirms the special value of the intergovernmental nature of the IPDC, derived from its mandate and governance structures. It notes the particular contribution of the combination of media expertise and politically-attuned diplomatic skills among the IPDC Council and Bureau delegates in a forum dedicated to the development of media and communication with a strategic long-term horizon. This enables the development and endorsement of normative instruments that are both technically competent and accepted by government as neutral and impartial (Section 5.1).

The evaluation notes that the UNESCO General Conference specifies that Council representatives shall “preferably be specialists”, and that this should apply *a fortiori* to the Bureau which deals extensively with specialist media and communication issues. It draws attention to the positive practice of many Member States diplomatic missions to support their respective appointed expert delegates through attending Council and Bureau meetings as observers, and by providing them with advice and briefings (Sections 3.1 and 6.2).

This is a practice that should be encouraged as a means to address a concern expressed that the Bureau could benefit from additional experience in diplomatic procedures (Section 6.2).

b. Develop clear, objective criteria for approval of projects.

This evaluation notes that the procedures for project approval could be improved in several ways.

In describing the Project Selection process in detail (Sections 2.3 and 6.2) it is noted that the application guidelines do not contain prioritised or weighted criteria, and that such weighting are not deployed in the selection process by the Bureau. Furthermore, the final selection from among applications deemed eligible and budget adjustments made involve an informal and unsystematic process, with somewhat arbitrary reference to IPDC priorities and UNESCO priorities such as Africa countries, gender, SIDS and Least Developed Countries.

The evaluation recommends that more detailed guidelines should be provided in line with conventional tender assessment good practice including weighted criteria; and that a tutorial would be provided especially to new Bureau members to ensure greater uniformity in the rationale applied to decisions and that the quality of proposals is factored in appropriately

c. Examine roles of Bureau and Council in selection of projects.

The evaluation notes the current IPDC Statutes define the work of the governing bodies such that the Bureau has full responsibility for project selection, approval and allocation of funds from the Special

Account (Section 3.1). Opinions regarding the roles of respective roles of Bureau and Council in Project selection were gathered through interviews with all but one Bureau member, several Council members, the Secretariat and Field staff. A large majority of those interviewed feel that the current situation, in which the Bureau has full responsibility, remains appropriate. Concerns were expressed that providing the Council with a larger role would, if it involved an additional Council meeting, be costly although an online role could also be envisaged. More substantially, there were concerns that greater Council participation might result in a selection process with lower potential for positive outcomes, because of increased complexity; because only a small number of Council members might play an active role, skewing the results; and/or because of a perceived higher potential for politicising the process (Section 6.2). Therefore no change was suggested in this area (Section 8).

The evaluation also notes a concern among some members that the Council is insufficiently informed of developments in relation to Project selection and other areas (Section 6.2), and a Recommendation is made that would improve communication between the Bureau, Council and Secretariat (Section 8). This would ensure that the process of selection is more transparent and enable the Council to be better informed on Project selection issues and related issues.

d. More balanced consideration of six priorities, including capacity-building.

The evaluation noted that the current six Priorities are heterogeneous in nature, some referring to outcomes (such as enhanced media pluralism and safety of journalists), and others to tools and methods of interventions (such as conducting media assessments and capacity building of journalists). This has led, in part, to a blurring of the Priority focus among some donors and Council members (Sections 3.5 and 6.1). The lack of strategic alignment between priorities and IPDC's Objectives was also commented on (Section 6.1).

As a result of this and other considerations the evaluation has recommended (Section 8) that the Council approve a Strategic Framework that would include a review of the current Priorities.