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LIST OF ACRONYMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACP</td>
<td>Africa, Caribbean and Pacific Countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATI</td>
<td>Access to information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BBC</td>
<td>British Broadcasting Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIMA</td>
<td>Center for International Media Assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSO</td>
<td>Civil society organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAC</td>
<td>OECD Development Assistance Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DfID</td>
<td>Department for International Development (UK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC</td>
<td>European Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDF/FED</td>
<td>European Development Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIDHR</td>
<td>European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENPI</td>
<td>European Neighbourhood and Partnership Instrument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FoE</td>
<td>Freedom of Expression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOSS</td>
<td>Free and open source software</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT</td>
<td>Information and Communications Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INGO</td>
<td>International non governmental organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPA</td>
<td>Instrument for Pre-Accession Assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E</td>
<td>Monitoring and evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDI</td>
<td>Media Development Indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non Governmental Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>Political economy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEMM</td>
<td>Political Economy Media Matrix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sida</td>
<td>Swedish International Development Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ToR</td>
<td>Terms of Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNESCO</td>
<td>United Nations Educational, Scientific, Cultural Organisation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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BACKGROUND: WHY THE PE APPROACH?
In recent years there has been a call for donors to take account of the broad political environment in which they are intervening rather than merely applying normative governance assumptions to countries. For example, rather than simply applying a standardised media framework regardless of the local situation, this approach starts from an understanding of how power is exercised, whom by and what would cause them to change their behaviour. The expression ‘political economy analysis’ is often used to describe this trend and it deploys tools that have come to be known as Drivers of Change and Power Analyses. The political economy analysis is becoming increasingly influential among bilateral donors such as the British Dfid or the Dutch development ministry, and multi-lateral institutions such as the World Bank, though it is still to be fully put into practice at the operational level.

The European Commission has begun to integrate a political economy approach throughout the project cycle. This guide tailors the PE approach to the media development sector specifically. Using a PE media matrix (PEMM) as its basis, it explains how to integrate the PE approach throughout the programme cycle.

Many existing [donor] approaches to aid are not working and donors need to radically change the way that they work. In particular the ‘good governance’ approach is widely criticised for its use of ideal models and technocratic ‘best practice’ solutions that take insufficient account of political realities.

In thinking about the goals of projects donors should support goals which may not be ideal but which are ‘good enough’, and which fit the political and social realities of aid-recipient countries. Evaluations across donor programmes have shown this is often the approach adopted in practice on the ground.

Political economy analysis can be ideologically challenging for donors in that it does not always fit the capacities and skills of many implementing agencies and may be politically awkward for the donor to publically accept.

Internal organisational incentives and cultures in donor agencies themselves are among the most significant obstacles to putting politics into practice. For example - information asymmetries, rapid staff turnover, pressures to disburse aid and to ‘do more with less’ staffing, as well as the need to comply with reporting requirements and demonstrate effectiveness can also prevent more realistic and politically feasible ways of working. In an institution like the EU, with multiple delegations, in multiple countries, representing multiple member states this is even more marked.

---

1 The EC approach is reflected in a paper on ‘Using Political Economy Analysis to Improve Development Effectiveness’. Two annexes to the paper provide a tool for country level political economy analysis. The EC framework is a development of the Strategic Governance and Corruption Assessment (SIGACA) tool used by The Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs (CRU 2008). It also builds upon the Sida approach encapsulated in their “power analysis”

2 Wild, L. and Foresti, M (May 2012), Politics into Practice, Overseas Development Institute
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APPLYING
THE PE APPROACH
TO THE MEDIA SECTOR
2.1. THE THREE LEVELS TO A POLITICAL ECONOMY ANALYSIS

**THE THREE LEVELS OF ANALYSIS ARE**

**STRUCTURAL** – which represents the historic legacy and culture of a society. For the media this would include not just the historic culture of the media but broader questions such as the balance between state, society and market, the viability of public institutions (as opposed to state controlled or private bodies) and the historical strength and independence of civil society.

**INSTITUTIONAL** – this comprises the main, relevant institutions of society - executive, legislative and judicial - that impact upon the media environment. This includes regulatory bodies and institutions.

**ACTORS** – the people and groups whose behaviours will shape the outcomes of any development project. These will include: ‘demand-side’ media users and citizen journalists and ‘supply-side’ media institutions and journalists; those who champion reform and those who oppose change; and those potential winners from the desired change, the neutrals, undecided and those likely to lose if change comes about. This environment is often coloured by the political demands of donor governments promoting international standards and norms - creating a balance between demand and supply that may be difficult to disentangle.

2.2. COMPONENTS OF A SUSTAINABLE MEDIA ENVIRONMENT

At the same time, any PE analysis has to take into account the type of media landscape necessary to support democracy and development both in terms of standalone programmes as well as part of other programmes (electoral support, governance, post conflict reconstruction, private sector development, literacy, human rights and so on). This is a rapidly changing landscape with new digital platforms for accessing information and exercising the right to free expression emerging - bringing new challenges and possibilities for online and offline news production and communication.

Over time a broad consensus, at international level has emerged. For example the Swedish Development Agency Sida and UNESCO hosted a seminar on Waxholms Island in May 2003 whose conclusions were subsequently encapsulated in the UNESCO Belgrade Declaration adopted at World Press Freedom Day event in May 20042. The main elements of a media necessary to support democracy identified in this approach were:

- A legal policy framework that protects freedom of expression;
- The establishment of an independent regulator;
- A guaranteed mixed media environment of public, private and community broadcasters;
- Professionalism of and physical security for journalists.

This emerging consensus led UNESCO to commission a study to examine the different systems that sought to assess the state of media. This study showed 26 separate methods of assessing the state of a media and its environment. These other indicator systems focus on specific issues, such as safety, legal environment, market analysis and can be complementary to the approach adopted by UNESCO. The UNESCO report itself tried to arrive at a consensus by distilling the variety of approaches in to one comprehensive analytical tool. This approach was endorsed by member states in February 20084 and remains the most internationally accepted system for understanding media environments. Five major components of a sustainable media environment were identified5:

---

2 UNESCO Belgrade Declaration
5 Ibid
A system of regulation and control conducive to freedom of expression, pluralism and diversity of the media: Existence of a legal, policy and regulatory framework that protects and promotes freedom of expression and information, based on international best practice standards and developed in participation with civil society. Such regulation should cover offline and online platforms and embrace competition law. In the Internet sphere this should include ensuring competition in last mile access to consumers, the absence of an Internet kill switch and no attempts to hold intermediaries liable for the content they carry.

A pluralistic media environment with transparency of ownership: the existence of multiple forms of media – print, broadcast, online, with multiple ownerships – public, private and community, each of which is transparent so people can know what viewpoints, if any, are represented by the media outlets available. The impact of digital communications may mitigate a lack of pluralism in the offline media.

Media as a platform for democratic discourse: The media, within a prevailing climate of self-regulation and respect for the journalistic profession, reflects and represents the diversity of views and interests in society, including those of marginalised groups. There is a high level of information and media literacy. Content may exist across multiple platforms both offline and online so the assessment should take account of all aspects of media.

Professional capacity building and supporting institutions that underpins freedom of expression, pluralism and diversity: Media workers need access to professional training and development, both vocational and academic. Media managers should have access to both professional and business training. It is also important in the modern world that journalists are able to operate across multiple platforms and have the skills to manage a more intense news cycle, which incorporates citizen input.

Infrastructural capacity is sufficient to support independent and pluralistic media: The media sector should have high levels of public access, including among marginalised groups, and make efficient use of technology to gather and distribute news and information, appropriate to the local context. Given the growing importance of digital communications the development of a telecommunications infrastructure is a crucial element here. Within the digital sphere infrastructure capacity is best guaranteed by the presence of redundant technologies for delivering content and multi-entry gateways for Internet access.

In addition to the five above mentioned components it is also important to analyse the media market and the players at stake. Such analysis should include understanding market regulation (the enabling environment for private sector development), taxation, advertising markets, the nature of audiences and so on.
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POLITICAL ECONOMY MEDIA MATRIX (PEMM)
3.1. ANALYSIS THROUGH A MATRIX

Any analysis of the media environment needs to be broken down into levels of analysis (structural, institutional and agents) as well as the components of a media landscape that support democracy and development, which are described above. A matrix structure provides an appropriate and workable framework for doing this.

3.2. WORKING THROUGH THE PEMM

HORIZONTAL AXIS
The matrix is structured with the components of a media landscape along the horizontal axis. These are based on the UNESCO MDI categories mentioned above, but have been renamed for greater clarity to:

- Law and regulation
- Pluralism of media
- Diversity of content and opinion
- Capacity of media institutions, journalists, civil society and citizens
- Infrastructure

VERTICAL AXIS
The vertical axis of the matrix is dedicated to the levels of analysis. A series of questions directs the type of material needed for each box.

At the level of structural analysis we would expect to find media components such as the constitutional and legal position governing media e.g. whether there are laws supporting freedom of expression or the right to information on the one hand, or whether there are laws restricting free expression. These may be explicit such as provisions for censorship or requirement for media outlets or journalists themselves to register with the state in order to operate. They may also be implicit – laws, which take legitimate grounds for restricting free expression such as the protection of privacy, reputation or national security but interpret them restrictively so as to restrict what would be regarded in international law as legitimate speech. Laws that regulate the business sector may also be important. And of course, informing the specific media laws and provisions is the wider question of whether there is a culture of rule of law, or an accepted adherence to norms and values; and whether parliament and the judiciary are independent and respected.

More subtly, and bearing upon whether the media can provide a platform for democratic debate is what one might call the political tone of society. Is there an acceptance that disagreement is a normal part of democracy rather than a threat to the state, that scrutiny of those in public life is an accepted price for holding power, rather than a form of insult, that truth is best determined by the clash of contending views rather than the assertions of those who hold power in various forms? This goes to the heart of the normative values of a society and while, in one sense the media help forge those values, they are shaped by those values themselves. One only has to look at how a series of independent media channels in Iraq in 2003, established with western normative values, became ethno-sectarian mouthpieces as the civil conflict developed.

At the institutional level the key media components are the relevant media institutions. These will include the media organisations themselves and their plurality both in terms of ownership and content. Particular attention should be paid to the functioning state controlled media and whether they perform a public service function or act as mouthpieces for the government. This means understanding the difference between the state and the public, a separation common in Europe but not widely embraced elsewhere. It would also embrace the relevant government institutions, particularly those playing any role in regulating media either legitimately (in terms of competition) or illegitimately in terms of censorship. It would also embrace any communication regulator, and the question of its independence and effectiveness.

At the institutional level questions of infrastructure and capacity also come into play (those these also emerge at the stakeholder level). A relatively open regulatory climate is of limited value if media are not accessible or are prohibitively expensive. Independent media need to be sustainable in the market place, rather than reliant upon subsidies from parties or the state, so the business capacity of media becomes an important institutional issue.

---

6 http://www.policy.hu/ammarah/policypaper_lawjournal.pdf
Finally in looking at **actors and agents** and using the political economy approach of separating “supply” side and “demand” side, on the supply side there are media owners, editors, journalists, politicians, public officials, and lawyers. On the demand side there are the general population, civil society groups, and journalists. In looking for reform champions these will vary from situation to situation but generally it will be those who do not have power in the current dispensation while the converse will be true of those resisting change. Reform opponents will also vary but likely to include those who currently dominate the media markets, public officials and senior politicians. Incentives for change can be internally generated – in the desire to be winners and not losers – or externally generated by the unsustainability of the current system and external pressures for reform (political or market).

### 3.3. CONSIDER THE SIGNPOSTS

When approaching the PEMM it is helpful to consider the signposts, that is, the broad type of socio-political environment being analysed. The five categories below are generalised, but can help to frame the right questions when thinking in more detail about the structural and institutional environment in which the media operate and the balance of power in the sector.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Developed established democracies</th>
<th>Emerging democracies</th>
<th>Authoritarian societies</th>
<th>Political stasis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developed democracies potentially needing reform. While developed democracies generally respect freedom of expression and the existence of an independent media, most have flaws of one kind or another. They may retain criminal or excessively broad libel laws on the statute book, or have insufficient access to information laws, or have a weak community media sector or an inadequate public broadcaster or one that is insufficiently independent. However, such societies are unlikely to be the subject of aid from the European Union. So while it is important to note this category of states it is unlikely to be of operational significance.</td>
<td>Where there is still a significant commitment to and appetite for political reform. Such societies may derive from a variety of causes – the overthrow of a repressive regime, the passing power from an exhausted autocrat, defeat, colonial freedom or independence or even a reforming leadership responding to public pressure. In all of these cases we would expect to see a process of change underway and an appetite for reform among the emerging ruling group. Such a climate will not endure over time however, the realities of power, the entrenching of a new elite, the inevitable focus upon economic development means that the window of opportunity for media reform and development will be limited. It would be important to support projects that are timely and designed to achieve structural reform.</td>
<td>Authoritarian societies, which are committed to market reforms and integration into the wider world market. In these circumstances, media would be expected to be economically sustainable rather than rely upon government subsidy and the existence of market pressures, the need to appeal to an audience and advertisers will create incentives for media development and professionalism that otherwise would be blocked. Market forces can in themselves create some opportunities for media reform which, though more limited than those in a society in transition, are still worth exploiting.</td>
<td>A variant of an authoritarian society with limited or purely protections for freedom of expression, little or no media independence and little integration with wider market forces. Here the media will be subsidised by governments or by wealthy individuals with connections to the ruling elite. In such countries there is little scope or leverage for change, other than activities which raise awareness of the need for media freedoms – though in truth the awareness is likely to be present but the realisation of such freedoms remote.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.4. GOOD PRACTICE WHEN OPERATIONALISING THE PEMM

PE analysis should not be viewed as a standalone or ‘tick-box’ activity within a programme. Instead, if used properly, it should shape programme design and implementation and, in doing so, effectiveness. It is a tool to strengthen support by making it relevant to and appropriate for the local context. For it to be most effective, the PE process should be based on the following good practice:

CONSULTATION
The knowledge required to map out the media environment in any context rarely lies with one person or organisation. Creating a comprehensive map will require input from multiple stakeholders including programme staff, media academics and experts (including legal), local and international NGOs, other donor organisations, media organisations, private sector and telecommunications companies, media professionals, syndicates and trade unions, citizens and users.

INFORMATION SHARING
Information gathered during the process should be shared with other organisations and donors working in the field. In depth analysis of any context is time and resource consuming and many local organisations do not have the capacity to carry out the process themselves. There is also little point in different organisations and donors carrying out the same exercise.

FREQUENT UPDATES
The social and political are constantly evolving, as is the media field. Maps of the media environment in any context need to be regularly updated to reflect changes at all levels. This will ensure that a programme of support remains relevant and appropriate in the context addressing priority areas through the right agents. In turn, experiences and knowledge of a country or context gained over the lifetime should be used to inform the PEMM.

INTEGRATED THROUGHOUT THE PROGRAMME CYCLE
If the PE approach is to properly influence programme outcomes then it needs to be integrated throughout the project cycle. Emphasis should be placed on the design phase when key stakeholders are identified and objectives, outcomes and outputs are set as this shapes how a programme is implemented. If we get this right, then implementation should reflect and react to a PE understanding of the reality on the ground. Once PE analysis has been done, the logical flow is then to develop programme outcomes and associated indicators and then finally, perhaps through dialogue with other donors, to assess the impact parameters and links to broader democracy and governance and development goals.
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POLITICAL ECONOMY MEDIA MATRIX (PEMM)
## STRUCTURAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Law and regulation</th>
<th>Pluralism of the media</th>
<th>Diversity of content and opinion</th>
<th>Capacity of media institutions, journalists, CS &amp; citizens</th>
<th>Infrastructure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is freedom of expression guaranteed in law?</td>
<td>Is there a tradition of transparency and openness about media ownership and control?</td>
<td>Is there a tradition of open and critical debate (including of the government) where it is legitimate to hold different views and where public discourse happens openly in the public sphere?</td>
<td>Are the independent media sustainable, wealthy and developed?</td>
<td>Is there active investment in new infrastructure and regular maintenance of existing infrastructure? Or plans/policies?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the right to information guaranteed in law?</td>
<td>Is there an assumption that power is concentrated across all spheres of society including the media?</td>
<td>Are minorities allowed representation in the media?</td>
<td>What is the literacy rate in the country?</td>
<td>Is universal access an objective?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are editorial independence and journalists’ right to protect their sources guaranteed in law?</td>
<td>Has the media historically been used as a mouthpiece of the State (do PSBs have a public service remit)?</td>
<td>Is there a general policy around diversity?</td>
<td>What are the levels of digital literacy in the country?</td>
<td>What are the penetration/reach rates for the following: Internet Mobile phone Broadband Broadcast (TV and Radio) Print media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do other laws – defamation, national security – place undue restrictions on freedom of expression?</td>
<td>Is there a tradition of corruption or collusion?</td>
<td>Is there a tradition of public service media (as a concept)?</td>
<td>Is the environment safe for media professionals to operate without fear of violence, physical threats or attack?</td>
<td>What are the demographics of the above penetration rates?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is independence of the regulatory system guaranteed in law?</td>
<td>Is the media and telecommunications industry driven by the free market?</td>
<td>Can digital and online platforms operate freely without control and inhibition?</td>
<td>Do media professionals have the right to join or opt out of trade unions or syndicates?</td>
<td>How high is ownership of the following: Mobile phones Televisions Radio Computers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there an acceptance of the principle of multi-stakeholderism (including for internet governance)?</td>
<td>Is there a high level of trust in the media or is trust low?</td>
<td>What are the levels of media consumption and what are the demographics?</td>
<td>Is there a right to take industrial action?</td>
<td>What are the demographics of the above ownership rates?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there a tradition of censorship or surveillance of offline and online media by the state or other actors?</td>
<td>What is the level of uptake of social media and which are the dominant platforms?</td>
<td>What are the levels of technological innovation?</td>
<td>What is the level of functionality of the majority of mobile devices?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Is there a culture of political awareness and citizenship that means citizens readily use the media to bring their leaders to account?</td>
<td>Is there an urban rural divide in terms of access to internet and mobile phones?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Does the size of the country and terrain affect distribution and infrastructure?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law and regulation</td>
<td>Pluralism of the media</td>
<td>Diversity of content and opinion</td>
<td>Capacity of media institutions, journalists, CS &amp; citizens</td>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is freedom of expression respected in practice?</td>
<td>Are there public media institutions?</td>
<td>Is there an independent public service media with clear policies reflecting the needs of society?</td>
<td>Are the majority of independent media organisations (including community media) economically independent? i.e. are they financially viable and able to sustain themselves without external support or subsidy?</td>
<td>Does telecom and broadband infrastructure extend to rural and remote areas?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is right to information respected in practice?</td>
<td>Is ownership transparent and open?</td>
<td>Are there professional codes of conduct within the media?</td>
<td>Do these institutions have the ability to sustain news content as well as entertainment?</td>
<td>Is there the technical means to broadcast TV and Radio to rural and remote areas?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there proactive disclosure of government information? E.g. through open data platforms?</td>
<td>Is concentration of media institutions high?</td>
<td>Are there systems of self-regulation?</td>
<td>Do independent media organisations have business and management expertise and know how?</td>
<td>Are there appropriate road and distribution networks for print media?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are editorial independence and journalists’ right to protect their sources respected in practice?</td>
<td>Are institutions vulnerable to politics and sectarianism?</td>
<td>Is staffing and employment practice for diversity?</td>
<td>Are traditional media organisations incorporating online platforms into their business strategies?</td>
<td>Is access to telecoms infrastructure affordable?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there censorship of traditional media by the State?</td>
<td>Are media markets – including print, broadcast, fixed and wireless telephony and ISP markets - liberalised and open to competition?</td>
<td>Is there convergence of media across different platforms?</td>
<td>Do training institutions exist and are they sustainable?</td>
<td>Are connection rates and price plans affordable for low income earning population?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there online censorship and surveillance by the State?</td>
<td>Is there corruption and collusion in media institutions?</td>
<td>Is there a strong community media sector?</td>
<td>Do journalists have access to a range of practical and academic courses?</td>
<td>Is digital switchover planned/ has it happened?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is independence of the regulatory system respected in practice?</td>
<td>Is regulation around tax, business and advertising used to favour one company over another?</td>
<td>Is there linguistic diversity within the media?</td>
<td>Do media professionals have access to modern technical facilities and equipment?</td>
<td>Are the financial costs of digital switchover affordable / subsidies sufficient for the low income earning population?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are crimes against journalists and activists prosecuted and is there no climate of impunity?</td>
<td>Is the regulator independent with transparent plans for implementing all policies?</td>
<td>Does the media report on issues of real concern to the population?</td>
<td>Are female journalists and journalists from ethnic, linguistic or religious groups fairly represented across the media industry, including at senior levels?</td>
<td>Does internet infrastructure include multiple and independently operated access links and gateways, multiple internet exchange points and competing communications networks using diverse technological infrastructures?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## INSTITUTIONAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Law and regulation</th>
<th>Pluralism of the media</th>
<th>Diversity of content and opinion</th>
<th>Capacity of media institutions, journalists, CS &amp; citizens</th>
<th>Infrastructure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the regulatory system operate in a way that ensures media pluralism and freedom of expression and information?</td>
<td>Is there an ombudsman?</td>
<td>Is there an emerging tradition of citizen journalism, peer to peer content, online and mobile platforms and applications?</td>
<td>Can media professionals and activists operate safely without fear of punishment, harassment or attack?</td>
<td>Is internet infrastructure owned and controlled by multiple non-state actors?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are internet institutions and internet governance decision making multi-stakeholder?</td>
<td>Have regulators ensured that sufficient complaints mechanisms are in place?</td>
<td>Is encryption, authentication, anonymity and circumvention technologies are readily available and accessible?</td>
<td>Is there is a lack of a technical kill switch which would turn off the internet at device or network level?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are media markets - including print, broadcast, fixed and wireless telephony and ISP markets - liberalised and open to competition?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does regulation allow market-based non state access to last mile consumers?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Are CSOs working in the field to monitor media practice, provide advocacy on issues around FoE and ATI and access to skills and equipment/technologies?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there fair and equitable access to the frequency spectrum to a plurality of media including community broadcasters</td>
<td></td>
<td>Do trade unions and professional associations provide advocacy on issues on FoE and ATI?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do pricing structures of licenses create barriers to entry for smaller media institutions or new telecommunications companies?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Are software and technology developers creating online and mobile platforms and applications to enable FoE and ATI?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ACTORS

**INCLUDING** Regulators, Government, Political Parties, Donors, Public Service Media, Independent media outlets, Community media, Telecommunications companies (including mobile and ISPs), Private sector companies, Media professionals (incl. journalists), Technology and software developers, CSOs, Citizens and activists, Other (drugs cartels, religious groups etc.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Law and regulation</th>
<th>Pluralism of the media</th>
<th>Diversity of content and opinion</th>
<th>Capacity of media institutions, journalists, CS &amp; citizens</th>
<th>Infrastructure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Who is in favour of stronger FoE and reform?</td>
<td>Who dominates the sector economically (if at there is clear monopoly)?</td>
<td>Who is engaged in content production?</td>
<td>Which of the following depend on outside sources of income to make them sustainable?</td>
<td>Does telecom and broadband infrastructure extend to rural and remote areas?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who is strong enough to bring about change?</td>
<td>Who has political influence in the sector?</td>
<td>Who seeks a controlled and censored offline environment?</td>
<td>Where does this income come from?</td>
<td>Who is promoting investment in infrastructure?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who is active and engaged in bringing about reform?</td>
<td>Who is corrupt?</td>
<td>Who seeks a controlled and censored online environment?</td>
<td>For the following actors:</td>
<td>Are there appropriate road and distribution networks for print media?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who has incentives to change?</td>
<td>Who is actively engaged in promoting pluralism?</td>
<td>Who is actively engaged in preventing control and censorship of both online and offline media?</td>
<td>What is the level of their professional skills and standards?</td>
<td>Which citizens have access to infrastructure?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What support or work is there to date in the area of law and regulatory reform?</td>
<td>Who seeks to protect economic and political dominance of the sector?</td>
<td>Who is promoting diversity of content?</td>
<td>What is their ability to effectively advocate on FoE and ATI issues?</td>
<td>What support or work is there to date in the area of infrastructure?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there current/future events and opportunities that would affect the ability or incentives of any of the actors identified to bring about change?</td>
<td>What support or work is there to date in the area of media pluralism and anti-ownership concentration?</td>
<td>Who has the power to increase diversity of content and opinion?</td>
<td>What is their ability to engage with digital and online media? (digital literacy)</td>
<td>Are there current/future events and opportunities that would affect the ability or incentives of any of the actors identified to bring about change?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ACTORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Law and regulation</th>
<th>Pluralism of the media</th>
<th>Diversity of content and opinion</th>
<th>Capacity of media institutions, journalists, CS &amp; citizens</th>
<th>Infrastructure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Are there current/future events and opportunities that would affect the ability or incentives of any of the actors identified to bring about change? | Are there current/future events and opportunities that would affect the ability or incentives of any of the actors identified to bring about change? | Of the following actors, who is actively supporting media professionals as well as citizens to engage in media?  
• Government  
• PSM  
• Independent media outlets  
• Community media  
• Telecommunications companies (including mobile and ISPs)  
• Technology & software developers  
• CSOs | Is internet infrastructure owned and controlled by multiple non-state actors? |
| Which actors if any are leading in innovation in the field? | What support or work is there to date in the area of capacity building and financial viability of the media? | Are there current/future events and opportunities that would affect the ability or incentives of any of the actors identified to bring about change? |
#5 DESIGNING MEDIA PROGRAMMES USING THE PE MEDIA MATRIX
To properly integrate a PE approach into the design and implementation of any programme or project, the PEMM should be used to:

- Map the environment
- Develop a programme strategy
- Set realistic programme objectives and achievable results
- Determine programme management systems which are flexible and responsive

### 5.1. MAP THE ENVIRONMENT

Before designing any programme or project, there should be thorough analysis of the country context using the PEMM. The matrix is designed to prompt programme staff through a series of key questions. As already mentioned this should be based on consultation with a variety of stakeholders, including other funders, so that the exercise is as comprehensive as possible. This is important not only because it pools together different perspectives and knowledge, but also because it is a way of gaining insight into the work that is already being done in that environment.

### 5.2. DEVELOP A PROGRAMME STRATEGY

The PEMM should be used to inform the programme strategy be it a country programme or a small community project. From the PEMM, programme staff should be able to:

**PINPOINT THE NEED**

Once the environment is comprehensively mapped, the gaps and needs of a particular context become visible and programme staff should be able to pinpoint the need. By examining the structural and institutional issues it is also easier to identify links between the different media components and actors. For example, the PEMM may highlight that: the government is committed to universal access to internet, but access to internet is low because infrastructure does not reach rural areas and mobile connectivity prices are high as a result of a monopoly in the telecommunications sector. At the same time literacy levels may be relatively high, but digital literacy low. This points to need for a comprehensive approach to increasing access to information through the internet by focusing on regulatory reform, infrastructure investment, as well as a focus on digital capacity building.

**ENSURE COMPLEMENTARITY**

If done thoroughly and based on consultation, the PEMM should also highlight existing support efforts by multi-lateral donors such as the UN and World Bank, European and other bi-lateral donors, INGOs, local NGOs and civil society groups, private foundations, and the private sector. Having the knowledge of what support is already underway, planned or has been attempted, should give programme staff the means to design a programme that compliments other efforts rather than duplicates them. It should also enable them to align EU strategy in a country or context with that of its member states.

**IDENTIFY KEY ACTORS AND POINTS OF ENTRY**

The PEMM should clearly map out the agents at play in the media environment: their ability to bring about change, their will for reform, and their relationships with one another.

Opportunities for support in any sector can be found with the strong actors as well as the weak actors. To bring about change within a specific area it may be necessary to work with actors who are already influential and have the potential to affect change. On the other hand, it may be necessary to build the strength and capacity of another actor to influence the power balance so that they may be able to eventually bring about change themselves. When considering agents’ power within the field it is also important to map out connections between agents. The strength of a specific group may come not from within the group itself, but through relationships or connections with other groups. In many cases it might not be possible to work directly with the end target group, and so it is necessary to work through other actors. Identifying points of entry and target groups, though, is highly dependent on who donors already have connections with in the given country or context.
**IDENTIFY APPROPRIATE TYPES OF SUPPORT**

Having used the PEMM to shed light on the need, targets and potential points of entry for support, it then becomes easy to identify appropriate types of assistance. Below is a list of the types of assistance that may be suitable under each media component, and which can be approached through a variety of actors.

- Establish, strengthen or protect FoE and ATI and laws to protect editorial independence and the protection of sources
- Access to information systems and processes: systems for handling information requests, proactive disclosure initiatives such as open data platforms
- Civil advocacy on FoE and ATI legal and regulatory reform
- Internet governance
- Issues affecting Internet governance (including cyber security; intermediary liability, privacy etc.)
- An enabling environment for the private sector

**LAW AND POLICY**

- Development of encryption, authentication and circumvention technologies and tools
- Online and offline security capacity building
- Professional training for journalists and media professionals
- Business and management skills for media organisations including community media
- Digital literacy training
- Access to technologies and equipment for journalists, activists, CSOs and citizens
- Support to Public Service Broadcasting

**DIVERSITY OF CONTENT AND OPINION**

- Development of interactive mobile and online platforms and applications with appropriate functionality for the country e.g. blog aggregators
- Support to community media
- Programming for broadcast media on/in a range of issues and languages
- Support to underground media and citizen journalism initiatives
- Development of free and open source software (FOSS), applications and platforms and access to FOSS
- Direct support to content in exceptional circumstances such as conflict societies
- Advice on coverage during elections and requirements for balance and fairness

**CAPACITY AND FINANCIAL VIABILITY**

- Development of encryption, authentication and circumvention technologies and tools
- Online and offline security capacity building
- Professional training for journalists and media professionals
- Business and management skills for media organisations including community media
- Digital literacy training
- Access to technologies and equipment for journalists, activists, CSOs and citizens
- Support to Public Service Broadcasting

**PLURALISM OF MEDIA**

- Anti-monopolisation measures, including licensing and pricing reform
- Support to independent regulator, including telecommunications regulation
5.3. SET REALISTIC PROGRAMME OBJECTIVES AND ACHIEVABLE RESULTS

The PEMM provides a comprehensive understanding of the, often stark, reality on the ground. In this way it can help to the tendency to set unattainable objectives and unfair expectations on project partners. The PEMM allows programme staff to understand the range of challenges and risks, to determine the probability of change, and the expected timeframe in which this change can happen. It is crucial for PE analysis to inform objectives and planned results so that they are realistic and achievable from the start, rather than idealistic.

5.4. DETERMINE PROGRAMME MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS WHICH ARE FLEXIBLE AND RESPONSIVE

PE analysis recognises the constant evolution of an environment. Programmes need to be able to adapt to these changes. This requires programme management systems, which are flexible and responsive to these changes, particularly if programme cycles are over a longer period of time (3-5 years). As such, programmes should be structured so that activities and even outcomes can be adapted to fit the changing environment. M&E systems should provide insight not only into programme progress, but also the changes in the environment that could limit this progress (see section below). There needs to be the ability for implementing partners to review a programmes direction together with EU programme staff and without the fear that funding could be cut.
#6 EVALUATING MEDIA PROGRAMMES
6.1. WHAT IS M&E?

Monitoring and Evaluation are two distinct but complimentary processes.

**MONITORING**

is the tracking of activities and progress towards achieving outcomes and objectives. This happens throughout a project/programme and provides lessons that can be fed back into project implementation.

**EVALUATION**

is the assessment of a programme’s effectiveness in achieving its intended outcomes and objectives and its overall impact. It requires harnessing and analysing data to understand what worked and how.

6.2. M&E FOR MEDIA DEVELOPMENT

Adapting M&E practice to the media development field is an on-going process. And there is no agreement on a specific methodology or toolkit. In fact, most M&E methodologies and toolkits have been developed within the broader development sector rather than specifically for media development initiatives. Over the past few decades, both donors and practitioners have placed increasing emphasis on the changes that development initiatives are making – what is working and what is not? This is for a large part a result of the renewed focus on accountability.

The digital revolution has elevated the role and significance of the media and communications sector today. The media development field, though, still lacks the evidence base that shows impact.

6.3. THE CHALLENGES

First there are the more general challenges facing the field as a whole. The media development field is extremely broad – broad in terms of the issues, contexts and actors it is addressing (all of which the PE matrix helps to organise) – and broad in terms of the types of approach and project being implemented. The rapid rise of digital communications technologies and the role that they have to play in the media landscape has further complicated the field. As such, there is no homogenous means of measuring change. M&E methodologies and toolkits are, as with everything else in media development, highly dependent on a number of factors. Such as the type of media and level being addressed (for example telecommunications regulation); the political and socio-economic landscape; project size, duration and approach; the stakeholders involved and so on.

There is also the question: where does media development fit? In most organisations, media development is a rogue field cutting across a broad set of other rights and development issues. As a result, few organisations have distinct media development divisions or portfolios. Media development initiatives, therefore, tend to be scattered across departments and tends to be a component of other areas of assistance particularly in the governance field. This is the case for several multi-lateral organisations such as the EC, World Bank and Commonwealth Secretariat. Finding space for digital communications has also proved challenging for donors across the board – particularly because of the blurring with digital communications for development. As a result institutions tend not understand the size and scope of their media development work – measuring the impact of this work is therefore difficult.

The M&E challenges for the sector for the most part, however, are the same challenges faced across the aid sector in general and include:

- **Difficulty in quantifying the impact of development projects.** This is particularly the case for development projects focusing on ‘intangible development goals’ (SIAPA, p.13) – such as the free flow of information, or the openness of society - media development falls in this arena. Developing appropriate indicators for these intangible goals is difficult. It is not just a case of counting numbers, but of a nuanced understanding of the changes occurring.

- **Problem of attribution.** This is particularly the case when we start looking for higher-level changes and
impacts. Media development projects do not happen in isolation of either other development initiatives, or political and socio-economic factors and events. The question then becomes how far did my programme cause this outcome?

- **Short-term nature of projects.** Long-term outcomes and impacts happen over time: 10-20 years and certainly beyond the timeline of a particular project. Depending on donor, though, media development projects tend to last between 1-3 years with frequent reporting requirements during these time frames. Impact during this time tend to be negligible and so instead donors and implementers tend to either resort to superficial indicators or to focus on immediate and quantifiable outputs rather than real changes.

### 6.4. HOW IS THE PE APPROACH INTEGRATED INTO M&E?

If it is to have any true value, it is important that the PE approach is integrated at all stages of the programme cycle and this includes M&E. This does not necessarily call for an entirely new set of M&E tools, but there are a number of ways that the PE approach can be integrated into the M&E process.

#### WAYS TO INTEGRATE THE PE APPROACH

- In formulating an evaluation framework
- Monitoring progress and changes in the media environment
- A retrospective tool for evaluations

### IN FORMULATING AN EVALUATION FRAMEWORK

- Setting up objectives, outcomes and outputs that are realistic and fit with the political and social realities on the ground rather than donor ‘idealistic’ expectations. Many ‘unsuccessful’ programmes are this because the bar is set too high. To compensate, the programme indicators that are created tend to measure superficial rather than meaningful change in order to demonstrate any success. For instance, counting the number of journalists trained rather than an increase in the quality of journalism.

### MONITORING PROGRESS AND CHANGES IN THE MEDIA ENVIRONMENT

- The PEMM can be used as a regular exercise by programme staff to monitor the media field so that there is continuous awareness about how the environment and the players are changing and whether alternative strategies are needed in response to these changes. With this knowledge, programme staff should be able to modify programmes so that they remain relevant to needs and are focusing on the right points of power. It can also prevent programme staff from becoming too focused on activities and outputs acting as a reminder of the broader changes that a programme is seeking to achieve.

### A RETROSPECTIVE TOOL FOR EVALUATIONS

- The PE matrix should act as a reference point for external evaluators when framing their own evaluation questions. It is also a useful starting point for them to better understand the complexities of the environment that the programme was attempting to initiate change.

- It is a helpful tool in thinking about impact because it helps to frame the programme within the wider context. At the same time, however, it helps to put into perspective the level of impact that can actually be achieved.

- The PE matrix can also be used post-evaluation as a diagnostics tool to pinpoint those factors which made the programme a success or a failure. This can be conducted as a participatory exercise with programme staff, partners and beneficiaries.

### 6.5. KEY CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING MEDIA DEVELOPMENT

The PEMM is not an evaluation framework in itself, however and does not replace the need for thorough evaluation of a programme. The five OECD DAC criteria (relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and
sustainability) provide a standardised approach to evaluation and have shaped how most donor organisations and grantees design and implement programme evaluations. They do not dictate the process of an evaluation, but are helpful in framing the questions that should be asked when assessing how effective a programme has been. Put in the context of media development, they are as follows, with the addition of another criterion, ‘congruence’.

**RELEVANCE**
Are the project’s assumptions (or theory of change) appropriate and logical for the context? Does the intervention relate in a meaningful way to the current state of the media and factors affecting its development? Does the project fit well with the needs of stakeholders in the country or context? Are outputs and activities congruent with the overall objectives of media development?

**EFFICIENCY**
Are project activities the most efficient way of contributing to media development in a country or context, both in terms of cost and time? Is there a balance between quality of outputs vs. number of outputs?

**EFFECTIVENESS**
How far have outcomes and objectives been achieved? And what contributed towards or prevented these achievements?

**IMPACT**
What higher level changes happened as a result of the media development project? Direct or indirect, intended or unintended. And why? Which actors did the media development intervention affect?

**SUSTAINABILITY**
Will the benefits of the project be maintained after project/support has ended? Have durable, long-term knowledge, structures and institutions for media development been created? If the project has focused on financial sustainability of the media, has this been achieved?

**CONGRUENCE**
Does the project relate to other policy instruments such as governance, finance management, service delivery, elections, human rights, conflict prevention, and infrastructure? Are different efforts undermining each other? Is their strategic alignment with other EU
programmes or programmes of member states? Is there congruence between EU objectives and the objectives of the implementing partner?

6.6. M&E TOOLS FOR MEDIA DEVELOPMENT

The array of M&E tools and methodologies is extensive and which one or ones are most suitable is highly dependent of the type of media or development support, the actors involved and the scale of the programme. There is consensus, however, on some fundamental M&E principles for media and development projects.

BASELINE DATA

It is extremely difficult to show that a programme has contributed to or brought about change if there is no point of reference. Baseline data is any form of information - be it quantitative or qualitative - recording the state of the landscape before a programme is initiated. In this way, the PEMM can be used as a baseline tool.

LOGFRAMES

Logframes are a useful tool for both implementers and donors in that they lay out a clear plan of the steps that a programme needs to take to achieve its objective. They provide a focused strategy for turning activities into outputs, and outputs into outcomes and impacts. However, a big criticism of logframes is that they take too linear and rigid approach. Logframes, though, should be a tool to aid implementation rather than define it. Flexible programme managers will allow log-frames to be updated and modified as the media landscape changes and programme lessons are learned.

MONITORING ACTIVITIES AND PARTICIPANTS

Documenting progress is an important means of knowing what is working and what is not. This is particularly important for longer-term programmes where there tends to be substantial investment of resources. Feeding lessons back into a programme is essential to ensuring that objectives are eventually achieved. When tracking progress, however, it is important not to focus on only superficial indicators of change, such as number of journalists trained. Finding out how these journalists have used their skills and how this is affecting the overall professionalism of the media is far more important. This level of monitoring requires more thorough techniques, such as content analysis which involves monitoring traditional and online media content to assess accuracy, objectivity, variety, readability, audience contribution and so on.

SHARING DATA WITH ALL STAKEHOLDERS

There is a common misconception that accountability is to the donor alone and not beneficiaries. There is also a tendency to hold onto information rather than share it with other stakeholders in the field. It is for the benefit of all if information collected during programme M&E is shared with all stakeholders.

A BALANCE OF QUALITATIVE AND QUANTITATIVE INFORMATION

It is difficult to determine the balance between quantitative and qualitative data collection. With quantitative data there is the danger that results are simplified, superficial or simply lost. On the other hand there is a danger that qualitative data is too reliant on the subjective opinions of others and can become too anecdotal, lacking any hard evidence. Any evaluation should draw on both and seek corroboration between the two types of data.

KEEPING THINGS MEASURABLE

All programme benchmarks need to be measureable. Being able to pinpoint how to measure something often reflects on how doable the activity is or how achievable the outcome is.

---

BALANCING INTERNAL MONITORING WITH EXTERNAL EVALUATION

External assessment and opinion is beneficial to any programme as those involved often become biased or caught up in the details of implementation. External evaluators will have the more technical skills required to evaluate a programme which may not be present within an organisation. However, there is a risk that out-sourcing turns M&E into an add-on activity, rather than a fundamental part of programme design and implementation. In order to avoid this, it is important that programme staff and implementers are directly involved in the design of M&E frameworks as well as in monitoring and tracking progress. This should mean that implementers are always aware of what is working and what is not and can feed lessons back into a programme immediately.
#ANNEX1: POSSIBLE FUNDING MECHANISMS
The support can be financed by a variety of instruments, of which some are thematic and others with a geographic focus. During the past decade the European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights (EIDHR), with its focus on civil society, has been the most important source for media assistance and freedom of expression support. The EIDHR is used in a complementary fashion and is a comparatively small financial instrument compared to the more long-term and large scale programmes under the European Development Fund (EDF), ENPI (ENI) or other geographic instruments aiming at cooperation with governments. The Instrument for Stability can also be combined with other sources in order to maximise the impact of the interventions.

THE TABLE BELOW SHOWS THE MAIN FUNDING INSTRUMENTS AVAILABLE FOR MEDIA SUPPORT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>MISSION</th>
<th>GEOGRAPHICAL FOCUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1 Instrument for Humanitarian Aid (under ECHO)</strong></td>
<td>Humanitarian aid is aimed first and foremost at the people in developing countries and covers not only short-term relief but also disaster prevention and reconstruction operations, and ensuring functioning media can be part of the intervention.</td>
<td>Global focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2 Instrument for Stability (IfS)</strong></td>
<td>The Instrument for Stability (IfS) is a strategic tool designed to address a number of global security and development challenges in complement to geographic instruments. <strong>Short term</strong> ‘Crisis response and preparedness’ aims to prevent conflict, support post-conflict political stabilization and to ensure early recovery after a natural disaster. <strong>Long-term</strong> • fighting and protecting against the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, • strengthening response capacities of non-EU member countries to cross-border threats such as terrorism and organized crime, including the illicit trafficking of weapons, drugs and human beings, • enhancing pre- and post-crisis preparedness capacity building.</td>
<td>Global focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3 European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights (EIDHR)</strong></td>
<td>To provide support for the promotion of democracy and human rights in non-EU countries with a focus on civil society.</td>
<td>Worldwide (except EU member states)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrument for the Pre-Accession Assistance (IPA)</td>
<td>IPA offers assistance to countries engaged in the accession process to the European Union (EU) for the period 2007-2013.</td>
<td>The IPA beneficiary countries are divided into two categories: • EU candidate countries • Potential candidate countries in the Western Balkans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Neighbourhood and Partnership Instrument (ENPI) ENI 2014-2020</td>
<td>ENPI is designed to target sustainable development and approximation to EU policies and standards - supporting the agreed priorities in the ENP Action Plans</td>
<td>ENPI covers the EU’s neighbours to the east and along the southern and eastern shores of the Mediterranean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Development Fund (EDF)</td>
<td>EDF is the main instrument for providing Community aid for development cooperation in the ACP States and OCT</td>
<td>EDF covers the ACP States and OCT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Co-operation Instrument (DCI)</td>
<td>The aim of DCI is to improve development cooperation and hereby improve community assistance targeting poverty reduction, sustainable economic and social development and the smooth and gradual integration of developing countries into the world economy.</td>
<td>Latin America, Asia, Central Asia, the Middle East and South Africa.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
#ANNEX2: TERMS OF REFERENCE

REINFORCING EC MEDIA DEVELOPMENT CAPACITIES
FWC COM 2011 - LOT 1
REQUEST FOR OFFER Nº 2011/279788/1
1. BACKGROUND

1.1 EC DEMOCRACY SUPPORT
Three main instruments are used by the European Union to support democratisation process in third countries: political dialogue, mainstreaming of democratic values and principles and dedicated financial and technical assistance programmes.

These programmes aiming to support democratisation can either follow a top down approach targeting democratic institution building (e.g., capacity building of electoral commissions and parliaments, support to elections, electoral observation, reform and training of the judiciary, human rights, anti-corruption and media regulatory commissions, etc.), or a bottom-up approach targeting civil society (CS) (e.g. advocacy, information and education on HR and democracy issues to bring pressure to secure political change or to monitor the action of public institutions).

THEY FOCUS ON FOUR KEY AREAS:
1. Promotion fair, free and transparent electoral processes, by means of civic and voter education, awareness raising programmes, support to electoral management bodies, and election monitoring and observation.

2. Strengthening of the institutional, organizational and technical capacities of parliaments as well as their ability to interact with civil society and the media.

3. Promotion of a free, independent and professional media (including removing legal and technical obstacles to freedom of the press and promoting the access and penetration of media to the population).

4. Promotion of a genuine pluralist political participation, support to political parties, putting emphasis on the promotion of freedom of expression, association, peaceful assembly and of the inclusion of women, minorities and disadvantaged groups.

1.2 EC MEDIA SUPPORT
Freedom of expression and opinion and free, independent and plural media are significant pillars of the European Commission's democracy support. It is a crucial area of work to facilitate access to information, exchange of views and opinions, and strengthening accountability. A vibrant free and independent media has played a central role in the development of the EU Democracies. Article 19 and 20 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights as well as Article 11 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union provide the framework and the objectives for media support.

A free and plural media is to be seen as a goal and a sector in itself. Media support is to address deficiencies in the regulatory framework and capacity constraints of various key media actors (from journalists to media regulators, public broadcasting, etc). The economic viability of media and the related issue of its independence is also something that ought to be included in media support efforts.

Capacity building measures target technical resources, technical skills (including financial and managerial skills), and professionalism and ethical standards (focusing on deontology issues and the definition and application of voluntary codes of conduct). Another set of measures aim to improve the legal and regulatory framework of media, facilitating the debate on freedom and independence of the press, assisting in the elaboration of legislation, encouraging its implementation and monitoring its application.

EC media support so far has been taking different forms, from a limited number of larger self standing and comprehensive media support programmes to integration of media support aspects in other governance programmes such as electoral assistance and the issue of media monitoring and access to media for different political candidates or parties. The EC has been very active in training and capacity building of journalists, often also focused on awareness raising on specific themes such as Human Rights.

Different instruments have been used to provide media support (from the European Instrument for Democracy and Human Right (EIDHR) and the Non State Actors & Local Authorities, Instrument to the Instrument for Stability and the various geographic instruments). The EIDHR has been particularly active in supporting media and should receive significant attention in the assignment.
Geographically, the EC’s support for media development has put quite some emphasis on Africa. The first Forum on Media and Development held in Ouagadougou in September 2008 successfully contributed to move reflection forward and to identify concrete proposals that were enshrined in a Joint Road Map for Action signed by the European Commissioner Louis Michel and African Union’s Commission Chairperson Jean Ping.

With the exception of the Media and Development in Africa initiative, which included some mapping and study of its work in Africa, the EC has so far never done a proper mapping and analysis of its media support.

In light of the increased emphasis on democracy support in the EU’s external relations and the new Development Policy - Agenda for Change which suggests reinforced democracy support it is time now to also deepen the EC’s media support (as has been done for our electoral and parliamentary assistance) and provide EU staff with practical guidance on how to approach media support.

2. DESCRIPTION OF THE ASSIGNMENT

2.1 GENERAL OBJECTIVE
The global objective of this study is to improve and facilitate EC and other donors’ external assistance to media.

The overall purpose of this study is to provide EC staff and relevant stakeholders with a stocktaking and analysis of the EC’s assistance to media in third countries as well as recommendations and guidance on options available, best practices, and issues to be taken into consideration regarding support to media in external development and cooperation programmes.

The study will therefore tackle the four critical questions as to what has been done, how it has been done, what should be done and how it could be done. The study should thus be forward-looking, incorporating lessons learnt in an analysis of the strategies, approaches, instruments, methods, and interventions used to reinforce Media that will feed into the elaboration of practical tools for project management purposes in particular guidelines for the design, monitoring and evaluation of projects and programmes in the area of media support.

FOR THAT PURPOSE, THE STUDY WILL NOTABLY:
• Address the question of the synergies and complementarities that can be established with projects in other areas (e.g., electoral and parliamentary assistance, gender, civil society, conflict prevention, programmes); and of the mainstreaming of cross-cutting issues;

• Tackle specific issues such as national political development and dialogue, the efficiency and effectiveness of supporting global versus partial activities, windows of opportunity, entry points, drivers of change, potential “spoilers”, etc.;

• Notwithstanding the fact that the aim is to provide universal recommendations and general tools applicable in all regions of the world, highlight the importance of context specific factors at the national but also, where relevant, regional and continental levels. It should also make the distinction between different settings, at least between post-conflict, transitional, and stable situations;

• In addition to a comprehensive desk phase, include 2 country case studies in countries to be identified at a later stage.

The study should cover primarily activities that directly target media from regulatory reform work to capacity development of relevant media actors (e.g. journalists), to the space for media, etc. It will also cover media support as part of broader governance programmes and the synergies that can be established with the other areas of democratic governance.

The increasingly important role of new (social) Media in democratic transition and development, and possible avenues for new media support needs to be addressed. Various relevant ICT tools for media need also to be elaborated. Particular attention will dedicated to the use of the EIDHR for media development.
The study will rely on an analysis of EC’s media support based on projects ongoing or formulated since 2001 (drawn from CRIS and other sources). It will also consider, mainly through a desk review, the practical guidance, latest knowledge tools and activities of at least four (4) other international actors active in the field of media support (to be decided at a later stage such as the Swedish SIDA, the UK Department For International Development and the BBC World Trust, DW Akademie, Internews, Reporters sans Frontières, OSI, etc.).

The overall objective of the present assignment is to contribute to improving the design and implementation of programmes, as well as the impact, of EC assistance in the field of media development, through providing EU Delegation staff with guidance on issues to be taken into consideration, case studies, tools and options available regarding support to media in external development cooperation programmes.

2.2 SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES

1. Map and document EC media support and analyse the strategies, approaches, instruments, methods, and interventions developed and used by the EC and some other actors of the international community in the area of media support since 2001, document lessons learned and good practices of EC in supporting media development worldwide (with a particular focus on the EIDHR media support). Look at novel ways of mobilising support to media, building synergies within the EU’s geographic and thematic programmes.

2. Produce a practical guide and a related training module on media support for EU officials and others as an aid to analyse media’s capacity and performance and determine the most effective and efficient means for designing, monitoring and evaluating support.

2.3 REQUIRED OUTCOME AND OUTPUTS/ACTIVITIES

The main outcome of the present assignment will be an increased arsenal of tools and guidance for the EC’s support to media development worldwide. This outcome is based on the following outputs/activities:

**OUTPUT 1: DESK REVIEW OF MEDIA SUPPORT WORLDWIDE**

A senior consultant (senior media development specialist) will be requested to review through a desk study EC support to media in different countries. He or she will be supported by an administrative support staff who will help in getting all relevant documentation (project document, ROMs, evaluations) from the CRIS-database and relevant Commission services at Headquarters and EU Delegations. The focus of the desk study will be mapping and analyzing the past EC actions on media (since 2001). By choosing a 10 years period, the study will provide a detailed overview of what the EC has done so far, identify gaps, extract trends of this support and by analyzing all available documentation also come up with some lessons learned and recommendations for further involvement of EC in media development.

The review will look in a detailed manner at the different strategies, approaches, instruments, aid delivery methods, and interventions used to strengthen the media in all its aspects. Particular attention will be given at:

- Problem analysis
- Objectives, expected results and activities proposed;
- Stakeholders and target groups; ownership;
- Risk assessment
- Indicators (outputs, outcomes, and impacts);
- Implementation modality;
- Instruments and equipment used/provided
- Management arrangements
- Synergies and complementarities (coordination with donor and other programmes, links with political parties, parliament, election assistance, civil society, etc.).
Once the desk review is completed, the consultant will be requested to analyze, in agreement of DEVCO D1 and interested EU Delegations, 2 diverse cases of media support more in detail. This will include field missions in the given countries. The main aim of those missions will be to make an in-depth analysis of ongoing or recently terminated EC media support in the given country, with a view to document the lessons learned, the used implementation methodology and produce a case study which can be used for future training, online sharing etc.

The specific Terms of Reference for the field mission will be prepared by DEVCO D1 and the Delegation concerned.

**Out of all this work the following should be delivered:**

- A paper with a review of EC Media support worldwide including some analysis on the trends, types, size of support efforts, instruments used, lessons learned and recommendations (20 to 30 pages)

- Two case studies of each about 10 to 15 pages, including a one page summary and a Powerpoint that can be used for training purposes.

**OUTPUT 2: PRACTICAL GUIDE ON MEDIA SUPPORT**

Produce a practical guide on media support for EC officials and others that includes:

(a) A brief presentation of the core functions and actors of media, the connection of media to the broader democratic governance agenda and main challenges for media in different contexts of EU partner countries.

(b) A summary of Output 1

(c) A matrix for the analysis of the state of media, especially as regards:
   (i) Its structure and organisation;
   (ii) Its independence;
   (iii) Its pluralism;
   (iv) Capacities

(d) A methodology for the setting-up, monitoring and evaluation of projects and programmes of support to Media. This tool should provide guidance on how to address step-by-step the different elements of a project or programme of assistance. It should provide a set of options to remedy deficiencies identified through application of the matrix and related general and specific objectives, activities and results, risks and assumptions, stakeholders and beneficiaries, implementation method, indicators (output, outcome and impact), etc. It should include political economy analysis elements. The methodology will tackle operational implications of the choices made applicable to all of the latter or specific to some of them, including identification of entry points, drivers of change, obstacles to change, management of risks, etc. It will also draw the distinction between different country settings (e.g. conflict and post-conflict, democratic transition or authoritarian regimes, etc) either in each or as a separate section as the case may be. It should also address the relation between ICT and media development and the new (social) media versus traditional media.

(e) A list and a short description of selected tools and resources available as well as of main actors active in the field.

**Deliverable:** A guide containing the 5 above mentioned chapters of no more than 50 pages (without annexes), will be produced in English. An executive summary will be produced by the Consultant. The contractor will also be tasked with the graphic design of the Guide, along guidelines provided by Commission DG Devco services.

**OUTPUT 3: TRAINING MODULE**

Produce a training module of one day on the basis of the practical guide. This module will enable the EC to train its staff on media support using the practical guide, more particularly on the analysis of the state of media and on the setting-up, monitoring and evaluation of projects and programmes. The module is to be submitted in standard format and should include trainer’s support material (presentations, notes and any other type of documents) as well as the material to be distributed to the participants.
OUTPUT 4: ONE DAY VALIDATION WORKSHOP

Assist the EC (DEVCO D1) to organise a one-day workshop in Brussels (around 25 participants including the consultants, EC officials and external leading media development practitioners to be identified in due time), to present and discuss the practical guide and test the training module for EC staff in this area. In addition to organising and possibly covering the costs of the trips of up to 2 external participants (booking and payment of flights, hotels and daily allowance), this includes providing refreshments, food (lunch) and documentation, presenting the draft guidelines and facilitating the meeting. The EC will provide the room facilities for the meeting.

This workshop will also provide additional input for the consultants to review the final draft of the reports.

2.5. PROJECT MANAGEMENT

Responsible body
The project is being commissioned and will be managed by the DEVCO, Unit D1 and more in particular the media specialist of the Democracy Sector.

Management structure
DEVCO D1 will be responsible for the follow-up of the project in terms of content and technical issues, and will be the interlocutor of the Consultants for any aspect of contract implementation.

2.6. LOCATION AND DURATION

Location
The inception meeting will take place in Brussels.

The 2 field visits for elaborating country case studies will be decided upon once the initial desk study of EC projects has been completed.

Each mission will be of 5 to 8 days of duration in order to meet all relevant stakeholders and gather the necessary information.

Prior authorisation from DG DEVCO D1 will be required in relation to the foreseen missions.

Timing

The work of the assignment will start end of January 2012 and the period of performance of the contract will be 9 months from this date (end of October).

The key experts will visit Brussels at least for inception and final (workshop) meetings with DEVCO D1 in Brussels. At the inception meeting (second half of January), DEVCO D1 will provide the experts with the available projects and programmes documentation at their disposal which will have to be complemented by the research undertaken by an administrative support staff. The experts will prepare and submit a brief inception report which includes the initial conception and methodology of the study and a work plan within 2 weeks of the briefing meeting. During their assignment the experts will liaise regularly with DEVCO D1 Media specialist to inform about work progress in relation to the work planning and of any circumstance or event that may affect the development of the mission, or its outcome. The workshop in Brussels for the presentation of the outputs (Desk report/case studies and practical guide) will be organised at the end of the mission. It will inform a further revision of the end-products.

3. EXPERTS PROFILE

The assignment will require one senior expert, one junior expert and one administrative support staff.

The senior expert (Team leader) will be specialised in media development and have at least 10 years experience in the area, should have a MA in law, political, social or communication sciences, extensive knowledge in democracy support, institutional development and in particular media development within international development cooperation, field work experience in media development, proven knowledge of EC media support programmes and of EC Aid Modalities. Publications on the subject will be an asset.

The expert should have fluency in English (both orally and in writing), preferably English native speaker or equivalent, French and Spanish fluency would be considered an asset. The expert should also have excellent writing and communication skills.
Previous work on EC projects and knowledge of its contractual and financial procedures will be considered an asset. S/he should have experience in Project Cycle Management activities, including the identification and design/formulation of projects and programmes as well as in conducting evaluations of development cooperation programmes.

A total of 90 days will be allocated, of which approximately up to maximum 18 days in field missions (with per diem if required). All work meetings will be held in Brussels or virtually. Working languages in meetings will be mainly in English, reporting will be in English. The Team Leader will be responsible for the delivery of the 4 outputs.

A second associated expert (junior expert), will be specialised in media development and have at least 5 years experience in the area, have a MA in law, political, social or communication sciences, knowledge in democracy support, institutional development and in particular media development policy within international development cooperation, field work experience in media development, some knowledge of EC media support programmes and of EC Aid Modalities. The second expert will support the Team Leader with the delivery of output 2 and output 3. A total of 30 days will be allocated including the days in Brussels for meeting with Commission services.

An administrative support staff will assist the Team leader with the data research mainly for output 1, country case-studies.

In accordance with the general Terms of Reference of the Framework Contract, the Contracting Authority may decide to organise phone interviews with the proposed experts. These interviews would take place in the week following the submitting of the offers. The offers should therefore indicate the dates and hours when the proposed experts would be available during that week for a phone interview of about 30 minutes, as well as the phone number where they could be reached.

The selection of experts shall be subject to approval by the Contracting Authority.

4. INDICATIVE TIMETABLE

End of January 2012
start of consultancy and briefing meeting with DEVCO D1 Democracy Sector

Mid February 2012
second meeting with DEVCO D1 for a first outline of proposed methodology and start desk review

February -March 2012
desk review and planning of field missions

April 2012
approval of field missions and submission of draft desk review

May 2012
field missions + work on guide and training module

Mid June 2012
submission of final desk review and draft case studies

Mid July
Presentation and discussion of draft guide and draft training module with DEVCO D1

September 2012
Delivery of final versions of case studies (including PPT and one page summary) and revised draft guide and prepare validation seminar and testing of training module (Early September)

Mid September 2012
Validation seminar and subsequent finalization of draft guide and training module

Beginning of October 2012
Work on final editing, proofreading and layout/graphic design of Guide be completed by end of October 2012
5. ADMINISTRATIVE INFORMATION

- Maximum total budget: 140000 Euros
- Items to foresee under ‘Reimbursable’:
  - Travel and per diems for the experts field missions and 2 to 3 meetings in Brussels
  - Editing; proofreading and graphic design of EN version of Guide with PDF for printing and website

Final Desk Review with case studies, and practical guide and training module are to be submitted in electronic format after the final validation seminar. Approval will be given or, as the case may be, additional comments will be submitted by DEVCO D1 within 2 weeks of reception of the various drafts.
This report has been prepared with the financial assistance of the European Commission. The views expressed herein are those of the consultants and therefore in no way reflect the official opinion of the European Commission.