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>BBC</td>
<td>British Broadcasting Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARDS</td>
<td>EU Assistance programme to the Western Balkans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIMA</td>
<td>Center for International Media Assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRIS</td>
<td>Current Research Information System (EU Data Base)</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>DG Development</td>
<td>Directorate General Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DG-ENL</td>
<td>Directorate General for Enlargement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DW</td>
<td>Deutsche Welle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBU</td>
<td>European Broadcasting Union</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>EQ</td>
<td>Evaluation Questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FES</td>
<td>Friedrich Ebert Stiftung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOJO</td>
<td>The Media Institute FOJO (part of Linné University, Sweden)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBP</td>
<td>British Pound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT</td>
<td>Information and Communications Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFEX</td>
<td>International Freedom of Expression Exchange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMS</td>
<td>International Media Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPA</td>
<td>Instrument for Pre-Accession Assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IREX</td>
<td>International Research &amp; Exchanges Board (US Based NGO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MENA</td>
<td>Middle East and North Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NED</td>
<td>National Endowment for Democracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non Governmental Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSI</td>
<td>Open Society Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSF</td>
<td>Reporters Without Borders</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>WAN-IFRA</td>
<td>World Association of Newspapers and News Publishers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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#1
INTRODUCTION TO POLICY FRAMEWORK
The media and communications landscape is undergoing a rapid, and profound, transformation. Successive communications and media technologies, from telephone to radio to television and film, developed over the course of the twentieth century. All evolved in an open and enterprising environment though each, in turn, became dominated by large conglomerates, which assumed a near monopoly over the mass media. The internet is the latest communication technology to evolve with over 2 billion people having access worldwide. This technology, like others before it, has the power to transform how we realise freedom of expression.

The right to freedom of expression has always rested upon public platforms of communication to give them effect. Newspapers were the champions of free speech from the eighteenth century onwards, which is why attempts to tax and control them were so fiercely resisted. By the end of the twentieth century broadcast media (radio and television internationally), provided mass access to news and information of all kinds. As “mass” media they came to constitute ‘mass societies’ for the first time in human history – where millions of people could share experiences and events together, creating new identities. The development of the internet and the mobile phone is one further stage in the development of communication technologies, creating an increasingly converged world of modern communications.

The advent of the internet has brought specific new challenges and opportunities. No longer does the power to communicate on a mass scale rest solely in the hands of elites, with the costs of setting up and operating a newspaper, radio station, or television show acting as natural barriers to participation from the wider public. Anyone with access to the internet can create and share or edit their own or others’ content. The explosion in digital communications – mobile phones, internet access, and digital cameras – is allowing citizens to engage in public debate on a level unparalleled in history.

Of course, the traditional offline media – print, radio and television – remain centrally important for most of the world’s population. But they are operating in a changing landscape where news and factual content is increasingly operating across multiple platforms. A particularly alarming trend for traditional media everywhere is the declining resource available for news and factual information (as opposed to entertainment of all kinds). A combination of declining revenues in developed societies and market pressures in less developed, are squeezing the funds available for producing such content. This is having a severe impact upon investigative journalism. How to pay for content that is important to democracy is one of the most significant dilemmas facing the media, donors and anyone concerned with democracy and human rights.

This changing landscape will require new analysis and methodologies. What donors did twenty years ago, after the collapse of the Soviet Union and dictatorships throughout the world, is unlikely to be appropriate today. Many of the issues, of course, remain the same – such as how to ensure balanced content from a variety of independent sources - but there are new stakeholders, new technologies, new patterns of access, and new patterns of control. The landscape of free expression has changed. It follows that the modalities for support to media development and freedom of expression need to be changed and modified.

A specific challenge for the EU is that there has been no specific overall focus on media and communications and no coherent driving philosophy. Communication initiatives linked to specific development outcomes are lumped together with media support work and the EU’s public diplomacy.

This paper aims to set out the continuing rationale for a freedom of expression programme that supports a variety of media and communication programmes. It looks at the lessons of past experiences of EU donor activity and the lessons from other donors, suggests an analytic approach to programming based upon the political economy approach increasingly adopted by member states, and finally suggest a methodology for assessing and analysing programmes.
#2
CORE FUNCTIONS
OF THE MEDIA AND
RELATIONS TO DEMOCRACY
AND GOVERNANCE
2.1. WHY FREEDOM OF EXPRESSION?

Democracy depends on people being able to shape the society they live in, and in order to do this they need to express themselves. The right to freedom of expression is widely seen as underpinning human rights and democratic freedoms in that it guarantees the exchange of views and opinions necessary to inform public debate as well as supporting freedom of association, the right to form political parties, the questioning and challenging of public officials, and so on. It has long been valued as a foundation right in all democratic societies.

2.2. PUBLIC PLATFORMS

Freedom of expression, however, requires public platforms. It can only be an effective pillar of democracy and human rights if it can be exercised publically - if information and ideas can be freely exchanged between citizens without fear. For this reason, the media are widely recognised as an essential element of the democratic process as it is the media that gives public voice to our individual right to freedom of expression. Today, what we know as ‘the media’ has expanded beyond traditional offline print and broadcast media to encapsulate the internet, social media and a variety of mobile platforms. The media, in all these forms provides the means for citizens to discuss and debate with each other, to advocate views and lodge protests. It allows politicians views to be known and questioned, public officials to be exposed to scrutiny. By facilitating debate it is one of the guarantors of free and fair elections. Given the important democratic role of the media many have concluded that a precondition for the media fulfilling this function is independence from political interference and government control; a plurality of different media outlets providing a variety of content to ensure no-one has a monopoly of views; and a diversity of different viewpoints capable of expressing the range of views held within a society.

2.3. HOW DO THE MEDIA HELP DEMOCRACY AND HUMAN RIGHTS?

The media can play a variety of roles. Media outlets can function as **channels through which citizens communicate** with each other and in this way act as a facilitator of informed debate between diverse social actors, also encouraging the non-violent resolution of disputes. In the world of offline media this aspect of the media depends on the editorial policy of the media channel and the ability of the journalist to reflect a broad balance of views. In the case of online platforms, the capacity for peer-to-peer communication is considerably enhanced, without reliance upon gatekeepers of any kind. The internet offers unprecedented scope for interactive communication using a variety of devices (though its unmediated nature means that rumour, allegation and falsehood can also spread rapidly without recourse to remedy). The political impact of this peer-to-peer communication was evident in the events in the Middle East in 2011 when citizens were able to bypass the formal media and censorship to organise mass protests that toppled regimes.

The media can also function as a **watchdog**, promoting government transparency and public scrutiny of those with power by exposing corruption, maladministration and corporate wrongdoing (and can thereby be a tool to enhance economic efficiency). The watchdog role requires high quality investigative journalism, however, which is under significant and increasing cost pressure as margins are squeezed globally. One of the emerging dilemmas of all news content organisations is how to pay for quality journalism given the availability of free content on internet platforms. There is increasing evidence in societies with high levels of access to the internet that young people are increasingly unwilling to pay for content. It is also clear that the market dominance of content aggregating and sharing platforms such as Google, YouTube, and Facebook is happening at the expense of those organisations that create and need to pay for content.
Another function of the media is to be a national voice, a means by which a society or a country can learn about itself and build a sense of community and shared values, a vehicle for cultural expression and cultural cohesion within nation-states. This aspect of the media can be contentious in divided societies, or countries that contain different ethnic groups where one might be dominant. A sense of community and shared values has to rest upon a base that is inclusive, where all the constituent elements of a society feel that they are represented while at the same time conveying a sense of the core values that unite people. This is a classic role for a public broadcaster.

Finally, the media are often advocates of certain issues or causes, in other words they are social actors in their own right. This aspect of the media can sit uneasily alongside its role as platform for the expression of views. There is clearly a potential contradiction between a media that facilitates the free exchange of view and opinions in a society and one that takes a partisan view on an issue. This dilemma was resolved with newspapers by having a clear separation between the editorial pages of the paper (its social actor role) from the news pages (its platform role). However most observers believe this kind of distinction is breaking down in print media. And while public broadcasters may be obliged to be balanced in their coverage the same obligations may not apply to private broadcasters.

Increasingly the partisan role of media is beginning to swamp its role as a platform for the expression of wide range of views. The growth of online platforms is accelerating this trend. Citizen journalism is a powerful new addition to the media environment, providing new opportunities for people to shape and even create news. But it throws up new challenges. News stories are interwoven with citizen comments, blogging, and tweeting in a rolling twenty-four hour cycle, often unedited and where the wildest rumours and allegations can circulate. Social media are becoming important actors in themselves – encouraging people to focus on certain issues, and striking partisan positions without regards for traditional journalist conventions. Technological, political, and economic changes are changing the ways in which the media can support democracy.

There is also an on-going debate about assessing the impact of specific media initiatives. Much donor activity has supported training whose long-term impact is uncertain. There has been little, if any, systematic evaluation of media programmes and little sense of what works in different environments.

2.4. THE MEDIA ENVIRONMENT IN A DEMOCRATIC SOCIETY

In Section 3.2 we talked about what kind of media environment could support democracy and human rights. It would be independent, plural and diverse. If we unpack these requirements what do find to be the necessary conditions?
## THE MEDIA ENVIRONMENT IN A DEMOCRATIC SOCIETY

**Media institutions will be free.** In law and practice and subject only to narrowly defined restrictions consistent with international standards on freedom of expression, to report and comment as they see fit.

**The media should be independent.** Independence should not be understood simply as synonymous with non-state (private) ownership. Bearing in mind the problems of media monopolisation and active interference in editorial independence by owners, it should be understood as editorial independence regardless of ownership. In this sense independence might, for example, be found in public owned media with a clear public service remit and with an independent managing board. Independence may also mean freedom from political or other vested and economic interests. Media also needs to be financially viable - through a variety of income sources (public and private) - if it is to sustain the capacity to be editorially independent.

**There will be a plurality of media** meaning people will have access to a wide variety of media, offline and online, with a variety of content, as it is the plurality of different media platforms and choices that prevents one group in society monopolising freedom of expression. Access to media needs to be affordable, which may require investment in infrastructure and non-discriminatory tax policies. All sectors of society, including those who are most disadvantaged or marginalised, should be able to access media to gain the information they need and make their voices heard. Limited access to - or lack of engagement with - the media contributes to an environment that can undermine democratic development.

**There will be a diversity of media,** meaning that wide ranges of views are available across the media spectrum. If sections of society are excluded or not represented then the media environment will distort, not support, democracy. This will require active editorial policies and a strong journalistic culture. It may also mean requirements for balance in reporting, ensuring not just that all views are represented somewhere in the spectrum, but that critical and contrary views are heard within the mainstream media.

**Access to media** is particularly important in the development context. The poor and marginalised should be able to communicate amongst themselves and with those in power if development is to take place. Access in turn links to **infrastructure capacity:** promoting a diverse media environment requires money to flow into supporting the means of communication, including broadcast reception quality, the provision of electricity supplies and access to telephones and the internet. In many parts of the world there is little or no access to the means of communication. In such environments, formal freedoms mean little. Finding a regulatory approach that facilitates private investment is the key to much of modern communications’ development, and is vital. It helps ensure that information reaches as many citizens as possible, and that they have access to the communication channels that give them the voice to bring about political change.

A free media environment is often assumed to be one free from state control. But the absence of state intervention on its own is no guarantee of a media environment that supports democracy and human rights. If a media environment is to be accessible to the poor and marginalised and characterised by pluralism and diversity it may require active state intervention. For example, media pluralism will require regulators to make provisions for public broadcasting, commercial broadcasting and community-based broadcasting in allocating spectrum and tough, enforceable anti-monopoly laws.
In fact, in an increasingly converged communications environment, the underpinning regulatory structure will be crucial in shaping private investment. For example, if the regulatory authority does not insist upon interoperability in telecoms providers, the ability of the mobile phone to provide widely available content (an increasing trend in Africa) will be inhibited. The state can also play a crucial role by investing in human resources, specifically in education that helps build the professional capacity of media workers, through academic and vocational training, ‘on-the-job’ development and the development of professional associations.

2.5. DIGITAL COMMUNICATIONS AND THE EVOLVING NATURE OF MEDIA PLATFORMS

Any analysis of the media’s contribution to human development must also be situated in the context of rapid and far-reaching changes in the platforms for communication. The rapid evolution of digital communications technology\(^1\) over the past decade has dramatically changed communication practices across the world. The internet and mobile phones have opened up new horizons for communication, connecting people to a global network for sharing information and ideas. This has had profound implications for the media on a number of levels. Digital communications have provided people with new tools to share and exchange information and ideas. For example: internet access via mobile phones gives citizens the power to communicate information in real time to global audiences; social networking tools connect people across the world to enhance collaboration and information sharing; censorship circumvention technologies allow people to bypass attempts to monitor and control information and communication flows. Notable trends include the use of mobile phones as a platform for internet access, with 1.2 billion people thought to access the internet using mobile browsers compared with 1 billion people using PCs or laptops\(^2\). This makes access to the internet a crucial communications priority.

2.6. CHALLENGES TO MEDIA DEVELOPMENT

Assessing the global media and communications landscape presents a varied and complex picture. There is a popular assumption that traditional media such as offline newspapers are in permanent decline. The true picture is more variable. For example, in the years prior to 2010, paid-for daily newspaper circulation rose by 5.7 per cent globally, though this was a pattern that concealed significant regional differences. In the same period newspaper circulation rose by 30 per cent in Africa, 3 per cent in Asia, 5 per cent in South America, but went down by 10.6 per cent in North America, 7.9 per cent in Europe, and 5.6 per cent in Australia and Oceania\(^3\). The revenue picture for newspapers is bleaker. Over the same period, global advertising revenues fell by 17.9 per cent. The decline was most marked in North America where revenues were down by one third. There were also large falls of 15 per cent in Western Europe and 5.4 per cent in Asia. However newspaper advertising revenue rose by 46.5 per cent in Latin America (which is emerging as one of the wealthiest traditional media markets in the world), by 1.1 per cent in Central and Eastern Europe, and was stable in the Middle East and Africa\(^4\). Overall, television remains the most popular medium and has the largest share of global advertising at 39 per cent share, followed by newspapers with 24 per cent and the internet with 12 per cent.

The last decade has seen the deregulation of media markets in many parts of the world and, with that, the emergence of a tier of large media conglomerates operating on a global scale across different media platforms, overlaying a second tier of regional and

---

\(^1\) Following Souter (2009a), digital communications can be divided into four broad categories: computing and information technology; broadcasting, including radio and television; telecommunications via fixed and wireless networks; and the internet and internet-enabled services. The term “digital communications” refers to not only communication tools and platforms, but also the products, services and applications that they support. “Communications environment” is used to describe the vast array of technologies, people, organisations and structures, and the interrelationships between them, that influence communication practices and activities. For further discussion of communications environments see Horner (2007a).

\(^2\) UNESCO (2009), Information Society Policies. Annual Report 2009 Rab, A (eds.) Information for All Programme, UNESCO

\(^3\) http://www.wan-press.org/article18612.html

\(^4\) Ibid
national media giants. Intense competition between these large corporations has led to downward pressure on costs and the search for mass audiences. Unsurprisingly many observers note the “depoliticisation” of commercial media content, the lowering of journalistic quality and the emergence of “infotainment” as a marked trend. The traditional notion of a media providing a disinterested “public sphere” through which citizens communicate with each other and are kept informed is fading fast (if it ever was a reality). The real challenge going forward is to identify how to sustain news and factual content production across multiple platforms in a world where there is, as yet, no settled economic model to fund such content.

Traditional media giants are increasingly moving into and dominating the online space. The internet is often described as a “long tail world” where, despite a countless array of websites and a huge user base, the vast majority of the audience is shared between a small number of top sites. Evidence from Indonesia and the United States shows that the top sites accessed in those countries are predominately either the websites of offline media giants, or the new communication giants, including Facebook, Google (which owns YouTube, Orkut and Blogger), and Twitter.

Citizen-originated media can offer an alternative to this commercial landscape, sitting alongside existing alternative media such as community radio, but on a significantly larger scale. Whereas community radio sought to emulate the professionalism of other sectors, focusing upon local content (whether the village or interest group), citizen media has become far more ubiquitous. Citizen media can interact with traditional media – the pattern we saw in the Middle East with Al-Jazeera and online activities. This combination can be even more powerful. But media companies must adapt to the new environment, learning to take advantage of the benefits that widespread communications bring. Many have developed sophisticated and popular tools for allowing users to engage with them. The Guardian website is one of the leaders in this respect. Its website combines professional with non-professional journal blogs and a huge user comment section. It has also made ground-breaking use of crowd sourcing to process large volumes of data. For example, when the MP expenses scandal broke in the UK, the Guardian made the nearly half a million documents available to download in a public widget that about 23,000 citizens across the country helped to dissect, flagging up potentially interesting survey for analysis by journalists.

---

http://issuu.com/world.bank.publications/docs/9780821382004
2.7. THE IMPACT OF DIGITAL COMMUNICATIONS UPON MEDIA

With every citizen a possible mass communicator, we are potentially on the horizon of a more diverse and vibrant media environment than could ever be achieved using old media tools alone. Instant and on-going conversations, new forms of crowd-powered information gathering and dissemination, openness and transparency in all areas of public administration: these are the potential rewards. Peer-to-peer communication empowers users to act as participants in the public sphere – creating, editing and disseminating information and ideas with a global audience. At the same time, a number of powerful digital communication companies are assuming an increasing domination in the global market, from Apple – currently the most valuable company in the world with a market cap of over $530 billion\(^6\) in April 2012 – through to platform companies such as Google, to carriers such as Verizon or AT&T. Much of internet advertising remains embedded in “search”, which is controlled by one player – Google – that takes 65 per cent of the market\(^7\).

Given the rapid evolution of digital communications, traditional media companies are trying to identify sustainable business models – particularly in North America and parts of Europe where the challenge is the greatest. In these developed countries, new media is undermining traditional media revenue raising activities. Newspaper circulations are falling as more people consume media online (often for free). The resulting loss in advertising revenue is not being reproduced online where the supply of advertising space is much larger and viral campaigns are increasingly the marketing method of choice, and classifieds are moving to free websites designed for that purpose. The revenue loss has been accelerated by the economic crisis, most dramatically in the USA where 13,400 newspaper journalist jobs have been lost in the last four years. In the global south the digital challenge has been somewhat alleviated by growing middle classes’ use of offline media and developing media markets. But, it is likely that as these markets develop and migrate increasingly to online platforms, the same challenges will emerge in the global south.

\(^6\) [http://ycharts.com/companies/AAPL/market_cap](http://ycharts.com/companies/AAPL/market_cap)
\(^7\) [http://www.wan-press.org/article18612.html](http://www.wan-press.org/article18612.html)
Newspaper circulations are falling in Europe and the US as more people consume media online – often for free. The resulting loss in advertising revenue is not being reproduced online.

There is undoubtedly a significant challenge for media in the global north to find a sustainable economic model, which is not reliant upon public subsidy (like the BBC) or unpaid contributions (like the Huffington Post). There are many experiments with online revenue raising. Some involve collecting users’ personal data to construct profiles for so-called behavioural advertising for which they can charge a higher price. However, the companies with access to this data tend to be intermediaries such as search engines rather than content providers, and this model raises privacy issues and may be curtailed by future privacy legislation. Other ideas range from taxing Google and other content carriers, to erecting pay barriers in various formats (though this undermines the free flow of information and prevent such stories from going “viral” as users are less likely to disseminate these stories if their contacts are not able to access them). Some premium brands are able to exist behind an online pay wall – the Financial Times and the Economist being among the most successful. But to date no widely replicable sustainable business model has been found, which leaves a growing anxiety over how to fund quality journalism.

It would be wrong to think of these developments as being antithetical to older media forms. While there are those who see internet media simply as an alternative to traditional media, in fact traditional media itself is changing in order to utilise new technologies. The internet and mobile telephony make communications universal and connected for journalists as much as the general public. This is creating a media world where media is both personal and everywhere, where information and ideas arrive immediately as events unfold. As Charlie Beckett has written the “almost endless networks of communications are now characterised by increased speed and volume of information that is hyperlinked and interactive”.

But this new media and communications environment, where old and new technologies interact, is still in its infancy. Traditional media companies remain powerful and in many parts of the world are increasing their wealth and influence. Telecommunications companies are becoming significant media players as carriers of content. Many fear for the future of journalism but we still need the profession to curate information, provide analysis, and conduct investigations. But journalism must adapt, and this means identifying new ways of engaging in a multi-dimensional media conversation, while developing new and sustainable business models. At the same time, the freer, open online space must be protected. New monopolies are already emerging in the online space, with attempts to limit access to their own products and services. A new range of intermediaries has emerged, operating at every layer of the digital communications environment, and they play a vital role in shaping the environment. As these platforms become commercialised and governments seek to extend their control through agreements with companies, new opaque or even hidden forms of gate keeping are emerging.

Governments have woken up to the danger of allowing their citizens new possibilities to exercise freedom of expression and information. For reasons both legitimate and illegitimate, governments are introducing new measures to control new media: increasing intermediary liability, introducing filtering and blocking mechanisms, and criminalising expression. These tactics show a lack of insight (or concern) about appropriate regulatory and technological approaches for the digital age. Our ability to confront these challenges will shape the way that the media landscape develops.

---

#3
THE EUROPEAN UNION
3.1 THE SPECIFIC ROLE OF THE EUROPEAN UNION

The European Union has placed a high value upon freedom of expression and has recognised the importance of independent media. The EU’s Charter of Fundamental Rights, Article 11 states:

“Everyone has the right to freedom of expression. This right shall include freedom to hold opinions and to receive and impart information and ideas without interference by public authority and regardless of frontiers. The freedom and pluralism of the media shall be respected.”

There are other relevant guiding documents, frameworks, and policies. The Treaty of Lisbon made the Charter of Rights enforceable9. The 2009 EU Council Conclusions10 on EU’s external relations call for further consolidation of the approach to democracy and human rights support, including through a strong focus on supporting independent media. Following the popular uprising in the Arab region in 2011 the EC is also strengthening its efforts to promote freedom of expression on the internet by focusing on bloggers and journalists online. EC development cooperation is guided by the “Agenda for Change”11 which stresses that the promotion of human rights, democracy, the rule of law, and good governance, as well as inclusive and sustainable growth are two basic pillars of our policy and should receive strengthened support. They are mutually reinforcing. More recently the EU Strategic Framework and Action Plan on Human Rights and Democracy12 gives a high priority to freedom of expression. There are moves to develop a comprehensive policy on internet issues, originally focused upon cyber security but now there are also moves to broaden the scope and stress the importance of internet freedom.

In addition to bilateral relations with countries and regions in all continents, the EU has also over 130 EU delegations throughout the world and works with a number of multilateral institutions (though the potential impact is not being fully utilised).

The EU has worked to stabilise highly vulnerable states while supporting those states seeking accession to the EU itself. It launched a European Neighbourhood Policy (ENP) in 2004, to promote prosperity, stability, and security in neighbouring countries to the east and south. It has been active in the Balkans funding projects in seven countries to build stable societies in a region that has been ravaged by conflict. The EU has made human rights a central aspect of its external relations: in the political dialogues it holds with developing countries; through its development policy and assistance; or through its action in multilateral fora, such as the United Nations. Its role in trade is particularly important - the Union is a single player in foreign trade and it can exercise real influence, accounting as it does for nearly 20 per cent of world imports and exports.

Media assistance operates through a number of instruments13 examined in more detail in the report “Mapping EU Media Assistance 2000-2010”. These range from the European Initiative for Democracy and Human Rights to the European Development Fund to the Development Co-operation Instrument14, the Instrument for Stability15, and the European Neighbourhood and Partnership Instrument16. This creates a particular challenge in that there is no overall oversight of the EU’s support for free expression and the media.

---

13 http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/how/finance/programming_en.htm,
http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/how/finance/dfi_en.htm,
http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/how/finance/mff_en.htm,
http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/how/finance/ifs_en.htm,
http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/how/finance/enpi_en.htm
3.2. LESSONS FROM CASE STUDIES

Looking back at the past ten years of funding, our paper analysing the EU's record draws the following conclusions, although we were hindered by the absence of a comprehensive information base on media development.

The project information held by the EU in its database (CRIS) was not complete and reliable. For example, there was no clear distinction on the database between media development projects and promotional activities for the EU and the enlargement process in particular. The main focus of EU support – like most donors – has been on training journalists and editors in journalistic skills and raising professional standards. Other initiatives include legislative reform and direct support to endangered journalists and writers.

It is noticeable that very few projects have benefitted from the potential comparative advantages of the EU as a multinational entity – rather EU projects are similar to those funded by bilateral donors. Furthermore, few projects have been designed and implemented in cooperation with member states or other donor agencies.

The principal recipients of aid tend to be specialised international organisations rather than local groups or media organisations. This is efficient as the use of intermediaries minimises EU administration and project management and guarantees a certain level of quality control and project reporting. But inevitably, the use of international intermediaries means that fewer funds reach the local implementers.

3.3. REFLECTIONS ON THE EXPERIENCE OF OTHER DONORS

In the course of this review we examined the practice of several bi-lateral donors – Swedish SIDA, the UK’s Dfid, the World Bank and the Dutch government. We found that media projects were becoming bigger and more sector oriented, which is why donors tend to finance media programmes via international intermediaries. Instead of focusing only on skills training of journalists and editors, the projects are broader in scope, tackling issues such as media legislation, the roles of regulatory bodies (press councils or press complaints commissions), the capacity of trade organisations, business management etc. It has also become more common to involve private sector actors and to include the business aspects of the media. Apart from this our main findings were:

MAIN DONOR TRENDS

- Social media and internet users are getting increasing attention from donors.
- Donor awareness of issues of coordination, alignment, accountability, results and local ownership is increasing though more could be done to align funding with like-minded donors.
- The combination of donor priorities being set out in advance of funding, and the use of West-based intermediary organisations can sometimes make local ownership difficult.
- Using the skills and knowledge of intermediaries to deliver aid may also inhibit reaching out to innovative actors in the field.
- Standardised approaches and models are popular, but may have limited local relevance.
- Donors could be more adventurous in embracing risk. Some aid must fail if other aid is to succeed.
- The issue of sustainability is recognised, but programmes sometimes lack a strategy for long term support.
Social media, internet publishing and general internet freedom issues are getting increasing attention from donors – to some extent at the expense of traditional media, support for which is diminishing. Donors are becoming better at coordinating their support so that there is less duplication of activities and fewer attempts of “double-dipping” when organisations seek support for the same activities from different donors. The reporting requirements from donor organisations are increasingly focused on documentation of results and impact.

Most donors are starting to place greater emphasis on local ownership of projects, while looking to align and harmonise their work with other donors. There is also an increasing desire to examine how development aid can be more accountable and how results can be measured. Despite these ambitions, most donors are notorious for failing to align their funding priorities with those of other like-minded donors or to collaborate – be it collaboration through information sharing and co-learning; co-funding; exploring common challenges; and sharing best practices. Donors of all varieties – uni-lateral; bi-lateral, sub-granting NGOs or private philanthropists – frequently do not understand other donor initiatives that are happening in the same geographic location or funding area. For the EU, aligning donor programmes ought to be an important concern as the EU is not merely another bilateral funder; rather through its funding it represents the interests of its member states (and given the rising tide of Euroscepticism this should be an important objective). It may be helpful to understand bilateral donor policies and funding priorities of its member states, and coordinate its development cooperation strategies and programmes with those of its member states. A lack of collaboration and alignment risks undermining programming funded by member states.

In reality, local ownership of projects has also proved very challenging for donors. Governments, donor agencies or parliaments tend to set priorities for how their money should be spent (understandably, given that taxpayers provide the money). There is also a tendency in all donor countries and the EU to use nationally based or European intermediaries to provide the bulk of the support to the local organisations. This combination of donor determined priorities together with the perspective, skills and capacities of intermediaries means that the scope for local groups (or even local donor staff) to set priorities is, in practice, often limited.

This limitation is compounded by the way that standardised approaches or easily replicable models of activity, such as training, are rolled out. They are often based on normative assumptions about governance or the experiences and skills of the intermediaries or recipient local civil society organisations, again with little that is specific to the local context. There is no discernible attempt to apply a political economy analysis (the implications of which are set out in the following section). Programmes thus become shaped by the perceptions of the providers rather than by the needs of the recipients. The use of standardised or replicable approaches is also driven by the short time frames for planning, the fact that preparation time for applications is unfunded, the need to spell out detailed project plans some time in advance and the lack of an inception phase for projects. All of this is a challenge in adopting a more nuanced approach.
A further complication is that there will be a tendency for an institution receiving support to extract the value it sees in the programme whatever the intention of the donor. Donor programmes get used by organisations for the things they wish to do, even if these do not exactly correspond with the original donor intentions. This process may still produce useful reforms and positive change but not necessarily in the form the donor desired.

There is a complex dynamic here between donor, local partners, intermediaries and private sector partners that needs to be re-examined in the current circumstances. The EU will be dependent upon the skills and capacities of intermediaries and local implementers. There is bound to be a tension between exploring new issues and approaches while relying upon an existing skill base, which may be based upon what is already familiar and will tend to adapt replicable models of working to whatever donor priorities are established. For example, few donors know how to respond to the growth of digital communications or how to reach new actors in the field who tend to be much smarter in their utilisation of technology than the existing intermediaries or donor staff. This involves forming relationships with unconventional and alternative actors, such as global newspaper trade associations.

A second issue that goes to the heart of donor aid is the willingness, among donors, to embrace risk, which means being able to recognise that some aid must fail if other aid is to succeed. There are lessons to be learned from the private sector here in the embrace of entrepreneurialism, innovation and risk taking. If we are to encourage new responses to the new challenges that are emerging, it will require new thinking among civil society organisations, new forms of activity and fresh approaches. This will mean a willingness to see projects fail as this willingness to risk failure is the price of success. A simple rule of thumb in the private sector is that for new business start-ups, one third eventually succeed (make a profit), one third break even, and one third lose money. According to a study by the U.S. Small Business Association, only two thirds of all small business start-ups survive the first two years and less than half make it to four years. If we want to see entrepreneurship, innovation and risk taking in the voluntary sector we might expect to see and tolerate similar failure rates among projects.

This is a difficult issue however as there is an understandable fear of adverse reaction from taxpayers if aid is perceived to have failed. Nor is there a clear understanding of what failure or success look like. If a country’s free expression protections are eroded despite EU funding media development projects in that country, have the projects failed? Or could they be seen as having prevented things from being even worse? To what extent is the continuing existence of an independent media voice a mark of success in some environments? There is no consensus on these questions.

There is a similar question in considering the issue sustainability. For the Development Co-Operation Directorate (DAC) of the OECD, sustainability “is concerned with measuring whether the benefits of an activity are likely to continue after donor funding has been withdrawn”\(^1\). While the intermediaries and local implementing organisations all recognised the importance of sustainability, many programmes lacked any strategy for future funding or long-term support. Sustainability did not seem to be given priority in programme planning and implementation. Partly this reflects the fact that donor funds may well be the only source of funding for the issue in question. But it is also clear that sustainable outcomes are achieved when the reform envisaged works with the grain of change in the country/area concerned, rather than one which seeks to push an agenda that is external to the perceptions of the recipients. This is why a political economy approach to programming is so important – where there is serious local opposition to norms as being “western” impositions, there will be a struggle to sustain projects in line with the EU’s goals.

\(^1\) [http://www.oecd.org/document/22/0,2340,en_2649_34435_2086550_1_1_1_1,00.html](http://www.oecd.org/document/22/0,2340,en_2649_34435_2086550_1_1_1_1,00.html)
#4 CONCLUSIONS
Understanding the role of the media, online and offline, in a society is not a simple issue. To use abstract terms, the media constitute a space in which the different interests of society can be articulated but in addition they are inevitably themselves actors in conflict over competing issues. To use sociological terms, the media are both structure and agency. Moreover those championing different interest – politicians, combatants in a conflict, civil society, businesses – will usually relate to each other through the way they are represented in the media. And so influencing media representation of their interests is crucial. The belief that the media simply articulate one interest, or simply provide a platform for all points of view – state or non-state – is profoundly misconceived, as most media play both interweaving roles.

For the purposes of supporting development and democracy – essentially social goals – the European Union and member states policy makers need to focus upon the media's role in constituting the public sphere of society. This includes thinking about how that can be fostered and nurtured in a way as to allow the expression of different views, the challenging of authority, inequalities in information possession and the other factors discussed in section one of this paper. By public sphere, is meant that range of communication outlets and media, which enable a society to view the representations of itself. To function properly, a public sphere must have free flowing access to information, and enable the views of ordinary citizens to be heard. In the words of Jürgen Habermas it is “a discursive arena that is home to citizen debate, deliberation, agreement and action”18.

The key question for policy makers and media alike is how to create a media and communication framework and practice that can sustain such a public sphere across a wide range of societies, which means understanding how to integrate digital platforms and communication solutions – the mix of legacy media and “new” media. To state the obvious, the challenges posed by a developed democracy, with isolated flaws in the systems for protecting freedom of expression, will be a very different challenge from supporting independent media in a divided, conflict ridden society. Equally, some repressive societies are relatively stable with the ruling elite well entrenched. Supporting media here will require a different approach to that which is appropriate in a repressive society undergoing a process of change. The range of media interventions that should be made will need to reflect the opportunities, challenges and contingencies in each environment. It is particularly important not to be focused on one communication technology rather than another. The EU itself is subject to constant lobbying pressures from different industries, each of whom will try to argue that their technology is the one most appropriate for investment. In practice, in the modern world, a healthy communication environment will be characterised by a range of different technologies, offline and online, whose interaction creates a climate most conducive to democracy.

In considering the types of media programmes to support, donors are increasingly looking at the broad political environment in which they are intervening rather than merely applying normative governance assumptions to countries. This approach seeks to understand how power is exercised in a society, by whom and what causes them to change their behaviour. This approach has become known as ‘political economy analysis’. There are three levels to such an analysis. The first is structural – representing the historic legacy and culture of a society (including such factors as the balance between state and society, the viability of public institutions (as opposed to state controlled or private bodies) and the historical strength and independence of civil society. The second is institutional – comprising the main relevant institutions of society – executive, legislative and judicial – that impact upon the media environment. The third is agents, the people and groups whose behaviours will shape the outcomes of any development project including ‘demand-side’ (media users, citizen journalists) and ‘supply-side’ (media institutions and journalists).

18 Villa, Dana R. “Postmodernism and the Public Sphere.” American Political Science Review, Vol. 86, No. 3 (September 1992),
This framing is examined in more detail in the publication "Freedom of Expression, media and digital communications - a practical guide". It includes a survey of the different outcomes that should result from supporting media programmes:

**POTENTIAL OUTCOME OF MEDIA SUPPORT**

- The systems of regulation and control support and enable freedom of expression, pluralism and diversity of the media rather than hinder it.
- A pluralistic media environment exists with transparency of ownership.
- The media have the capacity to act as a platform for democratic debate.
- There are sufficient professional skills and supporting institutions to underpin freedom of expression, pluralism and diversity.
- The communications infrastructure is sufficient to support independent and pluralistic media and there is an enabling environment for online and offline private sector media/media market.

Much attention has focused upon the importance of the mobile internet and social media. The mobile internet is helping to advance human rights and capacities through providing new opportunities for citizens to share information and ideas and to participate in public life. Mobile phones facilitate instant and ubiquitous communication, thereby increasing the power of citizen journalism, crowd sourcing and other forms of expression. Mobile phones are also helping to bridge the digital divide for people who do not have access to computers and fixed-line connections.

There are currently six billion mobile phone subscriptions in the world - expected to rise to nine billion by 2020. Mobile phone penetration is, on average 79 per cent globally (with 53 per cent penetration in Africa).

Nearly 70 per cent of mobile phones sold were feature phones, that is they have some data, text and Internet access. Phones do not need to be “smart” to access the internet. And the cost of some low end feature phones can be as little as US $15 which makes them accessible to the poorest people, given the willingness of people to spend large amounts of disposable income on a mobile phone.

These trends mean that it is likely that the mobile phone will become the dominant platform for accessing content for most of world’s population. However, the evidence from different projects around the world is that it is the interrelationship between mobile phones, the internet and other communications technologies, which is transformative, enabling citizen journalism and peer-to-peer information sharing and democratising freedom of expression.

For example citizen media platforms such as SeenReport in Pakistan allow people to file stories and reports via a range of communication platforms. It accepts reports via SMS, MMS and email, automatically uploading them onto the web and disseminating headlines via Twitter and Facebook. The mobile phone as a tool works best when it combines voice and data, allowing people to both file and access citizen journalism reports via mobile phones. Examples include CGNet Swara in India and the FreedomFone system developed and used by the civil society organisation Kubatana in Zimbabwe.

The other advantage of the mobile phone is its ability to collect information from a variety of sources and composite the information. There are many examples of people web enabled co-operation, such as the crowd wisdom platform Wikipedia, and the crowd funding application kickstarter. Mobile phones bring a new dimension to crowdsourcing – by adding a geo spatial capacity which allows data/ people’s location to be recorded, such as the Kenyan developed Ushahidi platform. This has been deployed for uses as diverse as monitoring water deliveries in India, monitoring sexual harassment in Egypt – HARASSmap – and famously monitoring election violence in Kenya.

The ability of people to utilise these technologies depends upon a number of factors: the affordability of the mobile internet (including the availability of pay as you go contracts), the usability of hardware and software, whether people have capacity to create and access relevant content, the architecture of the mobile internet and the persistence of social inequality.
FOR THE EU, IN CONSIDERING WHAT TO FUND THIS PRESENTS A NUMBER OF OPTIONS

- Supporting projects that provide technical solutions and the development of skills and capacities.

- Supporting market reforms that encourage open competition, appropriate regulatory frameworks and partnerships with telecommunication companies to help create a human rights-based infrastructure.

- Support for open source applications and innovation particularly those which are driven by a specific need from a community.

- Support for projects that address emerging digital issues, such as new corporate practices and regulatory environments that affect media development and free expression rights online. These will include the spread of intermediary liability and the “privatisation” of censorship – states pressing industry to censor for them, legally or otherwise – and the use of “choke points” in the internet to block access to online content.

- Support for policy and governance reform – by promoting discussion of normative values or examining the best regulatory environment that supports increased access.

- It would also help donors to share skills and knowledge in this emerging field. The temptation is to fund the latest shiny tools but the tools will always change – it is the capacities of civil society groups and the policy environment that need nurturing.
#5
RECOMMENDATIONS
In looking at the EU’s record of support for media, a number of lessons merge. We can summarise our conclusions under the following categories:

- Internal organisation
- Co-ordination
- Programme development

INTERNAL ORGANISATION

- There is a need for the EU to establish a classification system that would enable all media programmes to be identified, whatever the programme source and under whatever category of programmes they are funded. This would involve maintaining consistent searchable database of all projects and key lessons/evaluation results.

- There is a need to resolve the conceptual confusion between projects that support media and digital communications that are a platform for the exercise of democracy and human rights, and those communication projects geared to supporting development goals – be it health, education or infrastructure. A clear separation should be made between programmes and projects that support media and those that support communication for development.

- We recommend the EU establish permanent professional support for the media programme with staff who can provide expertise and advice to missions and programme staff to help ensure continuity and learning. This might also include building a database of media and digital specialists available for consultation to EU delegations or the EU centrally.

- We recommend that periodic reviews and evaluations be conducted and the results tracked in a common accessible format.

KEY RECOMMENDATIONS

- Explore ways of integrating EU diplomatic power alongside its development programmes in order to support freedom of expression and independent media and communications.

- Enhance coordination between the different operational arms of the EU.

- Utilise EU’s convening power to bring together member states to co-ordinate the application of media development programmes.

- Base the EU’s approach to media development on principles of freedom of expression as a foundation human right.

- Use political economy analysis - of both online and offline media - when considering what to fund. This will involve identifying those who are allies for and obstacles to change, as well as the incentives for change.

- Any media programme should take into consideration digital freedoms and the interrelationship between mobile phones and the internet and offline media.

- There should be more focus on increasing digital skills, capacities and awareness.

- Fostering an enabling environment is important if media and to thrive as businesses and be financially viable.

- There is potential to collaborate with European companies to create new CSR strategies, funding mechanisms, soft loans and guarantee instruments.

- Rethink criteria for measuring impact and outcomes so that they are specific to the media development and communications field.
Finally, it would also be useful to review all application procedures in order to minimise the administrative burden on both the applicants and the EU itself. Many local organisations find the co-funding requirement difficult and onerous to implement – this requirement should be reviewed.

**CO-ORDINATION**

- The EU should examine ways to use its diplomatic power, alongside its development programmes, to support freedom of expression and independent media and communications. The EU has great influence through its ‘Neighbourhood Policy’ with states to the EU’s south and east and through regional alliances in Asia, Africa and Latin America. If support for media and communications is integrated into these regional programmes, it could have a considerable impact.

- Many external observers believe that there is a need for the EU to adopt a more co-ordinated and collaborative intervention strategy. While at the regional level there is often good local co-ordination, the overall impression the EU gives is that of a lack of central co-ordination between different operational arms – DevCo, EuropeAid and the EEAS. As a first step in working towards better co-ordination, we recommend a working group be established in Brussels with representatives from DevCo, (EuropeAid) and the EEAS and including DG CNECT and DG Enterprise, DG Trade, to provide a forum that exchanges best practice in the field of media and communications support.

- The EU has a significant convening power, bringing together different actors. We recommend that EU working group undertakes regular consultations and considers ways to bringing together EU member states to co-ordinate the application of media development programmes. There is also a need to ensure the European Action Service diplomacy uses its political muscle to support broader media development goals where appropriate. One option would be for media and communications to become a standing agenda point during established dialogues with governments and civil society, for example in the human rights dialogue.

- Consideration should be given to combining media development assistance with freedom of expression dialogue meetings at the country and regional level.

- The EU and its institutions work across a number of silos, and best practice or lessons learned in one region or field do not necessarily translate into other fields. The working group could consider how to capture best practice across the media and communications field and share learning about the projects and approaches that are most effective.

**PROGRAMME DEVELOPMENT**

- The EU’s overarching approach to media development should be rooted in an approach that makes its guiding principle guaranteeing freedom of expression as a foundation human right. Not only should media and communication development projects be supported through various EU funding instruments, but alongside self-standing media support efforts, media support should be encouraged within governance and other thematic work.

- A political economy analysis should be applied to online and offline media and communication issues, when considering what kind of programmes should be supported to identify the agents of change and the most productive areas for providing support.

- This approach will mean looking at structural issues such as law and regulation as well as institutional factors such as the diversity and plurality of the media environment. But the most important element of any analysis is identifying who are the main allies for change, who the main obstacles and what the incentives are to change behaviour.
• Without being too prescriptive, it would be helpful if media support was seen as an essential component of the EU/UNDP Electoral Cycle Support as well as to other major democracy interventions programmes such as public financial management (which link to domestic accountability and service delivery). While it has been an element in some instances until now it has not been systematic.

• Any media programme has to incorporate an integrated approach regarding digital freedoms and media development (which requires a basic understanding of the impact of digital communications). This means understanding the interrelationship between mobile phones, the internet and offline media and communications technologies. It is this interaction that is transformative, enabling citizen journalism and peer-to-peer content creation and information sharing. In effect, this democratises freedom of expression.

• The EU should support specific programmes that increase digital skills and capacities, from specific technical developments that support democracy and human rights, as well as programmes that increase awareness and skills among civil society groups and the general population.

• Achieving EU objectives will also mean fostering an enabling environment for the private sector that allows media to thrive as business enterprises. Financial viability is important not just for sustainiability reasons but because it contributes significantly to editorial independence.

• There should be possibilities to collaborate with European companies not just as implementing partners but also partners in developing CSR (corporate social responsibility) strategies and new funding mechanisms, soft loans, guarantee instruments (if the appropriate EU regulation allows, otherwise European bilateral donors could be encouraged to do this).

• Many donors are concerned that it is difficult to assess the impact of media programmes upon democracy and human rights. The value of independent media and communications is often assumed, or even asserted, but it remains difficult to establish clear evidence of impact or measure how one type of intervention is more effective than the other. The EU could consider an initiative (perhaps jointly with the World Bank and OECD) to both improve the DAC classification categories about media to distinguish between communication for development, media development and public diplomacy in order to obtain more reliable data and develop more systematic criteria and indicators for assessing the impact of media development programmes. There is a need for both programme indicators which measure the outcome of programme interventions and impact indicators that show the effect of the outcomes. These will form part of the joint donor dialogue on human rights and democratic governance at the country level. The link between programme indicators and impact indicators must be made clear.

• More specifically, where the recipients of EU aid are substantial international organisations, it would be helpful if there was a requirement to build in a degree of local capacity development so that some aid reaches local actors.

These recommendations are a starting point rather than the final word. Rather than set grandiose objectives couched in general terms, they provide some practical steps forward to consolidate EU donor activity and establish a direction of travel. It is for the EU itself to prioritise the final objectives and goals and the means necessary to achieve them.
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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 be 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.