



General Conference
35th session, Paris 2009

rep

United Nations
Educational, Scientific and
Cultural Organization

Organisation
des Nations Unies
pour l'éducation,
la science et la culture

Organización
de las Naciones Unidas
para la Educación,
la Ciencia y la Cultura

Организация
Объединенных Наций по
вопросам образования,
науки и культуры

منظمة الأمم المتحدة
للتربية والعلم والثقافة

联合国教育、
科学及文化组织

Report

35 C/REP/15
20 July 2009
Original: English

**REPORT BY THE INTERGOVERNMENTAL COUNCIL
OF THE INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMME FOR THE DEVELOPMENT
OF COMMUNICATION (IPDC) ON ITS ACTIVITIES (2008-2009)**

OUTLINE

Source: Article 11 of the Statutes of the International Programme for the Development of Communication (IPDC).

Background: The Intergovernmental Council of the International Programme for the Development of Communication (IPDC) submits this report to the General Conference of UNESCO in accordance with 21 C/Resolution 4/21 and in pursuance of Article 11 of its Statutes adopted at the 21st session, which stipulates that the Council shall submit reports on its activities to the General Conference of UNESCO at each of its ordinary sessions.

Purpose: The present report covers IPDC's activities during the current biennium (2008-2009). It provides an overview of important decisions and initiatives of the Council, IPDC projects and the financial situation of the Programme.

Decision required: No decision is required on this document.

INTRODUCTION

1. The International Programme for the Development of Communication (IPDC) is the only intergovernmental programme in the United Nations system mandated to mobilize international support in order to contribute to sustainable development, democracy and good governance by strengthening the capacities of the developing countries and countries in transition in the field of electronic media and print press.

2. This unique role was recently reaffirmed by resolution A/RES/63/100 “Information in the service of humanity” adopted on 5 December 2008 by the United Nations General Assembly at its 63rd session, urging all countries, organizations of the United Nations system and all others concerned “to provide full support for the International Programme for the Development of Communication of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, which should support both public and private media”.

26th SESSION OF THE INTERGOVERNMENTAL COUNCIL OF THE IPDC

3. The overall responsibility for the Programme lies with the Intergovernmental Council of the IPDC, which meets every two years to assess the work carried out by the Programme. It consists of representatives from 39 countries elected by the General Conference of UNESCO. The 26th session of the Intergovernmental Council of the IPDC was organized at UNESCO Headquarters, Paris from 26 to 28 March 2008.¹

Election of the Bureau

4. At the beginning of the session, in accordance with its rules of procedure, the Council elected, its Chairperson, Vice-Chairpersons, members and Rapporteur of the Bureau, as follows:

Chairperson: Mr Walter Fust (Switzerland)

Vice-Chairpersons: Afghanistan, Tunisia, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

Members: Namibia, Russian Federation, United States of America

Rapporteur: Mr Mamadou Koumé (Senegal)

Setting standards for media development – Decision on media development indicators

5. In line with its standard-setting and policy-making role, the Council has debated and endorsed a comprehensive set of media development indicators (MDIs)² developed by a group of international experts at the request of the Council. The indicators have been categorized into five areas: (1) a system of regulation conducive to freedom of expression, pluralism and diversity of media; (2) plurality and diversity of media, a level economic playing field and transparency of ownership; (3) media as a platform for democratic discourse; (4) professional capacity-building and supporting institutions that underpins freedom of expression, pluralism and diversity; (5) infrastructural capacity to support independent and pluralistic media. Taken as a whole, the MDIs provide an aspirational picture of the media ecology to be constructed in order to ensure freedom of expression, pluralism and diversity of the media. The Council agreed that these media development indicators constitute an “important diagnostic tool for all stakeholders to assess media development in a given country and to thereby determine the areas in which assistance is

¹ Final report of the 26th session of the IPDC Council available at: <http://www.unesco.org/webworld/en/ipdc>.

² Full MDI report available at: www.unesco.org/webworld/en/media-development-indicators.

most needed". The Council described the MDIs as an important contribution to the definition of a United Nations common approach to Common Country Assessments (CCAs) and United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) in the fields of media development and good governance. Moreover, the Council directed the IPDC Bureau to link the Media Development Indicators to development objectives when selecting project proposals for approval.

Decision on the safety of journalists and the issue of impunity

6. The Intergovernmental Council decided to function as an oversight body on the safety of journalists. It recalled 29 C/Resolution 29 on the "Condemnation of violence against journalists" (UNESCO General Conference, 29th session, 1997) which calls upon Member States to take the necessary measures to protect journalists and prosecute those responsible for attacks. The Council also noted that the patterns of violence against journalists remain essentially unchanged while impunity of those who instigate the assassination of persons exercising the right to freedom of expression is prevalent. Following the report submitted by the Director-General on his condemnations of the assassinations of 121 journalists in 2006-2007, the Intergovernmental Council decided to launch an IPDC initiative to deal with the impunity of such crimes. The Council urged Member States "(a) to comply with the relevant obligations under international law to end impunity and to prosecute those responsible for violations, where actions have not been taken; (b) to inform the Director-General of UNESCO, on a voluntary basis, of the actions taken to prevent the impunity of the perpetrators and to notify him of the status of the judicial inquiries conducted on each of the killings condemned by UNESCO". The Council also invited the IPDC Bureau to give priority to projects that support local capacity-building in the safety of journalists.

Follow-up to the two decisions adopted by the IPDC Intergovernmental Council

7. In follow up to the endorsement of media development indicators (MDIs), UNESCO has launched a process of applying them in selected countries, including Croatia, Maldives and Mozambique, in order to complete comprehensive assessments of their national media landscapes. The MDIs have been widely distributed, translated into five languages and have been acknowledged by major actors in the media development field, including UNDP, the World Bank and the Council of Europe (see resolution 1637, 3 October 2008).

8. As for the decision on the safety of journalists and the issue of impunity, an official letter was sent to the governments of those countries in which journalists were assassinated in 2006-2007 and their assassination was condemned by UNESCO's Director-General. Governments were encouraged to provide information on their investigations into these crimes. A report based on the responses received from the relevant Member States will be submitted to the IPDC Council at its next session.

Evaluation of recent IPDC projects

9. The projects submitted to the IPDC are considered to be a part of the long-term programme implemented by the IPDC in each country. Therefore, when selecting projects, the IPDC Bureau considers the progress made in the country through previous IPDC support, based on project implementation reports and external evaluations. Each year, the IPDC Bureau makes a random selection of implemented projects to undergo external evaluation. Evaluation reports on 10 recent IPDC projects in Nepal, Palestine and Guatemala were presented to the 26th session of the IPDC Council. In this connection, the Chairman of the Council, underlined that the evaluation reports constitute important working documents, especially for the Bureau, and serve as a useful reference for other partners that may wish to come on board, including private donors.

IPDC SPECIAL INITIATIVE

Africa – Institutional excellence in training

10. Having recognized journalism education as a major issue to be addressed in Africa, UNESCO developed a set of criteria for institutional excellence in journalism training. After a mapping exercise to assess the capacities of African media training institutions, UNESCO identified 12 institutions that have the potential to become centres of excellence in journalism education. IPDC has provided support and launched partnerships with a number of these institutions to help them reach the defined level of excellence within the next four to five years.

52nd AND 53rd MEETINGS OF THE BUREAU OF THE INTERGOVERNMENTAL COUNCIL OF IPDC.

11. Two annual meetings of the Bureau of the IPDC Council were organized at UNESCO Headquarters, Paris from 23 to 25 April 2008 and from 23 to 25 February 2009. The meetings were chaired by Mr Walter Fust, IPDC Council Chairperson. The Advisers for Communication and Information from UNESCO's field offices attended the meeting to present the projects under their responsibility. The main purpose of the meetings was to select the media development projects to be financed by IPDC in 2008 and 2009.

IPDC projects approved in 2008-2009

12. One hundred and sixty-three (163) project proposals were submitted for the Bureau's consideration by local media organizations from developing countries worldwide. Proposals were developed on the basis of the IPDC guidelines for project preparation³ with expert assistance from UNESCO professionals based in 33 field offices. Proposals were eligible to be considered only if they were submitted by credible organizations, had a clearly stated objective, and contributed to at least one of IPDC's priorities:

- Projects that promote or strengthen freedom of expression by supporting electronic and print media or by building the capacities of media professionals to defend their right to freedom of expression and its corollary press freedom, including projects aimed at improving legislation in this respect.
- Projects that promote community media (electronic and print), including community multimedia centres with integrated community broadcasting facilities.
- Projects that support the training of media professionals and, in particular, capacity-building of media training institutions to offer high-quality training and to train trainers.

13. Among 163 project proposals considered, the IPDC Bureau approved **26 regional and 107 national projects from 71 countries for a total amount of \$3,666,230** for financing from the IPDC Special Account. For details, please see the table below:

³ IPDC guidelines for project preparation available at : <http://www.unesco.org/webworld/en/ipdc>.

| DISTRIBUTION OF IPDC FINANCIAL SUPPORT IN 2008-2009 | | | | | |
|---|--------------------|-------------|--|--------------------|-------------|
| COUNTRY | NUMBER OF PROJECTS | AMOUNT US\$ | COUNTRY | NUMBER OF PROJECTS | AMOUNT US\$ |
| AFRICA | | | ASIA AND THE PACIFIC | | |
| REGIONAL PROJECTS | 2 | 78,870 | REGIONAL PROJECTS | 10 | 316,745 |
| 1. BENIN | 2 | 42,350 | 34. AFGHANISTAN | 4 | 99,000 |
| 2. BURKINA FASO | 2 | 55,000 | 35. BANGLADESH | 4 | 112,200 |
| 3. BURUNDI | 1 | 33,000 | 36. BHUTAN | 1 | 16,500 |
| 4. CAMEROON | 1 | 24,200 | 37. CHINA | 1 | 43,230 |
| 5. CAR | 2 | 93,500 | 38. EAST TIMOR | 3 | 80,000 |
| 6. CHAD | 3 | 86,900 | 39. INDIA | 1 | 25,300 |
| 7. COTE D'IVOIRE | 2 | 60,500 | 40. KAZAKHSTAN | 1 | 20,900 |
| 8. GABON | 1 | 24,200 | 41. KYRGYZSTAN | 1 | 24,530 |
| 9. GAMBIA | 2 | 49,500 | 42. MALAYSIA | 1 | 27,500 |
| 10. GHANA | 2 | 68,200 | 43. MICRONESIA | 1 | 20,350 |
| 11. GUINEA | 1 | 25,300 | 44. MYANMAR | 1 | 33,000 |
| 12. GUINEA-BISSAU | 1 | 33,000 | 45. NAURU | 1 | 24,200 |
| 13. KENYA | 2 | 44,000 | 46. NEPAL | 1 | 38,500 |
| 14. MALAWI | 1 | 22,000 | 47. PAKISTAN | 2 | 64,900 |
| 15. MALI | 1 | 39,600 | 48. PALAU | 2 | 58,300 |
| 16. NAMIBIA | 1 | 31,500 | 49. PAPUA NEW GUI. | 1 | 33,000 |
| 17. NIGER | 1 | 14,300 | 50. SRI LANKA | 1 | 13,200 |
| 18. RWANDA | 2 | 37,400 | 51. TAJIKISTAN | 1 | 27,500 |
| 19. SAO TOME AND PRINCIPE | 1 | 29,370 | 52. THAILAND | 1 | 26,400 |
| 20. SENEGAL | 1 | 40,095 | 53. UZBEKISTAN | 1 | 16,500 |
| 21. SEYCHELLES | 1 | 35,200 | 54. VANUATU | 1 | 16,500 |
| 22. SOMALIA | 3 | 104,500 | LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN | | |
| 23. TANZANIA | 4 | 123,200 | REGIONAL PROJECTS | 11 | 320,540 |
| 24. TOGO | 1 | 27,500 | 55. BAHAMAS | 1 | 33,000 |
| 25. UGANDA | 2 | 64,900 | 56. BELIZE | 1 | 24,200 |
| 26. ZAMBIA | 2 | 41,800 | 57. BOLIVIA | 1 | 24,200 |
| ARAB REGION | | | 58. CHILE | 1 | 20,900 |
| REGIONAL PROJECTS | 2 | 72,930 | 59. COLOMBIA | 1 | 24,200 |
| 27. JORDAN | 1 | 45,100 | 60. COSTA RICA | 1 | 27,500 |
| 28. LEBANON | 2 | 38,500 | 61. EL SALVADOR | 1 | 16,500 |
| 29. MAURITANIA | 1 | 11,000 | 62. ECUADOR | 1 | 10,560 |
| 30. MOROCCO | 1 | 19,800 | 63. GUYANA | 2 | 49,500 |
| 31. PALESTINIAN TER. | 4 | 99,000 | 64. HAITI | 1 | 38,500 |
| EUROPE | | | 65. MEXICO | 1 | 22,000 |
| | | | 66. NICARAGUA | 1 | 36,300 |
| | | | 67. PANAMA | 2 | 46,970 |
| | | | 68. PERU | 2 | 52,800 |
| | | | 69. St. LUCIA | 1 | 13,200 |
| REGIONAL PROJECT | 1 | 27,500 | 70. St. VINCENT&GREN. | 1 | 15,950 |
| 32. ARMENIA | 1 | 17,600 | 71. URUGUAY | 1 | 18,700 |
| 33. MOLDOVA | 1 | 22,000 | | | |

FINANCIAL CONTRIBUTIONS TO IPDC IN 2007-2008

13. In accordance with IPDC's procedures, the Bureau allocates funds to projects only on the basis of financial resources already available on the IPDC Special Account at the end of the financial year preceding the meeting of Bureau. This practice helps to avoid any deficit in the IPDC budget and to proceed with the launching of the projects immediately after the Bureau's meeting. 133 projects were approved and financed in 2008-2009 thanks to the following contributions made in 2007-2008:

| Financial contributions to the IPDC in 2007-2008 | | | | |
|---|---------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| in US dollars | | | | |
| | | 2007 | 2008 | Total |
| 1. | Afghanistan | | 500 | 500 |
| 2. | Andorra | 15,104 | 14,742 | 29,846 |
| 3. | Czech Republic | 56,066 | 56,540 | 112,606 |
| 4. | Denmark | 97,929 | 93,457 | 191,386 |
| 5. | Finland | 294,986 | 278,948 | 576,833 |
| 6. | Germany | 42,773 | | 42,773 |
| 7. | Greece | 20,161 | | 20,161 |
| 8. | India | 30,000 | 30,000 | 60,000 |
| 9. | Israel | 15,000 | | 15,000 |
| 10. | Italy | | 50,000 | 50,000 |
| 11. | Japan (FIT) | 86,600 | | 86,600 |
| 12. | Norway | 362,448 | 142,958 | 505,406 |
| 13. | Russian Federation | | 100,000 | 100,000 |
| 14. | Spain | 358,906 | 567,376 | 926,282 |
| 15. | Switzerland | 115,767 | 457,497 | 573,264 |
| 16. | United States of America | 305,500 | 118,544 | 424,044 |
| | Total | \$1,801,240 | \$1,910,062 | \$3,711,302 |

14. In 2007-2008, IPDC received a total of \$3,711,302 from 16 donor countries. Both the number of donors and the size of contributions have considerably increased in comparison with the previous biennium. The main contributors were Denmark, Finland, Norway, Spain, Switzerland, and the United States of America. In particular, the important contribution by Spain (\$926,282), representing about 25% of the total contributions received in 2007-2008, should be noted. It should also be noted that Italy and the Russian Federation have decided to resume their financial support to the Programme.

15. In order to further build up the funds available to IPDC to support media development projects, the Council's Chairperson has sent letters to both traditional and potential donors, including developing Member States, underlining the importance of supporting IPDC, even through symbolic contributions. They were reminded that any contribution, however modest it may be, is of great symbolic significance as it demonstrates their confidence in this unique multilateral assistance programme.