



## **Agenda item: Discussion: Strengthening IPDC for the period 2014-2021.**

### **BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE**

This document is being presented to the 57<sup>th</sup> meeting of the IPDC Bureau in order to share developments in regard to making IPDC more focused and effective. The Bureau may wish to consider the actions recommended in section 8 below.

#### **Contents:**

1. Introduction: parameters for strengthening IPDC.
2. Strengthening IPDC in pursuit of “stretch” objectives
3. IPDC mission and the changing context of media.
4. Streamlining the work
5. Special Initiatives
6. Knowledge-Driven Media Development
7. Conclusion
8. Recommended action.

### **1. INTRODUCTION: PARAMETERS FOR STRENGTHENING IPDC**

#### **1.1. Remit**

The unique status of IPDC continues after 30 years and this point merits underlining: IPDC remains the only intergovernmental programme in the UN system mandated to **mobilize international support for strengthening the capacities of developing countries and countries-in-transition in news media**<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> By “news media development” is meant interventions that empower institutions whose core function is the dissemination of news and information (i.e. journalism).

**development.** In the total global landscape of media development, this is the only aggregated programme that draws in contributions from States on a global (as distinct from regional or national) basis.

As evident from studies using the UNESCO Media Development Indicators, as well as other sources, there remain gaps in media in many countries, and so there is still a need for IPDC's role. The Programme continues to be congruent with the mission of UNESCO as a whole, and so the Programme continues to be relevant for the period 2014-2021 which is the next medium-term strategic planning period for the Organization.

This document is tabled for the 2013 Bureau, as an opportunity for Members to discuss IPDC issues for this forthcoming period, and decide on possible support for a number of measures. The document covers IPDC in the wider context of work done in other sections of its institutional home which is UNESCO's Division for Freedom of Expression and Media Development – FEM.

At the 2014 Bureau meeting, it will be possible to further discuss alignment of IPDC with the wider direction and focus of UNESCO in the light of:

- a. UNESCO's "C4" setting out overarching objectives for 2014-2021 (to be discussed at 2013 Executive Board meeting in April 10-25);
- b. Location of UNESCO's programmatic work on freedom of expression and freedom of press;

## **1.2 Resources**

IPDC relies on both financial and human resources, which are discussed below:

Financially, the media development projects of the IPDC rely on extra-budgetary funds, as has also been the case for many activities carried out under the IPDC Special Initiatives of safety of journalists, Media Development Indicators and Potential Centres of Excellence in Journalism Education.

Therefore, a central part of IPDC's role going forward needs to focus upon such extra-budgetary income flows. As funding has been declining in the past two years, it is important that this issue is addressed along with the related question of visibility. Strategy documents have been developed to address these issues, and are tabled separately at the Bureau for discussion.

UNESCO's Regular Programme budget covers the human resources costs for IPDC (the three-person Secretariat, as well as staff time in HQ backstopping and Field Offices project development, management and reporting). The same budget covers IPDC statutory meetings and translation requirements.

Concerning human resources, it is important to note that since the beginning of 2012, IPDC's human capacity has been shrinking. The Programme lost the services of a Senior Administrative Assistant (part of whose work had been to service IPDC, but whose retirement saw the post frozen as part of the financial situation at UNESCO). Then in mid-2012, there was the end of term of an Associate Expert who had been made available by the government of Spain for a period of three years.

The result is that the existing Junior Office Assistant has been shouldered with some tasks formerly done by the Senior Administrative Assistant and the Associate Expert. A number of activities have also now been relocated outside the Secretariat. One area concerns the administrative work on safety of journalists, such as the letters to Member States requesting reports on judicial follow-ups to killings. From 2013 onward, these are being processed by the section for Freedom of Expression (FOE) as part of its broader work on safety. The results will still be reported under IPDC auspices as required by IPDC Council

resolution. (More discussion on this is located in section 5 below). Another area previously handled by the Associate Expert at IPDC has been the Potential Centres of Excellence in Journalism Education. The Secretariat now proposes that the Centres initiative be formally concluded. (See section 5 on Special Initiatives below).

These responses help to partly compensate the loss of human resource capacity. However, it would be optimum if a Member State could support IPDC “in kind” by providing a new Associate Expert. Meanwhile, some streamlining is needed so that the Secretariat can also have time to give extra attention to servicing the two particularly important areas that have arisen (fundraising and visibility). The following streamlining could assist:

- Putting more emphasis on Field Offices to produce quality work at source, as opposed to the Secretariat at HQ having, on occasion, to return project proposals for further work. Related to this the proposal solicitation and sifting process will also be reviewed with a view to improving quality and efficiency.
- For the work in building up the knowledge role of IPDC, capacity in the wider FEM can assist here, with the partial deployment of Fackson Banda (located in the IMD section of FEM) to work on this issue.
- Improving the process of decision-making at the Bureau, so that Members have more time to engage with issues that can help IPDC become more efficient and effective.
- Section 4 lists a number of other proposals.

### 1.3 Results-based management

The RBM philosophy has special relevance to IPDC’s work in 2014-21. IPDC’s general credibility and its “fundability” will increasingly be linked to the extent to which the Programme explicitly engages with this concept in all aspects of its diverse activities. While it is a challenge to guarantee “outcomes” as compared to “outputs”, IPDC will need to orientate in this direction, and in this regard the “knowledge-based” role discussed below (in section 6) has an important role to play. The focus on results highlights the need for IPDC to generate and use knowledge more systematically as part of continuously learning what works best.

## 2. STRENGTHENING IPDC IN PURSUIT OF “STRETCH” OBJECTIVES

Despite the capacity constraints, appropriate streamlining should make it possible for IPDC during 2014-21 to be ambitious and to stretch itself to achieve the following Expected Results:

- the **widest possible knowledge and ownership** of the Programme by Member States and UNESCO structures.
- global respect, including especially by UNESCO Member States, for IPDC’s **visible efficiency and effectivity** in delivery of media development projects,<sup>2</sup>
- acknowledgement as a **global leader in knowledge about media development**, playing a prominent intellectual role in the wider community of practice of media development actors internationally (donors, implementers, scholars).

---

<sup>2</sup> This means that IPDC’s operational systems and parameters should be improved and related to the changes taking place in news media which will intensify in the 2014-2021 period.

These Expected Results are integral to IPDC's remit, resources and need for results. They are also underlined by the changing media context in which the Programme finds itself.

### **3. IPDC MISSION AND THE CHANGING CONTEXT OF MEDIA**

Seen in terms of UNESCO's mandate, the Programme is not in the business of supporting media development just for its own sake. Its purpose is to facilitate the free flow of information, as per UNESCO's constitution, and the contribution of communication to the objective of peace. Since the Organization's endorsement in 1991 of the Windhoek Declaration, the orientation has been to support media that is free, pluralistic and independent.

In this context, IPDC has supported the development of what is increasingly referred to as "legacy" media – such as through projects related to journalism safety (part of media freedom), community radio and Public Service Broadcasting (part of pluralism), and the upgrading of journalism education (part of independence). This reflects the ambition to support the capacity for free, pluralistic and independent news to be generated and for it flow safely and sustainably. With a changing media environment, IPDC should continue in this vein, and particularly in assisting news media institutions (and their supporting institutions such as media NGOs, professional associations and university journalism schools) to respond to the changing communication opportunities.

The contextual changes are evident in the rise of many other actors engaged in public communications (not uniformly as regards information of professional journalistic standard). In addition, many media institutions are engaging in multi-platform operations and interactions with audiences and the proliferation of other content sources. Innovations in news gathering and dissemination are continuous. At the same time, the changes are challenging the sustainability of many media institutions, while excessive commercialization has damaged journalistic ethics and models of self-regulation at a time when the distinctiveness of professional journalism is especially significant within the expanding information universe. Audiences increasingly need advanced competencies in Media and Information Literacy. Media development work needs to recognize this whole complex and dynamic situation.

In particular, such changes require that IPDC becomes more attuned to being part of a learning cycle, where the Programme seeks to become more knowledge-driven in response to the changing conditions about media development. In turn, this also directs IPDC increasingly to support innovation and to draw the lessons of support in these cases. The virtuous learning "loop" envisaged is as follows: project-support → project assessment → knowledge → more-informed project-support → more impact → new assessment → new knowledge → further-informed project-support, etc.

It is against this backdrop that IPDC's general mission remains relevant, although in the application of this mission it is important to register that "legacy" news media can, and should, no longer operate in isolation of the new communications environment. Indeed, IPDC has a key role to play in assisting the transition from stand-alone analogue media platforms to the new networked and more pluralistic communications era. In other words, IPDC should remain news media-centric, but become more active in assisting "legacy" media institutions to thrive in, and intersect with, the new communications environment over the 2014-21 period.

It is in this context that IPDC to support innovative media development projects that can enhance, in the fast moving communications context:

- Media freedom and the safety of those who produce news.

- Pluralism in the media, particularly as regards community media and gender dimensions.
- Ethical initiatives, effective self-regulatory systems and new sustainability models, which can strengthen news media independence and quality.

In the light of all this, the relevant IPDC statutory document wording for the mission could benefit from a degree of updating as follows, although this is not a fundamental change:

<p><b>Current mission statement (adopted 2003)</b></p>	<p><b>Proposed wording for mission statement 2014-21 (This will require a change of statute; accordingly, it would need to be presented to the 2014 IPDC Conference). It can, however, be informally implemented in the meantime as a contemporary interpretation of the current mission statement.</b></p>
<p>The objective of IPDC is to contribute to sustainable development, democracy and good governance by fostering universal access to and distribution of information and knowledge by strengthening the capacities of the developing countries and countries in transition in the field of electronic media and the printed press.</p>	<p><i>The proposed wording for the IPDC mission statement will be in line with the UNESCO constitution and acknowledging change:</i></p> <p>IPDC contributes to UNESCO’s objectives of peace, sustainable development and the eradication of poverty by strengthening media freedom, pluralism and independence, and the safety of journalists, in developing countries and countries-in-transition, in a context of evolving communications.</p>

The IPDC structures and processes may also merit some streamlining and updating in two respects: the eligibility to become Chair of the IPDC, and the voting system at the Bureau. These two issues arose in 2012, and they concern matters where the IPDC statutes do not give detailed guidance. Consultations with Council Members in 2012 produced the following informal resolutions:

- On the eligibility of the Chair, the broad sentiment in the consultations has been that any State, whether a contributor to IPDC or not, is eligible for election to the Chairship.<sup>3</sup> This position has no statutory implications, because the current statutes do not point in one way or another.
- The voting power in the Bureau also evoked discussion in 2012. In practice this issue has not been a problem in the past, because Bureau decisions have been invariably consensual.

To date, the practical interpretation of IPDC statutes has been that the positions of Chair and Rapporteur can vote at Bureau meetings, and that the countries of their incumbents are also represented and can vote. From one point of view, this could be seen as giving extra representation to the regional groups (even although Chair and Rapporteur are elected in personal capacity). The current incumbents in the Chair and Rapporteur positions have agreed, after

---

<sup>3</sup> The consultations further urged that all UNESCO member countries should become donors to IPDC.

informal consultations with Council members in 2012, that their countries will not have voting additional seats at the eight-member Bureau.

The Bureau in 2013 may wish to discuss whether the matter should be addressed more formally, which could involve recommending a change to the statutes to be considered at the 2014 Council. If this is the case, the Secretariat recommends the approach below which is informed by the principle that each country (representing a regional group) has a single vote on the Bureau (in the unlikely event of a ballot).

The principle here would be that Chair and Rapporteur can vote, but their countries (and thence their regions) would not have additional representation. In this regard, if the statutory Bureau size changed from eight to six positions (including Chair and Rapporteur), all regional groups would have the same votes irrespective of the position occupied on the Bureau.

Further to this scenario, (again in the unlikely event of a ballot at the Bureau), the Chair and Rapporteur would cast their votes as a representative of their regional groups. In a tie, the Chair would have a casting vote. Notwithstanding this arrangement, the Chair would (qua the office held) maintain a responsibility to the collective Bureau members in regard to all other dimensions of Bureau business and to the positions agreed by a majority of members.

#### **4. STREAMLINING THE WORK**

To streamline IPDC means assessing the two areas of work under the Programme: first, allocating financial support for specific meritorious Projects, and second, Special Initiatives. (The latter are discussed in section 5 below).

##### **4.1 Project-related work:**

IPDC has been operating in recent years with a benchmark of 150 projects per biennium, funded from its Special Account (in which donations are not earmarked for particular purposes beyond the IPDC general priorities). In 2012, this was complimented by one earmarked donation (to the IPDC Funds-in-Trust account). The combined result was a total of 85 projects that were supported (from a much larger selection of options prepared and provided to the Bureau). This worked out as an average of \$20 000 grant per project. However, with lower funds in 2013, the expected figure is lower.

To take an informed position on IPDC projects going ahead for 2014, the Secretariat believes that the situation where the IPDC grants average an amount of \$20 000 per project is an optimum one. (This would mean for instance that circa 60 projects could be supported in 2014, *at varying amounts*, with a budget of \$1m). While \$20 000 often does not cover the full costs for a project to materialize, a factor in selecting which projects to support is an estimate of a given applicant's ability to leverage the significance of UNESCO backing to attract support from other donors.

This recommendation for maintaining the \$20 000 average for 2014–2021 and a corresponding ceiling of project numbers, can allow for expansion of the scale of operation of IPDC. On its existing three-person staff and systems, IPDC could accommodate an increase up to a certain level of additional projects, if more funding came in. This means that IPDC has a margin to increase its output of media support without incurring extra costs – a relative efficiency gain. On the basis of a sought-after \$1.5m to disburse p.a. in 2014 (see Funding Strategy document), the Secretariat has capacity to handle more than 100 projects a

year @ \$20 000 average. For five years after that, the Secretariat could also probably manage a 10% growth rate if an equivalent 10% growth of funding p.a. could be secured.

At the same time, it should be noted that fundraising activity is inherently difficult in the context of the complexity of relations between UNESCO delegations and government budgets in home countries.

As discussed in section 3 above, the changing media context does mean that over 2014-2021, there should be streamlining in regard to the kinds of projects that are eligible for support. Several changes can be considered in this respect. These are dealt with the next section below.

#### 4.2 Project focus and operational parameters:

Taking into account the changes in the news media landscape and proposed updated mission as discussed earlier, it makes sense to streamline the priorities, eligibility of projects and the maximum amounts granted. The 2013 Bureau can consider the following:

- **IPDC main priority areas for support**

With a view to sharpening IPDC’s focus on media institutions and professional media capacities, the Bureau may wish to consider amending the wording of current priorities as reflected in the table below:

- It is proposed to drop “promotion of international partnership” as this has not elicited a volume of project proposals, and those which have secured grants from IPDC do not stand out particularly as having had much enduring impact.
- The new landscape should be reflected by introducing wording that highlights the need for projects to be innovative, knowledge-enhancing and – where appropriate – policy-relevant

<b>Current priorities (Note: <i>these are not part of the Statutes, so the Bureau has the competence to amend</i>).</b>	<b>Proposed priorities for 2014-21 are projects that entail:</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Promotion of freedom of expression and media pluralism;</li> <li>▪ Development of community media;</li> <li>▪ Human resource development;</li> <li>▪ Promotion of international partnership</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Promotion of freedom of expression, and press freedom (including the safety of journalists), pluralism (particularly community media) and independence.</li> <li>▪ Capacity development for journalists and media managers</li> <li>▪ Innovation in convergence and integration of legacy (traditional) news media and new communications.</li> </ul>

- **Eligibility criteria**

Eligibility criteria for IPDC project support are also proposed for amendment by the Bureau, the recommended changes being in the light of Secretariat experience to date and the changing media context.

<p><b>Current eligibility criteria</b> <i>(these are not part of the Statutes, so the Bureau has competence to amend).</i></p>	<p><b>Proposed eligibility criteria</b></p>
<p>Project submission should be undertaken by media organizations that produce and distribute print or broadcast media, professional associations of media workers or organizations that deal with the training of media professionals (journalism and broadcasting organizations, as well as institutions and universities offering regular training for working journalists - journalism education courses can also be included in this category). As far as community media are concerned, community organizations and NGOs working in the community media sector, such as community radio, can submit proposals.</p> <p>The involvement and contribution of the community must be ensured from the inception of the community media project.</p> <p>IPDC will not support projects if such support gives an undue advantage to the submitter over other competitive media organizations in the same location.</p> <p>Individuals are not eligible to submit proposals. All submitting organizations should have a credible status recognized by the media community and a working relationship with UNESCO field offices.</p>	<p><b>IPDC assistance is only provided to projects with:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential impact at national or regional level</li> <li>• Clear compliance with the Programme’s focus on contributing to media freedom (including the safety of journalists), pluralism (particularly community media) and independence.</li> </ul> <p><b>IPDC assistance decisions are positively influenced by whether a project entails:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wider lessons or learning outcomes that are included in the project design</li> <li>• Explicit gender-sensitivity as regards beneficiaries</li> </ul> <p><b>Eligible projects are those which:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are submitted by editorially-independent media organizations, professional associations of media workers, or institutions offering regular media development services.</li> <li>• Are based, in the case of training projects in particular, in organisations that offer regular, systematic and model courses for working and future journalists.</li> <li>• IPDC will support strategic research that will contribute to knowledge development and dissemination around media development, such as the Media Development Indicators (or a relevant aspect thereof).</li> </ul> <p><b>What IPDC does not normally support:</b></p> <p>Budgets where air travel and per diem costs of consultants and participants exceed 50% of budget requested. Normally, conferences are not supported unless they are clearly a programmatic part of a wider and ongoing initiative.</p> <p>IPDC does not normally support regular operating costs or venue hire costs.</p>



	<p>IPDC will not support projects if such support gives an undue advantage to the submitter over other competitive media organizations in the same location.</p> <p>IPDC will not support specific audiovisual television productions/films and communication campaigns.</p> <p><b>Spreading the benefits:</b></p> <p>Only two projects per developing country are normally approved for financing, with exceptions such as those projects that could have much wider relevance (eg. development of an online training course that can transcend country borders).</p>
--	--

- **Maximum and average amounts to be allocated for IPDC Special Account projects**

In order to reduce the difference between the currently advertised possible level of project financing (\$40,000) and an average of \$20,000 per project, the Secretariat proposes that the Bureau reduce the maximum amount which can *normally* be requested to \$30,000. The specific mode (i.e. the most common) figure per year can be recommended by Secretariat on an annual basis in relation to available funding, and should continue to be decided by the Bureau.

**5. SPECIAL INITIATIVES:**

As agreed in IPDC governing structures over the years, this side of IPDC’s work has covered: (a) safety of journalists, (b) Media Development Indicators (MDIs), and (c) Potential Centres of Excellence in Journalism Education. These initiatives are rather different in character and origin. However, it can be noted that they all have an organic link to the subject matter agreed by IPDC governing bodies for the Thematic Debates at the IPDC Council.

The Secretariat proposes to the Bureau that IPDC should retain these general characteristics of Special Initiatives (SIs) as open and flexible instruments, and advises against over-formalising criteria or prescribing a fixed longevity. Depending on issues such as capacity, resourcing, and impact, the SIs can be either long-term initiatives, without a specified closure point, or have a medium-term lifecycle with clear conclusion or relocation to a home outside IPDC at a certain point. These issues can best be decided on a case-by-case basis by the Bureau.

As regards the current three Special Initiatives, they have to date usefully helped to orientate the decisions of the Bureau in regard to which projects should win support. In this way the SI’s have added to the general prioritization focus that has guided the Bureau. In effect, safety, MDIs and the Centres have been added as criteria alongside the existing criteria of freedom of expression and pluralism; community media; human resource development; and promotion of international partnership. The SI’s have also entailed valuable programmatic work by the IPDC secretariat, as is outlined below:

**Safety:** Support for projects on journalistic safety has become an important component of what IPDC sees as central to projects to be supported as part of media development. The logic here is that projects in general are likely to be constrained optimum in their impact, if they take place in an environment where journalists are being intimidated or killed. In addition to IPDC giving support for safety-related projects, the Programme has also become, under Council resolutions, a structure under whose auspices the Director-General provides a biennial report on safety. In 2012, the IPDC Council required the Director-General to continue indefinitely to table her report at its biennial sessions.

As a spin-off of this programmatic work, IPDC was also mandated by its Council in 2010 to mobilise the UN at large on the matter of safety. The result of this has been the UN Plan on the Safety of Journalists and the Issue of Impunity, co-ordinated by UNESCO. This in turn was followed up at a conference in Vienna in November 22-23 which developed a global Implementation Strategy and Work-Plan for all stakeholders. Since mid-2012, these areas of work are being taken forward by the CI Section for Freedom of Expression (FOE), while IPDC remains an important structure within UNESCO where the relevant work can be reported and where future initiatives may also be forthcoming depending on Member States.

In the light of all this, it therefore makes sense to retain safety as a formal IPDC SI, and for the wider context of activity to continue to inform the Bureau's selection of projects – such as whether a given project on safety helps to reinforce the UN Plan of Action.

**MDIs:** This instrument has been endorsed by the IPDC Council, and serves as a prestigious and influential diagnostic tool that can give guidance as to what areas of media development most need support in a given country. The logic of keeping the programmatic work on MDIs as being under the IPDC umbrella continues. Elaborated sub-tools in certain areas such as safety or new media also need to be considered. A specific document on these issues is on the agenda for the 2013 Bureau discussions.

**Potential Centres of Excellence:** The IPDC has been a vehicle for identifying 20 centres of journalism education in Africa that are worth investing in. The logic has been to work cumulatively and to build strong institutions through sustained assistance. This SI has both given some focus to grant-making and entailed a range of programmatic work outside of grants. The initiative is currently under review to see if the identified institutions have in fact come closer to their agreed definition of excellence. Due partly to the reduced human capacity in IPDC, but primarily to a lack of Regular Programme budget and difficulties experienced in fundraising for the Centres, the Secretariat recommends that the initiative as a whole should be formally discontinued as an IPDC Special Initiative. Notwithstanding this, the Bureau can be assured that FEM will certainly continue with a range of work to strengthen journalism education particularly in Africa. In this light, the members of the IPDC Bureau may wish to continue regarding African journalism education as a cause worth supporting, and particularly proposals from those institutions which did improve successfully improve their potential during the Centres initiative.

### **In summary on SIs:**

The trajectory that IPDC is on suggests that streamlining in Special Initiatives entails:

- Continue with journalism safety issues as a Special Initiative through supporting related projects, and tabling the DG's report on safety (with operational work done by the FOE section);
- Continue with the Special Initiative of MDIs;;
- Conclude the Special Initiative on the "Centres", while recognizing that programmatic work on journalism education will continue in FEM, and that special consideration is given to applications from Centres which have closer to excellence.

The question arises as to whether IPDC Bureau should consider any new Special Initiatives for, or during, the 2014-21 period. It is proposed by the Secretariat that IPDC's work in knowledge-driven media development (see Section 6 below) should be elevated to this status.

## 6. KNOWLEDGE-DRIVEN MEDIA DEVELOPMENT

IPDC has a clear role to play in 2014-21 in regard to knowledge development and circulation. This is not currently a "Special Initiative". However, to attract greater attention to this part of IPDC's functioning, it could be considered by the Bureau for elevation to this status. It is significant that UNESCO has diagnosed the current historical period as one entailing the construction of knowledge societies. As such, it becomes increasingly relevant for IPDC to promote **knowledge-driven media development**. Here, IPDC is sitting on the proverbial goldmine constituted by a sizeable volume of information related to the large number of projects which it funds per annum. As noted earlier, it is in this light, that IPDC can be conceptualized within a wider learning cycle and results-based management.

It is in this vein as well, that the selection of projects by the Bureau (as proposed in Section 4 above) should assess the potential of each applicant's project to serve as a pilot in the sense of generating value far beyond the immediate scope of the activities. In this way, the information arising from these projects can generate knowledge, which in turn can enhance future project selection and learning, in a virtuous spiral of learning (as outlined in Section 3 above).

In this way, IPDC can also become a global leader in transparency and sharing of information about media development. This would include enhancing its database, and by leading a global process to promote research and knowledge generation within the media development community of practice.

For these reasons, it is important to take the maximum advantage of concrete and general lessons that emerge as a result of the development and implementation of IPDC projects. Information to fuel this learning can come from three sources:

- First, one source of information is the body of **reports on the implementation of IPDC projects**. These are prepared by project officers for submission to the IPDC Bureau and Council. The paragraph contained within these reports entitled 'Conclusion' has been replaced in 2013 by a paragraph under the heading 'Lessons learned from project implementation'. The information found in this part of the report needs to be summarized and analyzed by the IPDC Secretariat and presented to the Bureau in a separate document.
- Second, information is also present in the **evaluation report of IPDC projects**. Due to cost factors, the current biennium can provide for only 16 projects to receive in-depth (and independent) evaluations. Nevertheless, it is possible to use the lessons arising from these in appropriate ways. They can assist the CI sector in determining general trends and can inform Bureau future choices about developing and selecting project proposals. The lessons can also be circulated to the Field Offices. Further, the project officer responsible for project implementation could, in future, be asked to formally respond to the IPDC concerning the recommendations put forward in evaluation reports. Criteria are needed to target what prioritization should apply in regard to selection of projects for evaluation.
- **Overview reports** from CI Field Offices could become the third source of information. The preparation of such a report can be requested by the IPDC Secretary, in addition to the mandatory Implementation Reports. These documents could primarily contain information on media development actors and trends in the countries covered by the designated Field Offices. A

template could be developed for this purpose. All these overview reports and the lessons in them could serve as a basis for the preparation of **an analytical document** entitled ‘**Main lessons and trends in implementation of IPDC media development projects**’, to be prepared on a regular basis for submission to the IPDC Bureau in order to contribute to an improvement in IPDC delivery and monitoring. The reports could also be adapted for publication in academic journals.

IPDC should also take the lead in cooperating with other media development agencies to promote “**open data**” on media funding and the associated results, including popularizing the IPDC database. IPDC could also develop relations with academic partners, such as in schools of development studies and associations like the IAMCR and ORBICOM, to encourage the uptake of “media development” as a serious subject for study and research. UNESCO could encourage the development of Chairs in Media Development. One activity could be to catalyse the formation of a centre or institute for media development studies.

IPDC’s 2013 Bureau meeting is thus requested to discuss the issue and consider it as a new Special Initiative. Fundraising could be sought through partners, although the Bureau in 2014 may wish to allocate an initial amount of \$10 000 - \$15 000 for the launch of a pilot section on the IPDC website devoted to this topic of “open data”.

## **7. CONCLUSION:**

To recap the points in this document:

- For 2014-21, IPDC as a unique Programme in the UN system remains relevant and focused on mobilizing and allocating funds for effective media development;
- With the support of the Bureau, IPDC can be streamlined to meet new challenges.
- Two existing Special Initiatives are recommended to continue (safety and MDIs), and a new one is recommended to be added in the form of Knowledge-Driven Media Development.

## **8. ACTION REQUIRED:**

After discussion of this document, the Bureau may wish to decide that it:

- Takes note of IPDC’s limits on Human and Financial Resources and commends the proposed streamlining to deal with these.
- Recognises the ambition for IPDC to stretch itself in terms of achievements during 2014-2021.
- Acknowledges that the changing media context should be reflected in a resolution to the 2014 Council that recommends an updated mission of the Programme.
- Endorses the proposed streamlined priorities, criteria and bracketed amounts as regards projects being considered for IPDC support.
- Agrees to continue the Special Initiatives of the safety of journalists and the Media Development Indicators, and to incorporate Knowledge-Driven Media Development as a third Special Initiative.