



United Nations
Educational, Scientific and
Cultural Organization

IPDC THE INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMME FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF COMMUNICATION

CI-17/BUR.61/1
30 January 2017

60TH MEETING OF THE BUREAU OF THE IPDC INTERGOVERNMENTAL COUNCIL UNESCO HQ, 17-18 March 2016

MINUTES

Present:

- Assistant Director-General for Communication and Information, Mr. Frank La Rue
- Chairperson, Ms. Albana Shala, The Netherlands
- Rapporteur, Ms. Diana Heymann-Adu, Ghana
- Bureau members
 - Algeria, Mr. Ahmed Benzelikha
 - Bangladesh, Mr. Ahmed Martuza
 - Denmark, Mr. Mogens Blicher Bjerregård
 - Niger, Mr. Mamoudou Djerma Abdoulaye
 - Peru, Mr. Victor Altamirano
 - Poland, Mr. Krzysztof Wojciechowski
- IPDC Secretariat: Mr. Guy Berger, Ms. Rosa Gonzalez, Ms. Saorla McCabe, Mr. Fackson Banda, Ms. Christine Hugoninc-Sayag, Ms. Sarah Donkersley and Mr. Sean Bertran
- Chair of the Intergovernmental Council of the Information For All Programme (IFAP): Ms. Chafica Haddad
- Observers

Item 1 - Opening and Minutes of the 60th IPDC Bureau meeting

The IPDC Chairperson, Ms. Albana Shala, declared open the 60th meeting of the IPDC Bureau. She congratulated Mr. Frank La Rue for his appointment as the Assistant Director-General of the Communication and Information (CI) Sector. The Bureau then formally adopted the minutes of the 59th meeting.

Item 2 - Adoption of the Agenda

The Agenda of the 60th Bureau meeting was adopted.

Item 3 - Opening remarks by the new Assistant Director-General

The new ADG, Mr. Frank La Rue, reminded the Bureau that UNESCO continues to offer solidarity to France following the terrorist attacks of last November. UNESCO's efforts to stem the rise of extremist and violent ideology continue to underline IPDC's activities in ensuring the protection of journalists and working with its sister body, IFAP, to counter radicalisation. This was also a time of unprecedented migration, including of people seeking refuge from war and persecution. Accordingly, IPDC had organised a special debate on this issue.

The ADG pinpointed key developments since the last Bureau meeting. These covered: (i) IPDC project support and (ii) special initiatives on knowledge-driven media development, journalism education, media development indicators and the safety of journalists. He also mentioned some major activities within the CI Sector which provide the wider programmatic context of IPDC.

Regarding project support, the ADG reported that these activities have continued to complement the work that IPDC supports through the Regular Programme. Even on a smaller budget, 80 project proposals were received, of which 59 were eligible for the Bureau's consideration. However, there has been a drastic reduction in the funds available. Member States were encouraged to translate their verbal support for IPDC into tangible budgetary contributions.

Item 4 - Report by the Chairperson

The Chair stated that the past year had been an opportunity to reflect upon how to maximise IPDC's strategic relevance to ensure that it meets the challenges of a continuously evolving media environment.

She reported on her participation in the session of the Communication and Information Commission at the 38th UNESCO General Conference last November, in which she briefed Member States on the Programme's latest achievements. IPDC's results were praised by many delegations. IPDC now has its own Expected Result (n°3) within the CI Programme, which the Chair hoped will promote the visibility of the Programme's achievements and attract greater funding.

The Chair then reported on her intensified fundraising efforts. Over the past year, she had visited more than 30 delegations and was confident new voluntary contributions will arrive in the coming months. In addition, an IPDC Progress meeting was organised in September with 9 countries and, in November, the Chair met with Nordic countries and followed up on previous meetings with donor countries. She also welcomed new donors, including Latvia, Ghana and Bangladesh. The Chair pointed out that IPDC is in the midst of discussions about funding a media development project in Gambia, which she hoped will be supported by the Bureau.

The Chair also mentioned that she had maintained a high level of visibility for IPDC, raising its profile at numerous conferences and roundtables. She drew attention to the new IPDC brochure and encouraged Bureau members to distribute it among their networks.

Item 5 - Discussion

Denmark was keen to know what will happen with the follow-up to the 5th February Conference "News organisations standing up for the safety of media professionals". Mr. Berger explained that many of the initiatives proposed during this Bureau meeting aim to encourage Member States to set the pace for the follow-up process. Niger asked what exceptional measures were to protect journalists working in conflict zones. Mr. La Rue answered that, if funds allow, IPDC could hold a conference specifically for journalists and media in conflict zones, with the involvement of humanitarian organisations such as the International Committee of the Red Cross and/or UN peacekeeping operations. Regarding World Press Freedom Day, IPDC will work with the media to try to systematically collect evidence of any new developments since the February Conference.

Denmark emphasised the need to enhance visibility, for example by making a selection of completed IPDC projects on safety visible through the media.

The Chair highlighted that, despite a lack of funding, support for IPDC is high. Member States, project partners, and UNESCO staff recognise IPDC's unique ability to work with governments, which is essential for ending impunity. The Chair further mentioned that she was pleased that funds had been found for the proposal of Niger in 2015.

The IFAP Chairperson reminded the Bureau of the decision made during their last meeting for IFAP and IPDC to work together. She was pleased that their first cooperation in organising the Conference on Youth & Internet was a success and looked forward to discussions on how to follow up on this conference. She hoped that cooperation between the two programmes will be enhanced and that more financial support will be found.

Mr. Banda noted that the project proposals for 2016 have been made available online, in the spirit of transparency and accountability.

Item 6 - IPDC financial situation

Ms. Rosa Gonzalez presented two documents explaining the financial position of the IPDC Special Account and Funds-in-Trust 2016. For the contributions made last year, the figures take into account both regular contributions to the Special Account and specific contributions for the 5 February conference on safety. The most important figure is the amount available for new projects to be approved (US\$ 1,404,433.93). Ms. Gonzalez also highlighted that each funding cycle normally generates an amount that is not implemented because some projects face roadblocks, such as a crisis occurring in the country. This money is reused for projects approved the following year. The second document summarised the financial implications of all agenda items and showed that there is just one funds-in-trust contribution, which is from Norway.

Item 7 - Assessment of IPDC-supported projects

Mr. Fackson Banda gave an overview of the implementation of IPDC-supported projects. Africa continues to be the top priority, with support for over 60 projects. In total, 151 projects were supported with over US\$ 2.4 million, which indicates that funding has decreased over the years. There were four takeaway messages for Bureau members. Firstly, gender reporting is still an issue; project implementers must be encouraged to explicitly refer to the gender imperative. Secondly, difficult situations can be turned around to become opportunities for innovation. This was the case for Tunisia, where a project responded to the bombing of a museum by analysing media coverage of violence and intercultural sensitivity. Thirdly, regarding community media initiatives, there has been a shift in focus from mere implementation to ensuring sustainability. This presents an opportunity for enhanced collaboration between project implementers. Fourthly, there is a need for explicit linkages between training projects and UNESCO's normative publications. Denmark commented that IPDC should seek to keep in touch with projects.

The following decision was approved.

The Bureau:

- *Notes the key achievements recorded in the implementation reports as forming an important knowledge base that can inform ongoing and future decision-making regarding the IPDC's media support.*

Ms. Saorla McCabe gave a presentation on gender transformative projects within IPDC, focusing on their important role within the IPDC framework and on how gender dimensions are taken into account in project design and implementation. UNESCO distinguishes between three approaches to integrating gender perspectives: gender sensitive (i.e. registering basic gender differentials); gender responsive (i.e. seeing how these differentials have a bearing on the project); and gender transformative (i.e. tackling existing gender inequalities). Applicants for funding are required to demonstrate that they are at least gender-sensitive, for example by disaggregating numbers of men and women beneficiaries. Gender equality is then promoted at all stages of the project cycle. In addition, IPDC has endorsed UNESCO's Gender-Sensitive Indicators for Media (GSIM) and has supported numerous projects involving their application. In 2014, IPDC elected its first ever woman Chair as well as a woman Rapporteur. Despite all these efforts, a survey carried out by the Secretariat in 2015 found that there is a lack of gender sensitivity in most IPDC projects. It concluded that gender mainstreaming needs to be done in a more systematic and rigorous manner. On a more positive note, the report found a significant rise in gender-transformative projects (up from 14 percent in 2014 to 21 percent in 2015). In terms of possible Bureau action, consideration could be given to increasing the priority of gender-transformative proposals and positioning gender equality and women's empowerment at the centre of IPDC's agenda.

The following decision was approved.

The Bureau:

- *Will consider increasing the priority given to gender-transformative project proposals.*
- *Requests the IPDC Secretariat to organize at the next Council session a debate on 'Moving from gender-sensitive to gender-transformative projects'.*

- *Requests that, in line with UNESCO's crosscutting priority in gender, IPDC safety projects ensure gender mainstreaming, by addressing when appropriate particular risks and dangers faced by women.*

Item 8 - Discussion and Decisions

Independent media consultant Ms. Silvia Chocarro Marcesse presented her paper, commissioned by the Secretariat, on IPDC's role and impact in promoting the safety of journalists. Her study found that conditions for media freedom and the safety of journalists have decreased in two-thirds of the countries assessed, compared to last year. Furthermore, the Director-General's condemnations for the killings of journalists are almost twice as high as ten years ago. At the same time, IPDC is better prepared than ever to tackle this issue because many useful mechanisms have been developed to promote the safety of journalists, including by UNESCO and IPDC. Since IPDC began working on the safety of journalists in 2008, it has developed standard-setting tools (including the UN Plan of Action on the Safety of Journalists), reporting and monitoring mechanisms (including the DG's Report on the Safety of Journalists and the Danger of Impunity) and assessment and diagnostic instruments (such as the Journalist Safety Indicators, which allow the situation within a given country to be assessed and for actions to be taken). The paper also showed that small grants could have large impact on safety issues, citing several examples.

Based on the key findings of Ms. Chocarro Marcesse's research, four groups of recommendations were made. The first is at the strategic level. Most important is to commit to working in a country for 3-5 years (rather than one) and to conduct a follow-up assessment using the Journalist Safety Indicators (JSIs). In addition, explanations of what IPDC's various initiatives are and how to use them could be improved. The second category of suggestions concerns IPDC's knowledge-driven role. UN information on the safety of journalists could be collected and systematised. In addition, practical guides on how to use this information could be developed for NGOs. The third group is about IPDC's standard-setting and monitoring role. IPDC could expand upon the DG's report by providing recommendations and solutions to Member States. The final group of recommendations is based on challenges identified in UNESCO's field offices. Suggestions include engaging more in institutional capacity-building rather than physical safety, since the former is something an NGO may not be positioned to do.

Discussion:

Algeria and Peru believed gender should remain a priority, while the ADG, the Chair, Poland and The Netherlands stressed that gender sensitivity should become a strict requirement. The Chair argued that it is necessary to adopt a gender transformative approach in order to create an impact. She believed it is important to move beyond mere 'box ticking' and look at the content of the programmes media are producing. Poland thought there is a need for more reflection of what 'gender transformative' means and was concerned that adopting this approach would lead to some salient proposals being rejected. Poland believed that gender sensitive is enough because it is easy to measure and is often also gender transformative, proposing that acknowledging gender inequality is already doing something to transform the situation. The observer from the Asia-Pacific Institute of Broadcasting and Development (AIBD) was concerned that placing too much emphasis on gender might distract from other important issues.

The Dominican Republic (observer) asked whether the safety of women journalists in conflict situations has been considered. Ms. Silvia Chocarro Marcesse stated that there are two ways to include both gender and safety in all projects. The first is to mainstream gender through all projects. The second is to support projects focused on women, such as one addressing online harassment of women journalists. Mr. La Rue believed both approaches should be taken. The IFAP Chair thought the specific context must be considered so as not to miss out, for example, on projects that help young boys. Uruguay as an observer urged evaluation of medium term impact. The Delegate for the Netherlands asked whether there is collaboration with UNESCO's gender division during the project approval process.

Niger addressed safety and asked what the limitations were for the tools described in Ms. Chocarro Marcesse's report and whether there is (or would be) a mechanism for involving non-state organisations and the media. Niger and Denmark thought it was important to focus more on projects to support national legislation to protect the safety of journalists, which many countries are lacking. The Rapporteur stated that it is crucial to have a law protecting the right to information, particularly for investigative journalists. The Chair noted that laws may not be effective without secondary mechanisms, such as training judges.

Niger also stressed the need for information channels that provide a degree of transparency in crisis situations, especially if there is armed conflict. The value of the journalist's work and the need to recognise his/her human dignity should be emphasised, perhaps in the preamble to IPDC documents. It is also important to ensure that the players involved in providing security, such as the government and media employers, take on more responsibility.

Denmark and the Chair thought IPDC's efforts regarding the issue of killed journalists could be enhanced by following up condemnations in the relevant country. Denmark suggested involving local embassies in a given country. Denmark also suggested collaborating with the Council of Europe, which has created an alert platform for violations against journalists. Poland believed that the impact of the DG's reports would be greater if they were accompanied by awareness-raising and capacity-building activities.

The Netherlands made four suggestions for improving IPDC's reporting and monitoring mechanisms:

- 1) Improve the content of the DG's report and distribute it to actors outside of IPDC;
- 2) Enhance the follow-up by UNESCO and Member States regarding the information sent to the Human Rights Council;
- 3) Regarding the DG's requests for judicial inquiries, consider following the example of the Netherlands and involving embassies in the countries in which the inquiries are being made;
- 4) Consider ways to improve the reporting mechanism, given that the letters do not always end up in the hands of people who can reply;
- 5) IPDC projects should focus more on institutional capacity-building, which will make use of the added value of IPDC (i.e. the link between IPDC and governments).

Latvia, as an observer, said the research by Ms Chocarro Marcesse was timely and concrete and could enrich IPDC strategy discussions at the Council meeting. The Secretariat explained that the second Bureau recommendation would extend the DG's reporting mechanism to provide capacity-building opportunities to Member States that are willing but unable to provide information. This decision would allow IPDC to launch one pilot project. Mr. Berger added that systems to monitor attacks could be the basis for mechanisms to provide protection, and also for following up on impunity. IPDC is pushing for laws on the right to information, which could be used to help ensure that cases stay alive. Denmark and Algeria asked which pilot countries the Secretariat is considering. Mr. Berger replied that the Secretariat would see who was interested. Possibilities include one of the pilot countries of the UN Plan of Action and other countries with which IPDC is working, such as Guatemala, Honduras or El Salvador.

Denmark wanted to know how these recommendations will be followed up. The observer from the Dominican Republic asked if a policy to identify good practice could be considered, i.e. having South-South or South-North cooperation frameworks. The Dominican Republic was concerned that introducing a new framework for fighting terrorism might jeopardise democracy. Mr. Berger said that IPDC has created a proposal for collecting and sharing best practices around the world.

The following decision was approved.

The Bureau:

- *Requests the Secretariat to promote more actively the uniqueness of IPDC's reporting mechanism on safety of journalists and impunity issues and improve the IPDC branding of this important initiative.*
- *As a follow-up to the international conference "News Organizations standing up for the safety of media professionals", requests the Secretariat to strengthen IPDC's monitoring and reporting mechanism on the safety of journalists and impunity issues, by proposing an action plan for the next IPDC Council meeting based upon:*
 - o the outcome of 5th February Conference*
 - o the analytical paper on the safety of journalists*
 - o the discussion which took place at the 60th Bureau meeting and by preparing and submitting proposals to donors that focus on the development of new dimensions for the mechanism, such as providing capacity-building opportunities to Member States to improve their national monitoring systems. This follow-up includes making a special financial allocation of US\$ 20,000 to allow the formulation and launching of a pilot project in a selected country.*

Item 9 - Media Development Indicators (MDIs), Journalism Safety Indicators (JSIs), Media Viability Indicators (MVIs), and Journalism Education

Ms. McCabe gave a presentation on the MDIs and MVIs. The MDIs are an IPDC Special Initiative and have been applied in almost 40 countries. They serve as a capacity-building exercise by involving a wide range of stakeholders and as a roadmap for legal and policy change. Three Special Allocations have been made to the MDIs (in 2009, 2011 and 2015) and new studies have been completed in Curaçao, Jordan, Libya (partially), South Sudan, Madagascar, Myanmar, Mongolia and Swaziland. Another six are in their final stage (Bolivia, Brazil, Morocco, Myanmar, Uganda and Uruguay). One innovation since the last Bureau meeting is an improvement in the graphic design of the publications. Given that one of the aims is to translate the recommendations of each project into practical action, follow-up activities have been developed in Jordan, Palestine, Curaçao and Mongolia. In Jordan, for example, UNESCO has launched a dialogue with various universities that provide journalism training to see how the recommendations can be integrated into their educational programmes. The MVIs are a subset of indicators that were recently developed in partnership with the Deutsche Welle Akademie. Their aim is to assess the sustainability of the business models used by media organisations in different countries. A wide-ranging consultation process was done to finalise the MVIs and the initiative was endorsed at the 59th Bureau meeting. These indicators have not yet been applied because of insufficient funding but IPDC has developed a number of funding proposals. A related idea is to integrate a **light version**¹ of the MVIs into the MDI framework.

Ms. Reeta Pöyhtäri presented a closely related set of indicators developed by IPDC: the JSIs. Developed in 2013 and 2014, they allow for an evaluation of the safety situation of media workers in a given country and of actions taken to promote their safety. This involves measuring the implementation of the UN Plan of Action and it serves as a baseline for future actions. The first pilots were conducted in 2013-14 in Pakistan, Guatemala and Honduras. They were conducted in collaboration with local research organisations, UNESCO field offices and UNESCO HQ, with an emphasis on inclusive and participatory multi-stakeholder processes. They are already being used by stakeholder organisations in those countries and IPDC hopes to publish them online shortly. In 2015, new projects were launched in Nepal, Kenya and Iraq; it is hoped they will be published in the first half of 2016. The JSIs have been funded, in large part, by an IPDC Special Allocation of US\$ 55,000.

Mr. Banda then presented an update on the Global Initiative for Excellence in Journalism Education. IPDC has continued to apply UNESCO publications through the collaborative training of African journalists for COP21 and the forging of strategic partnerships with issue-specific think tanks during COP21. Beyond Africa, highly successful trainings were conducted for journalists and students in Iran and Turkmenistan, with a focus on science reporting, particularly on climate change. Proof of the usefulness and global relevance of the training resources is the fact that unsolicited translations were made into Tamil and Mandarin. In addition, IPDC has continued to contribute to redefining journalism education. It had recently published a book entitled “Teaching Journalism for Sustainable Development: New Syllabi”. Another book was published and launched in Mexico City at the ORBICOM conference and became very popular because the launch coincided with the adoption of the Sustainable Development Goals (STGs).

Discussion

Denmark thought the indicators and the issue of journalism education should be handled separately. Regarding education, Denmark believed this is a task for universities rather than for Special Allocations. Mr. Berger explained that it was the Regular Programme rather than the IPDC that was funding further work in this area. Mr. Banda clarified that the Bureau had previously not been against funding journalism education *per se* and asked the Bureau to think of journalism education in a broader sense at the next meeting, recognising that UNESCO is an intellectual powerhouse that contributes to debates on this issue. The Rapporteur pointed out that it is useful to supplement classroom education with external knowledge.

The following decision was then approved.

The Bureau:

- *Welcomes this status report and notes the ongoing contributions that the Global Initiative is making in producing and popularising new specialised journalism syllabi as a way of reflecting the changing face of journalism education globally.*

Regarding safety, Denmark wanted to ensure that the recommendations raised at the Bureau will be brought to the Council. The Netherlands asked to specify in the decision that the recommendations were those from the analytical paper on the safety of journalists. Ms. Chocarro explained that the JSIs provide an important strategic advantage by helping IPDC best allocate relatively small amounts of money.

The following decision was then approved.

The Bureau:

- *Welcomes this status report and acknowledges the important contribution of the MDIs, JSIs and MVIs in providing normative frameworks and monitoring tools that can guide UNESCO and other media development actors in their efforts to foster a safer and more enabling environment for free, independent, pluralistic and sustainable media.*
- *Requests the Secretariat to strengthen IPDC's Special Initiatives and further position the MDI assessments so that they continue to be recognized in national media development plans. Ensure follow-up to the assessments so that each stakeholder can identify and play its role*
- *Approves a special allocation of US\$ 30,000 to the JSI Special Initiative to facilitate the implementation of the following activities:*
 - (i) Address new requests for JSI assessments, including those that need to be implemented urgently, e.g. in cases of planned reforms of the protection framework of journalists, or of major political or security changes affecting the working environment of media and journalists;*
 - (ii) Translation and publication of the JSI assessments in local languages, thus allowing local stakeholders to access and implement the findings of the assessments adequately;*
 - (iii) Carry out well-designed follow-up activities aimed at raising awareness about the findings of the JSI assessments among national stakeholders and ensuring the implementation of the reports' findings.*

Item 10 - Recap: Current IPDC priority areas and project assessment criteria

Ms. Gonzalez gave a recap on IPDC's current priority areas and project assessment criteria. Two project ceilings were chosen: US\$ 10,000 for small projects and US\$ 35,000 for larger projects. The Bureau had emphasised the need to have local, regional and national projects and to involve different stakeholders.

Ms. Gonzalez then outlined the criteria. Given the financial constraints, a limit of one project per country/organisation was applied (except for Least Developed Countries). Projects must avoid high day-to-day and travel costs, and there lists for equipment were not what IPDC supported. There is also a criterion about correlation between the CI/FEM programme and IPDC Special Initiatives. Endogenous initiatives are prioritised over external interventions, although exceptions exist for regional projects. It is also obligatory for projects to be gender-sensitive. Media editorial independence must be guaranteed, and support that gives undue advantage to one private media over another should be avoided. Concerning community media projects, community involvement and broadcasting licenses must be guaranteed. Stand-alone content websites, blogs, AV archiving projects, seminars and conferences are avoided. Neither AV productions nor running costs, salaries or establishment costs of media NGOs are covered. Regarding beneficiaries, they must not be individuals and must be an organisation with a solid background and preferably also a working relationship with UNESCO. Beneficiaries that are media organisations, professional associations of media workers and institutions offering regular media development services should be editorially independent and should cover staff salaries, project coordination costs, and recurrent and transaction costs.

Item 11 - Examination of projects submitted to the Bureau

The Chair explained the new process that the Secretariat has introduced this year, whereby submitters produced a brief summary before being invited to provide a full application. Reports were then reviewed in detail at HQ and fine-tuned by the responsible Field Offices. Eighty-eight projects were submitted for this

year, of which 59 were approved. The remaining 29 were not eligible but were nevertheless shared online with Bureau members in the spirit of transparency. Bureau members were then asked to rank the 88 projects online as either a low (LP) or high priority (HP); responses were received from 5 of the 8 members. For HP projects, Bureau members were asked to indicate their preferred level of funding. However, some members recommended a budget for LP projects as well. There was general agreement on all but 14 projects. As in previous years, only projects with disagreement on the level of funding or with disagreement from two or more members would be discussed, and decisions would be made by consensus.

Discussion

Denmark and the Chair asked the Secretariat to consider elaborating on the remarks section at the next Bureau meeting.

The Chair asked to look at the rejected projects, since the reasoning behind their rejection was not always clear to her. The Secretariat explained that they do not meet eligibility criteria. Nevertheless, both the ineligible projects and Secretariat explanations for their rejection are available online. The Secretariat subsequently also provided printed copies of the non-eligible projects on day two of the Bureau meeting.

After discussing and reaching a provisional decision on the projects, the budget ceiling was surpassed.

The Secretariat informed the Bureau of the last-minute withdrawal of one of the proposals for Somalia. It suggested not approving the global proposal submitted mainly by European institutions, since they could receive support elsewhere, and removing the four proposals with the least support from Bureau members (which are for Mexico, Myanmar, Samoa and the CAR). If this course of action were taken, 6% would still need to be cut. The Chair was concerned that cutting regional proposals would send a message to the partners that such proposals cannot be accommodated, while the Rapporteur was concerned that reducing the spending on each project might jeopardise their effectiveness. The latter thought it might be possible to reduce the number of participants for a training programme but reducing spending on materials is not a good idea. Algeria suggested either reducing spending only on projects above a certain size, or reducing spending only on those that involve training. Bangladesh suggested only reducing projects above US\$ 10,000. In the future, Niger thought the Bureau could give less priority to countries that have consistently received IPDC support. Peru thought it is more equitable to fund all projects that to exclude some entirely.

Poland thought it would have been helpful to know beforehand how each project fit into the overall funding available. Poland supported the Secretariat's recommendation except for the Mexico project, which Poland understood was a top priority with reduced funding.

Four projects were removed and the amount for the Mexico project was reduced to US\$ 16,000, which Poland thought was enough to maintain its symbolic value. It was agreed that 7-8% would be deducted from each project.

Item 12 - Thematic Debate on "Media and Migration"

The Chair gave an introduction to the debate, underscoring how the refugee crisis is forcing many Middle-Eastern and European countries to come face-to-face with their ability to uphold human rights and protect the vulnerable. She explained that these dynamics raise many issues relevant to the work of IPDC on media development and concern all media - including news and social media. She asked several pertinent questions, such as how migrants and refugees portray themselves through news and social media, and emphasised that it is useful to analyse how refugees are reported in their original, transit and "destination" countries. This debate would contribute to fostering an open discussion among media and migration experts and Member States' representatives about the role of the media in dealing with migration, especially the issue of refugees from the conflict in Syria. The Chair informed participants that the debate would begin with contributions from a panel of five experts. Member States and observers would be then invited to participate. The Chair passed the floor to the Assistant Director-General, who emphasised the timeliness of the migration issue. He highlighted the special role the media can play in moving beyond xenophobic, discriminatory and prejudiced views of migrants and instead portray them in a humanistic manner.

Ms. Melissa Fleming, Head of Communications and Chief Spokesperson for the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, discussed the language used to describe refugees and why this matters. The media has contributed to the public response to the refugee crisis, whereby security concerns reign and the

term “refugee” is replaced with “irregular migrant”. This is dangerous, given the dehumanising and derogatory connotations associated with the term “migrant”. To illustrate the potentially huge influence of the media, Ms. Fleming gave an example of German tabloid *Bilt*, whose compassionate response to the issue was perceived to have had huge positive implications for the generally decent reception and treatment of refugees in that country. Ms. Fleming also highlighted the near absence of correspondents dedicated to covering refugees. As a result, reporting on this issue is characterised by constant errors, neglect of the truth and an over-reliance of politicians as sources. She called for this gap to be filled so that public understanding of this complex issue could be improved.

Dr. Guita Hourani, Director of the Lebanese Research Centre and Assistant Professor of Law and Political Science at Notre Dame University in Lebanon, discussed the treatment of Syrian refugees by the media in Lebanon and abroad. At the beginning of the Syrian crisis, the Lebanese media unanimously praised the government’s supportive response. However, a variety of social, historical, political and economic factors have led most media outlets to adopt a more negative view and to resort to a discourse of fear that propagates animosity towards the refugees. Studies have found that these stories mix fact and opinion, feature stereotyping, racism and expressions of hate, and use words that conjure up memories of the civil war. Such unethical reporting is influenced by political affiliation and a lack of time and funding for in-depth work, and is further fuelled by the plethora of negative, inaccurate and one-sided stories published by foreign media. Reporting by international organisations and local NGOs is one-sided as well, concentrating only on the negative humanitarian aspect of the story. Only a small minority of stories have been positive, giving voices to the refugees in a sensitive and ethical manner. Dr. Hourani said she is campaigning for the media and NGOs to highlight more positive stories, such as the creative ways many women refugees have emancipated themselves. She believes these can inspire us all, particularly the refugees themselves. She also advocated training journalists to understand issues of refugees and migration.

Mr. Aidan White spoke about how the Ethical Journalism Network, of which he is Director, has been working to improve reporting on refugees/migration. A study by the Network discovered that while unethical reporting on the issue is sometimes the result of a lack of resources, the main reason is intense pressure to follow populist political lines propagating racism, hate speech and sometimes incitement. Furthermore, time and budget constraints mean less specialised correspondents and training, a shrinking capacity for investigative journalism, the exclusion of migrant voices and the acceptance of migration myths. All of this undermines the ability to effectively communicate issues of public concern. Reporting either focuses on human tragedy or on the numbers, using terms such as ‘swarm’ and building upon people’s legitimate fears to induce antagonism towards refugees. Mr. White emphasised the need for specialised correspondents who can address all aspects of the story and for media training in international law and rights. He also called for more minorities in newsrooms, the establishment of links with migrants and refugees and for intolerant political rhetoric to be challenged. Finally, he urged the media to recognise the inherently human nature of migration and its role in promoting progress, development and security.

Ms. Nevin Yildiz Tahincioglu, from Hacette University in Ankara, talked about the representation of Syrian refugees in the Turkish mainstream news media. A lack of professional training prevents the media from adequately covering refugee issues. Refugees are either portrayed as helpless, suffering victims or as people abusing the sympathy of the Turkish people and state; damaging the national economy; causing disorder; and threatening moral values. Female refugees have very limited visibility in the media and are mostly represented only as mothers and wives. They are sometimes labelled ‘co-wives’ or prostitutes, and thus as moral threats. Of all categories of Syrian refugees in the media, children receive the least coverage. The media negatively affects communication between locals and the refugees, sometimes leading to hate crimes against Syrians. Ms. Tahincioglu concluded by emphasising the need for the media to promote intercultural communication and to receive support to build the necessary principles.

Dr. Jacco van Sterkenburg, Assistant Professor at the Department of Media & Communication at the Erasmus Research Centre for Media, Communication and Culture in the Netherlands, discussed the coverage of refugee migration by the mainstream European media. Nearly all stories fit into either a ‘refugee as a threat’ discourse or “refugee as victim’ discourse. Both constructions view refugees as different, even abnormal. The former blames refugees for the problem and reinforces feelings of fear, whereas the latter views them as victims dependent upon Western humanitarian and government aid. While the humanitarian approach may be seen as more positive where it gives a voice to the refugees, this focus on individual narrative masks wider structural problems. Dr. Sterkenburg highlighted the need for specialists who can connect the individual narratives with the wider context, thereby creating a new discourse based on empathy. This would play an important role in helping to inform citizens.

Discussion

Niger asked Ms. Fleming why she thought the press prefers the term 'migrant' to 'refugee'. Ms. Fleming explained that the distinction is important because, unlike refugees, there is no protection under international law for economic migrants. Niger also noticed that the press does not address the true reasons why these people migrate and believed IPDC should support journalism training projects that focus on humanistic reporting of this issue.

Denmark said it was important to develop mechanisms to support refugee journalists. Denmark had created a network of refugee journalists coming into that country. Dr. Hourani stated that many refugees are not very articulate because they are vulnerable and rarely well-educated. The Ambassador of Greece pointed out that in many cases, immigrant voices are not completely missed from the story. Ms. Fleming stated that those working for the communications departments of UNHCR, UNESCO and similar organisations also act as journalists and have increasingly large audiences. This is an opportunity to introduce responsible reporting and to tell individual stories in order to lead audiences to the larger story. Mr. White warned that non-governmental and international organisations are not substitutes for independent journalism.

The Chair thought that the model curricula developed by IPDC, which includes how to cover migrants, could be used in newsrooms. Ms. Geraldine Mouche, AIBD, highlighted the need for workshops to train journalists on how to put a positive spin on stories without audiences feeling that they are being manipulated. Dr. Sterkenburg believed that countering negative stories with positive ones was not the answer. Rather, refugees should be portrayed as normal people dealing with problems to which audiences can relate. This requires journalists to have direct contact with refugees. Mr. White thought it is often necessary to focus on an individual story in order to tell the general story. He urged the media, refugee communities and policymakers to work together to provide the public with more reliable and useful information on this issue. The ADG added the need for a rights-based approach.

The Ambassador of Canada hoped IPDC would also train media bosses, since many mistakenly believe that publications and newscasts cannot open with positive stories.

Dr. Hourani explained that in Lebanon, refugees are being informed about their own conditions through meetings organised by local and international organisations. Many refugees access the media (particularly social media) through their mobile phones and televisions.

The AIBD Director believed there should be a follow-up meeting on the roots of migration. He thought the international community should consider how to solve the war in Syria so that there are no more refugees.

Dr. Hourani explained some of the benefits for Lebanon of the refugees, such as cheap labour, full hotels and schools, and successful startups.

Item 13 - Monitoring progress towards the SDGs: IPDC's role in measuring Goal 16, Target 10 (public access to information and fundamental freedoms)

Mr. Fackson Banda provided an update on IPDC's contribution to advocating the inclusion of free, independent and pluralistic media in the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. He reminded members of SDG 16 and Target 16.10 on Public Access to Information and Fundamental Freedoms, before outlining IPDC's tripartite advocacy strategy: 1) Intra-UNESCO engagement with Member States, 2) Inter-agency strategic partnerships and 3) Civil engagement (e.g. the Global Forum for Media Development). Mr. Banda concluded by presenting successfully adopted indicators by the UN Statistics Commission: 16.10.1, concerning the safety of journalists and ending impunity, and additional indicator 16.10.2, addressing public access to information.

Discussion

In the context of SDG 16.10, Mr. Guy Berger reminded the Bureau that Member States had agreed last year on the observance of an International Day for Universal Access to Information. If the Bureau was in favour, IPDC could organise an event with IFAP on this day (28th September). Mr. Berger stated that the Secretariat was not requesting IPDC funds for the occasion. The Bureau agreed.

The Ambassador of Turkey mentioned that although Turkey has not been able to secure a financial contribution, the Turkish International Coordination and Development Agency (TIKA) has offered to cover the travel expenses of a group of journalists from Africa to attend a training programme, provided by one of its national agencies. In addition, the Ambassador has received an official initiation for IPDC to visit the media academy of Anadolu Agency, a news agency in Ankara, where they are already conducting training programmes. These programmes are more security-oriented but the organisers would be very keen to incorporate one of IPDC's conceptual projects into the training. The Ambassador hoped the programme would be able to begin by the middle of the year. If it is a success, the Ambassador was sure it could be sustained in the coming years.

The following decision was approved.

The Bureau:

- *Welcomes the status report and encourages continual engagement by the IPDC in monitoring the implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, including by lobbying Member States to support the IPDC's work in promoting the safety of journalists through the DG's Report on the Safety of Journalists and the Danger of Impunity.*

Item 14 - Follow-up on conferences on "Youth & Radicalization" (June 2015), "Community Radio Sustainability" (September 2015) and recommendations, "News Organizations Standing up for the Safety of Media Professionals" (February 2016) and Media and Migration thematic debate

Ms. Gonzalez gave a presentation on the follow-up to the four conferences that have taken place over the last year. Concerning the Youth & Radicalization Conference led by IFAP, with an IPDC partnership, the Chair had made some opening remarks and IPDC funded a panel of experts. Both of these contributions increased the visibility of IPDC. This conference resulted in UNESCO's new integrated Framework for Action – Empowering Youth to Build Peace, with the full involvement of the Secretariat. IPDC is awaiting confirmation from potential donors. Follow-up conferences will take place in Lebanon (May 2016) and Canada (November 2016). In addition, two studies are being developed by UNESCO this year on media and terrorism, and Internet and radicalisation. Concerning the conference on Community Radio Sustainability, 42 recommendations were created for governments/regulators, community media, UNESCO (including IPDC) and international donors. The 5 February safety conference, which was initiated by the Executive Board and convened with IPDC support, provided exposure to two IPDC-based initiatives: the UN Plan of Action on the Safety of Journalists and IPDC's Reporting Mechanism on the Safety of Journalists and Issues of Impunity. The Chair had spoken in the closing session, which once again heightened the visibility of IPDC. Finally, the debate on Media and Migration aimed to demonstrate IPDC's response to contemporary issues; clarify roles played by news and social media; and provide insight for future follow-up.

Discussion:

Poland thought more information was needed regarding the translation of IPDC reports into capacity-building actions.

Denmark asked for more information concerning the pilot projects envisaged as follow-up to the conferences. Mr. Berger believed that one pilot training in Turkey could focus on improving media coverage of the refugee, this would allow IPDC to produce a global resource. The Ambassador of Turkey suggested going one step further and looking at a programme of 2-3 weeks to 'train the trainers', which would contribute to capacity-building and improve the sustainability of the programme. Denmark thought that further reflection on the choice of pilot project was needed and suggested the Secretariat consult the Bureau members on this via email.

Algeria, Poland and the Chair requested further information on the approach to allocating funds to the Special Initiatives. The Chair asked whether the budget for the Special Initiatives could also be used to support projects that the Bureau had been assessing but were not able to support. The Secretariat explained that this was legally possible but that this budget has always been separate from the budget for the projects proposed to the Bureau.

Denmark and the Representative of Latvia were interested in a more systematic approach in the follow up to the 5 February safety conference. Denmark suggested asking for commitments from the participating media organisations.

The Rapporteur emphasised the need for greater visibility so that it becomes easier to secure funding. When she visited one of the projects being supported by IPDC in Ghana, they did not know IPDC and said they were working with UNESCO. She suggested putting IPDC publications in local libraries. The Chair asked how IPDC could help countries internalise the Plan of Action, since many do not feel that it is theirs. Regarding migration, the observer from the French Delegation hoped that UNESCO's glossary, *People on the Move*, will be more widely disseminated and that UN websites on these issues, such as *Relief Web*, would be promoted. Doing so would involve few costs.

Denmark requested to know the financial contribution of IFAP to follow-up the Youth & Radicalisation Conference. The IFAP Chair said that IFAP's contribution to the two follow-up conferences would depend on how much it receives from donors and how much UNESCO contributes, both of which are currently unknown.

The observer from BBC Media Action, noted that international discussions on strategies to combat radicalisation need to be evidence-based, which presents an opportunity for IPDC to make an important contribution.

The observer from Spain noted that hate speech is not one of the criteria for assessing projects and was not very present in the projects presented to the Bureau. He wondered whether this has been followed up.

The Chair mentioned that the new Global Alliance for Gender and Media (GAMAG), which gave a presentation during the last Bureau meeting, is lacking capacity and urgently requires funding. Given these conditions, the Chair asked the IPDC Secretariat to agree to consider via email a proposal from GAMAG pending the arrival of funds for 2017, rather than waiting for the next Bureau meeting. The Bureau agreed.

The decision was approved.

The Bureau:

- *Encourages the Secretariat to keep actively participating in the follow-up initiatives related to the International Conference on Youth and the Internet: Fighting radicalization and extremism, particularly in UNESCO's new integrated Framework for Action – Empowering Youth to Build Peace: Youth 2.0 Building skills, Bolstering Peace, and makes a special financial allocation of US\$ 10,000 for this follow up. Takes note of UNESCO's current work in the field of community media sustainability, acknowledges the recommendations of the International Seminar on Community Radio Sustainability, Strengthening Policies and Funding, and shall continue its support to community media development projects which meet IPDC priorities;*
- *As a follow-up to the International Conference News Organizations standing up for the safety of media professionals, requests the Secretariat to strengthen IPDC's monitoring and reporting mechanism on the safety of journalists and impunity issues, by proposing an action plan for the next IPDC Council meeting based upon:*
 - *the outcome of 5th February Conference*
 - *the analytical paper on the safety of journalists*
 - *the discussion which took place at the 60th Bureau meeting and by preparing and submitting proposals to donors that focus on the development of new dimensions for the mechanism, such as providing capacity-building opportunities to Member States to improve their national monitoring systems. This follow-up includes making a special financial allocation of US\$ 20,000 to allow the formulation and launching of a pilot project in a selected country.*
- *Makes a special financial allocation of US\$ 20,000 for the formulation, publication, translation (English, French, Spanish, Arabic) and dissemination of a (print and on-line) booklet explaining IPDC's monitoring and reporting mechanism on the safety of journalists and impunity issues to Member States, UN bodies, civil society, NGOs, human rights bodies, media professionals and other stakeholders.*
- *Makes a special financial allocation of US\$ 30,000 to compile and disseminate best practices in monitoring, reporting on and promoting the safety of journalists, including national and regional protection mechanisms for journalists, in view of tapping into IPDC's role as a vehicle for developing and sharing experiences from different parts of the world.*

- *Makes a special financial allocation of US\$ 10,000 to follow-up on the issue of Media and Migration, by participating and/or co-convening events on the subject, where IPDC can promote best practices of professional reporting on migration issues and high ethical standards in this field.*

Item 15 - Allocation of funds to IPDC's Special Initiatives and additional items

The allocation of funds was approved.

Item 16 - IPDC funding and communication

Ms. Rosa Gonzalez gave a presentation on this topic. A fundraising and communication strategy was approved in 2013. In 2015, the Bureau decided to intensify its fundraising efforts and requested contributions from all Member States (even if only symbolic amounts); Bureau members were asked to act as champions. Regarding the latest developments in fundraising, more than 30 delegations met over the past year and there had been an increase in donors (from 6 to 9). However, total contributions to the Special Account have decreased because individual contributions were smaller. IPDC also participated in Commission V of the General Conference and a new dedicated expected result (ER 3) for IPDC was added to the overall UNESCO programme (38 C/5).

Concerning the latest developments in communication strategy, IPDC has been visible at most CI-organised events and has participated in strategic UNESCO and non-UNESCO conferences. Its publications were displayed and distributed at these events. The Secretariat has also developed a new brochure, online materials such as articles and pictures, a new online system for project submission management, and a database of IPDC partners. However, social media communication and a project database are still pending. Ms. Gonzalez thanked the IFAP Chair for supporting the visibility of IPDC.

IPDC will continue current fundraising efforts and extend these to include the private sector. It will also prepare fundraising missions to capitals and explore EU funding for FIT/IPDC. The Secretariat will highlight the results of IPDC micro-funding and cost-effectiveness. It will strengthen IPDC's JSI visibility, further position the MDIs and ensuring follow-up. Furthermore, the Secretariat will more actively promote the uniqueness of IPDC's monitoring mechanism and improve IPDC branding. The Bureau/Council members will be asked to lobby for contributions through Special A, FIT or in-kind. Bureau members will also be asked to act as champions and the issue will be brought to the Council's attention.

Discussion

The Chair pointed out that the Secretariat is still looking for capacity for social media and communication. Ms. Gonzalez stated that developing audiovisual material and choosing platforms from which to disseminate this content are top priorities for the Secretariat. IPDC now has interns and will hopefully receive monetary contributions from Member States very soon. The Chair suggested having a dedicated staff within the Secretariat to communicate using Twitter, Facebook and/or other platforms, while Denmark suggested employing a trainee to work on IPDC's social media strategy. Poland suggested that media organisations sponsoring the projects could produce photos or short videos on IPDC, since they have the capacity to do so. This option could be on the questionnaire that applicants complete. Another good, inexpensive idea is a YouTube channel for IPDC projects.

The Chair believed that visibility, and possibly also fundraising, should concern not only the Chair and the Secretariat but the whole Bureau. She believed Bureau members could be involved in the assessment process for projects within their respective countries. Algeria felt that promoting visibility was a significant challenge for Bureau members. Poland thought Bureau members would benefit from a one-screen summary of what IPDC does and from a toolkit on different ways of communicating about IPDC, including how to approach the private sector. An observer from Denmark highlighted that the 2005 UNESCO Convention on culture was receiving a lot of private funding and suggested IPDC learn from them. The IFAP Chair mentioned that IFAP had also secured funding from the private sector but that this required considerable negotiation with the administration. Poland emphasised the need for cooperation between IFAP and IPDC.

The decision was approved.

The Bureau:

- *Requests the Chair and the Secretariat to continue current efforts to fundraise for IPDC, analyze current priorities of the most important media donors and approach them with IPDC proposals; extend efforts to include private foundations and the private sector; go beyond permanent delegations and prepare fund-raising missions to the capitals of strategic countries; and explore EU funding for thematic/regional FIT grants;*
- *Requests the Secretariat to give more visibility to the real impact of IPDC micro funding, highlight their results-based focus as well as their cost-effectiveness;*
- *Requests the Secretariat to strengthen IPDC's Special Initiatives and further position the MDI assessments so that they continue to be recognized national media development plans, while ensuring follow-up to the assessments so that each stakeholder can identify and play its role.*
- *Requests the Secretariat to promote more actively the uniqueness of IPDC's reporting mechanism on safety of journalists and impunity issues and improve the IPDC branding of this important initiative.*
- *Reminds Bureau and Council members to actively lobby their respective governments to fund the IPDC through both its established modalities: IPDC's Special Account (voluntary contributions or contributions to earmarked projects) and FIT, even through symbolic contributions and/or by seconding personnel.*
- *Reminds Bureau and Council members to act as champions of IPDC, promoting its work and raising its international and national profile, wherever and whenever possible.*
- *Will bring this issue to the attention of the Council with a view to further mobilizing the support of Council members, highlighting the potential for resources so that IPDC can function at its optimum level of potential, scale and impact.*

Item 17 - Future priority areas and project assessment criteria

Ms. Rosa Gonzalez gave a presentation on this topic. She outlined the six priority areas of IPDC, which relate to media pluralism and independence; the safety of journalists; hate speech, conflict-sensitive journalism and cross-cultural/cross religious dialogue; law reform; media assessments and research; and capacity building and education. She then presented some proposals for updating the prioritisation process. These concern reducing the number of focus areas; having an annual thematic allocation for a particularly pressing need (perhaps of 10%); having a more selective approval process; focusing on gender-transformative projects; focusing on LDCs, PCPDs and regional proposals, and excluding middle-income countries; and freeing the Bureau from individual assessments to focus discussions on issues/strategies.

Discussion:

Algeria thought the new procedure would withdraw some of Bureau members' prerogatives, requiring the Secretariat to work even more on assessing and validating projects. Denmark agreed that the Bureau should retain a hands-on approach. Niger, Poland and Peru thought the Bureau's input is necessary because sometimes the Bureau has a different perspective to the Secretariat, which adds value. The Assistant Director-General and the Chair thought it is important the Bureau sees the projects in order to promote transparency and engagement.

Denmark urged the Bureau not to reduce spending by more than 10%. Poland thought it would be helpful if Bureau members could have a more holistic picture of how the projects fit into the overall funding available.

The Chair asked for clarification on the difference between lesser and lower priority. Denmark suggested not allowing allocations for top priority projects to be increased. Poland thought the priorities are still relevant and should not be amended; making them more specific would make prioritisation more difficult.

The Chair thought IPDC should retain the focus areas but consider regrouping them. The IPAC Chair highlighted that excluding middle-income countries could be problematic because small island developing states fit into this category but are a priority group. Ms. Gonzalez stated that there would be a specific item on the gender transformative issue at the Council Meeting.

The decision was approved.

The Bureau:

- *Carries forward current focus areas;*
- *Will continue to accept projects between a minimum of \$10 000 and a maximum of \$35 000.*
- *Will consider increasing the priority given to gender-transformative project proposals.*
- *May consider making a special allocation in cases where urgent issues arise.*

Item 18 - Any other business and closure of the meeting

The Chair thanked all participants for their valuable contributions and declared the 60th Bureau meeting of the Intergovernmental Council of IPDC closed.