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1. BACKGROUND

This marks the first IPDC Analytical Report, based on implementation reports of IPDC-supported projects over the 2011-2013 period. It is submitted to the IPDC Bureau for noting. In endorsing the Knowledge-Driven Media Development Initiative, the 57th IPDC Bureau requested the IPDC Secretariat to produce an annual analytical report that would incorporate lessons learnt from the Programme’s media support, thereby generating a knowledge base for future media development efforts.

2. DESCRIPTION

A total of 76 IPDC project Implementation Reports were analysed as part of the sample for this Analytical Report. Forty-seven percent of these projects fell into the thematic category Promotion of freedom of expression and press freedom, while 42% of them focused on Capacity development, reflecting that these subjects are among the key areas of media development supported by IPDC. Media assessments and Innovation had 8 percent and 3 percent of the projects respectively. However, while the theme of Innovation appeared to have registered the lowest number of projects, it was also referenced in some projects that focused on promoting freedom of expression and capacity development. Forty-four projects of the reported 76 were
completed, while 26 were still ongoing. The implementation status of six such projects was not clearly noted in the reports analysed.

3. ANALYSIS

Several key lessons are evident in the overall reporting. These concern: (i) the applicants’ technical and administrative capacity for delivery; (ii) UNESCO’s normative influence on the beneficiaries; (iii) the cultural and institutional context of project implementation; and (iv) sustainability concerns.

Taking the first lesson, there was a correlation between the partner’s technical know-how and successful implementation. For example, the World Association of Community Radio Broadcasters (AMARC) Brazil used its wide experience and partnerships to facilitate participatory diagnosis and planning with its local community radio partners. In general, such delivery issues could be anticipated through more rigorous assessment in future of the technical and organisational capabilities of implementing partners, including a sounder risk analysis of the wider context.

Secondly, a number of projects showed how UNESCO’s normative function was received and perceived by beneficiaries, especially in training workshops based on UNESCO documents in such areas as freedom of expression, journalism education, assessments of media landscapes, etc. In some Asia Pacific countries, for example, there was concern about the extent to which UNESCO’s reference materials contextualised the local challenges faced by editors and journalists. Elsewhere, the very normative conceptualisation of community broadcasting was an issue. In at least one country, although community broadcasting was broadly seen as undoubtedly potentially democratising, there was concern about the nature of the relationship between community broadcasters and the State. This invites greater conceptual reflection in the development of IPDC project proposals, so that they can better represent an inclusive understanding of the normative functions of free, independent and pluralistic media in society.

Related to the normative aspect above, the third issue concerns the cultural and institutional context for implementing IPDC projects. Some reports suggested that the content of training programmes on trauma in conflict and post-conflict countries needed to be especially sensitive to the “needs of the different cultures represented at the training”. This analysis is equally valid for dealing with gender-related projects in some countries. At the institutional level, a project in one country was not successful in recruiting experienced journalists for training simply because such journalists could not take two weeks’ leave from their jobs. Understanding the wider political economy of journalism should thus be part of the IPDC project formulation process.

Finally, in terms of sustainability, especially with regard to training programmes, there was concern that people trained often left the beneficiary institutions, leading to doubts about how such institutions ultimately benefitted from IPDC support. A related concern was how such institutions could provide an enabling environment in which trained staff could better use their newly-acquired knowledge and skills. A key recommendation here could be that IPDC applicants should be encouraged to include an institutional analysis that forecasts the organizational arrangements to be deployed to leverage IPDC support sustainably, and that projects build in foresight that provides for wider sharing and institutionalisation of competencies learned or other results, beyond the immediate beneficiaries of the project.
4. CONCLUSION

IPDC can benefit from annual analysis of all Implementation Reports, and the lessons of this exercise should also be communicated to the Field Offices who oversee the implementation and are also responsible for the reports. To this end, all such offices implementing IPDC projects should be encouraged to submit their Implementation Reports on time and, where there is a delay, reasons should be established, as part of the wider cycle of organisational learning.

8. BUREAU ACTION

The Bureau, having discussed this document, may wish to:

- *Note* the findings and conclusions of the Analytical Report as forming an important *knowledge* component of IPDC media assistance within the framework of the Knowledge-Driven Media Development initiative.