

Annual Report

International Media Support (IMS)

1. September 2001 – 1. September 2002

List of Content

1. Introduction
2. Establishment of IMS Secretariat
3. IMS interventions
 - 3.1 Criteria for intervention
 - 3.2 Media Assistance in Conflict-Threatened Zones
Zimbabwe, Ukraine
 - 3.3 Media Assistance during on-going Conflicts
Middle East, DR Congo, Colombia, Sudan, Nepal, Liberia
 - 3.4 Media Assistance after the Cease-fire
Afghanistan, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka
4. Methodological considerations
5. Information and international networking/cooperation
6. Sustainability and priorities the coming year

I. Introduction

The present annual report provides testimony on the interventions carried out by International Media Support (IMS) during the initial 12 months of its existence. The report further elaborates on a report submitted to the IMS board, FRESTA and Danida in mid April 2001.

During the reporting period the IMS secretariat has been successfully established within the Danish Centre of Human Rights.

The IMS secretariat has since 1. September 2001 planned and implemented 20 interventions in 14 countries in accordance with the operational focus specified by the IMS board as well as by the approved IMS project document.

During its first year of existence IMS has been directly involved in the following countries (regions):

- Afghanistan, the Middle East, Zimbabwe, Sierra Leone, Liberia, Sudan, DR Congo, Colombia, Sri Lanka, Tunisia, Nepal, Indonesia, Ukraine

IMS is in addition planning to intervene in the following countries (regions):

- Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, Tajikistan, Kyrgyzstan, Caucasus, Somalia, Burma, (Iran), (Iraq), (India/Pakistan).

The report is structured according to the four *strategic components* and the output descriptions of the approved IMS Project Document. The four Components are as follows:

1. Establishment of IMS Secretariat
2. Initiation of concrete interventions
3. Method Development
4. Information and international networking cooperation

Reporting on component 2-4 will include

- A brief background and justification + established criteria for the actions
- A presentation of the specific actions carried out and relevant results/outputs
- A list of possible *indicators of success* for each of the activities carried out.
- A methodological assessment of the specific IMS interventions

2. Establishment of IMS Secretariat

Outputs as identified in IMS Project Document:

- *Three qualified staff employed*

- *IMS secretariat up and running within the initial three-six months of the project placed as an independent entity at the Danish Centre for Human Rights*

On 1. September 2001 the IMS board employed the executive director; Jesper Højberg and the deputy director Martin Breum joined the IMS by 1. October. By 1. November the IMS secretariat was ready to engage in specific media emergency activities. Preparations for the employment of the administrative assistant were terminated in December and from 1 February Tine Rasmussen has been responsible for project administration at IMS.

Organisational and management matters related to the hosting organisation, the Danish Centre for Human Rights (DCHR) have been put in place.

An IMS web site has been finalised and is launched with the following site addresses: www.i-m-s.dk & www.internationalmediasupport.dk.

3. IMS interventions

Outputs as identified in the IMS Project Document:

- *At least 20 interventions carried out the first year and 30 the second year of the project*
- *A number of media specialists trained*

3.1 Values and criteria for IMS intervention

The criteria for the IMS interventions are defined in relation to the broader objective and mandate of IMS. The objective is defined as:

“To enhance peace, stability, democracy freedom of expression and pluralism of the press in conflict and conflict threatened areas through rapid assistance to media practitioners and media institutions”.

Peace and stability as well as democracy and freedom of expression and pluralism of the press constitute the framework (values and principles) for the work of IMS in conflict and conflict threatened areas around the world. During the first year of its operations IMS has slightly expanded this objective and included immediate post-conflict areas in its mandate.

Values

The importance of clearly and explicitly articulated organisational *values* has become clear during the first year of IMS operations. Clarity on values ensures that collaborating partners and parties do not misunderstand the work of IMS. In the coming year IMS will still need to more effectively convey these values to avoid misapprehensions. IMS values are reflected primarily in IMS commitment to

- Freedom of expression and the international human rights and press freedom standards endorsed by the international community,
- Promotion of conditions for professional journalism to develop
- Independence, impartiality, strict political neutrality
- The establishment of partnerships and
- Confidentiality as well as accountability

Criteria

The sequence of events in an IMS intervention can roughly be described as follows:

Step 1: Alert

The IMS secretariat receives a report from a conflict area indicating directly or indirectly that emergency assistance is needed.

These reports reach IMS through international, regional and national media monitoring organisations (IFEX, CPJ, RSF, MISA MFWA, ICG, Human Rights Watch etc).

IMS is also often contacted its national and international board members (WAN, IFJ, NPI and ARTICLE 19) on pertinent IMS related issues.

Step 2: Assessment

IMS will investigate the situation in the reported conflict area and carry out a rapid assessment (contextual analysis) of the best possible intervention.

Step 3: Strategy

IMS then engage in consultation with national or international partners in order to arrive at a strategy for constructive intervention. This process will often flow directly from the assessment phase in an unbroken chain of exchanges.

Step 4: Intervention

Subsequently IMS will mobilise the needed professional assistance and initiate an intervention either by itself or in collaboration with local and international partners. If possible the short-term intervention is linked up with a long-term media development initiative.

Step 5: A critical eye on own actions

Lastly self-monitoring and evaluation form an integral part of all IMS interventions. Lessons learned are transformed into a "toolbox".

The IMS secretariat has been constantly engaged in specifying criteria for its operations. Particularly criteria for making *assessments, interventions and follow-up actions* have been discussed and refined during first year of IMS's existence.

Specific *criteria* have been established for engaging in *assessments* and *interventions*. These criteria can be broken down in two categories: Criteria related to *the conflict* and criteria related to conditions for IMS *intervention*.

Criteria related to the conflict

- The *type and stage* of a conflict in a given country or region.

IMS does not consider any conflict more or less important than others.

IMS engage in all stages of a conflict – although terminating its engagement when a post-conflict turns into long-term peace building.

The exercise of distinguishing potential conflict areas from non-conflict areas is difficult and contentious. It has been, however, a criterion for almost all IMS interventions that the country or region in questions was affected by violent conflict or violent conflict potential. It is not within the key mandate of IMS, as it has so far been interpreted, to engage in areas where the ‘only’ indicators are general threats to press freedom, if these are not coupled with indicators of (violent) conflict. IMS would thus not presently intervene in, for instance, Zambia, Namibia or Cambodia. On the other hand, the distinction between pre-conflict and non-conflict areas will often be difficult. In Ukraine there is no threat of immediate armed conflict, but sustained repression of independent media, widespread economic and political corruption and the general political outlook indicate risk of increased tension and, certainly, increased repression.

IMS should avoid focusing solely on ‘high profile’ areas such as Afghanistan or the Middle East. IMS has consequently engaged in Sudan, Somalia, Colombia, Liberia, DR Congo, and Chechnya.

Criteria related to IMS intervention

Media Sector:

- The general *press freedom conditions* in any country or region around the world (potential conflict, conflict or non-conflict area).

Particularly in non-conflict or pre-conflict areas it has been important to determine relevant, media-related indicators of conflict.

Pre-conflict warning signs¹ as criteria for intervention include:

- Increased state control of media outlets
- Censorship of journalists amplified
- Suppression of external media sources
- Media polarizing resulting in stereotyping of others – emergence of hate-speech

¹ Ross Howard: “An Operational Framework for Media and Peace-building”

- Alternative media grows stronger

The involvement of IMS in Central Asia and Zimbabwe shall be seen in this perspective (see further under 3.2).

In identifying these warning signs IMS has relied partly on its own assessments and on the work of institutions like IMPACS Canada, DFID, FEWER etc. When the warning signs have been identified a decision to act should reflect whether IMS - with the resources available – could contribute constructively to alleviate the consequences that a given conflict will have on the media.

- The *inter-relationship* between conflict and media

The media (impacts on media) will not only be negatively affected by the conflict. Media also has the potential to constructively influence the resolution of the conflict. IMS interventions have addressed both aspects. The possibility of acting with this double focus (working with media negatively affected by the conflict and with media working constructively on the conflict) has been a guiding criterion.

In Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka and Nepal IMS has been focussed on the possibility of influencing the conflict constructively through media work. In Sri Lanka it was essential that a new political situation (ceasefire) made it relevant to work with the media and its role in the ceasefire/peace process.

- The existence of relevant media *actors (partners)* and organisations that ensure local grounding as well as regional and international backing of IMS interventions.

This criterion has different dimensions. IMS can act on its own providing direct assistance to threatened media institutions. It has done so in Tunisia and in the Middle East. To enhance impact it has, however, proved essential to link interventions to organised local media initiatives. This was done in Colombia and Zimbabwe. The construction of a good working relationship with reliable partners has proven crucial in order to ensure impact and sustainability of IMS interventions.

In addition the possibility of connecting interventions to regional media institutions and relevant international organisations has been a critical success criteria. The interventions in relation to Zimbabwe, Liberia, and Sierra Leone have been backed or even carried by a strong regional involvement through MISA and MFWA respectively.

Similarly, it has been a key criterion for the engagement of IMS that relevant international organisations were or became involved. In several instances IMS has identified an approach to media assistance and has subsequently facilitated the involvement of IFEX (Sudan), IFJ (Afghanistan/Pakistan), IMPACS (Sri Lanka) or WAN (Sudan). Likewise have these organisations approached IMS for collaboration

(IFJ on Safety Training in the Middle East and Nepal) or referred specific intervention ideas to IMS (WAN for exiled Liberian journalists in Ghana and re-launching of Tajik newspaper).

Most media issues in conflict areas are best addressed not by the initiative of one single organisation. The possibility of developing different levels of engagement – horizontally and vertically - (national, regional and international), creating relationships between otherwise incompatible organisations, is viewed as an important criterion for IMS intervention. In several instances, IMS has identified needs and successfully matched these with the expertise and comparative advantages of other international media support organisations.

- The *sustainability* of IMS intervention.

A key criterion for all IMS intervention is whether sustainability and a long-term perspective can be secured. This is closely related to the emphasis put on establishment of reliable national and international partnerships.

Whereas IMS should – due to its mandate – initiate *immediate effective and timely responses* to a crisis the organisation should continuously keep a long-term vision in mind. The identification of key actors/partners and possible donors for continued engagement is therefore a main concern for all IMS interventions.

3.2 Media Assistance in Conflict-Threatened Zones

Zimbabwe, Ukraine, (Central Asia)

General Considerations

As indicated above a number of *warning signs* have guided IMS decisions to initiate interventions in conflict-threatened zones.

In design of specific interventions it has been important to include analysis of root-causes of conflict and their interaction with the media. This has been particularly important in countries directly threatened by conflict as Zimbabwe and the Central Asian republics and in a country with less tangible signs of rising tension such as Ukraine.

- *Political tension* has been high resulting in what Ross Howard has called intensified central authority. This has resulted in increased media monopoly and outright censorship.

- *Economic instability* has followed the political tension and corruption is rampant. Consequently the editorial and economic independence of the news media becomes illusive.
- The operations and *rights of civil society groups* have been *restricted* resulting (Central Asia) in a decline in reporting on rights abuses (Ukraine). In Zimbabwe the infringements on freedom of expression have severely hampered independent media.
- Direct *abuse of the electoral system* (Zimbabwe) is widespread. When the media has focused on this, they have either become partisan have been targeted by government. Newsrooms and radio stations have been bombed (Zimbabwe) or critical investigative journalists exiled (Uzbekistan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan – see 6.2) or killed (Ukraine).

Zimbabwe

Background

In the run-up to the March 2002 elections in Zimbabwe increasing harassments and attacks on the media and individual journalists by the Mutable Government were widely reported.

Following the elections these harassment have continued and the Government approval of the Access to Information and Protection of Privacy Bill has been described as the most calculated and determined assault on the liberties guaranteed by the Zimbabwean constitution. In July 2002 alone 15 assaults on the media (action alerts) were reported by MISA-Zimbabwe.

Throughout 2002 the media community in Zimbabwe has initiated several concrete actions to address the assaults on the media.

Intervention 1.

Establishment of a Journalist Safe Haven in South Africa

In early December 2001 IMS carried out a mission to South Africa and Zimbabwe to assess the possibility of setting up a *Safe Haven* mechanism outside Zimbabwe. South Africa was chosen since many media organisations there already have some experience with exiled journalists seeking assistance.

IMS subsequently facilitated and funded the establishment of a safe Haven, which has been implemented by ARTICLE 19 in Johannesburg. The project is co-funded by *Open Society Institute*.

Results

- On the initiative of IMS a group of key media organisations agreed to establish a formalised mechanism for assistance to exiled journalists with the Zimbabwean situation as an immediate case.
- ARTICLE19/South Africa negotiated an agreement with the Ministry of Interior allowing “foreign” journalists to work as interns for a given period of time in South Africa.
- The Safe Haven mechanism utilised primarily by one Zimbabwean journalist.
- IMS contacted by local and international organisations acquiring information about the Safe Haven option in Zimbabwe.

It is still too early to determine how much Zimbabwean journalists will use the Safe Haven mechanism. Conditions for the media in Zimbabwe are still deteriorating.

Intervention 2.

Assistance to safety measures in Zimbabwe and to regional campaign

During the IMS mission to Zimbabwe in early December 2001 it became clear that the Safe Haven in South Africa was considered an important, but very last resort.

Subsequently, IMS made available funds – through MISA Zimbabwe – for basic security of working journalists and outspoken media organisations in Zimbabwe, as well as for enhanced research capacity of MISA Zimbabwe.

As a third leg in the IMS assistance package support was provided to a regional campaign, which aimed at preventing the passing of the Access to Information and Protection of Privacy Bill in Zimbabwe. This was implemented by regional MISA office in Namibia.

Results

No journalist made use of the internal safety option. Instead, by mutual agreement between MISA Zimbabwe and IMS, the funds were subsequently used to produce the following results:

- MISA researcher employed for six months; a computer, a chair and a table. This improved the capacity of MISA Zimbabwe to research, report and follow-up on media freedom violations in the country; to prepare relevant legal opinions and to assist in the preparations of the *Media Defence Fund (MDF)* prompted by MISA Zimbabwe. The MDF is now assisting journalists and media houses in need of legal defence.

- Funds mobilised from Danish NGO "Arbejdernes International Forum" to assist *Voice of the People* to re-launch short-wave radio in Zimbabwe. Collaboration with OSISA .
- Regional campaign against the Access to Information and Protection of Privacy Bill in Zimbabwe implemented by the MISA regional secretariat through print and broadcast media, street protests in front of Zimbabwean embassies and a specific international and African campaign.
- Following the presidential elections in Zimbabwe the regional and international media organisations working in the Southern Africa have joined forces to discuss and plan a *strategy* for continued support to the media in Zimbabwe and elsewhere in the region where media is threatened by conflict or potential conflicts.

Criteria for success

- Number of Action Alerts issued by MISA Zimbabwe in the run up to the elections. This cannot be attributed solely to the assistance from IMS, but IMS has strengthened the capacity of the organisation to carry out this important function.
- Preparation of legal opinions on laws attempting to stifle the media – such as the Law on Defamation.
- Established Safe Haven mechanism in South Africa enabling exiled journalist to stay (accommodation) and continue to work as journalists for a period of time without having to seek asylum.
- Number of exiled journalists actually using the Safe Haven option in South Africa.
- Ability of the newly established Media Defence Fund to support journalists in legal proceedings.
- Number of journalists and media institutions assisted by the MDF.
- Established working relationship with other media organisations to ensure a more viable/sustainable approach to the assistance to the media in Zimbabwe. Indications of this lie in the efforts to collaborate and co-fund with Open Society Institute Southern Africa, ARTICLE 19, NIZA and others.

Methodological considerations

IMS has in the Safe Haven initiative attempted to *pro-actively* suggest a mechanism that would be able to “step in” if necessary and assist exiled media workers from Zimbabwe and other countries in Southern Africa. It has been important that the mechanism inside Zimbabwe is combined with the regional Safe Haven option.

The South African organisations as well as the Zimbabwean organisations have been keen to find an immediate solution to a problem. Previously only ad-hoc attempts were made to deal with the safety issue. The Safe Haven initiative has attempted to tackle the issue in a more holistic way. The efforts have also tested the possibility of joint donor approach by inviting the Open Society Institute to support the establishment of the mechanism.

General experiences from the initiative are now being transformed into a booklet and IMS is facilitating that Safe Haven experiences from around the world are brought together and a concerted global approach discussed with relevant stakeholders – such as IFJ, CPJ, UNHCR etc.

In Southern Africa IMS has intervened at different levels attempting to address the situation in Zimbabwe at a local as well as a regional level and in collaboration with other donors.

Ukraine

Background

In June 2002 the government of president Kuchma in Ukraine remained firmly opposed to most suggestions of political and economic reforms in this former member of the Soviet Union. President Kuchma continued to pursue closer links with the EU, but without making any real efforts to answer EU calls for increased protection of human rights, freedom of speech and economic liberalisation.

Repression of dissent was widely expected to increase significantly as the end of president Kuchma’s last term in office in November 2004 draws nearer.

Russia still had more than 100.000 troops stationed on Black Sea navy bases in the Crimea, serving as a permanent reminder that the Russian majority in the Crimea have not abandoned hopes for re-unification of Crimea with Russia.

All main electronic media in Ukraine remained firmly under the control of pres. Kuchma or his oligarch allies. The larger print media were subservient to the government, but several political parties and

enterprises also publish newspapers. Editorial content, however, remained subject to a host of restrictive legislation and arbitrary reprisals. Any breach of written or un-written regulations will potentially result in instant and abusive tax-inspections, fire-regulation enforcements, rent-increases, criminal proceedings or other less specified reprisals. Any coverage of corruption or economic crime is dangerous. In mid 2002 at least nine murders of Ukrainian journalists were still not properly investigated.

Intervention

In September 2002 IMS fielded a mission to Kyiv and Simferopol in the Crimea.

The objective of the mission was to assess options for promotion of investigative journalism on human rights issues in Ukraine, its production and publishing. This objective was designed to correspond with a call for proposals issued by the EU's European Initiative on Democracy and Human Rights in August 2002.

Results

The mission confirmed that the establishment of a nucleus of independent journalists, which would produce and publish investigative journalism, would be a constructive and timely addition to development of independent journalism in Ukraine, and that this perspective was not being addressed by others.

IMS has subsequently been engaged in the establishment of partnerships with relevant Ukrainian media and human rights organisations as well as with an agency for investigative journalism in Russia.

Indicators of success

- Investigative reporting on human rights issues produced and published through existing Ukrainian media on a regular basis
- Sustainability of this production secured

Methodological considerations

Ukraine (and Byelorussia) exists in a different category than other countries in which IMS interventions have taken place: Ukraine is not affected by or directly threatened by violent conflict.

The IMS intervention was based on the following main considerations:

- Freedom of the media in Ukraine has been severely restricted since independence in 1991, with no signs of relaxation. Repression of dissenting voices was expected to increase.
- Production and publishing of investigative journalism on human rights issues would be an important step forward in Ukrainian media development. After ten years at the receiving end of internationally sponsored training courses, Ukrainian journalists are increasingly eager to organize real outlets for their skills.
- The EU's call for proposals presented a possibility for combining EU funding with IMS's own capacity for rapid action. This could cater for a process of implementation, which would be both quick and sustained.

3.3 Media Assistance during on-going Conflicts

- *Middle East, DR Congo, Colombia, Sudan, Nepal, Liberia, Chechnya*

General considerations

Being a rapid response mechanism constantly presents a dilemma between:

1. Acting quickly based on a relatively swift analysis and
2. Acting slowly based on a thorough and well prepared conflict analysis.

The challenge is to act quickly based on a rapid but well prepared conflict analysis. For each intervention IMS has attempted to identify both common and specific conflict indicators - indicators that have assisted IMS in designing its assistance package.

Several countries in which IMS has intervened have shown the following features or a combination of several of them.

- Open conflict with *killings and atrocities* where the military and different "guerrilla" (Indonesia) and paramilitary groups play a key role in escalating the conflict. Independent news media are either suppressed/destroyed (Chechnya) or taken over completely by government/military forces (Liberia). Journalists trying to work put their *personal life at risk* by reporting about the conflict (Colombia & Middle East)
- Civil society organisations during a conflict suffers severely and in certain instances collapses completely (Liberia & Chechnya). Consequently the media associations and organisations that normally would defend the rights of journalist/media

professionals disintegrate. The defence of journalists becomes difficult, media rights are suspended and impunity reigns (Colombia & Liberia).

- *Censorship* is getting more brutal and (as in the Middle East) “centrally enforced patriotism”² becomes the order of the day. Propaganda, self-censorship and bias is common.
- Media facilities are destroyed (Middle East and Chechnya).
- There is no dialogue between the conflicting parties. (Middle East, Liberia, Colombia and Chechnya.)

Middle East

Background

Since the start of the second Intifada in 2000 animosity in Israel and in the Palestinian Territories increased dramatically. Among many media professionals on both sides there are a feeling that the political climate is back to square one with only few signs of constructive political developments taking place.

Within the media environment in Israel and Palestine the present conflict has had very tangible consequences.

- The media on each side of the conflict (as well as international media) have increasingly been part of the political polarisation through their journalistic coverage of the conflict.
- Many media professionals lack an understanding of the professional media context under which their peers on the other side are working.

A number of international media and monitoring organisations observed that particularly Palestinian journalists and media institutions have been under attack. Not only have their ability to work as professionals been stifled by the inability to move (freedom of movement) due to restrictive Israeli measures, their own authorities also muffle them and they are often caught in crossfire between the Israeli military and the Palestinian militants.

Interventions

IMS fielded a *mission* to the Middle East in February 2002

- To implement – in conjunction with IFJ - a safety training course for 100 Palestinian journalists.

² Ross Howard , IMPACS 2002

- To assess the fact that media increasingly are becoming of the political polarisation through their journalistic coverage of the conflict and develop appropriate actions.

The *Safety Training* course was implemented as a collaborative effort with the International Federation of Journalists. The courses took place in the West Bank and Gaza. The UK based company AKE provided the safety training – a similar approach used in Afghanistan in early 2002.

IFJ has decided to focus its efforts in the region on the establishment of a Journalists Safety Centre in MIFTAH. Linked to this Centre would be the possibility for journalists to access helmets and bulletproof vests as well as medical aid kits. IMS has, apart from input to the Safety Training, co-funded purchase of bulletproof vests.

As a second leg of the Middle East intervention IMS initiated a *twinning co-production* project, which involves international (Danish), Israeli and Palestinian journalists. It has not been a collaboration (dialogue) projects between Israeli and Palestinian journalists. Instead IMS tested the idea of having one or more international journalists working separately (in parallel projects) with Israeli and Palestinian journalists. Focus is on the role of the media in the present conflict.

The intervention comprises different phases. The broader aim of the first phase has been to sharpen awareness among media professionals in the Middle East and internationally on the strengths and weaknesses of present media coverage of the conflict and the impact on media coverage on prospects for de-escalation of the conflict. In addition it would attempt to develop new approaches for media coverage of the conflict internationally, in Denmark and in the Middle East media.

In a *second phase* the project will aim at providing Israeli and Palestinian journalists with increased awareness of the professional approaches of their colleagues 'on the other side' and at the same time produce better journalism on the conflict for the media in both societies. A Danish consultant, engaged as of September 2002, will work with Palestinian and Israeli journalists and participants from phase 1 in designing the exact activities in phase 2 and assessing possibilities for engaging local, institutional partners for the project.

Results

- Safety training courses (carried out in collaboration with IFJ) were implemented in the cities of Hebron, Bethlehem, Ram Allah, Gaza and Jerusalem. An instructor from AKE Limited Ltd. trained approximately 100 Palestinian journalists. 15 flack

- jackets and helmets made available to Palestinian journalists (through IFJ).
- Co-production of journalistic articles/television programmes by Danish/Palestinian journalists and Danish/Israeli journalists with a focus on media self-reflection finalised. The first series of articles have been published in Jillian's Postern (DK) and Allayed (Palestinian daily), respectively and also published on www.amin.org. The television programme will be broadcast on Israeli Channel 10.
 - Two new teams have been formed and they will terminate their productions in the fall 2002.
 - Consultant engaged for design of second phase of the project and collaboration being established with journalism training institutions; Bir-Zeit University at the West Bank and the Journalism Faculty at Tel Aviv University.

Methodological considerations

The safety training proved to be a constructive way to initiate collaboration with the Palestinian media and pave the way for follow-up with additional training, which would focus on more sensitive issues related to conflict awareness and the role the media/journalists are playing in the conflict.

The joint IFJ/IMS venture has successfully developed a one-day safety awareness-training package for adaptation to specific conflict areas and for quick implementation. (This was utilized in Nepal in September 2002). It is, however, essential that further work in this field attempts to reduce the relatively high cost of the present package.

IMS has not been able to move as quickly as initially preferred in the Middle East. Apart from the specific safety training course carried out in collaboration with IFJ IMS decided to take a step-by-step approach, which would constantly reflect the political situation in the region. The aim has been to initiate immediate actions – be it safety training or a twinning co-production and thereby constructively (and modestly) contribute to media development relevant in the immediate crisis. The intention has been to develop a (methodological) reporting approach, which could expand and be continued by others.

Democratic Republic of Congo

Background

The first half of 2002 brought a series of failures to the internationally brokered Dialogue on Peace in the DRC, but in July direct talks between the Kinshasa government and rebel movement in the north of J.P. Bemba and, more significantly, between Kinshasa and the Kigali government in Rwanda. The de facto rulers of eastern DRC, the Rassemblement Congolaise pour la Democratie (RCD) installed by Rwanda, declared its intent to start negotiating with Kinshasa on sustainable peace. Some civil society actors in DRC now advocate peace in DRC build on a relative high degree of regionalism.

The security situation in Eastern Congo remains volatile, human security remains precarious with several armed groups pursuing separate agendas. Root causes of conflict includes difference over land, ethnicity and, increasingly, control over mineral deposits.

There is little or no involvement of civil society in the ongoing peace process.

Independent media operate, although under some restrictions, in the government controlled parts of DRC. In the northern and in particular in the RDC controlled areas in eastern DRC only very few sources of independent information exist.

Intervention

In June 2002 IMS fielded an assess- and support mission to the city of Bukavu in the RDC controlled eastern DRC, which is the seat of the RDC-rulers of eastern Congo. The objectives of this mission was to provide emergency material support as well as consultancy services to Radio Maendeleo (RM), an independent community broadcaster in Bukavu, and to make recommendations to IMS on how to further assist RM, in particular in its efforts to link up with national structures of independent media.

Results

The following are the direct outcomes of this IMS intervention

- Spare parts brought to RM by IMS enabled the radio to sustain broadcasts during a crucial phase in the peace process
- Expert technical advice (site surveys, needs assessments) provided to RM
- Formal partnership between RM and international partner (Netherlands Institute for Southern Africa, NiZA) facilitated, making RM eligible for NiZAs long-term support programme
- Workshop for Bukavu-based NGOs on establishment on joint internet access facilitated

- Fundraising re. core funding for RM initiated
- Specific recommendations for further support made to IMS, based on map of all stakeholders

Indicators of success

Two specific factors may be regarded as indicators of success

- independent broadcasts in the Bukavu region, including information on the actual peace process, sustained during critical phase of the peace process
- formal partnership between RM and the NiZA programme of sustained technical support is now being established.

Methodological consideration

Taking into consideration the nature of the conflict in DRC, IMS decided that support for one of the only independent media in eastern DRC could possibly contribute to stability in this, the most volatile region in DRC. At least, sustained broadcasts by RM was viewed as a possible means of assisting civil society address the severe human rights situation in the region and to maintain a level of freedom of expression.

RM was targeted for its strong base in Bukavu civil society, its record of impartiality and its proven commitment over time.

Technical support to RM, which was ailing for lack of spare-parts, was decided on as a means to sustain one of the only organs of public debate and independent information in eastern DRC, providing crucial news and analysis to the citizens of the region on the peace process and humanitarian issues.

By focussing also on linking RM with national media structures, timing its intervention with national media seminars in Kinshasa arranged by PANOS and NiZA, IMS sought to assert also a broader perspective and support existing initiatives.

By selecting a (Dutch) consultant, already closely associated with media development in DRC, IMS sought to facilitate long-term links with other sources of support. The subsequent RM-NiZA partnership may have happened without any facilitation, but the IMS mission at least facilitated its progress.

The unresolved issue of core funding for RM beyond January 2003 is now subject of further efforts by IMS. In retrospect, the IMS interventions should probably have included earlier emphasis on assisting RM establish a funding strategy.

Colombia

Background

"The journalists are in the middle of a battlefield - they don't know where the bullets are coming from. All factions in the civil conflict believe they can use violence, threats and intimidations to compel the press to cover them favourably" (Joel Simon, Committee to Protection of Journalists).

The civil war in Colombia between the paramilitaries of the United Self-defence of Colombia (AUC), government forces and the guerrillas of the FARC and the ELN, is also an information war. Journalists have become military targets, with all parties trying to coerce the media. Killings of journalists are common and 97 pct of all crimes go unpunished.

In March 2002 WAN and the Colombian Publishers Association organised an international conference on violence against the media in Colombia. 200-300 journalists, editors, publishers and other media professionals attended.

IMS participated in order to assess the media situation in the country and to consult with local press organisations to determine an appropriate assistance package.

Following the consultations between IMS and the Columbian press organisations preparations of a specific intervention packages have largely been done by the organisations themselves.

Interventions

The support package has had three tracks:

1. Assisting the efforts to promote a strong/joint press freedom organisation with representatives from the different sectors of the media, i.e. "PROYECTO ANTONIO NARINO".³
2. Assisting the organisation "Medios Para Las Paz" in further developing its web-site dealing among other things with "*Responsible Journalism in Times of War*"
3. Provision of financial support to the (Publishers Association) to implement a 'Newspaper in Education' Conference.

Results

³ The "Antonio Narinio Project" promotes a culture of self-protection among the journalists/media institutions when exercising their profession. Its objectives are: to assist in strengthening an established media alert network (FLIP); to channel information on violence against the media/press to the Columbian public and to international organisations such as IFEX and to advocate freedom of expression issues.

- The alert network – FLIP - operating within the framework of the “Antonio Narinio Project” assisted. FLIP, which is a member of the IFEX network, consists of a network of reporters monitoring the media situation in different parts of the country.
- FLIPs production of media alerts from Colombia’s warring provinces has been resumed.
- The FLIP co-ordinator assisted by IMS to attend the IFEX conference in Senegal.
- “Medios Para Las Paz” supported in its efforts to sensitise journalists about “*Responsible Journalism in times of War*”.
- The web-site of the organisation up-dated to more effectively provide guidelines to working journalists on how to cover and report on a conflict and practice non-conflict journalism.
- Discussions held with WAN and Colombian Publishers Association on consultancy package for Colombian provincial newspapers. Support for a conference on *Newspapers in Education* has been agreed on.

Indicators of success

- FLIP is again the key media monitoring institution in Colombia reporting on a daily basis on the atrocities taking place in the country towards media professionals.
- “Medios Para Las Paz” has up-dated and improved its web-site providing essential (safety & conflict reporting) information to journalists

Methodological considerations

In Colombia IMS helped secure rapid follow up to the Conference, “Media in Danger” organized by WAN and ANDIARIOS. The Conference provided IMS with an entry point and a quick overview of the media situation in the country.

The situation in Colombia – being the most dangerous place in the world to work as a journalist – does not call for a quick fix or easy solutions. The inclusive approach of the ANTONIO NARINIO PROJECT is commendable and any international assistance to the media in Colombia should somehow relate to this initiative.

It has been a *key element* of the IMS intervention in Colombia to assist existing constructive efforts and avoid creating any form of destructive competition between organisations, which, through a cumbersome process, have managed to create a joint approach.

Sudan

Background

In early 2002 international efforts to facilitate peace talks in the civil war in Sudan intensified. In July a significant framework for peace was agreed by the National Islamic Front (NIF)-government in Khartoum and the Sudanese Peoples Liberation Army (SPLA). This did not result, however, in any ceasefire or other tangible results on the ground. Fighting intensified in August and continued in September, where the NIF-government suspended its participation in the talks.

In September 2002 the humanitarian situation remained catastrophic. Obstruction of badly needed emergency food aid to the peoples of southern Sudan remained part of the arsenal of all parties to the war.

There is no involvement of civil society in the peace process. Privately owned print media exist in the NIF controlled northern half of the country, but they operate under heavy-handed and arbitrary government censorship. No mass media operate out of Southern Sudan. International support for media development in Sudan has been very limited.

Intervention

In June 2002 IMS fielded an assessment mission to northern Sudan to explore possibilities for media support, which could underpin local and international efforts to sustain the fragile peace process.

Results

The mission resulted in:

- Publication of an assessment report with an update on the media situation and outlines of potential IMS support activities. The report was widely distributed in July 2002 and served as input for an international conference on 'Media for Peace in Sudan'-conference in the Haag in September 2002.
- Establishment of working relations / partnerships with local actors in the Sudanese media community and IMS
- Initiation of four lines of IMS activities: a) support for local efforts to establish a Publishers Association b) support to media monitoring mechanisms in Sudan c) implementation of conflict reporting training- and production seminar d) promotion of Sudanese participation in regional and international exchanges in the field of media development / freedom of speech.

- A key member of the Khartoum media community subsequently took part in the IFEX annual general meeting in September, facilitated by IMS. Sudanese participation is anticipated for IMS's 2. International Conference on Emergency Assistance to Media in Copenhagen, October 2002.

Indicators of success

- Increase in international support for media development / freedom of speech in Sudan. Sudanese media professionals consistently identify international pressure on the NIF government as the currently most important tool in promoting free media
- Increase in media coverage of the war and its consequences. Lack of independent information on the war is a key obstacle to public participation in the peace process.
- Increase in Sudanese participation in regional and international exchanges on media development. Current needs of the media community are not well known by the international community and unique experiences of the Sudanese media community are not brought to attention elsewhere.

Methodological considerations

An IMS Sudan assessment was decided upon when international and internal factors resulted in significant new developments in the civil war in Sudan. Analysts identified 'a window of opportunity' and IMS research indicated an unusually low level of international involvement in media development.

The IMS assessment uncovered much practical scope for international support for relevant local initiatives and several eligible local partners. Based on this assessment the four lines of activity mentioned above were initiated.

IMS has made concerted efforts to alert the IFEX community and RsF to the possibilities for additional media support in Sudan. Central Sudanese media professionals have been invited to make presentations at key international freedom of speech events.

International consultant for IMS activity in Sudan have been selected for their ability to bring expertise from WAN, IWPR, IFEX and other international organizations to bear in Sudan.

Nepal

Background

In November 2001, the government in Kathmandu imposed a countrywide state of emergency. This followed rapid escalation of the armed conflict between the Nepali government and extremists Maoist groups.

Continued escalation of the armed conflict and a general rise in tension in Nepal presented the media and its professionals with a range of new risks and challenges. The Maoist insurgents now regard journalists in general as 'agents of the enemy', access to areas under their control is highly restricted and the government is restricting access to the zones of combat. Fear and self-censorship curtails media coverage of the conflict, human rights abuses and of civil affairs in general.

There are no discernible signs of reconciliation between the insurgents and the government. Indications are that the conflict will continue to be violent for the foreseeable future.

Interventions

In February 2002, the IMS chairman travelled to Nepal to work with the IMS Nepalese board member to identify a possible assistance package to the Nepali media community.

Subsequently, IMS, IFJ, the Nepal Press Institute and the Centre for Investigative Journalism implemented

- A Safety Training course (run by AKE Ltd. UK),
- A Conflict Conscious Journalism Programme run by the Canadian media and conflict expert, Ross Howard
- Preparation of journalist teams, which will report from the conflicting areas. The teams will comprise local, regional and international reporters.

Results

- Provision of consultancy assistance by IMS to the Nepalese media.
- Financial assistance for the Khoj Patrakarita Kendra (KPK - Centre for Investigative Journalism), which has subsequently initiated a series of investigations on human rights abuses in the wake of the state of emergency
- KPK enabled to initiate a media-monitoring programme to analyse the role of the media and the medias' access to information during the state of emergency.
- Support for of economic support for a monitoring program within the Federations of Nepali Journalists (FNJ) offered by

IMS. In September 2002 the FNJ had not approached IMS for an initiation of the project.

- 25 Nepali journalists training in Safety and Conflict Conscious reporting.
- Seven Nepali editors sensitised to the Conflict Conscious reporting practice.
- Team reporting exercise planned for implemented late 2002.

Indicators of success

- Conflict areas monitored and investigative journalism produced from the conflicting areas by the Center for Investigative Journalism.
- 25 Nepali journalists trained in Safety issued and editors introduced to the significance of this subject.
- 25 journalists trained in Conflict Conscious reporting and now interested in the journalism reporting teams.

Methodological considerations

At a time when the conflict in Nepal is on-going and with no de-escalation in sight the two IMS interventions provided media support likely to help reduce repression of the media and other human rights abuses during the conflict.

The investigative reporting of the KPK will assist in retaining a level of accountability in Nepal at time when the media is increasingly subjected to harassment and subjecting itself to self-censorship. The lessons learned by PKP through this project will serve as a basis for IMS interventions in other conflicts.

The close connection between the KPK and the Himal Association, a non-profit entity with high standing in Nepal publishing, ensures credibility and may possibly also assist in securing the safety of the journalists involved.

Through partnership with a politically neutral organization (Nepal Press Institute) IMS assisted in raising – through the Danish Embassy in Katmandu – funds to cover the local costs of the three training modules.

Liberia

Background

In September 2002 the armed conflict between the authoritarian government of James Taylor and rebel forces continued with no early de-escalation in sight. A cease-fire / peace-arrangements in 2000 failed and the human rights situation has continued to deteriorate. Repression of dissent, and any independent media activity, has led to widespread self-censorship, closure of media and many journalists have left. The conflict has strong implications for regional stability.

In July 2002, the Media Foundation for West Africa (MFWA) held an international meeting of human rights organisations, civil society and other pro-democracy advocates to develop strategies for an international campaign to address the situation in Liberia.

IMS participated in the meeting with a view to identify and develop activities in collaboration with MFWA, Centre for Democratic Empowerment (CEDE) and the Liberian Human Rights coalition. A six-month programme was developed.

Intervention

The programme consist of the following three components, developed with input from and partly financed by IMS:

Monitoring and Information

This involves setting up:

- A information monitoring and collection desk in Monrovia reporting to MFWA in Ghana.
- Processing at MFWA and distribution to the African Commission for Human and Peoples Rights, IFEX, human rights groups, ECOWAS and other intergovernmental bodies.
- The CEDE office in neighboring Ivory Coast will provide further contextual analysis

Legal Defence

A Legal Defense project will raise international attention on freedom of expression abuses; strengthen the independence of the judiciary and mobilize local lawyers. It will also providing legal support for victims and rights defenders.

An important feature is the engagement of international expertise in order to ensure attention, publicity and thereby pressure.

Safe Haven for persecuted journalists

A temporary Safe Haven project in Ghana intended to keep exiled journalists professionally active and to prepare them to return to Liberia. Beneficiary journalists will publish a newsletter for Liberian refugees also to be published on the Internet.

Results

- MFWA organised and carried out the Liberia Conference and IMS provided input to the meeting
- MFWA publish book on Human Rights Violations in Liberia with support from IMS.
- The key media monitoring person in Monrovia was funded by IMS to attend the annual meeting and training workshop of IFEX in Dakar in September.
- MFWA has started its Liberia Campaign.

Indicators of success

- Conference held and plan of action for further Campaign and monitoring activities finalised
- Project document with detailed strategy for the Liberia Campaign submitted to IMS.

Methodological considerations

The Conference presented key issues related to media, human rights and freedom of expression in Liberia. Important Liberian press and human rights organisations and individuals participated. This gave IMS an opportunity to design immediate follow-up interventions. A strategy for the Liberia campaign has been developed as collaborative effort between IMS, local Liberian partners and MFWA, which has spearheaded the Campaign.

Chechnya

Background

In August 2002, the war in Chechnya continued and there were no significant signs of any settlement or structured negotiations between the warring parties.

The population of some 700.000 people still in Chechnya are under constant threat of arbitrary harassment from Chechen separatists fighting for the independence of the Chechen Republic – or groups pursuing less transparent causes – and Russian troops known for their lack of discipline. Amnesty International reported how, during 2001, both sides to the conflict in Chechnya continued to commit

serious human rights abuses. Violations committed by Russian forces included arbitrary detention in secret detention centres and pits in the ground, torture and ill-treatment, "disappearances", and extra judicial executions. Chechen forces attacked civilians working in the local administration in Chechnya, failed to take steps to minimize civilian casualties during attacks and ill-treated and unlawfully killed captured Russian soldiers.

Neither political, nor military solutions to the conflict looked likely in the near future.

No independent media operate in Chechnya. Electronic and print media all operate under firm control of the pro-Russian authorities installed in the main city of Grozny and backed by Russian troops.

Some Chechen media professionals continue to supply independent information, including still photos and live footage, to underground networks, which feed this material to international media, to Chechen media publishing outside Russia (primarily on the internet) and to human rights groups.

International support help maintain one or two media in the Chechen communities in Russia, but these are strictly monitored by Russian authorities.

Russian media are often accused of biased reporting on Chechnya and many Chechen complain of inadequate coverage of the war in the international media.

Interventions

In August 2002 IMS engaged a consultant, temporarily working in Moscow, in a process to map existing media development initiatives addressing the Chechen war, as well as potential partners for politically neutral IMS intervention.

IMS has also established partnership with the Caucasus program of the Institute for War and Peace Reporting (UK), which has a significant Chechen component.

Results

In September 2002 the intervention was still in its research phase.

Indicators of success

- In September 2002 the intervention was still in its research phase.

Methodological considerations

In mid-2002 the war in Chechnya, apart from being utterly brutal and unpredictable, was causing increasing tension in the Caucasus region. Research indicated no increase in the relatively low level of international support for media initiatives addressing the issue, and an IMS intervention was decided upon.

The overall objective of IMS is to assist in sustaining and develop channels for open debate and free flows of information in the Chechen communities, and, if feasible, to contribute to professional coverage of the war in Chechnya in the Russian media.

The IMS intervention pursues strict political neutrality – IMS supports neither the separatists nor the Russian authorities.

Identification of relevant individual or institutional partners, and establishment of constructive partnership-structures, is a key priority and is likely to take considerable time.

Partnership with other international actors already engaged in media initiatives or related activities are considered a necessity in countering inevitable logistical and politically motivated obstacles. Also, IMS remains cognizant of the severe security implications to any local partners engaged.

3.4 Media Assistance after the cease-fire

- *Afghanistan, Sri Lanka, Sierra Leone*

General Considerations

IMS has intervened in immediate post-conflict areas focussing on emerging opportunities for media support, which could assist in securing conditions for cease-fires or more substantial peace processes. At this stage of a conflict it has been important to identify the appropriate entry points as well as best options for engagement.

Any conflict transformation period is complex. It has therefore been important for IMS to identify a selection of mechanisms and instruments tailor-made to the specific, immediate post-conflict situation. Again, it is important to consider the roles and capacities of various actors involved – at local, regional and international level.

IMS has attempted to identify key factors indicating opportunities for promotion of better conditions for media work:

- The presence of international peacekeepers and/or an outright defeat of one of the warring parties (Afghanistan & Angola).

In Afghanistan this lead to a quick emergence of a diversity of media outlets and restructuring of existing media.

- Resumed peace negotiations or ceasefire.

At this stage in the conflict, national institution will often be eager to cooperate with international actors in promoting sustainable peace (Sri Lanka/Sudan). An urgent need for reconciliation creates new responsibilities for the media (Sri Leone).

- The presence of transitional governments (Afghanistan).

This may indicate that the process is going in the right direction, although the risk of a return to partisan and biased reporting is still present. Political power struggles may prevent positive media development, as may lack of professionalism and proper codes of conduct.

- Media association re-focus on professional standards and legal frameworks for free media are put in place

Professionalization becomes paramount (Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka and Afghanistan). IMS interventions introduce new conflict reporting practices (Sri Lanka/Sierra Leone on TRC).

As the media legal framework in a transitional country and region is in place the IMS mandate runs out. It is now the task of media development organisations to take over and continue the work.

IMS key achievements in this phase of the conflict are primarily linked to its role as initiator and facilitator of partner constellations better suited to address emerging needs.

Afghanistan

In September 2002 the newly established interim government in Afghanistan, supported by international troops, was still mainly in control only of the Kabul region, with unclear power structures in several provinces. President Karzei narrowly missed an assassination attempt and unknown opponents to his regime detonated large bombs in central Kabul. Strong warlords in the provinces were still reluctant to pledge alliance to the government in Kabul.

A mushrooming independent media community in Kabul was filling an information vacuum created by the Taliban, and there were moves to promote independent journalism in other urban centres. The government signed internationally acclaimed vows to defend freedom of the media, promote public service broadcasting and generally create an environment conducive to independent media.

International organisations involved in media development met little or no government opposition to their initiatives.

Intervention

In late 2001, three weeks into the war in Afghanistan, IMS undertook a mission to Pakistan with a double objective:

- To appraise the feasibility of an Afghan Radio Project by the Baltic Media Centre and
- To assess the general media and freedom of expression situation in Afghanistan and identify specific media related projects

Shortly after, IMS provided support to two smaller, international media development organisations eager to engage in media development in Afghanistan (Paris-based AINA, and London-based Institute for War and Peace Reporting, IWPR).

In January 2002 IMS fielded a short mission to Kabul with a double objective:

- To provide input for a joint IMS / ARTICLE19 project to facilitate concerted Afghan participation in policy making for media development
- To promote coordination among international organisations involved in media development in Afghanistan

Results:

The following are considered the main results of these interventions:

- The 2001 IMS mission (with ARTICLE19 and BMC) published an early assessment of possible action for media development in Afghanistan
- In January 2002 the mission also resulted in a joint project by the IFJ and IMS providing basic security training for about 100 Afghan journalists
- The involvement of BMC in the first IMS mission provided input for what is now a high-profile joint BMC / Radio Afghanistan project ('Good Morning Afghanistan') in Kabul.
- IMS support to AINA and IWPR enabled them to quickly establish a presence in Kabul. Both are now among the key international organisations in media development in Kabul.
- IMS facilitation helped establish cooperation between international media developers, a number of which now share a common platform in Kabul at the Afghan Media & Culture Centre, managed by AINA.

- IMS provided key input to a joint ARTICLE19/IMS project to facilitate participation by the Afghan media community in policy making for media development. ARTICLE19 is implementing this project in Kabul, providing new opportunities for the Afghan media community to influence donors and policy makers.

Indicators of success

- Safety training provided to 100 Afghan journalists
- Kabul has one, all-embracing media resource centre (and not several competing centres, as the outlooks were in late 2001)
- The Afghan media community is receiving expert input (by ARTICLE19) for formulation of common positions on media development

Methodological considerations

Experience from other post-conflict environments indicates how strong involvement of the national media community in media development (at policy as well as project level) is essential if sustainable results are to be achieved, and that this involvement is not easily established. Likewise, synchronizing of efforts by international media development organisations is also recognised as key to sound media development, but not easily established.

IMS reacted quickly to the crisis in Afghanistan. This allowed for early provision of information and contacts to several international media development organisations were preparing to engage in Afghanistan. It also created an opportunity for IMS to advocate inter-organisational synchronization and information sharing; an approach, which proved effective and which is now pursued elsewhere (Sudan).

Throughout, IMS has emphasised the need for strong involvement of the Afghan media community and civil society in the shaping of a post-Taliban media environment. As no other international organisation seemed to be addressing this issue directly, IMS decided to engage in a one-year project on this core perspective, and formulated a joint project with ARTICLE19.

As the time frame and budget for this project outgrew the short-term mandate and the financial limitations of ordinary IMS interventions, an application for funding was submitted to the Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs. IMS did not succeed in raising the necessary funds for its part of the project, but as from mid-2002 the core components of the project were being implemented by ARTICLE19.

Sierra Leone

Background

Sierra Leone has for the past ten years been one of the most dangerous countries for both local and foreign journalists. Now the country is trying to return to normal life under the peace agreement established in Lomé July 1999.

The agreement provides for a Truth and Reconciliation Commission as a healing instrument, modelled on South African experiences. The Commission has been established and a Special Court set up by the UN and the Government of Sierra Leone, which will try people accused of genocide or crimes against humanity.

In this situation, where a fragile disarmament process is on-going on, the Sierra Leone Association of Journalists (SLAJ) is working to ensure informed and sensitive coverage of the Truth Commission's work.

Already one disruption of the disarmament process has occurred because the rebels got the feeling through the media that they would be witch-hunted by the Commission.

Intervention

Training for Truth and Reconciliation-reporting

Based on the recommendation of (SLAJ) and a report from the International Crisis Group indicating that " a better public information job needs to be done to explain the Special Court to prevent fears of indictment from disruption of the peace process" IMS is now developing a training programme for selected journalists who will report on the work of the Truth Commission.

Experienced trainers from South Africa, who have been part of the Truth and Reconciliation process there, have been engaged.

IMS collaborate with MWFA and SLAJ in the design of a concrete approach to this training exercise.

In mid-2002 MWFA and SLAJ, with IMS funds, made an initial assessment of the needs among journalists and within the Truth Commission.

Secondly an IMS mission, implemented by MFWA further developed the approach. Cooperation has been established with the South African consultants, Canadian Journalists for Free Expression (CJFE) and a Danish Consultant. CJFE has set-up an important and appropriate development programme for five newspapers in Sierra Leone and the IMS intervention will build on the experiences gained by CJFE.

Phase three will be the actual implementation of the training course in two phases with an interim period of practical work (October-December 2002).

Indicators of success

- Improved coverage of the TRC process
- Greater understanding in the larger public on of the TRC process.

Methodological considerations

In preparing for this TRC training intervention the MFWA has been involved considerably. This approach is essential since it allows the exercise to be carried out by a regional partner with substantial expertise from Sierra Leone.

IMS sees the collaboration through regional organisations such as MWFA as crucial.

Sri Lanka

Background

In late February 2002 a cease-fire agreement between the Liberation Tamil Tigers of Eelam (LTTE) and the government in Sri Lanka brought a halt to the 19-year old armed conflict. Four previous cease-fire attempts have failed to bring peace.

In September 2002 the Colombo government formally lifted the ban on LTTE and started formal negotiations with LTTE on a power-sharing arrangement.

The conflict have severely affected the media: A number of journalists have been killed, harassed and threatened by both sides of the conflict, censorship prevailed until recently as a central tool in government attempts to influence public opinion, and no independent media have operated in the zones under LTTE control.

After the signing of the ceasefire, however, it became evident that the media themselves also constituted one of the obstacles to the cease-fire / peace-process. Several mainstream media pursue strong, nationalistic agendas, not only in their editorial comment, but also through slanted and/or unprofessional journalistic coverage of the cease-fire process.

Intervention

In early April 2002 IMS fielded a consultant to assess possibilities for promoting professional standards in media coverage of the peace process. The mission forged partnerships between IMS and several Sri Lankan media institutions.

Based on these partnerships, as well on a partnership forged with the Canadian Institute for Media, Policy and Community (IMPACS) IMS in June implemented a series of short seminars and in-house training sessions in Colombo to promote professional standards and modern editorial tools for conflict reporting. The main components were

- A two-day training seminar for sub-editors and senior reporters
- Four half day in-house seminars for media institutions in Colombo
- Training-of-trainers in conflict reporting with four Sri Lankan media professionals

Results

- Towards 100 media professionals in Colombo mainstream media introduced to practical tools for more professional coverage of the ceasefire/peace process.
- Four Sri Lankan media professionals introduced to teaching methodology suitable for modern concepts on conflict reporting.
- A hand-book on professional coverage of conflict designed for Sri Lanka (now under production)
- International media development actor (IMPACS) engaged in follow-up activity in Sri Lanka

Indicators of success

- Adherence to professional standards in media coverage of the peace process strengthened
- Hand-book on professional conflict coverage distributed to media professionals in Sri Lanka
- Follow-up activities implemented by project partners, including IMPACS, in Sri Lanka

Methodological considerations

Several earlier peace processes in Sri Lanka have failed. In mid-2002 observers in Colombo, including local media professionals and Norwegian peace talk mediators, identified the non-adherence to professional standards by mainstream Sri Lanka media as a serious obstacle to peace. As no other actors appeared to be immediately addressing this issue, an IMS intervention was decided upon.

Emphasis was put on establishment of the closest possible relationship with local media institutions (Editors Guild, Free Media Movement, Centre for Counter-Conflict Journalism).

Actual project design was done in partnership with a Colombo think-tank, Centre for Policy Alternatives, selected for its record of scrupulous impartiality and professionalism.

Ross Howard, an international consultant and IMPACS associate with a proven record in promoting professional standards in conflict reporting was engaged. Sustainability was pursued through a training-of-trainers component, encouragement of local follow-up activities (including the production of a handbook) as well as through the engagement of IMPACS as project partner. IMPACS decided to combine involvement in the IMS project with its own needs-assessment and follow-up activities.

Tunisia

Background

In January 2002 RSF recommended that IMS focus on the media situation in general in Tunisia and more specifically on an independent publication *Kalima*.

The president of Tunisia, Ben Ali is running for a fourth (unconstitutional and unprecedented) term of office. Since 1987 he has created a highly personalized political system that is managed through authoritarian rules and principles. Imprisonment, torture and other physical threats make it increasingly difficult for civil society organizations to operate. Independent media are virtually non-existent, save *Kalima* and one or two others.

Intervention

In April 2002, after consultation with RSF, *Kalima* staff and a human rights network for the Mediterranean countries (Euromed Network) IMS fielded a consultant to:

- Assess the general media environment in Tunisia with a specific focus on the conditions for print media
- Make recommendations with regard to IMS' approach to assisting individual publications

- Assess the newspaper *Kalima* and recommend an IMS approach to assisting the paper.

Results

- An offer of substantive management training was made, but this was not a preferred avenue for *Kalima*, who focused on ensuring financing for its publication.
- IMS provided short term financial assistance and an offer to resume cooperation when this is deemed appropriate by *Kalima*.

Indicators of success

- *Kalima* continues to publish

Methodological considerations

Although Tunisia is not an immediate conflict zone the severe human rights abuses, prolonged suppression of independent media and the fact that only limited international attention is paid to this conundrum justified an IMS intervention.

Also, the intervention was a means to develop a model for support to the numerous individual publications, which approach IMS and other funding agencies for assistance. The mission assisted IMS develop a package that would focus on tools for sustainability instead of simply providing grants.

IMS has to work with the dilemma that it is defined as a short term/rapid response mechanism and most often the problems individual publications are facing are of a long-term nature demanding a long-term developmental approach.

The ambition of IMS, when developing strategies in this area of media support, would be to look at ways by which *sustainability* can become an element of its work (in conflict areas) without transforming IMS into a development organization.

The recommendations made with regard to *Kalima* underlines the importance of IMS facilitating a link between such individual media and the international publishing expertise.

Discussion on development of a 'Extreme Management' package for individual media in crisis has since been initiated with the Media Development Loan Fund, Prague.

4. Methodological Considerations

Outputs as identified in the IMS Project Document:

- *During year one of the project process tools developed as general IMS instruments within the areas of; Needs Assessments, Project and Strategy Development; Project Cycle Management; Monitoring and Evaluation of Impact;*
- *During the pilot period of two years toolbox developed as specific IMS instruments within: Conflict-analysis, Facilitation of Processes. Organizing Associations of Journalists in pre-conflict and conflict areas; Legal Assistance; Distribution in pre-conflict and conflict areas; Human Rights/Freedom of Expression instruments; Training of trainers and development of procedures for self-monitoring and conflict management/prevention as well as Conflict resolution techniques, Lobbying and Campaigning.*

Background

The IMS Project Document requires the IMS to

- i) Develop project process tools that would enable IMS to sharpen its approach to the preparation and management of provision of emergency support to media.
- ii) Develop specific tools for implementation of projects in pre-conflict, conflict and immediate post-conflict scenario

Actions

1. Project tools

Attempts have been made to initiate the development of *project process tools* by introducing a Logical Framework Approach (LFA), i.e. working according to *objectives* - to the development of:

- Precise *Terms of Reference* (TOR) for consultancies carried out for IMS. Being an output & action oriented organisation it has been important for IMS that both staff and consultants hired by the organisation is familiar with project planning and implementation tools.

TOR has been prepared requesting staff and consultants to transform findings into immediate actions. The IMS secretariat has provided consultants with a structure and format for reporting to IMS.

- Actions have in most cases been preceded by a *project document* detailing the *objectives, strategy, outputs, inputs (budgets) and activities* for the specific interventions.

The intention has been to transform classical project preparation formats used for long-term developmental interventions into tools for short-term media emergency assistance.

- *(Self)Monitoring and evaluation* constitute an important part of the work of IMS. This is done through a continuous direct contact with partner organisations.

Implementation is in fact carried out as a partnership arrangement. Monitoring is also done through reporting from IMS staff, consultants and partners. Classical parameters for reviews and evaluations (*relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability*) have been established. It is, however, still an area that needs focus.

2. Tools for intervention

2.1 *Analysis.*

The development of tools for analysis has been inspired by existing attempts to systematically carry out conflict assessments. (DFID, Forum for Early Warning and Early Response, International Alert and Safer World).

Early IMS analysis should answer fundamental questions related to: *Why* a conflict? *What* is it about? *Where* is the conflict? *Who* are the main protagonists? and *Which* media are involved?

Secondly, during missions analysis and assessment will continue. (Sudan, Middle East). In other instances rapid assessments have been made through participation in larger conferences and workshops in or in the vicinity of a conflict area. (Colombia, Liberia, Indonesia).

2.2 *Strategy*

When analysis and assessments are carried out strategy development takes place either on the spot, or as an extensive mail dialogue with potential partners – or both.

In the case the Middle East, Indonesia and Somalia consultative fora were set-up with resource people from different fields of expertise discussing appropriate strategies for intervention.

The choice of strategy is made through a prioritising exercise, which looks at:

- What are the most critical issues to address,

- What capacities exist locally, regionally and internationally and within the identified partners
- What resources are available
- What are the other initiatives of other agencies and partners
- What is the time frame for the activity
- What are the possibilities for follow-up (long-term assistance)

2.3 Operational tools

IMS interventions during the first year of operations have designed on the basis of one or more of the following approaches:

Institutional/Organisational approach

The institutional and organisational approach has been divided in roughly two lines of action:

- i) Support to organisations involved in *joint actions*.

IMS has in some instances facilitated setting-up joint collaborative initiatives (Afghanistan, Zimbabwe, – Safe Haven – and Angola) in order to strengthen impact. The joint approach also has proven to be more focused on action needs (i.e. what is necessary to address) rather than based on an arbitrary agenda of the individual local, regional or international media organisation (AINA, IWPR, MISA).

In other cases IMS has assisted existing attempts to address pressing media emergency and safety needs (Colombia). In the case of Colombia the *Antonio Narino Project* exemplify an effort to bring together media stakeholders representing different interests (journalists, publishers, training initiatives, electronic media etc.) with a view to address issues of common interest (Media Para Las Paz, FLIP, ANDIARIOS, MFWA).

- ii) Assistance to individual media organisations and institutions.

International media organisations such as RSF, IFEX, IFJ and WAN has on several occasions forwarded requests for assistance from individual media institutions. IMS has in each case made a thorough assessment of the activities and needs of the institutions. In most cases has IMS provided a combined package with institutional support linked to capacity building (SOAT - Sudan, Kalima – Tunisia, Scharogi Rus - Tajikistan) or up-link with regional/international peers.

Media content transformation and safety approach

Different tools have been identified for possible use in interventions aimed at providing improved media content. Leading international experts in the field of training for better conflict reporting have been engaged. A combination of this expertise and physical safety training

for journalists (which has proven to be a singularly effective ‘ice-breaker’) has now been developed and successfully tested (Nepal).

As a separate tool, the promotion of investigative reporting on conflict issues/human rights abuses during times of increased (self) censorship, has been applied in Nepal. Lesson learned here are instrumental in shaping this tool for possible use in other interventions.

Facilitation approach

Facilitation is an increasingly important part of IMS operations. As the challenges and threats to media operations around the world become increasingly complex, so does the need for multi-faceted answers.

To address a specific upcoming media emergency task IMS has on several instances facilitated a joint approach by inviting relevant organisations to partake in appropriate interventions – e.g. Safe Haven for journalists in South Africa and Ghana.

During fact-finding missions IMS has also identified immediate needs and subsequently established cooperation with suitable organisations to address those needs – (safety training for Afghan journalists with IFJ, media monitoring in Sudan with IFEX, conflict reporting training with IMPACS in Sri Lanka, media support for Chechnya with IWPR).

IMS approach to pro-active sharing of information (see section 5) is an integral part of its facilitation efforts.

IMS intends to further develop its approach to facilitation.

Sustainability

IMS has financial resources for short-term *crisis interventions*. It is, however, also within its mandate to ensure that the initiated activities (addressing immediate needs) can be continued by other organisations. IMS therefore fundraises not only to continue activities that it has initiated but also to allow other relevant organisations to engage with new and relevant activities.

In Nepal it has been possible to mobilise funds through the Danish Embassy for a combined package containing safety training, conflict conscious journalism training and team reporting. Financial input to this package came from IMS, IFJ, UNESCO, The Danish Embassy, and the Rory Peck Foundation. Fund raising was in this case a joint effort of IMS and IFJ.

In Sri Lanka IMS initiated intervention with its own funding. Subsequently, partnership with IMPACS was established: IMPACS facilitated (CIDA) funding for implementation and developed its own approach to continued conflict related media support in Sri Lanka.

2.4 Further considerations on methodology

Methods have to emerge from the actual activities implemented. IMS should therefore not operate with a rigidly pre-defined methodology and intervention package. IMS methods continue as a mix of:

- i) A specific IMS perspective on interventions in pre-conflict, conflict and immediate post-conflict situations – based on needs assessments and facilitation of immediate actions through joint approaches,
- ii) Specific tools for project development and facilitation
- iii) Specific training packages developed to address immediate needs (Conflict Conscious Journalism Training in Sri Lanka, possibly combined with safety training as in Nepal ('the body and soul package'); training for Truth and Reconciliation coverage / Sierra Leone)

During the initial 12 months of IMS operations the choice of intervention areas around the world has both been determined by an assessment of the specific conflict as well as the possibility for IMS to develop and test new tools for intervention. The development of appropriate tools is and will continue to be an on-going exercise and challenge.

5. Information and International networking & Cooperation

Outputs as identified in the IMS Project Document

- *Network of Danish and International specialists established and database developed for operational use.*
- *Network and mechanism for information sharing and coordination established with the International and national organizations/institutions working with (emergency) assistance to*

Background

The outputs defined for this component of the IMS project focus on two key aspects of its operations:

- i) The development of a functional web site and database containing information about Danish and International experts in the field of media and conflict management. The database was also meant to gather comprehensive information about media emergency projects around the world.
- ii) Secondly this component would attempt to develop an approach to the networking and collaboration with potential partners among International organisations and institutions working with media emergency assistance.

Information

The IMS *website* was launched in May 2002. The first version of the website contain the following areas:

- A documentation area providing users with an overview of past and ongoing IMS interventions
- Easy access to information about IMS
- Links to IMS partners
- A search facility.

The establishment of a web site has been time consuming. In September 2002 the process of filing back material on the web site was still ongoing.

In mid 2002 an *IMS brochure*, outlining the IMS mandate and means of operation was produced.

In July 2002 a draft *IMS communications policy* was produced, covering IMS's communication needs and a communications strategy for the second year of IMS operations. This draft policy paper embraced lessons learned through the first year of IMS ad hoc information activities (web, TV- and radio-appearances, print media articles etc.)

The draft communication strategy suggests that "IMS has an obligation to partake in public debate on freedom of expression. (...)The expertise and experience accumulated through IMS operations should therefore be regarded as a public resource and activated whenever this is relevant and when this will not jeopardise the operations of IMS or its partners".

It also suggests how "future IMS interventions should be systematically communicated through the mass media (...) so as to inspire related interventions by other actors or to assist directly in promoting the concept of media support / freedom of expression as a tool for promotion of peace and stability."

The draft policy highlighted "the possible negative fall-out from the publication of, for instance, critical comments about the authorities or policies in a specific country. Paramount to any information activity should be the safety of individuals and institutions who collaborate with IMS and of their operations, and secondly, the protection of the IMS intervention in question. In general, any material made public under the IMS banner should be designed so as not to jeopardize either."

International networking and cooperation

After the first year of operation, the establishment of optimal relations with other media development agencies and other actors in the field of media support remain central to IMS. It appears that these links and IMS' ability to create grounds and strategies for coordination and common action may be one of the keys to better understanding the proper role of IMS in the future.

The creation of optimal links to relevant international partners is sustained mainly in three ways:

- Through joint interventions / facilitation
- Through pro-active sharing of information and networking
- Through formal structures (board, Advisory Council)

The approach to *joint operations and facilitation* is covered elsewhere in this report.

Pro-active sharing of information is emerging as a significant tool. It is in the nature of IMS interventions that they will often

generate information, which is valuable for other actors in the field of media support. This may be information accumulated through pre-mission research, through assessment missions or during actual project implementation. In some instances a simple collection of names and local telephone numbers in a given country may make a difference, in other instances the value will lie in a more comprehensive, media- and conflict-oriented IMS field report.

IMS has adopted from the outset a strategy that differs from that of some other organisations. While some organisations may regard their base of knowledge a private asset, IMS regards the sharing of information as an integral part of fulfilling its mandate and as an important tool in its own operations.

This has proven to be an effective approach. By actively sharing information, IMS has been able to quickly forge active relationships with several organisations, which have since proven fruitful in the course of IMS operations.

In September 2002 a more systematic approach to this pro-active information sharing was under development.

Networking and cooperation has been pursued throughout the first year of IMS operation.

The IMS secretariat has in the reporting established working relations with the following organisations:

World Association of Journalists (WAN). Constructive collaboration has been established with WAN on Colombia (see above), Sri Lanka and for several other operations.

International Federation of Journalists (IFJ). IMS has collaborated successfully with IFJ on the implementation of Journalist Safety Training courses in Afghanistan, in the Middle East and Nepal and enjoys frequent contact with IFJ on several other matters.

Reporters Sans Frontieres (RSF). RSF directed the attention of IMS to the project in Tunisia, (see above) and IMS has consulted RSF on its intervention in Sudan.

UNESCO. Through the IMS chairman, Mr. Torben Krogh good contacts have been made with UNESCO. Collaboration with UNESCO has been established in relation to the Afghanistan and the Sri Lanka intervention.

Media Action International (MAI). The IMS met with the director of MAI, Edward Girardet.

Institute for War and Peace Reporting (IWPR). IMS has established a strong working relationship with this London based organisation through support for its operation in Afghanistan and, since August 2002, through IMS involvement in the IWPR's Caucasus (+ Chechnya) programme.

ARTICLE 19. Strong relations with ARTICLE 19 have been instrumental in several instances, and in particular in development of the Afghanistan Media Transition Project now being implemented by ARTICLE19. Collaboration with ARTICLE 19 was also crucial with regard to the Zimbabwean IMS intervention.

PANOS. Contacts have been established with PANOS London looking into the possibility of collaboration. The PANOS programme on Media for Peace in Africa is of particular relevance to IMS intervention in the Horn of Africa.

International Freedom of Expression Exchange (IFEX). IMS is working regularly with IFEX; supplying information to the network and cooperating with the IFEX Outreach programme in supporting media monitoring in conflict scenario (Sudan, Nepal, Liberia, Colombia).

Committee To Protection of Journalists (CPJ). IMS regularly consult the CPJs media monitoring efforts around the world. and has been in touch with the organisation in relation to a journalist from Uzbekistan seeking asylum in Denmark.

Index on Censorship. IMS has pursued cooperation with Index focussed on the extensive experience that Index has with regard to publishing and on with Index's project to provide "emergency assistance to individual publications under threat".

Media Institute of Southern Africa (MISA). Of regional/local organisations IMS have worked with MISA on media emergency programmes for Southern Africa, particularly Zimbabwe and South Africa. Contacts made through the Executive Director Mr. Luckson Chipara and the director of MISA Zimbabwe Ms. Sarah Chiumb.

NIZA – Netherlands Institute for Southern Africa. IMS has worked (co-funded) projects with NIZA in Zimbabwe and pursued coordination with regard to support for community radio in DR Congo.

Open Society Institute Southern Africa (OSISA). IMS has co-funded the Zimbabwe Safe Haven initiative with OSISA.

Institute for Media, Policy and Civil Society (IMPACS). IMS worked closely with IMPACS in design and implementation of the intervention in Sri Lanka.

Local media organisations.

The many local organisations, which IMS has worked with is listed under the individual interventions.

Conclusion

The networking efforts of IMS are an on-going exercise and key to fulfil the mandate of the organisation. Networking and facilitation of cooperation between international organisations and between international, regional and national organisations has emerged as a still more central feature of IMS interventions. It does not make any sense for IMS to operate by itself. It is by working with and through existing national, regional and international organisations that IMS will be able to make a real difference. So far the collaboration has mainly been with international organisations and the Danish partners have yet to be specifically involved in the IMS interventions.

6. Sustainability and upcoming interventions

6.1 Sustainability

An evaluation of IMS will take place early 2003 with a view to assess the *effectiveness, relevance and impact* of the work of IMS during the pilot phase. It is the intention to submit a proposal to FRESTA and Danida for further funding.

It is, however, also necessary for IMS to diversify the funding/financing base of the organisation.

IMS has prepared and initiated a limited number of interventions, funded by extra-budgetary funds. This has allowed the organisation to charge a 7% administration fee. This generates additional funds for the organisation (extending the operating field with more activities) but it is not likely that IMS would be "self-sustainable" through this type of income generation.

The possibility of "selling consultancy services" has been discussed and still needs to be carefully considered. It could distract the work of the organisation away from its core mandate.

6.2 Upcoming Interventions

	Country	Description	Status and Timing
1.	Indonesia	Fact-finding mission finalised and IMS preparing intervention possibly with UNESCO and Indonesian Conflict Studies Network re. conflict reduction. Possible collaboration with Alliance of Independent Journalists on Maluku Media Centre.	A modality for collaboration is being put in place and it is expected that activities will start November 2002.
2.	Iraq	Assessment of an approach to Iraq	Potential partners are being identified
3.	Angola	IMS has encouraged the setting up of a task force (with relevant organisations engaged in media development in Southern Africa) to travel to Angola for a joint needs assessment	The mission is being prepared by Media Institute for Southern Africa (MISA).
4.	Burma	Fact-finding mission to exiled communities in neighbouring countries.	Report commissioned; deadline app. 1.2.2003
5.	Central Asia	Assessment/fact-finding	Mission set-up as a joint

		mission to four Central Asian countries to identify possible interventions.	intervention with the FRESTA. October-November 2002
6.	Somalia	Assessment/fact-finding mission with national and regional perspective to identify possible interventions.	Mission to include IMS + Media Foundation for West Africa. Mission to visit also Ethiopia and Sudan for regional perspective December 2002
7.	Ethiopia	Emergency assistance to Eth. Free Journ. Ass. from Oct. 2002 to April 2003 based on urgent requests from EFJA, through IFEX and IFJ.	See above: 'Somalia'
8.	Montenegro	Assistance for round-table focusing on the governments intention to amend key clauses in the media legislation and thereby restricting freedom of expression in the country	Baltic Media Centre with other media organizations present in South Eastern Europe has taken the initiative. IMS has been requested to be available for follow-up. November 2002.
9.	Global Conference on Investigative Journalism 2003	IMS collaborating with the organisers to create focus on design of a 'rapid reaction mechanism' mobilising international investigative reporters for investigations of media related human rights abuses, e.g. killings of journalists/editors	IMS in ongoing dialogue with conference organisers (FUJ / IRE) for this world event 2003. Includes also conference invitations to journalists from conflict areas.
10.	International Safe Haven Initiative	IMS spearheading consultations on design of worldwide safe Haven mechanism for threatened media workers. Dialogue to include UNHCR, IFEX, CPJ, RsF, IFJ, WAN, Red Cross and others	Dialogue initiated at IFEX annual meeting, Dakar Sept. 2002.
11.	Handbook on Conscious Conflict Reporting	Handbook produced through IMS intervention in Sri Lanka, June 2002, adapted to Nepal in September 2002. Easily adaptable IMS Conflict Reporting Handbook now available for world-wide use	Handbook designed by int. conflict reporting expert, Ross Howard, based on his key role in IMS interventions in Sri Lanka and Nepal.