

Democracy Support through the United Nations

Report 10/2010 - Evaluation

Mozambique Case Report

COUNTRY CASE STUDY REPORTS

This country case study is one of several such reports that are part of an assessment of Norwegian support to democratic development (DemDev) through the United Nations system.

These case reports are not independent evaluations of the programmes or projects discussed, but rather studies of both the decisions taken by Norway and the UN to support the particular DemDev process, and the key factors that may explain the results. These studies should thus be seen as working documents for the general evaluation of the Norwegian support.

Task Team:

Mr. Arne **Disch**, Scanteam, team leader

Ms. Katia **Taela**, Independent consultant

Peer Reviewer:

Ms. Liv **Moberg**, Scanteam

Contents

1	Background and Introduction	1
1.1	The Mozambique Case Report	1
2	Country Context	2
3	Project Background and Description	4
3.1	Project Background	4
3.2	Project Development and Approval Process	8
3.3	Project Objectives	9
3.4	Management and Implementation of Project	9
4	Project Results	13
4.1	Documenting Project Achievements	13
4.2	General Changes to the Media Environment	17
4.3	Programme Theory and Linked-in DemDev Dimensions	21
5	Findings and Conclusions	25
5.1	Assessing Project Results	25
5.2	UN as Channel	29
5.3	Key Factors Explaining Results	31
5.4	Final Observations	32
5.4.1	Summing Up	39
	Annex A: Persons Interviewed	35
	Annex B: Documents Consulted	36
	Annex C: Results Frameworks	39

Abbreviations and Acronyms

AEJ	Association of Print Publishers (<i>Associação das Empresas Jornalísticas</i>)
AMCS	Association of Women in Media (<i>Associação das Mulheres na Comunicação Social</i>)
BDP	Bureau for Development Policy, UNDP
CC	Communication Centre
CMC	Community Multimedia Centre
CR	Community Radio
DemDev	Democratic Development
DO	Development Objective
FORCOM	National Forum of Community Radios (<i>Foro para Radio Comunitário</i>)
Gabinfo	Information Office (<i>Gabinete da Informação</i>), in Prime Minister's office
ICS	Institute of Social Communication (<i>Instituto de Comunicação Social</i>)
IO	Immediate Objective
IPDC	International Programme for the Development of Communication (UNESCO)
MASC	Fund for Civil Society Support (<i>Mecanismo de Apoio à Sociedade Civil</i>)
MDP	Media Development Project
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MFA	Ministry of Foreign Affairs
MISA	Media Institute of Southern Africa
MLS	Media Landscape Study
NSJC	Nordic-SADC Journalism Centre
NOK	Norwegian <i>Kroner</i>
OGC	Oslo Governance Centre (part of Bureau for Development Policy, UNDP)
RM	Radio Mozambique (<i>Radio de Moçambique</i>)
SADC	Southern African Development Community
TAG	Technical Advisory Group
TPR	Tri-Partite Review
TOR	Terms of Reference
TVM	Mozambique Television (<i>Televisão do Moçambique</i>)
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
UNFPA	United Nations Population Fund
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
USD	United States Dollar

1 Background and Introduction

Scanteam, in partnership with the Overseas Development Institute of the UK, the Stockholm Policy Group of Sweden, and Nord/Sør Konsulentene of Norway, were contracted by Norad's Evaluation Department to carry out the "Evaluation of Norwegian Support to Democratic Development through the United Nations", covering the period 1999-2009. This country case report is one of the foreseen results of this task.

Norway has provided about NOK 2 billion through the United Nations to the areas covered by the concept of Democratic Development. This is to be understood largely in terms of the UN usage: *increased possibilities to participate in the society and in decision-making processes that have impacts on citizens' lives*. The *Objectives* are:

1. **Document the results** of Norwegian multi-bilateral contributions to democratic development;
2. **Undertake an analysis** of how support to different types of activities (elections/ media, etc) has worked in different contexts (i.e. institutional set-up, socio-political context, degree of conflict and level of economic development);
3. **Assess how decisions are made** in relation to allocations and disbursements through the multi-bilateral channel and how this influences development results;
4. **Assess strengths and weaknesses** of different UN organisations and programmes in different contexts; and
5. Provide **recommendations** for future programming for democracy support and for Norwegian positions in relation to the relevant multilateral organisations.

1.1 The Mozambique Case Report

In Mozambique, the team reviewed the support to the development of independent media. This project was selected because it represents the single largest democratic development project Norway has funded through the UN in Mozambique, and because the dimension of media development in itself is an important aspect of democratic development.

This study is based largely on a review of available documentation (see Attachment B) complemented by interviews of relevant stakeholders in the field and at head office level (see Attachment A). Because the evaluation attempts to understand achievements in light of those factors that are considered critical to project results, some attention has been paid to the results frameworks that have been produced (see Attachment C), and studies that might throw some light on identifying the relevant factors, as explained in this report.

2 Country Context

At the time of the 1992 peace agreement between the government party FRELIMO and the rebel movement RENAMO, Mozambique was among the poorest in the world with a GDP/capita of under USD 100. The economy and infrastructure were heavily destroyed, and media was largely state owned and restricted to the capital and a few other cities.

A new Constitution was promulgated on 30 November 1990. In Chapter II on Rights, Duties and Freedoms, Article 74 paragraph 4 states that “the exercise of the rights and freedoms mentioned in this articles shall be regulated by law, based on the imperatives of respect for the Constitution, for the dignity of the human person, and *for the imperatives of foreign policy and of national defence*”(quoted in UNDP/UNESCO 2006, p. 21, their italics).

A new Constitution was approved on 16 November 2004, where Article 48 contains clearer statements on Freedom of Expression, and where the restriction in the last section in italics above is removed (see Box 2.1 below). While the 2004 Constitution thus enshrines a clearer rights-based language, the 1990 Constitution was considered quite liberal when it came to freedom of expression and media at the time it was passed.

Box 2.1: MOZAMBIQUE 2004 CONSTITUTION

CHAPTER II: RIGHTS, DUTIES AND FREEDOMS

Article 48 – Freedom of Expression and Information

1. All citizens shall have the right to freedom of expression and to freedom of the press, as well as the right to information.
2. The exercise of freedom of expression, which consists of the ability to impart one’s opinions by all lawful means, and the exercise of the right to information shall not be restricted by censorship.
3. Freedom of the press shall include, in particular, the freedom of journalistic expression and creativity, access to sources of information, protection of independence and professional secrecy, and the right to establish newspapers, publications and other means of dissemination.
4. In the public sector media, the expression and confrontation of ideas from all currents of opinion shall be guaranteed.
5. The State shall guarantee the impartiality of the public sector media, as well as the independence of journalists from the Government, the Administration and other political powers.
6. The exercise of the rights and freedoms provided for in this article shall be governed by law on the basis of the imperative respect for the Constitution and for the dignity of the human person.

Mozambique’s new Press Law (*Lei da Imprensa, 18/91*) was promulgated on 10 August 1991. Among the most liberal in Africa, during the process of preparing it, the President himself visited the National Journalists’ Association, spending several hours discussing it, thus giving both the *process* and the *final law* strong political legitimacy, in Mozambique society at large, but perhaps most importantly within the governing FRELIMO party itself.

However, the Law on State Safety (*Lei contra a Segurança do Estado, 19/91*) passed only a week later, contains paragraphs that make a wide array of information dissemination activities potentially punishable. While this law has not been used much, its defamation clause was used in August 2008 to prosecute three journalists who in an article in *Zambeze* questioned the nationality of the prime minister. The case was eventually thrown out, partly because the journalists made it a major issue – reflecting their confidence in being able to fight and win – but also because members of government and the President himself were unhappy with this (ab)use of the law.

Already in 1992, a group of journalists set up the independent *MediaCoop* and began publishing *MediaFax*, a daily newsletter distributed by fax, and later the weekly *Savana*. A number of other newspapers were established, largely in the major cities of Maputo and Beira, later on followed by independent radio stations and subsequently also TV. The radio and TV stations tend to belong either to larger institutions like the public Institute for Social Communication (ICS), faith-based organisations – the Catholic Church or the Brazilian *Igreja Universal* – and later on private actors, such as Soico TV.

The state privatized previously state-owned media enterprises, in particular printing houses, and transformed *Radio Moçambique* (RM) from a state radio into a general public service broadcaster. It decentralized, among other things to serve local language communities better: RM broadcast in 21 languages. In 1994 the Ministry of Information was dissolved and instead an information office, *Gabinho* (*Gabinete de Informação*) was set up under the Prime Minister's office, to deal with media policy and related issues.

A number of media projects emerged as the 1992 peace agreement took hold. The ICS was supported by UNFPA as of 1995 and later also by UNICEF. UNICEF provided help to the School of Journalism and to RM's efforts to broadcast more in local languages, and to upgrade its senders and other technical equipment. Denmark, and later on also Sweden and Norway, funded the Nordic-SADC Journalism Centre (NSJC) that had been set up in 1993 and which provided training to journalists from the region. The NSJC was placed in Maputo since Mozambique was the coordinator for communications in the SADC regional program. The NSJC was closed in 2008, largely because program management did not listen to the recommendations from independent evaluations carried out, and the donors thus ended up withdrawing their support.

In 1999, the MDP project funded a first *Media Landscape Study* (Bonin 1999). It mapped the planned and existing media outlets, human and technical resources in the sector and distribution pattern of the media. Over 90 media organizations were registered, with a strong concentration in Maputo, but even so reflected a considerable proliferation that had taken place since the Media Law was passed. This was attributed both to the struggle for more space by the independent press – which had fought hard to get the Press Law and its liberal wording – and the quite permissive atmosphere that reigned in the country.

But the situation for independent print media was precarious. Their reach was basically limited to the two largest cities, printing costs were high in large part due to monopoly printing capacity, the importation of newsprint was heavily taxed by government, distribution by the national (state-owned) airline to other parts of the country prohibitively expensive, state media had a strong hold on advertising and public announcement revenue streams, and management and journalistic skills were variable but generally weak – as they were across all media.

3 Project Background and Description

The UNDP/UNESCO Media Development Project (MDP), was designed by UNESCO in 1995. During the following two years the project document was discussed and revised several times before being signed in September 1997. The MDP has been an eight-year project implemented in three phases:

- A three-year initial phase, July 1998-June 2001, with a budget of USD 5.21 million, where Norway contributed NOK 14.5 million
- A three-year results strengthening phase, July 2001-September 2004, with a budget of USD 6.42 million, of which Norway contributed NOK 14 million;
- A two-year consolidation and exit phase, October 2004-September 2006, with a budget of USD 2.075 million, of which Norway funded NOK 8.7 million.

The total budget for the project was thus just under USD 14 million. Norway contributed a total of NOK 37.2 million, the equivalent of USD 4.9 million – over 35% of the total.

3.1 Project Background

Mozambique underwent a successful transition from conflict to peace with the peace agreement in 1992 and the multi-party elections that took place in 1994. The UN had been critical in both brokering the deal but even more in supervising the transition and the election process. It provided physical presence and funding but also legitimacy to the overall process, making it difficult for any of the parties to withdraw from the agreement or the electoral process under the pre-text of biases or serious malfeasance. The UN therefore had considerable credibility as a neutral actor and important supporter for national economic development and political progress built on democratic principles.

The proposal by UNESCO to strengthen Mozambique's independent media was therefore both relevant in terms of addressing a national need, and politically acceptable by a government that still felt some uncertainty in terms of what the new "political order" of multi-party politics and increased voice of other political and social forces might mean.

UN Policies

On 10 December 1948, the UN General Assembly adopted *The Universal Declaration of Human Rights*, where article 19 states "Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers." This is the foundation for all subsequent UN support for free media and access to information.

UNESCO and UNDP are the two UN agencies with the largest engagement in this field. Other UN bodies like UNICEF and UNFPA also provide funding, generally for specific fields like health information or on children's rights.

In 1991, UNESCO hosted a seminar on "Promoting an Independent and Pluralistic African Press" from 29 April to 3 May 1991 in Windhoek, Namibia. This culminated with the signing of the so-called "Windhoek Declaration" (see Box 3.1 below), and was later adopted by the UNESCO General Conference. It is seen as widely influential as it was the first in a series of

similar declarations adopted around the world. It also led to the establishment of the Media Institute of Southern Africa (MISA), a fundamental media support institution in the region.

The 1991 meeting addressed print media. At a meeting ten years later, also in Windhoek, focus was on broadcasting, leading to the proposal for “African Charter on Broadcasting”.

Box 3.1: The 1991 Windhoek Declaration (selected articles):

9. African States should be encouraged to provide constitutional guarantees of freedom of the press and freedom of association.

10. To encourage and consolidate the positive changes taking place in Africa, and to counter the negative ones, the international community-specifically, international organizations (governmental as well as non-governmental), development agencies and professional associations-should as a matter of priority direct funding support towards the development and establishment of non-governmental newspapers, magazines and periodicals that reflect the society as a whole and the different points of view within the communities they serve.

11. All funding should aim to encourage pluralism as well as independence. As a consequence, the public media should be funded only where authorities guarantee a constitutional and effective freedom of information and expression and the independence of the press.

12. To assist in the preservation of the freedoms enumerated above, the establishment of truly independent, representative associations, syndicates or trade unions of journalists, and associations of editors and publishers, is a matter of priority in all the countries of Africa where such bodies do not now exist.

UNDP and Operationalizing UN Media Policies

UNDP has focused on the *access to information* issue, based on its human rights approach to development. Its Practice Note in 2003 focused on four areas: (i) strengthening the legal and regulatory environment for freedom and pluralism in information, (ii) supporting capacity strengthening, networking and elevation of standards of media at national and local levels, (iii) raising awareness on rights to official information and strengthening mechanisms to provide and access information, (iv) strengthening communication mechanisms for vulnerable groups (UNDP 2003).

In April 2006, it then produced “A Guide to measuring the Impact of Right to Information Programmes”(UNDP 2006), with three main sections:

- ***Understanding the right to information context:*** These cover the four dimensions in the 2003 Practice Note: (i) the *legal regime* for the right to information, (ii) *implementation* of right to information legislation by government, (iii) use of right to information by the general public and civil society, and (iv) use of the right to information by marginalized groups. These four can be reformulated into typically desired ***Outcomes***;
- ***Making indicators gender sensitive and pro-poor:*** The Rights-based Approach leads to right-to-information programmes, and provides examples of how this has been achieved;
- ***Examples of Right to Information Indicators:*** Examples of relevant indicators along with proposals for Baselines, typical Outputs and related Outcome indicators.

This guidance note thus focuses on capturing context concerns, and ensuring that indicators are using a rights-based approach to assessing the situation. In line with this, in its 2008 report, UNDP’s Oslo Governance Centre (OGC) reports on a follow-on initiative to the MDP in Mozambique, where UNDP supports a “Communication for Empowerment” program built on access to information and rights-based foundations (UNDP/OGC 2008).

A study done for UNDP notes that about 35% of its 2008 programme expenditures went to democratic governance activities. Of the USD 1,427 million, about USD 36 million – 2.5% - went for Access to information activities (Munck 2009, p. 3). The study summarizes lessons learned in this field, grouped into five categories: political support, project design, partnerships, sustainability, and monitoring and evaluation (M&E).

While most of the lessons are rather standard ones for most development interventions, it notes the *low rate of replicability* of the Access to Information projects – they are context dependent – and the *importance of political support*. The need for more focus on local capacity building and the fragile sustainability of achievements is noted (op. cit., p. 8).

UNESCO and Operationalizing UN Media Policies

Within UNESCO, the International Programme for the Development of Communication (IPDC) was set up to support programmes in this field, with the objective defined in 2003 to be “*contribute to sustainable development, democracy and good governance by fostering universal access to and distribution of information and knowledge through strengthening the capacities of the developing countries and countries in transition in the field of electronic media and print press, and in particular to provide support in ... (i) Promoting of freedom of expression and media pluralism; (ii) Development of community media; (iii) Human resource development; (iv) Promotion of international partnership*” (UNESCO 2008, p. 67).

Box 3.2: UNESCO’s Media Development Indicators

UNESCO’s Media Development Indicator system contains five dimensions:

1. The five *development categories* (provided in the text below – see page 7);
2. Each category is de-composed into *issues*;
3. For each category, the *context and main issues* are discussed;
4. For each category there is a set of *indicators* with sub-indicators that operationalizes them;
5. For each indicator, *means of verification* (sources of information, data resources) are suggested.

In category 3, *Media as a platform for democratic discourse*, there are six issues: (i) media reflects diversity of society, (ii) public service broadcasting model, (iii) media self-regulation, (iv) requirements for fairness and impartiality, (v) levels of public trust and confidence in media, (vi) safety of journalists.

Under the first issue, there is a discussion on the context in which media needs to reflect the diversity of society along its myriad classifications – social, religious, gender etc – and ensure that the public discourse reflects the views and needs of the various social groups. The tension between being fair and inclusive while at the same time promoting debate and thus being a social actor in its own right remains a source of friction. The key indicators and sub-indicators are given as:

1. The media – public, private and community based – serve the needs of all groups in society,
 - Media use language/s that reflect the linguistic diversity of the target area;
 - Media use language/s that relied upon by marginalised groups;
 - Community media is produced for specific groups, e.g. indigenous and tribal peoples, refugees;
 - State or public media in practice represent the views of the entire political spectrum and a wide spectrum of social interests, including the weakest sections of society;
 - Information presented by the media is accessible to women and marginalised groups.
2. Media organizations reflect social diversity through their employment practices:
 - Female journalists are fairly represented across the media industry, including at senior levels;
 - Journalists from minority ethnic, linguistic or religious groups are fairly represented across the media industry or sector, including at senior levels.

Sources that produce information on various indicators are listed, such as web-sites of monitoring groups, media institutions, some UNESCO sites etc.

In 2008, the IPDC Intergovernmental Council adopted a set of indicators (see Box 3.2 above) based on an overall analytical framework that contained five development categories:

- *A regulation system conducive to freedom of expression, pluralism and diversity of the media;*
- *Plurality and diversity of media, a level economic playing field, transparency of ownership;*
- *Media as a platform for democratic discourse;*
- *Professional capacity building and supporting institutions that underpin freedom of expression, pluralism and diversity; and*
- *Infrastructural capacity sufficient to support independent and pluralistic media* (op.cit. pp. 7-8).

Norwegian Policies and Decisions

Norway did not have any own formal policies regarding support to media at the time of the signing of the project document. It relied on more general principles with respect to democratic development, such as the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights. But in May 2003, the MFA issued Guidelines for media support (box G.4).

The decision to fund the project was largely based on a wish by the Embassy to support the nascent free media in the country, which was providing important and critical reporting on a range of key political and economic issues and processes. The decision was facilitated by the Embassy having access to solid media knowledge through the services of a professor in media and communications at the University of Oslo, who on several occasions advised the embassy and led several project reviews.

The decision to fund the program was thus based on (i) acknowledgement of the UN's role and experience in media development, (ii) Norway's engagement in the discussions leading up to the approval of the project and thus acceptance of the program theory behind the project, (iii) Norway's own interest in supporting independent media in Mozambique and (iv) solid own knowledge about the technical issues facing the project with a clear recommendation to go ahead and fund it.

Box 3.3: Norwegian MFA Guidelines for Support to Free Media

"The objective of support for free and independent media is to support efforts to achieve greater transparency, democracy and good governance, including the fight against corruption.

Support for co-operation measures should concentrate on:

- Strengthening the media's legal position (statutory framework, independence of journalists, legal protection, etc)
- Bolstering the media's professional standards (building up competence and capacity, ethics, basic and further education for journalists and other media professionals, and media research)
- Helping the media to develop diversity, relevance and availability
- Helping to ensure that the media have access to information, have the opportunity to check information, sources, etc., and are able to be accountable...".

The Guidelines go on to detail the kinds of activities that can be funded under each of the four key areas, and that support can be given to media enterprises, CSOs, state institutions, regional and international/multilateral organizations, and in special cases even to individuals.

3.2 Project Development and Approval Process

The initiative for the project came from UNESCO/Paris, which drove the process during the following two years till signature. The main reason for this long time was the discussion on the content of the project – whether to focus on strengthening the publicly owned media and their ability to provide “developmentalist” messages, or the strengthening of independent media. The government wanted the resources for RM and TVM, since both organizations were in need of upgrading and expanding their equipment, skills and national coverage. The donors wanted the focus to be on new and independent media.

The final project covered both private and public media. Support was provided to RM’s decentralization and transformation efforts: moving more decision making and responsibilities to provincial offices and turning the RM into a public broadcasting entity with performance agreements with the authorities rather than a state-owned radio company. Most of the project funding, however, was to go to independent media, and in particular to the establishment and strengthening of community radio, as well as the strengthening of human resources in all media, on both the journalistic and management sides.

Another issue was the support to print media versus radio. While a number of independent newspapers – largely weeklies or monthly publications – had sprung up, all had very limited circulation and largely restricted to a particular city. They were all in Portuguese, so not accessible to the vast majority of the population who cannot read Portuguese. There was thus the issue of whether print media were just reaching the professional classes and elite in the largest urban areas, and the extent to which this justified a lot of donor funding.

Linked to this was the problem of the independence of parts of the private media. When the government privatized printing presses and other media businesses, some media actors saw the new owners as largely beholden to FRELIMO. Given the few printing presses in the country, some editors pushed very hard for funding a printing press owned by a group of free media, to ensure that they would not be squeezed either through price manipulation or restrictions on the quantity or quality of publications they could bring to market.

Community radio was a fairly recent phenomenon in Mozambique, where most local radio stations either were part of the RM network, or belonged to the ICS. The latter focused on classic “developmentalist” information dissemination, but with a perceived slant in favour of FRELIMO messages when political aspects entered the picture. At the same time there were pressures towards using more local languages and grounding the programming in local concerns and agendas that also RM and ICS were responding to.

There were thus a number of important media policy questions that were raised. In the end, focus was on the free and independent media, on strengthening the professional contents and management of media institutions, and on strengthening media outside the major cities, in particular radio, using vernacular languages and thus expanding access to information outside the Portuguese-reading part of the population. The project was furthermore to strengthen the role of women in media.

3.3 Project Objectives

For each phase, the project developed new results framework. The shift from Phase I to Phase II meant a considerable improvement in terms of realism and clarity on what expected results were. Attachment C provides the three sets of results frameworks.

The Development Objective provided for the second phase was *“to strengthen the human, technical **and organisational** capacity of the independent media and public service radio to enable them to become sustainable and to contribute effectively to the process of governance and democracy in the country ... [and] strengthening national reconstruction and development by increasing access to the media through decentralization, the creation of media facilities at the provincial and community levels **and empowering especially isolated communities, youth and women to actively participate in the media**”* (UNDP 2001, bolding added here). There is thus focus on organisational development and on specific marginalized and disadvantaged social groups. The five Immediate Objectives were given as:

1. Increase impact and sustainability of print media in Mozambique;
2. Increase the capacity of the provincial delegations of RM;
3. Increase impact and sustainability of community radio stations in Mozambique;
4. Improve journalistic skills and quality of media content; and
5. Strengthen the capacity of women in journalism and the media.

3.4 Management and Implementation of Project

UNESCO was the executing agency for the project and thus responsible for the substantive aspects of the activities, including the hiring of project staff and procurement of equipment. The office in Maputo handled the administrative and supervision activities while technical backstopping was done by the Southern Africa regional communications adviser, with the Department of Communications and Information of UNESCO/Paris.

UNDP had overarching fiduciary responsibility as the UN agency that signed the funding agreements with the donors. It formally represented the UN system at the annual Tripartite Review (TPR) meetings, which was the decision-making and policy-setting body for the project, with UNESCO participating as technically responsible.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs was the government representative at the TPRs, and chaired the meetings. Gabinfo in the Prime Minister’s office was UNESCO’s counterpart on the substance side. The collaboration with Gabinfo has been considered very positive.

Six donors – Denmark, Finland, Ireland, Norway, Portugal and Sweden – funded all or parts of the project and thus made up the third party at the TPRs. Norway was seen as the lead donor as it contributed the largest share of the funding over the program period.

In addition to the formal TPRs, a number of Technical Advisory Groups – TAGs – were established to function as discussion and advisory bodies to project management. The TAGs included a range of national stakeholders, to ensure that all relevant voices on key issues were heard, and in particular civil society organisations were heavily represented. TAGs were established for community radio, independent print media, and training.

The project itself had a strong project unit, which was housed separately from the UNESCO office. During the first two phases, the foreign CTA was full-time on the project, and during the last phase functioned as an advisor who visited quite.

The annual tripartite meetings were held as scheduled, with full participation by all and with solid documentation prepared by the project or the external evaluators as the basis for the discussions. Mid-term and final evaluations were carried out as per agreements. There was therefore general satisfaction with the structure and performance of the project governance, and with the performance and financial reporting.

Project Implementation: Administration and Procurement

The project was signed September 1997, but recruitment of a Chief Technical Adviser (CTA) nominated in May 1998 took half a year so she was only in place in Maputo in October. Other steps were also delayed as the UNESCO representative left in March 1998 and was replaced only in early 1999. UNESCO's Admin Officer, who certifies all payments, left in May 1998 with a new one only in place early 1999. This lack of leadership in the UNESCO office in the start-up phase was a problem. The gaps in leadership when one representative left occurred also later. In one case the project CTA acted as head of the UNESCO office, a practice criticized in the Phase I evaluation and thus not repeated (Rønning and Moniz 2001).

The administrative systems of UNESCO were experienced as unresponsive when it came to procurement. UNESCO/Paris responded slowly to requests for clearance, leading to delays of several months in some instances. In the case of transmitters for RM, UNESCO called on the assistance of ITU/Geneva, which demanded a technical mission that the project saw as unnecessary – the technical specifications had already been well documented. UNDP stepped in and pushed for administrative autonomy for the project, which was granted, so that the project could handle most of the administrative procedures directly. The transmitter procurement was addressed by UNDP taking on the implementer role for this and having RM procure directly from their traditional supplier (Rønning and Moniz 2001).

The introduction of a new accounting system in UNDP some years later led to disbursement delays. While this change in the end provided for better financial reporting, it caused unforeseen administrative costs and hurdles for the project, taking a disproportionate amount of project management time and leading to frustrations among local stakeholders.

Project Implementation: Consultations and Capacity Development

While equipment procurement was important in an early phase of the project, the main project activity was training: technical, journalistic, management. This required both skills to transmit, but also skills to listen and identify the actual needs that the media had. Project and evaluation reports underline the intensive consultation and visitation to provinces that project staff undertook throughout the project. This led to a number of changes.

A printing press for independent media had been included in the original project, but this was later discarded. The main reason was that the private media through their interest organisation, the Association of Print Publishers (AEJ) were not able to come up with a viable financial and management proposal. The profitability of the proposed press was questioned, but also the needs of the smaller provincial newspapers were also seen as more important, and they needed small-scale localized solutions, not a big central press.

Much of the training was done as workshop seminars: the final evaluation of Phase II notes that 12 seminars with almost 250 participants were held for journalists and producers, and 22 seminars/mentoring sessions for nearly 500 CR staff (Ammassari and Moniz 2004, Annex 5).

But particularly when it came to community radios it was discovered that the needs varied so much from one to another – the larger radios in urban areas like Maputo and Chimoio needed quite different advice than the local station in Metangula – that much more targeted mentoring was applied. This tailored and consultation-intensive aspect of the project was praised in several reports. This was a conscious choice by project management, and led to things like the preparations for Phase II involving over 30 local focus group discussions.

As the project progressed, more and more attention was put on the *sustainability* of the media. One thing was the improvement of business plans and management of the media organizations, which had been a concern from the first phase of the project. But the financial future was of greater concern, both for the smaller newspapers and radio stations. One thing was that continued donor funding through more open and pooled mechanisms was suggested, so that longer-term funding could secure the plurality in the media landscape. But there was also a push for media to become better at mobilizing advertising income within the local community, including as an expression of local ownership and support to that particular media outlet.

The question of the media coming together in interest organizations was also given increasing attention as a means of ensuring that the voice of the media as social actors was strengthened. The project thus encouraged and was critical to the establishment of several media organizations: the National Forum for Community Radios, FORCOM; the AEJ; the Association of Women in Media, AMCS; and was highly supportive in the establishment of the Mozambique branch of the Media Institute of Southern Africa, MISA and the Association of Editors, EDITMOZ.

While the project did not itself directly take on advocacy positions in national policy discussions, it supported arenas for this and encouraged the creation and strengthening of those national bodies that could be expected to play this role.

Project Implementation: Other Issues

Reference was made above to the high cost of producing and distributing print media. One concrete step the project took was to set up a centralized newsprint procurement scheme. The first case was a USD 200,000 Paper Fund set up to ensure sufficient newsprint for the 1999 elections, where this phase ended in June 2001. A study by the project showed that a Paper Purchase Scheme could generate 30% savings due to economies of scale and more reasonable financing. This was set up in May 2001, and when in 2003 the print media established the AEJ as the main interest organisation for the print media, it was meant also as a proponent of measures such as the Paper Purchase Scheme. The AEJ has remained a fairly weak organisation, however, due to differences of opinion on media policy issues, and the AEJ thus never took on either a clear advocacy role nor was able to come up with workable proposals for a more long-term paper purchase system.

Another important means for supporting media was the establishment of Communication Centres in urban areas that could provide shared and thus low-cost access to the internet, fax, printing and copying, so that production costs including access to information would be

reduced. Some of these worked well – the one in Beira did not and had to be dismantled, a reflection of both increased competition but also difficulties of finding viable management and financial arrangements in a complex and sometimes contradictory setting.

4 Project Results

Documentation by the project has been comprehensive throughout. It is easy to track progress of activities, and there has been a program of mid-term reviews and final evaluations for the three phases, though no mid-term review for the last exit phase.

4.1 Documenting Project Achievements

The project has produced baseline information, in-depth studies on key issues, and performance tracking of the key activity areas.

Baselines

Three studies done during the start-up phase 1998-99 provide good baseline information:

- A *Media Landscape Study*, MLS (Bonin 1999) carried out a detailed inventory of existing and planned media outlets, recording 91 media organizations producing 51 printed media and a further 7 planned; 32 broadcast media of which 4 were community radios but a further 9 planned; and a further six media outlets and a similar number planned. Media was heavily concentrated in Maputo and a few provincial capitals, and impact – apart from a few nation-wide newspapers and broadcast media – was limited. Print media reached about 1% of the population, and while RM could reach 80%, this was with uneven quality and time for large parts of the country. Furthermore, most media organizations were weak financially, managerially and in terms of journalistic quality.
- An *assessment of the technical capacity and training needs of the national public service radio (RM)*, which served as the foundation for project support;
- A *study on journalism education*, which noted the poor quality of journalism training with inadequate facilities, curriculum and human resources. New institutions have poorly articulated programmes. Most journalists need a lot of retraining.

The fact that the studies were done in the early implementation phase rather than as part of the planning was a strength. It meant that the TORs for the studies had been discussed by those who were going to be the major users of the studies, and thus the learning from them was integrated into project thinking and by the key stakeholder groups.

Project Achievements, Phase I

The evaluation of Phase I noted that *“the project is very well managed...The project objectives ... have in general been fulfilled in a manner which is impressive and more than satisfactory... There is no doubt that the project has contributed positively to the development of the media situation in the country”* (Rønning and Moniz 2001, p. 2). The evaluation noted that support to community radios was the most important aspect of the project, but also the high number of persons trained: a total of 480, mostly through two-week courses, in substantive journalistic fields (human rights, HIV/Aids, gender) but also management courses. Training was well planned and useful, but too much in the form of formal seminars and suggested more practical work.

The report noted the links and utilisation of regional resources: the Nordic-SADC Journalism Centre (NSJC), the Southern Africa Media Development Fund (SAMDEF), the Media Institute of Southern Africa (MISA) and others.

UNESCO as implementing agency is seen as logical and appropriate, but the slowness of its administrative and procurement procedures was the greatest hurdle the project had to face.

The 24 recommendations at the end covered a range of practical suggestions, most of which were adopted, suggestions for paying more attention to strengthening relevant interest organisations for the media, and that Phase I should not expand its area of attention and in particular not get involved in formal journalism education.

Project Achievements, Phase II

A mid-term review carried out in April 2003 was to focus on (i) achievements so far during phase II, (ii) look into a possible third phase with particular focus on community radio and communication centres. The report was very positive in its findings, noting that *“the project and its staff has created a generous, creative and open working culture internally and externally through efficient information, communication and the promotion of media sector networks and organisations...The project has a considerable impact on structures and participants in the project”* (Erichs and Moniz 2003, p. 4). The report goes on to note that *“General indications of public impact and sustainability are still limited. This is, however, by the assessment team not interpreted as a non-success of the project (op.cit.).*

The report went on to recommend a third phase; a scaling back of the ambitions when it came to the independent print media and a focus on assisting RM strengthen its broadcasting in local languages, but that most attention be given to CR support. Since training was a key component, it was also suggested that a person who could track the training results be hired. These recommendations were approved and implemented.

The final evaluation for phase II was also very positive: the project had *“a sound design and is very well managed and organised. It has a strong leadership and vision and there is a wide commitment to strategic planning among its staff... implemented by a committed and hardworking team of professionals. Adequate attention was focused on monitoring and evaluation to track progress, measure impact and readjust strategies and plans... Overall, the Project has attained the objectives it had set out to achieve during Phase II. The Project has contributed to: (i) improvements in the access to the media through the creation of media facilities at the provincial and community levels, a better distribution of print media and the decentralisation of Radio Mozambique; (ii) a diversification of the media by increasing their number, strengthening independent media and improving the quality of media content; and (iii) a greater participation of communities in the media and an increased involvement of critical target groups (e.g., women and rural population)”* (Ammassari and Moniz 2004, p. 3). It supported the idea of the third phase by making more specific recommendations for the activities to be carried out in the three main areas of print media, RM, and community radio, and suggested a thorough impact assessment about a year after the project ended. It also noted the need to pay more attention to politically sensitive issues such as the independence of the media and their legal and institutional frameworks.

But the TOR for the evaluation asked the team to *“assess the degree to which the objectives have been met ... determine the quality, relevance, impact and potential for sustainability... assess the impact of the project on the institutions which benefit from its support...assess project impact on gender disparities...assess factors outside the scope of the project, which impacted on the performance...assess the design of partnership strategy”* (op.cit., p. 31). The report does not answer most of these questions. It walks through the objectives, describes what has been done (*“review of activities and outputs”*), and then looks at Relevance and Sustainability. The more

interesting questions of Outcome and Impact are not looked at. While there is a detailed overview of all the training done and didactic materials produced there is no analysis of what this has led to in terms of change in either the beneficiary media organisations or the communities they are to serve. When discussing the third objective, community radios, for example, the key finding is that *“This is the component of the project which has had the greatest impact, essentially because it has created a new dynamic in the communities where the CRs were established. As a result individual behaviours are changing and community participation is increasing. However, the situation and impact of the CRs and CMCs differs considerably based on their socio-economic, cultural and political circumstances as well as their set-up and management”* (op.cit., p. 18). Such generic statements abound but without any data to back them up.

Project Achievements, Phase III

The final project evaluation is a more thorough presentation of results produced (Bolap and José 2006). It gives an overview of what the originally expected results were (Attachment C table C.1), and uses this to walk through the actual achievements. The final conclusions are worth quoting since they summarize the achievements of the project, the range and complexity of issues addressed, but also the difficulties and challenges that media in a poor and diverse society like Mozambique face (see Box 4.1 below).

The report looked carefully at management, governance and framework conditions for the project, and provided a series of “Lessons learned”. The first was that Mozambique was fortunate to have been selected as one of the first beneficiaries of UNESCO’s drive to support media in Africa (though the report does not, strangely enough, point to the much more important fact that the country was emerging from a conflict that ended with a successfully negotiated peace agreement that was actually inclusive and led to a strong democratisation process in the country – a somewhat unique occurrence). It notes the good working relationship between all the parties in the project; the strong and continuous leadership and staff of the project that ensured continuity and quality; the focus on capacity development with large-scale yet tailored training; that donors provided massive, continued and predictable funding throughout the period.

It also notes the challenge of working in a country where most people do not speak the official language (Portuguese) and are illiterate, and that this is an even greater problem for women. The focus on CR was therefore important in order to address gender disparities and involve women more in media development. The project should therefore already from the start have focused more on the key priorities.

The main concern is sustainability of the positive results: financial, technical (equipment + maintenance skills, and journalistic), managerial. Regarding funding, the main proposal is a general media fund to which all media that fulfil agreed-upon criteria can apply for support. The replacement of expensive and technically complex equipment is seen as a major headache, especially for CRs, while managerial and journalism upgrading needs to be addressed through the improvement to the country’s training institutions.

A number of final reports by the project amplify the picture provided in the evaluation. The project found itself in a rapidly changing environment – globalization of information flows, digitization and increased internet access (both reducing capital and information access costs but also increasing competition, increasingly from abroad), an increased concentration in the key information generation centres – a possible threat to genuine local and diverse media.

Box 4.1: Final Project Evaluation

“This UNESCO-UNDP Media Development Project is certainly a resounding success, in as much as it helped to reinforce media diversity, pluralism and vitality in the country. It also enlarged not only media relevance and role in the strengthening of democracy and governance starting at grassroots level, but in addition pushed forward media implantation and impact countrywide, by supporting and helping to set up eight community radios in carefully chosen urban, semi urban and rural locations. This is where the majority of Mozambicans live, but where no private investor would have dared to venture. This is one of the main achievements of this project, since it helped communities to start coming together and...are now used to fully taking part in the overall management, day-to-day operations... with these radios, crosscutting issues of acute importance have been promoted. They include gender mainstreaming, increased women presence in the media sector, women and youth active participation in community affairs through voluntary program production on HIV/AIDS prevention, health, agriculture, environment, education, intergenerational transmission of positive social values, culture and traditions or correction of negative aspects of local customs... locally elected or appointed officials’ accountability, responsibility and availability in the management of public affairs, are being dealt with by communities around the country. Moreover, information sharing habits, participation, and new management and ICT skills have been acquired by a variety of Mozambicans.

The six small print monthly or biweekly media that were supported... also contribute...Although their popular readership is more limited than the audience gathered by community radios...they have been decisively providing invaluable contributions in the public debate at their own level. One needs only to read any of their issues to assess that it is no more business as usual for public officials. Moreover, they provide cheap and easily accessible reading material to interested parties in remote parts of the country that had previously to make do with newspapers coming from Maputo....

- The capacity of media to promote democracy, good governance, peace and human rights in Mozambique has actually been enhanced, with the training of 550 journalists and editors... including a specific training on “ethics, democracy & good governance”...participation of CRs in the 2003 local elections in Mozambique, with their adoption of a common Code of Conduct contributed in this strengthening of democracy and governance in the country.
- The technical capacity of the independent media in Mozambique to cover news and information from the provinces and to distribute their copies throughout the country will have been strengthened through the provision of equipment.
- The quality and editorial independence of public service radio broadcasting has been improved through training of media personnel working at RM as well as provision of equipment. With participatory strategic management planning processes undertaken within all the 10 Provincial Delegations...it can be said that the Project successfully achieved this end-result.
- A policy and strategy for restructuring, upgrading and enhancing the capacity of training institutions to provide both professional and academic training in journalism and communication in Mozambique will have been formulated.
- The development of local/community radio stations has decisively been accomplished, since the Project created 8 new local/community radios from scratch, and supported 5 others. They are now part of the 53 community/local radio stations fully functioning in the country...Their technical sustainability problems will tentatively be solved through a central laboratory that is being funded in Chimoio, while they will receive institutional, lobbying and advocacy support through FORCOM...set up two and a half years ago.

Now, it is up to the media created, supported or strengthened so comprehensively and extensively by this project, to start thinking about their sustainability in the long run...For that, they can build on the MDP legacy such as institutions set up (FORCOM and EDITMOZ for instance), the technical, managerial skills acquired, technological office and broadcasting tools installed, physical infrastructures built, as well as from the country’s booming economy. Also, manifest goodwill and dedication from the international donor community...and a liberal, national political context as enshrined in the country’s media law together with national politicians’ mostly benevolent attitude towards the media, are favourable factors towards a strengthened and possibly sustainable media sector in the country“ (op.cit., pp. 63-65).

4.2 General Changes to the Media Environment

A number of recent studies have looked at various aspects of media in Mozambique. These provide a larger canvas against which the MDP achievements can be assessed.

Second Media Landscape Study

The MDP had as ambition to contribute to an improved media situation in Mozambique and not just provide support to specific media outlets. A draft second Media Landscape Study was presented in October 2006 though not formally approved (UNESCO/UNDP 2006).

It notes that despite all rhetoric about independent media, the public sector dominates. A conservative estimate is that they represent 80% of coverage and number of professionals employed. The exception is that in the most important TV market, Maputo, the private SOICO is now the dominant actor. Community radio services – ICS and non-public ones – have expanded rapidly. Community Multimedia Centres (CMCs) that were initially funded over the MDP project is now a separate project with a technical base at the informatics centre of the Eduardo Mondlane University (CI-UEM). This has led to a less capital intensive and technically more viable platform for CMC support and expansion.

Despite progress, Mozambique still lags badly with regards to internet and other communication technology penetration and utilization. The fastest growing segment is, as in many other places in Africa, cell phone, which is developed fully by commercial firms. There is no real ICT industry in-country except in the services segment.

Two drivers of change are pushing the country in the right direction. The first is general literacy, which is improving as general education expands – though completion rates and secondary school coverage remain very low even by African standards. Secondly, the overall economy has continuously improved since the peace agreement: the country has had an average GDP growth rate of 8% during 1996-2007 with GDP/capita at USD 900 in 2008. While concentration of income and assets is high, the affordability of media consumption is expanding quickly, as reflected in the fast growth of commercial TV and cell phones.

But media consumption, apart from radio, remains to a large extent an urban elite issue. Print media have small, limited runs; quality of journalism is improving but still is weak; the integrity of some of the journalism can be questioned though there is progress as exemplified in an agreed-upon Code of Conduct for election coverage. At the same time, all print media now use computers, which is a major advance compared with the situation back in 1999, and the use of the internet for information verification is now more common.

When looking at framework conditions for active journalism, self-censorship and cases of intimidation exist but are monitored and the actual number is low. The number of media organizations has clearly increased, providing a stronger foundation for media interests, and the overall political situation remains stable, with a lot of space for open debate and criticism of public officials in Maputo and somewhat less space as one moves into rural areas, as noted by a recent study on the right to information in districts. The three main conclusions are that (i) the population has little information about their right to information, (ii) this cuts across all social groups, including the better informed such as teachers, civil servants, students, (iii) civil servants often deny access to information, thus undermining the possibility for local insight and monitoring of public sector performance (MISA/M 2008, p. 11).

African Peer Review Mechanism and UN ResCoord Reports

The most thorough review of the overall situation is contained in the 2009 African Peer Review Mechanism (APRM) Country Review Report. It notes that *“the Constitution of Mozambique guarantees a wide range of civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights as well as duties...The [mission] received mixed reactions regarding the enjoyment of freedom of expression: Many felt that freedom of expression is observed, emphasising that there is open governance and the people are given opportunity to freely express themselves i.e. each Mozambican has a right to have and air his own ideas and opinions. Those who disagreed argued that Government is not pro-people, saying that especially at the community level those who speak out against what is wrong are seen as political adversaries. Others informed the mission that some people are afraid to speak openly; a person who criticises government consistently may most likely face persecution...Freedom of information in Mozambique is yet to be fully operationalized pending the enactment of the Access to Information Law. The absence of this law hampers sectors of society seeking information for investigative or other purposes, because the Official Secrets Law is cited as a ground of non-release of information. The accessibility of the written media will however remain limited as long as the problem of illiteracy prevails”* (APRM 2009, paras 43-45 pp. 34-35). The report singles out the assassinations of the journalist Carlos Cardoso in November 2000 and the senior bank inspector Siba-Siba Macuacua in August 2001, both for investigating corruption in major banks, as troubling examples of impunity at high levels of society and thus implicitly the limits to investigative freedom (op.cit., text box 3.6 p. 132)

The UN Resident Coordinator’s 2009 report nevertheless sees the trend in the governance field as positive: *“the country has witnessed a significant and positive change in the democratic governance and legislative reforms, which were strengthened to enhance the respect of human rights at all levels...The Rule of Law, access to justice and penal reforms with emphasis on public and human security was another area that enjoyed improvements... [including] preparation and approval of the legal framework for civil society organisations”* (UN Mozambique 2010).

African Media Barometer Surveys

MISA publishes the *African Media Barometer* for Mozambique. It rates that country’s media landscape on a scale of 1 (lowest) to 5 (highest) on a set of indicators grouped into four categories: (1) Freedom of expression (FoE) including freedom of the media, (2) media landscape (new media, diverse, independent, sustainable), (3) broadcasting regulation (transparent, independent, the state broadcaster is a public broadcaster), (4) media practise high levels of professional standards. Country reports for Mozambique were produced in 2005, 2007 and 2009 (see box 4.1 for an explanation and discussion of the methodology).

The ratings of key indicators are shown in table 4.1 below. The table shows variations in what the trends are across different variables/indicators, some which are not easy to understand: while Freedom of expression is seen as better guaranteed in 2007 than in 2009 (1.1), the feeling about the law and courts protecting confidential sources shows the reverse trend (1.7). But the trends for the four sector averages *all* show improvements in *each* of the two two-year periods, and the global average is thus also positive.

The most important positive developments over the last two-year period were seen to be the emergence of more media outlets, more confidence in a permissive situation for critical media, improved journalistic quality in the media, and the rapid denunciations against cases of violations of press freedom.

Table 4.1: AfroBarometer Media Ratings (selected), 2005, 2007, 2009

Indicator	2005	2007	2009
1.1 FoE, including freedom of media, is guaranteed in the constitution and supported by other legislation	2.6	4.7	3.6
1.2 The right to FoE is practiced and citizens, including journalists, are asserting their rights without fear	3.0	2.9	3.0
1.4 Govt makes every effort to honour regional and international instruments on FoE and the media	n.a.	n.a.	3.6
1.7 Confidential sources of information are protected by law and/or the courts	2.8	1.4	3.5
1.8 Public information is easily accessible, guaranteed by law, to all citizens	1.0	1.4	1.6
1.11 Civil society in general and media lobby groups actively advance the cause of media freedom	1.9	1.1	2.8
Sector 1 average	2.8	3.1	3.7
2.1 A wide range of sources of information is accessible and affordable to the citizens	2.2	2.5	2.6
2.7 All media fairly reflect the voices of both women and men	n.a.	n.a.	2.7
2.8 All media fairly reflect the voices of society in its ethnic, linguistic, religious, political and social diversity	n.a.	n.a.	1.6
2.10 Govt does not use its power over the placement of ads as a means to interfere with editorial content	1.3	4.7	2.5
Sector 2 average	1.7	2.2	2.4
3.1 Broadcasting legislation has been passed that provides for a conducive environment for public, commercial and community broadcasting	1.0	1.2	3.7
3.9 The state/public broadcaster offers diverse programming for all interests	2.3	2.9	3.9
3.10 The state/public broadcaster offers balanced and fair information reflecting the full spectrum of diverse views and opinions	1.7	3.7	3.5
Sector 3 average	1.5	2.0	2.5
4.2 Standard of reporting follows the basic principles of accuracy and fairness	2.3	3.0	2.7
4.3 Media cover the full spectrum of events, issues and cultures, including business/economics, cultural, local and investigative stories	2.4	3.6	4.0
4.4 Equal opportunities regardless of race, social group, gender/sex, religion, disabilities and age are promoted in the media houses	n.a.	n.a.	3.1
4.5 Journalists and editors do not practice self-censorship	1.6	2.0	2.2
4.7 Journalists and media houses have integrity and are not corrupt	n.a.	n.a.	2.5
Sector 4 average	2.1	2.8	3.4
Global average	2.0	2.5	3.0

Source: MISA 2009, pp. 12-57. Indicators here selected for illustrative purposes.

Box 4.2: Friedrich Ebert Stiftung Methodology

The **African Media Barometer** is produced with the assistance of the Friedrich-Ebert Stiftung. This is a self-assessment exercise done by African media professionals. It is based on the African Commission for Human and Peoples' Rights "*Declaration of Principles on Freedom of Expression in Africa*", adopted in 2002. This was in turn largely inspired by the *Windhoek Declaration* from 1991 (Box 3.1) and the follow-on "*African Charter on Broadcasting*" from 2001.

The assessment is carried out by a panel of not more than ten persons, normally half from the media and half from civil society, selected based on their personal qualifications. The panel comes together to discuss the indicators, the ratings scheme so that the criteria for allocating a value of 1 to 5 for each is agreed to. Each panellist is then asked to carry out the ratings individually, and each panellist's ratings are then recorded in the larger master table. The report both provides a discussion on what the panellists agreed were the key issues/changes to note, and then their quantitative ratings.

The values in table 4.1 are thus the arithmetic means for the ten panellists on each value. The sector average is an equi-weighted average for all the indicators in that sector, while the global average is an equi-weighted average of the four sector scores (see MISA 2009).

While the individual ratings are unproblematic, the validity of mathematical averages is questionable. The mathematical operations done here – estimating averages – require that the numbers are so-called *cardinal* numbers: the values are seen as "absolute" so that a "2" can be considered the same value for all indicators, but also that the "value distance" between "1" and "2" is the same as from "2" to "3", which is not the case here. There is also an issue if all the indicators are equally important, which is a requirement if one is to estimate averages as is done here. It is also problematic to provide averages across the four sectors since some sectors have more indicators than others.

There are important differences to the methodology used by the Public Expenditure and Financial Accountability (PEFA) indicator measurements. PEFA (along with Transparency International's Corruption Perceptions Index CPI), are the most commonly used systems for tracking public sector performance. The PEFA system also provides ratings on a number of indicators, but it does two things differently. The first is that it defines very clearly what are the criteria for allocating a particular score. While MISA has a scheme for 1 to 5 on each indicator, it does not explain, for each indicator, what would be the grounds for giving a "3" instead of a "2". This is easier in a public finance scheme, where quantitative measures can be used for assessing performance of the budget planning process, for example. But it means that there is considerable scope for different interpretations/reasons for giving the same rating in the MISA system, which means **reliability** is a problem: the PEFA system is much less person-dependent. The PEFA criteria are spelled out for all to see, and scores can therefore be challenged on the basis of evidence/data. The credibility of the scores and using them for trend but even cross-country comparisons is much more legitimate (one is always warned against comparing countries, but this happens all the time, especially with TI's CPI ranking scheme).

The second difference is that the scores are letters and not numbers, exactly to avoid the temptation to calculate averages on numbers that are not legitimate to aggregate (there are also *four* letters rather than five, to avoid the tendency of people to select the "non-controversial" mid-value).

If therefore the mathematical "accuracy" of this approach is put aside, the methodology, when applied consistently and with the same indicators over time, can help track **trends** along a given indicator over time, and can to some extent highlight differences in levels across "sectors". This is useful to monitor trends and identify areas the media community ought to focus its resources on when pushing for improvements. Table 4.1 shows that all four areas show positive improvements but that sectors 2 and 3 are lagging the other two quite badly. Media actors should therefore concentrate their attention on these areas when it comes to improving the media situation in the future.

The negative developments were more lawsuits against journalists, lack of political debate and some media not following basic principles of good journalism. The main **drivers** were seen to be the active work of the journalists themselves, efforts by media to improve, and the efforts by the president to improve the relations with the media. On the negative side many factors were institutional: no broadcasting legislation, no independent regulatory body, no "access to information" legislation, the continued existence and use of law 19/91 against the media, and in general a lack of public policies *in favour of* strong and independent media.

The UNESCO Indicators

UNESCO's 2008 media development indicators were immediately applied in Mozambique. The report (Rønning 2008) walks through the five categories, indicator by indicator, and has a more thorough discussion of the factors that lead to its conclusions when compared with the MISA surveys. The actual conclusions, however, are much the same on the indicators that overlap, but without any kind of quantitative ratings.

The report provides data on the coverage of the 2004 elections. While FRELIMO was the party that got the most air time both on radio and TV, it got less than half the total – the opposition parties together got more. The trend was also that *“Mozambican media in 2004 was more even and fairer than in 1999”* (op.cit., pp. 49-51). Especially since FRELIMO is both the governing party and receives over half the votes in national elections, this points to a degree of editorial freedom in the publicly controlled media that is unusual in the African context.

The report also quotes a report prepared by the former CTA: *“The number of people seeking HIV testing increased significantly after radio programmes created an environment where the subject could be discussed openly. Working on and listening to radio programmes also helped young people build up confidence to negotiate practicing safe sex”*. While the report mentions a number of other cases, it *“will, however, caution against assessing the impact ...purely in instrumental developmental goals. The most important aspect of community radios is to give development work a local voice and provide new opportunities for more inclusive sustainable development. The most significant benefit of community broadcasting is that it allows poor people to speak for themselves...The represent a concrete expression that the right to communicate is a fundamental human right, which is essential for the strengthening of a democratic society”* (op.cit. pp. 83-84).

The report goes on to discuss problems of donor support to the sector. There were serious delays by UNESCO in important follow-on projects to the MDP – Swedish aid to media organisations and Swiss support for the UEM-based assistance to CMCs. But there is also a lack of coordination – the report mentions in particular lack of collaboration between UNDP, UNESCO, UNICEF and the World Bank, but also that UNESCO in particular did not follow up projects directly after funding ended (op.cit. pp. 87-88).

A more recent report using the same methodology was commissioned by UNESCO from MISA (the Portuguese version was presented in February 2010 while the English-language version is being finalized). The main conclusions are the same, thus both validating the methodology as a useful approach and acceptable to critical bodies like MISA, but also that the 2008 report has findings and conclusions that reflect the issues on the ground.

4.3 Programme Theory and Linked-in DemDev Dimensions

The formal programme theory behind the support to media development in Mozambique is spelled out in the results matrix of the later phases of the project. The long-term Impact is to cover two fields, **governance** and **national development**: *“contribute effectively to the process of governance and democracy in the country ... [and] strengthening national reconstruction and development”*. This is to be achieved *“by increasing access to the media through decentralization, the creation of media facilities at the provincial and community levels and empowering especially isolated communities, youth and women to actively participate in the media”* and *“to strengthen the human, technical and organisational capacity of the independent media and public service radio to enable them to become sustainable”*.

These long-term results are to be produced through a focus on the five Outcomes/ Immediate Objectives specified for Phase II: (i) increase impact and sustainability of print media, (ii) increase the capacity of the provincial delegations of RM; (iii) increase impact and sustainability of CR stations, (iv) improve journalistic skills and quality of media content; (v) strengthen the capacity of women in the media. The programme theory must therefore be clear and reasonable in terms of how the project support was to contribute to the larger objectives, and how this was to be tracked. The actual results are analysed in section 5.1.

Another question is to what extent this project can be said to have contributed to the other six dimensions of Democratic Development which this evaluation is to address. This is addressed in the sub-sections below.

Access to Justice and Judicial Development

The most *direct* MDP intervention was a course on “Legal Reporting” while other courses also addressed legal issues and legal thinking, such as “Electoral Reporting” and “Ethics, Democracy and Governance”. More general issues like Human Rights, which was an important part of a number of trainings, had a strong legal foundation, so that overall the project contributed to raising awareness among journalists on legal issues in general, specific rights and obligations of journalists and the citizenry, and thus became topics in programs and articles produced.

A more indirect impact is the organisational and professional support provided to media actors during the project period. The increased professionalization has included greater awareness of specific rights and the confidence to challenge what media perceive as abuses of the legal system to prosecute journalists whom people in power wish to silence.

The *net* contribution of the MDP is difficult to judge. Mozambique had a fairly permissive environment, and the journalists themselves have been active in their pursuit of a better media environment, reflected in their involvement in formulating and passing the Press Law and pushing for further media legislation. Overall, the project has clearly contributed in a positive way, and thus contributed to its Goal of better governance in this field.

Human Rights

Support to human rights has been along two important dimensions: (i) formal training in human rights to journalists and other media professionals encouraged reporting on human rights abuses to become more prominent in the media picture, and (ii) the actual broadcasting and publishing of rights materials, making the population at large more aware.

Strengthening Civil Society and its “Voice and Accountability”

The project supported key media interest organisations: FORCOM, AEJ, ACMS, MISA and EDITMOZ (actual results are variable: AEJ and EDITMOZ never really took off), and in particular assisted their substance work.

More importantly, the project has provided direct support to strengthening local communities by having them getting involved in community radios, as well as ensuring that the contents of the CRs addressed local community concerns and provided a voice to marginalized groups. The strengthening of RM as a public broadcasting corporation has

pushed in the same direction. The decentralization led to more local programming and thus ensured that RM provided greater opportunities for local voices to be heard.

Women's Participation and Gender Equity

This was the only DemDev field explicitly addressed by the project, along two dimensions: (i) increasing the number and importance/role of women in media, and (ii) improving the gender perspective in the articles and broadcasts produced as well as increase the number and quality of media outputs that were relevant to women and their situations.

The project got off to a slow start with measurable improvements only really happening once additional funding was made available from Denmark towards the end of Phase II. Then more advanced training was made available to a few women, the Chimoio workshop for women in media was organized in June 2003 with the resultant "Chimoio Commitment" noted earlier, and the profile of women in media was more pronounced.

The more gender-aware programming in radios – both on topics and on approach – and the greater inclusion of women in CRs started earlier and appears to have been more consistent throughout the project. Women in print media is a much weaker area, and overall the gender dimension has been addressed better in broadcast than print media. While solid improvements can be noted in quantitative terms – women trained etc – there is still considerable ways to go before the sector has gender equity in its contents and staffing. The question of *attribution* – how much of the change can be credited the project – and relative performance compared with what happened in other sectors is not addressed in any report.

Electoral Processes and Institutions

The project helped media play an increasingly important role in the elections – presidential, parliamentary, municipal and regional. It assisted media agree to a Code of Conduct for covering elections, as well as providing training in electoral coverage for all media.

As noted, media are better at being fair and comprehensive in their coverage, and have been an important in making the population at large aware of electoral campaigns, the issues, and both reported facts and contributed commentary and investigative work in cases where abuse or attempts at fraud have been claimed.

Public Sector Oversight Functions

There is nothing in the documents that point to the project contributing to any significant extent in this field. What is known is that coverage of Parliament's annual budget debates, the Auditor-General's audit, and the work of the Prosecutor-General's office is more widely reported and analysed, and with more critical comment on the contents and performance of these offices. To what extent this can be attributed to the MDP is debatable, but the increased capacity and quality of media to address such difficult and sometimes controversial issues are in line with what the project has trained in, supported and argued for.

Summing Up

The MDP has *contributed* to most of the other DemDev dimensions. How important the project has been, and which changes can be attributed to the project and what has been caused by other factors – the history of relatively independent journalism, the quite liberal attitude to critical journalism especially in Maputo – has not been untangled in any of the

reports or evaluations seen. What remains is thus the more general impression that the project, as by far the best funded and among the most visible intervention in the media field, was an important support, contributor and even standard setter in some areas.

5 Findings and Conclusions

This chapter assesses project achievements before looking at the factors that can explain achievements and short-comings, before turning to the issue of the UN as channel for Norwegian support to Democratic Development.

5.1 Assessing Project Results

The MDP project was unusual both in its duration and funding levels: getting donors to provide USD 14 million over an eight-year period for an activity that was not priority, is unusual. This was undoubtedly due to the dynamics and results being produced, which made the donors feel they were supporting “a winner”, which is always highly appreciated. But the issue itself was an important one in a region where democratic development was still fragile and thus sensible interventions to strengthen this was eagerly supported.

The project, in large part due to the generosity of the funding, was able to take on a wide range of issues and thus provide a more comprehensive approach to the sector: print and broadcast media, national and local, and new technology in the form of Communication Centres and Community Multimedia Centres. While focus was on capacity building, it also provided a lot of infrastructure and equipment: it funded the start-up of eight radio stations, paid for new AM/FM transmitters for RM in Gaza and computer equipment for all RM's provincial delegations, and paid for a pilot newsprint fund for newspapers.

In the field of capacity building, it provided expertise from special topics like court reporting and investigative techniques to more general issues of ethics, human rights and professional standards. It addressed CR development and public broadcasting issues, print media, and management of media organizations. It increased the attention to gender in media, helped media organizations, and produced studies on issues like journalism education.

It produced a large number of printed manuals that were made publicly available for free on its web-site (a web-site that is still open thanks to the former CTA personally funding the annual fee, to ensure that these useful publications will continue to be available).

It introduced participatory planning techniques and approaches across the board, which led to a rethinking within the RM about its own corporate plan, and helped more democratic structures and processes in most of the media organisations with which the MDP worked: *“Fully loyal to the project's defined political objective, on ‘strengthening democracy and governance’, the adopted implementation strategy...has focused on the nature of democracy itself, a system that needs active, informed and responsible citizens – citizens who are willing and able to take responsibility for themselves and their communities and contribute to the political process”* (MDP project final report 2006, p. 12). That is, the project not only delivered “external outputs” such as support to CRs, but the manner in which the MDP worked and interacted with stakeholders was an example of and contributed to more democratic principles and learning.

Relevance

The project came at a time when media in general and free and independent media in particular were weak along virtually all dimensions: financial, journalistic and technical quality, outreach, thematic coverage, etc.

It provided much needed financial, technical and organisational support across the board: public and private media; broadcast and print; local, provincial and national media.

The project re-directed its resources more and more towards community radio, which was useful in addressing a number of inequities in the media picture: lack of non-public radio, strengthening decentralization and getting more media outside the large urban areas, strengthening the use of vernacular languages and getting more community involvement in defining the contents and producing it.

More formally, the project objectives of contributing to national development and good governance were in line with the Government's objectives, those of the UN system, and the donors providing the funding. The structure – activities and outputs – of the MDP was also in line with achieving these objectives. The project was thus *Highly Relevant*.

Efficiency

The *Efficiency* of the project can be assessed along two lines: the internal costs of delivering the project as such, and the unit costs of producing the various outputs.

The overall costs of project delivery – overhead to the agencies as well as the unit costs of the staff – dropped across the three phases of the project. From the first to the second phase, the donors asked for and got a reduction in UNESCO's overhead charge, and in the third phase the international CTA post was dropped and the person retained as an advisor on a part-time basis while project management was assumed by the national project coordinator.

Because of the dispersion of the project, especially the CRs, travel costs were high but a function of the approach taken and accepted by the parties.

In terms of the Outputs, the best overview of those are provided in the listing of expected end of project situation in table C.1. If as an example one looks at the first one, "*Capacity of media practitioners in promoting democracy, good governance & human rights enhanced with training*", one is immediately faced with the problem of how to measure this. Course participants rated the training events, so their satisfaction levels (generally very high!) were known. Training was also adjusted based on this feed-back. But this is not sufficient to document Output level *results*. In a more formal setting one should have verified the skills level attained through some kind of certification (exam, ...) process. But the data on this and the other Outputs in the table is largely similar in nature: ad hoc, qualitative, and impressionistic, with weak methodological and empirical foundations.

Yet good Output was most probably produced. One thing is the high scores provided by the participants on the training. Much of the written materials used were "good practice" manuals developed in the region and thus already adapted to local conditions, but were further refined and then posted on the publicly available web-site for comments and further improvements. Based on comments from the first mid-term review, much of the CR training changed from general workshops to tailored mentoring, depending on the radio station and its particular challenges. The project staff were furthermore, throughout the project, given high marks for their attentiveness to local needs, their solid technical skills, commitment and thus quality of support and training provided. These indirect ways of assessing Output production thus points to high value-added capacity building. Given that only the CTA was a foreigner, the delivery was probably about as cost-efficient as it could be.

On the equipment side, a careful study of RM needs was made, where procurement from the former supplier was done to ensure minimization of both technology-learning upgrade and maintenance costs. The costs of the eight community radio stations were high, and some observers believe things could have been done cheaper or that larger communities could have been reached with the same level of investments (Metangula, for example, is an extremely small community). But the selection of sites for the new radio stations was primarily a function of local commitment – strong demand to ensure sustainability – so efficiency criteria do not seem to have driven this component. The question is if the project developed the most cost-effective approach to establishing CRs, in order to encourage others to learn from and use the approach. There is nothing found in the documentation that this was either done or a concern looked into.

There were serious delays both in equipment procurement and in some disbursements. These held back activities so the *pace* of production of results was lowered. These delay costs were probably the most important ones in the project, as it meant that the use of the existing technical capacity was not as high as should have been, and in the end this was the most expensive part of the project. At the same time, the high level of staff commitment seems to have meant that time was re-directed to other useful activities, so net losses were small.

At the time of the project, no alternative channels/actors were realistic, so reducing costs by using for example NGOs for implementation was not an option.

All in all, *Efficiency* was probably above average for such a complex undertaking.

Effectiveness

The expected Outcomes (Direct Objectives) formulated for Phase II (see Attachment C) are the most relevant set: (i) increase impact and sustainability of print media in Mozambique, (ii) increase the capacity of the provincial delegations of RM; (iii) increase impact and sustainability of community radio stations, (iv) improve journalistic skills and quality of media content; and (v) strengthen the capacity of women in journalism and the media.

On the print media, the evaluations agree that the results have been variable: some of the newspapers supported folded, new ones came onto the market, but overall print media remain weak. There have been some improvements to business management and journalistic qualities, as perceived by informed observers, but the most important change may be the general improvement in the economy, which has both increased household incomes – especially in urban areas, where newspapers are bought – and the amount of advertising available. There is, however, no rigorous assessment available of the *situation* or *changes* regarding print media, including possible MDP contributions.

Improvements in RM's provincial delegations have been documented: increased local programming, better coverage due to additional equipment, but in particular better strategic planning due to MDP training and participatory methods that have also improved the relevance of programming – results that have been praised by RM management.

The last three objectives are the ones where reports and observers agree that the project has achieved the most. Evidence-based conclusions do not exist, however. There was a proposal for an *ex post* verification study one year after the project ended, but this was not carried out. Even now a quick survey of media professionals – both those who benefited from project activities and those who did not – could yield valuable insight into what worked, and why.

A considerable list of achievements against the last three objectives have been produced, but because of the lack of rigorous assessments, it cannot be documented (i) the degree to which for example sustainability of CRs has been achieved, (ii) what share of the improvements to the media landscape can be attributed to the project. However, in all fairness the *impression* is that *Effectiveness* has been quite good.

Impact

The desired Impact (Development Objective) of the project was “*to strengthen capacity of the independent media and public service radio to enable them to become sustainable and to contribute effectively to the process of governance and democracy in the country ... [and] strengthening national reconstruction and development...*”. The project reports and evaluations provide some evidence: people listen and are interested in what local radio transmits, it gives groups like women and youth opportunities for engagement and empowerment which they otherwise would not have. Radio in particular has been important during elections, providing information on procedures (registering as voter, polling stations etc), transmitting political debates and commentary, but also for developmentally relevant public service (health, education) and economic (prices, availabilities and opportunities) messages. This contributes to unify markets and reduces all kinds of transaction costs across the country, especially information and uncertainty costs on important topics, thus contributing to national reconstruction and development as well as governance, in concrete though not easily measurable terms. The increased use of local languages further contributes to this.

When relating project achievements to the very positive sector/macro level results – MISA studies, UNESCO indicator reports, larger political framework analyses by the African Peer Review Mechanism and the UN – it is difficult to say to what extent the project has *contributed* to this and to what extent it has *benefited* from it. Clearly there have been positive feed-back loops – and that is perhaps as much as can be said.

One aspect that is sometimes noted but not analyzed, is how media provide linkages to the larger Mozambique society. The general messaging on national issues (elections, HIV/Aids) are invaluable, but the more subtle effects on nation-building through increased awareness and “proximity” to general issues on gender, public sector accountability, human rights, may build a sense of commonality across ethnic, geographic, age and other local society divides. While such changes are slow, they may be quite profound, changing perceptions and aspirations especially among the young.

These kinds of changes can only be captured through more careful perceptions surveys and critical investigations. There may therefore be a number of reasons why more research-based investigations into longer-term Impact may be useful, including such issues as elite influencing (investigative print media) and different kinds of local radio, including how different ownership forms and funding profiles (public, commercial) may influence content and coverage of critical societal issues (see the issue of Public Goods funding below).

Sustainability

Sustainability of project results – technical (skills and equipment), financial and managerial – is poor, especially for print media and the smaller CRs.

Journalistic skills have improved but remain weak. On the equipment maintenance side, RM has its own capacity, some of which is made available to local radio stations. GESON station

in Chimoio was to act as a “super service” site for other CRs, though is struggling. The Informatics Centre at UEM has taken on responsibility for supporting the CMCs, and seems to be doing a good job, though dependent on donor funding. Replacement of technical equipment is a challenge for the radio stations since it is expensive and they do not generate sufficient surplus for this – a matter that is particularly grave for the smaller ones.

Management of both broadcasting and print media has improved, but this is a weak part of virtually all organizations in Mozambique. Once again this is at the end of the day a general challenge for the educational system in the country and not something where a project can deliver sustainable results, so here expectations need to be realistic. On the financial side, media has become more business-savvy and improved their overall management, but sustainability will primarily be a function of what happens in the larger economy.

An important point in this connection, however, is that media are providing an important *public good* – access to information and freedom of expression. The responsibility for funding these critical services for continued democratic development thus ought to remain an important donor obligation, yet does not seem to be treated as such.

5.2 UN as Channel

The initial observation to be made is that this project could not have been implemented by any other bodies except the UN. This was due to the political sensitivities around support to media – both as a substance field but in particular in the immediate post-conflict situation in which the country found itself.

UNESCO and UNDP played different roles in the MDP. The choice of UNDP as the main project proponent and signatory party on the UN side, rather than having only UNESCO engaged, was good for two reasons. The first was the more solid institutional presence on the ground. UNESCO in several periods – including at the start-up of the project – was without a Resident Representative (RR) and/or Administrative Officer, which slowed down project processes and created uncertainties. UNDP, as a much larger organisation, both had desk officers and management who could always be counted on to be present if and when issues arose. The other was on the policy side. Particularly in the early stages of project preparation and initiation, there were substantive disagreements among the parties, and in particular between the national authorities and the donors regarding the focus of attention: public media and national coverage, or independent media and their sustainability. The final formulation found was agreed to by everybody, but there were moments both in the finalization process and when some choices had to be made early on regarding priorities for implementation where the project faced serious challenges. The then-UNDP RR cut through on a number of issues, insisting that national authorities accept commitments agreed to in terms of project focus, and also pushed through the administrative independence of the project from UNESCO/Paris on some of the procurement issues, since these were holding back progress. The UNDP desk officers overseeing project progress were seen as pro-active and engaged by both donors and project stakeholders. UNDP must therefore be seen to have delivered well on its management and monitoring/fiduciary/reporting responsibilities.

UNESCO is seen as a weaker agency, but also criticized for being bureaucratic and lacking in enthusiasm for the media sub-sector. One issue was that the MDP as a major project was housed with its own administration away from the UNESCO office. The need for interaction

was thus more on administrative and procedural side than on substance issues. But the project was for many activities dependent on clearance from UNESCO. This had sometimes to go to the Paris office, where the response time was experienced as very long.

Another was that the *substance* support was largely from UNESCO/Paris. This was seen as constructive and useful. The regional media adviser was helpful in establishing regional links but otherwise fairly anonymous. The Maputo office had little to provide to a project team that was well staffed.

The situation since the MDP closed has changed considerably. There is now a general fund for civil society support, MASC (*Mecanismo de Apoio à Sociedade Civil*), where community radios can apply for funding. At the time of the visit of this mission (June 2010) this had not yet happened, though subsequent to this visit a first CR application has evidently come in. The advantage of MASC compared to the MDP is that this is a more open and general support mechanism where all CRs, new or old, can apply and supposedly can expect to receive support based on merit of the application and need. But MASC does not address the need of commercial media such as newspapers, since these are in principle for-profit bodies and thus not eligible. Other possible sources of financing exist, such as the Community Development Foundation, FDC (*Fundação para o Desenvolvimento da Comunidade*). It does not as yet have a media development programme, though is now considering this.

More important is that MASC only provides funding. MDP's main importance lay in its technical and advisory support. Media in Mozambique are in many areas still in need of further advisory services. The question is if the UN is still best placed to provide these.

Alternatives exist: private consulting firms, or bodies like the faith-based organisations or NGOs that are running community radio networks in Mozambique today. But no studies seen discuss advantages and disadvantages of these experiences in Mozambique.

The UN is seen to have two strong factors in its favour. The first is the political credibility to work in a sector that remains politically sensitive. The other is the perception that the UN is committed to local capacity development and has corporate commitment to the sector.

But UN agencies and UNESCO in particular will struggle to appear as a relevant "first choice" partner. One reason is that while the *project* has delivered very well, UNESCO as a technical body is not seen to have been a critical part of this. This is underlined by the delays and frustrations donors have had with some of the linked-in/follow-up activities to the MDP (support to media organisations and to CMCs), and the total lack of follow up to MDP achievements (having the former CTA pay the annual fees for the web-site that is still highly useful and one of the very important project results is only one example of this).

Another is that while UNESCO points to its formal mandate as grounds for continued relevance, this is not seen in the same way by actors on the ground. They wish to see what UNESCO can deliver that is value-adding to what they can find elsewhere. In that regard, UNESCO had commissioned a study to develop a joint communication program for the UN in the context of "Delivering as One", but reflects a poor understanding of what media actors are looking for. It provides a quick mapping of key stakeholders, notes the need for better cooperation, presents a highly UN-centric model of how support to the sector can be provided but with no strategic focus or prioritization. While it is meant as the basis for a dialogue within the UN family, it is a weak foundation for making the UN relevant.

5.3 Key Factors Explaining Results

The team has been asked to identify the key factors – external and internal, positive and inhibiting – that can explain project results. The most important ones are presented in the table below:

Table 5.1: Key Factors Explaining Project Results

	Positive	Constraints
Project internal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project design thoroughly discussed and adapted/ improved over time • Project team highly qualified, hard-working, committed, remained in post • High level and sustained funding, providing predictability, stability for partners and for wide scope of activities • Flexibility of project management, adapting to changing needs, priorities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project design unrealistic (too ambitious) with regards to objectives • Local UNESCO office weakly committed, bureaucratic • Weak documentation of results
External to project	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Political and legal frameworks positive • Media professionals strongly engaged, largely very positive to project • Project partners – local communities, RM – engaged, supportive • Donors remained committed to the project and its objectives • Critical: General economy, political stability improved, the 1992 peace agreement has held 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Level/quality of media management, journalism at start very low, putting limits on what could be achieved • Media training institutions weak and did not improve much during the period • General levels of poverty, education meant limited demand for increased media penetration, especially print • Poor infrastructure, high costs of printing, distribution for print media • While general framework conditions positive, also seen as fragile and vulnerable to political whim, with limited further progress in latter years.

The key *project factors* explaining project achievements are seen to be the following:

- The project was *thoroughly designed and discussed* with all key stakeholders before approval, leading both to political acceptance by all and firm donor financial commitments for an exceptionally prolonged project period, though given the time horizon and resource levels, the expectations on sustainability and impact were unrealistic, and documentation of results was weak;
- The *project team* was highly qualified, committed and hard-working, and remained in post throughout the project period;
- The *key stakeholders* – UN, donors, government, RM, local media and media professionals – remained committed to the project and maintained their support and engagement, with the exception of the local UNRSCO office that could have taken a more pro-active and supportive attitude towards more efficient implementation;
- The *level of funding* allowed the project to contract a range of skills and spread its wings fairly wide, thus encompassing a major share of the media community and provide support and assistance over time – critical to the local actors having confidence in the project, and thus its longer-term impact;

- The *flexibility of project management* that was reflected in its willingness to adjust the programme to the changing environment and priorities of their main beneficiaries, and thus remain relevant throughout the project period. .

The key *external factors* for the results seem to have been:

- The *political and legal framework* conditions were largely favourable: Mozambique passed a modern Constitution, followed by a liberal press law and signed on to the Windhoek Declaration. The peace agreement after the 16-year armed conflict was holding, with stability returning to both rural and urban areas;
- *The international community* has been interested in supporting the development of free and independent media, so there was considerable financial and technical resources available, and *media professionals* were in general highly supportive and engaged in the project;
- The *overall poverty* including low level of education was the most significant barrier. Few households could afford to spend resources on media, only about a quarter of the population was considered fluent enough in Portuguese to benefit from Portuguese-language media (print or radio), and with low levels of education the demand for general (national level) information was largely limited to urban populations. However, the positive dynamics in these areas – *increasing literacy rates and income levels* – are at the same time perhaps the most hopeful driver of change for independent media and freedom of expression;
- *Poor infrastructure* made costs of production and distribution high, restricting the spread of print media, while radio provided limited coverage to large parts of the country due to insufficient or outdated transmitters;
- The *quality of journalism* whether in print or radio media was considered poor and thus represented a serious barrier to the increase in the demand, but again the trend is in a positive direction and has resulted in the media being reported as being among the most respected and trusted institutions in the country.

The conclusion seems to be that the general *political framework* conditions have been favourable and moving in the right direction, the *economic, educational and infrastructure conditions* have represented major obstacles but are improving substantially, and that the within-sector conditions – journalistic education, import policies on material goods critical to the media sector – have not been conducive and are only slowly improving.

The most important factor, however, which is obvious but bears repeating, is that the peace agreement from 1992 has held, has been accepted over time by all parties, ensuring fundamental stability in the country and an acceptance of using legal and constitutional means for airing disagreements and resolving conflicts. The media have therefore been able to play their foreseen and constructive role, largely addressing issues from a *national or principled* point of view and not become the bullhorns of particularistic and fragmenting societal forces. If this key condition had not continuously been in place, it is difficult to see how the project could have contributed much to broadening and deepening the democratic space in Mozambique.

5.4 Final Observations

While the draft strategy document mentioned above provides a weak argument for *continued* and much less for a *central* UN role in media development in Mozambique, it also reveals a key weakness of the way the donors currently fund the UN system, which is on an *ad hoc* project basis. If the donors believe that the UN should play an important *standards* or *political* function, in strengthening the role of media in further DemDev, then this should be done through more long-term, structured and predictable funding.

In the case of the MDP, the UNDP did dispense its political and democratic development role well – UNESCO was clearly more a technical and administrative body. Yet the UNDP's performance, most observers seem to agree, was primarily a function of the individuals who filled those positions during the period in question.

This raises a question of whose expectations the UN is to satisfy. The group of donors funding the MDP wanted the UN to take on the policy and democracy promoting role rather than just a technical agency function of developing radio coverage and quality of journalism. But if UN "activism" is promoted by only a group of donors, the UN can become accused of pursuing particularistic agendas, even though they are grounded in agreed-upon policies: the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, UNESCO's mandate, Windhoek Declaration etc. What provided the strongest legitimacy for the MDP was thus not the donors' support but the demands from Mozambican media. And this itself was predicated on the quite liberal and open society that Mozambique in fact was, since in other settings such voices would have been suppressed or never allowed to develop.

Overall conclusions:

- *MDP as a project was a success:* The project delivered high quality inputs to key media actors, strengthening them in strategic fields, and through this has contributed to improved access to information and freedom of expression;
- *However,* attributable results are difficult to document and there is every likelihood that the net benefits may be considerably less than the more enthusiastic supporters would like to believe;
- *MDP has had positive spill-over effects into other dimensions of DemDev,* in particular regarding women in the media, but also in access to justice; strengthening civil society; promoting human rights; supporting democratic elections; and contributing to public oversight;
- The keys to the success were *fundamental peace and stability; a political and legal framework* conducive to stronger and more pluralist media; a tradition and existence of *critical journalism; project staff* that were committed, of high quality, and remained with the project throughout; *national authorities* supportive of the larger objectives and flexible in their demands, and *donors* willing to stay the course and ensure long-term large-scale funding
- The *UN* was at the time the only credible actor that could have taken on the task of implementing the MDP. In today's Mozambique the UN may be less relevant as the preferred partner for media development – but in the final analysis this choice should be made by Mozambican actors and civil society, and not by the donors.

Attachment A: Persons Interviewed

Government Officials

Mr. Ricardo Dimande, Director, Gabinfo

Project Staff

Ms. Birgitte Jallof, Chief Technical Advisor/UNESCO, 1998-2004

Mr. Tomás Vieira Mário, National Project Coordinator, 1998-2006

UN and Donor Officials

Mr. Ndolamb Ngokwey, UN Resident Coordinator/Maputo

Mr. José Macamo, Governance Programme Manager, UNDP/Maputo

Ms. Habiba Rodolfo, Justice Programme Specialist, UNDP/Maputo

Mr. Wijayananda Jayaweera, Director, Division for Communication Development, UNESCO/Paris

Mr. Noel Chicuecue, National Programme Officer, UNESCO/Maputo

Ms. Cristiana Pereira, Project Coordinator, Communication & Information, UNESCO/Maputo

Ms. Nina Bull-Jørgensen, UNESCO-UNV 2004-2006/Maputo

Ms. Berit Tvette, Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs/Oslo (in Mozambique 2004-2007)

Ms. Clarisse Barbosa, Programme officer, Norwegian Embassy/Maputo

Mr. Mark Smith, Senior Governance Advisor, DFID/Maputo

Mr. Salvador Forquilha, Programme Officer, Governance, Swiss Cooperation/Maputo

Other Informants

Mr. Helge Rønning, Professor, Institute for Media and Communications, Univ of Oslo

Mr. João Pereira, Management Unit Director, Civil Society Support Mechanism (MASC)

Ms. Polly Gaster, Head of ICT4D/CAIC, Eduardo Mondlane Univ Informatics Centre

Ms. Paulina Velasco, Managing Director, Radio Muthiyana

Mr. Fernando Lima, Editor, Savana Newspaper

Ms. Acia Sales, Executive Director, FORCOM, 2004-2007

Mr. Alfredo Libombo, Executive Director, MISA-Mozambique

Mr. Ericino de Salema, Project Officer, Information and Research, MISA-Mozambique

Attachment B: Documents Consulted

- African Peer Review Mechanism (2009), "Country Review Report: Republic of Mozambique", APRM Country Review Report no. 11, June.
- Ammassari, Savina and Botelho Moniz (2004), "Final Evaluation of the Second Phase of the Project 'Strengthening Democracy and Governance through Development of the Media in Mozambique' ", Maputo, September
- BBC World Service Trust (2006), "African Media Development Initiative", Research Summary Report. London: BBC World Service Trust.
- Bolap, Henri-Paul and Patricio José (2006), "Final Report, *Strengthening Democracy and Governance through Development of the Media in Mozambique*", Maputo, November.
- Bonin, Marie-Hélène (1999), "Media Pluralism Landscape: An Overview of the Media Sector in Mozambique", Prepared for UNDP/UNESCO Media Development Project. Nordic-SADC Journalism Centre, July.
- Cachamba, Simeão J. (2002), "Avaliação dos Centros de Comunicação: Eficácia, Funcionamento e Sustentabilidade". Maputo, March.
- Center for International Media Assistance (2008), "Empowering Independent Media. US Efforts to Foster Free and Independent News Media around the World", Washington, DC: NED.
- Erichs, Peter and Botelho Moniz (2003), "Mid-term Review, Phase II of *Strengthening Democracy and Governance through Development of the Media in Mozambique*", Maputo, April.
- Ferreira, Antonio (2000), *Assessment of equipment needs for RM* (exact title and date unknown – front page missing), report to project, Maputo.
- International Media Support (2007), "Media in Sudan at a Crossroads: Assessment and Outline of a Strategy for Media Support", Copenhagen: IMS.
- Lange, Y. and T. Hughes (2007), "Building Sustainability for Media Centres: A Handbook on Best Practices", Copenhagen: IMS.
- Lines, K. (2009), "Governance and the Media: A Survey of Policy Opinion", Report submitted to the BBC World Service Trust.
- MISA Mozambique (2009), "Panorama do Desenvolvimento da Comunicação Social em Moçambique" (*Overview of the development of social communication in Mozambique*), Prepared for UNESCO, Maputo, October.
- MISA Mozambique (2008), "Pesquisa sobre Direito à Informação em Moçambique: Um Olhar a Partir do Distrito" (*Research on the right to information in Mozambique: a view from the districts*)", Maputo, August.
- MISA (2009), "African Media Barometer: Mozambique 2009", Windhoek/Namibia.
- MISA (2007), "African Media Barometer: Mozambique 2007", Windhoek/Namibia.
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs (2004), "Guidelines for Support to Free Media in Developing Countries", Oslo.

- Mogekwu, Mathias and Eduardo Namburete (2000), "Study of Journalism Education and Training in Mozambique", Maputo, draft, undated.
- Mpengula-Tomas, Donna (2009?), "Development of a Joint Communication Program in the Context of Delivering as One", Maputo, undated.
- Munck, Gerardo L. (2009), "Promoting Democratic Governance: The Role and Contributions of UNDP", Report prepared the Democratic Governance Group Partner Event, "*One Vision, Many Approaches*", New York, 7 December.
- Myers, M. (2009), "Funding for Media Development by Major Donors Outside the United States", Report submitted to CIMA.
- Norad (2001), "Contract for *Strengthening Democracy and Governance through Development of the Media in Mozambique, Phase II*", Maputo, November.
- Orgeret, K.S. and H. Rønning (2002), "Media in Development: An Evaluation of UNESCO's International Programme for the Development of Communication (IPDC)", report submitted to MFA.
- Price, M. (2002), "Mapping Media Assistance". Oxford: Programme in Comparative Media Law & Policy, Centre for Socio-Legal Studies, University of Oxford.
- Rønning, Helge (2008), "The Media Development Situation". Study undertaken for UNESCO, Oslo, April
- Rønning, Helge and Botelho Moniz (2001), "Evaluation Report, *Media Development in Mozambique*", Maputo, June.
- Sitoe, (200x), "The Cost of the Freedom of the Press", Maputo.
- Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (2006), "Culture and Media in Development Cooperation", Sida, Stockholm.
- Swiss Agency for Development Cooperation (2004), "Media and Governance: A Guide", SDC, Berne.
- United Nations (2010), "UN Resident Coordinator Annual Report 2009", Maputo, March.
- UNDP (1997), "Project Document, *Strengthening Democracy and Governance through Development of the Media in Mozambique*", Maputo, September.
- UNDP (2001), "Project Document, *Strengthening Democracy and Governance through Development of the Media in Mozambique, Phase II*", Maputo, July.
- UNDP (2003), "Access to Information. Practice Note". Bureau for Policy Development, Democratic Governance Group/New York and Oslo Governance Centre/Oslo, October.
- UNDP (2006), "A Guide to Measuring the Impact of Right to Information Programmes. Practical Guidance Note". Bureau for Policy Development, Democratic Governance Group/New York and Oslo Governance Centre/Oslo, April.
- UNDP/OGC (2008), "Annual Report 2008". Oslo Governance Centre, /Oslo.
- UNDP/UNESCO (2006), "Media Pluralism Landscape Study", Maputo, November.
- UNESCO (2008), "Media Development Indicators: A Framework for Assessing Media Development". Paris, IPDC.

Select Project Team Documents

Project Progress Report (2006), covering Oct 2005-Oct 2006, Maputo, November.

Project Progress Report (2005), covering Oct 2004-Oct 2005, Maputo, November.

Project Progress Report, End of Phase II (2004), Maputo, September.

Project Progress Report (2002), covering July 2001-June 2002, Maputo, May.

Project Progress Report (2000), covering January-November 2000, Maputo, October.

Project Progress Report (1999), covering January-December 1999, Maputo, November.

Project Progress Report (1998), covering Sep 1997-Dec 1998, Maputo, December.

Attachment C: Results Frameworks

As the project developed and experiences gained, the results framework - Development Objective (DO), Immediate Objectives (IO) and Outputs – was improved both in contents and formal structure.

C.1 Phase I Objectives (1998-2001)

The project document defined the DO to be *“to strengthen the human and technical capacity of communication media... especially independent and private media... [and] at strengthening national reconstruction, reconciliation and development...by increasing access to the media through decentralization and the creation of media facilities at the provincial and community levels”* (UNDP 1997). It then went on to define ten IOs, each with one Output (except for the last one, which had two), most of them very specific: *“By the end of the first year to have organized three training courses for journalists working on the independent media and the public service radio on media role in the promotion of good governance, democracy and human rights”,* with the Output *“60 media practitioners trained in use of media to promote good governance, democracy and human rights”*. The first seven IOs were on training, the eighth to create editorial newsrooms in three provincial capitals, the ninth to create an independent printing press, and the tenth to (i) establish ten local/community radio stations and (ii) provide three repeaters for RM.

The project document was thus in one sense fairly general and ambitious in its DO, yet very pedestrian in its IOs/Outputs: quantitative targets for training by particular dates.

C.2 Phase II Objectives (2001-2004)

The second phase modified the DO somewhat *“to strengthen the human, technical **and organisational** capacity of the independent media and public service radio to enable them to become sustainable and to contribute effectively to the process of governance and democracy in the country ... [and] strengthening national reconstruction and development by increasing access to the media through decentralization, the creation of media facilities at the provincial and community levels **and empowering especially isolated communities, youth and women to actively participate in the media”*** (UNDP 2001 – bolding added here). There is thus focus on organisational development and on specific marginalized and disadvantaged social groups.

The IOs were reduced to five, with more of a medium-term results focus but at the same time more and better specified Outputs that complemented each other and made the attainment of the IO more realistic (only Outputs for IO 1 are listed below as an example):

6. Increase impact and sustainability of print media in Mozambique,
 - Three Communication Centres (CCs) established during phase I consolidated and further prepared for self-sufficiency;
 - Two additional CCs established and consolidated (Quelimane and Inhambane);
 - Report on effective and sustainable options for solving the prevailing newspaper distribution problems;
 - Management capacity of selected independent newspapers supported;
 - 30 young people trained in print media and radio production.
7. Increase the capacity of the provincial delegations of RM;
8. Increase impact and sustainability of community radio stations in Mozambique,

9. Improve journalistic skills and quality of media content; and
10. Strengthen the capacity of women in journalism and the media.

Two new Outputs were suggested added to Phase II. In the end the parties agreed that the project would maintain its focus on consolidating and improving the activities and achievements of the first phase, and not expand the project's reach and ambition.

C.3 Phase III Objectives (2004-2006)

While the DO was kept, the exit phase only kept the first three IOs from the second phase. The Outputs were updated and modified somewhat, with final Outputs listed below:

1. Increase impact and sustainability of print media in Mozambique:
 - Association of Publishers (*Associação das Empresas Jornalísticas*, AEJ) strengthened;
 - Organisational support, monitoring and consolidation of Communication Centres;
 - Strengthen distribution of independent print media;
 - Management support activity of selected independent newspapers supported.
2. By the end of the project, to have increased the capacity of the provincial delegations of RM to fulfil their increased editorial and financial responsibility:
 - Consolidation of the management capacity developed during the strategic management planning process of phase II of project.
3. By the end of the project, to have increased the impact and sustainability of community radio stations in Mozambique:
 - Community radio stations (CRs) supported under Phase I and II consolidated and further strengthened for sustainability;
 - Eight stations capable to function effectively organisationally while producing programmes moving the community towards the social change wanted;
 - Eight stations capacitated to capably manage their financial sustainability and partnership strategy;
 - Eight stations functioning optimally technically and station technicians upgraded towards "service level" capacity in project strategy;
 - 120 community radio producers and managers trained in CR management; CR programming; editorial teams; management, production and accounting for CR.
 - National women's network established for strengthening the role of women in the radios, for strengthening the image of women in the programmes and for exchange of programmes;
 - Web-pages and web-portal developed, and radios supported in their entry into the ICT area;
 - National CR network strengthened;
 - National CR conference held;
 - Experience and lessons learnt extracted and documented.

Summing Up

The Results Matrix has improved over time, though even for the last phase many Outputs remain vague in what the actual achievements are supposed to be. The specifications of organisational results are vague and not comprehensive: only AEJ is mentioned and not the important support to the community radio forum FORCOM, for example.

Much of this, however, has to do with the difficult nature of the task. One output is listed as “strengthen distribution of independent print media”, but the more specific activities are to be defined in a workshop. The key areas are known, however, which include (i) reduce or eliminate taxes and customs on the importation of newsprint, (ii) get the national airline LAM to reduce freight charges for distributing newspapers, (iii) get the national fixed-line telecommunications operator TDM to reduce phone/fax charges for media (distribution of fax newspapers in particular). So while the project can undertake advocacy tasks and work with other stakeholders to achieve these ends, the actual result is uncertain and depends a lot more on these other actors than on the project itself.

Table C.1: Overview of Planned Results, complete project (from Phase I document)

Immediate Objective	Outputs	Expected End of Project Situation
1. Three training courses for independent and Radio Mozambique journalists.	60 practitioners trained in the use of media for good governance , democracy & human rights	1. Capacity of media practitioners in promoting democracy, good governance & human rights enhanced with training
2. Four training courses for independent & RM journalists on economic, financial reporting, rural development	80 Media practitioners trained in economic, financial reporting, rural development issues	Same as above & technical capacity of independent media in Mozambique to cover news from provinces.
3. Two training courses for editors, managers of independent & private newspapers	20 editorial & management staff of independent newspapers trained in marketing, circulation, management	1 & 3. The capacity of media practitioners to promote democracy, governance & human rights and editorial independence enhanced through training.
4. Two training courses for RM & CRs editorial personnel on current affairs production, dissemination	40 Public service media & CR practitioners trained	3. The quality and editorial independence of RM is improved through training
5. Organization of a national seminar on the concept & creation of community radios	One seminar report on the enhancement of local/community radios	5 & 6. Development of local/community radio stations strengthened through training & equipment
6. Feasibility Study on reforming & upgrading journalism training institutions	Production of a report with recommendations on journalism training reform & upgrade in the country	4. Policy & strategy for restructuring, upgrading and enhancing capacity of training institutions in journalism and communication formulated.
7. National Seminar on policy & strategy for training media personnel	A Seminar Report with recommendations on policy & strategy for training media personnel	4. Same as above.
8. Creation of Editorial teams & newsrooms in 3 provincial capitals	Editorial newsrooms & teams with equipment/material created in 3 provincial capitals	2. Technical capacity of independent media to cover news & information from provinces and to distribute copies throughout the country strengthened in the country.
9. Setting up of a joint printing facility for newspapers and magazines	One jointly-operated & managed printing facility for independent, private newspaper set up.	2 The technical capacity of the independent media to cover news and information from provinces and distribute copies throughout the country enhanced with provision of equipment
10. Ten local, community radios set up, in collaboration with NGOs & women cooperatives	10.1. Ten community radio stations created in selected provinces	5 & 6. Development of local/community radios stations strengthened; access to & coverage of media in Mozambique improved through establishment of community radios.
	10.2. Three repeaters for RM provided & installed	3. Quality, editorial independence of RM improved, with training & provision of equipment.