



**AFRICAN
MEDIA
BAROMETER**

**Intermediate Analysis of First
AMB Processes in 16 Countries**

2005/6

Published by:
Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung (FES)
Media Project Southern Africa

Design and Printing
061-303216



ISBN
99916-832-4-0

The African Media Barometer - gauging the state of freedom of expression and freedom of the media through self-assessment

By Peter Schellschmidt¹

Executive Summary

The first round of *African Media Barometer* (AMB) surveys in 16 Sub-Saharan African countries has been concluded. The intermediate evaluation indicates that none of the countries under review has a media landscape which rated as predominantly free and independent. Mali, South Africa and Ghana (in this order) came closest to this standard.

The lowest marks (awarded by local experts according to African principles) went to Swaziland, Angola, Lesotho and Zimbabwe. The reasons for these results are manifold and the overall analysis is both worrying and encouraging:

Perhaps most worrying is the fact that in most countries the government controlled national broadcasters are seen as enjoying little credibility and therefore little relevance in the promotion of participatory development and democratisation. This is all the more serious because national TV, and even more so national radio, are the most important „media for the poor“, best able to overcome barriers of accessibility, illiteracy, low levels of education and income as well as the development gaps between rural and urban areas. So, the potential of national broadcasters to contribute to pro-poor development is severely hampered.

Very encouraging, on the other hand, are the first follow-up activities undertaken in many countries as an immediate result of the honest introspection triggered by the AMB. The

¹ Peter Schellschmidt is Head of the FES Media Project for Southern Africa, based in Windhoek/Namibia.

proven main deficits of the respective media landscapes, as described in the reports, have led to increased lobbying in several countries towards urgently needed reforms. The assessment exercises, jointly undertaken by representatives of media organisations and wider civil society, have forged new coalitions with the aim to strengthen the freedoms of expression and access to information. This is a clear indication that the prime motive behind the creation of the AMB, to stimulate new media reform debates, is beginning to produce results.

These days, freedom of expression and freedom of the media are measured globally by a number of organisations: There is the New York based Freedom House Index, for example. Its data are collected by foreign correspondents, visitors and human rights and media organisations. The criteria were developed in New York and that is also where the results are compiled and evaluated. The outcome is often far removed from the lived reality in the countries under review. Such surveys are also likely to be incomplete: The list of press freedom rankings compiled by Reporters Without Borders each year is, according to the organisation itself, no indicator of the quality of coverage in the respective countries. It also provides no clues regarding the erosion of media freedom through economic pressures.

There are good reasons then for a new approach, one that seeks to overcome existing methodological weaknesses of other efforts and, at the same time, tries to promote a reform agenda for positive change.

With both these core motivations in mind, the Media Institute of Southern Africa (MISA), a media lobby organisation in Southern Africa with country chapters in 11 states, and the Southern African Media Project of the Friedrich Ebert Stiftung (FES), have decided on a different route and started the *African Media Barometer* (AMB) in 2005². With the help of criteria developed for the purposes of the AMB, knowledgeable citizens themselves analyse and judge the

state of the media and of freedom of expression in their own country.

An exercise in self-assessment

The process is both simple and intensive. So far, panels of 10 people each in 16 countries have met for a retreat over a long weekend: half of them personalities from civil society (academics, trade unionists, clerics from different faith communities, jurists, human rights activists, members of women's groups), the other half those working in or on the media (journalists, publishers, media lobbyists, media academics). The panelists are chosen carefully, having regard to the experience, knowledge and merits they bring to the discussion as well as the fact that their word counts for something in their respective societies. They are not just attending another seminar talk shop or answering questions put to them. They themselves are the experts, compiling their knowledge and their assessments in a targeted and focused process. The moderator (the only outsider) has just one part to play: to moderate the discussion. The assessment is determined by the panelists only.

Their guide is a list of 42 indicators³, home-grown in Africa and not just made up somewhere in Berlin or Washington. African indicators for freedom of expression and the media? They do exist - and even enjoy official status. Over the past decade continental bodies have developed far-reaching consensus on such principles. Perhaps the most important document in this regard is the 2002 *Declaration of Principles on Freedom of Expression in Africa* by the African Commission on Peoples' and Human Rights. It is regarded as one of the most progressive of its kind worldwide and spells out the vari-

² For a detailed description of the methodology see "The African Media Barometer - a new instrument in media development cooperation", www.fesmedia.org.na. The methodology is partly based on works undertaken by the US-based IREX Institute (International Research and Exchange Board) with the "Media Sustainability Index" (MSI) in Middle and Eastern Europe.

³ See full list of indicators at the end of the document

ous aspects of freedom of expression in detail and in an exemplary fashion: from the guarantee of the right to freedom of expression, the demand for a diverse media landscape and a public broadcaster independent from the state, up to the right of the media to voluntary self-control. The declaration is largely based on documents previously drawn up by African media representatives: the Windhoek Declaration on Promoting an Independent and Pluralistic African Press (1991) and the African Charter on Broadcasting (2001).

These documents provide the primary benchmarks used to develop the AMB indicators, formulated, according to modern planning methods, as ideal goals and covering four sectors:

1. Freedom of expression, including freedom of the media, are effectively protected and promoted.
2. The media landscape is characterised by diversity, independence and sustainability.
3. Broadcasting regulation is transparent and independent, the state broadcaster is transformed into a truly public broadcaster.
4. The media practice high levels of professional standards.

The national *AMB* panels probe, among others, the question whether the right to freedom of expression is indeed being used - “without fear”, whether citizens have access to a wide variety of media, whether state-owned publications enjoy editorial independence, whether the state broadcaster is free from government influence and whether journalists uphold the principles of accuracy and fairness. Proceedings are carefully minuted and compiled into detailed reports. Two days of such intensive debate and exchange of views usually generate a wealth of information and assessments worth weeks of interviews and field work by a researcher. “It is as if we are all writing a book together”, one panelist said.

The discussions are always very vigorous and probing. All members of the group seek to make up their own minds on each of the indicators, they ask questions, offer their personal analysis, contradict or

support other views. This is because they really want to know and are committed, but also because at the close of the debate they all need to take a personal, unequivocal stance. In a secret ballot they decide on how their country scores with regard to the respective indicator, using a scale from 1 (country does not meet indicator) to 3 (country meets many aspects of indicator but progress may be too recent to judge) to a maximum 5 (country meets all aspects of the indicator and has been doing so over time).

This procedure does not just help to concentrate minds. It also allows for comparisons between countries and the mapping out of trends in each individual country: the plan is to repeat the same test every two years. The first round of repeats starts in 2007.

Results

All in all, findings so far were both realistic and plausible. ⁴ Country by country ⁵, these are some of the highlights ⁶:

- *Mali* is one of the most democratic countries in Africa, and has been for the past 15 years. No wonder then that it is the front runner with a country score of 3.38. Mali's constitution, for example, expressly guarantees freedom of the press (not a matter of course in Africa). Citizens have a choice among more than 30 newspapers and magazines and 180 (!) private radio stations. These stations began to flourish immediately after the introduction of multi-party democracy in 1991, at the time without any legal basis. The broadcasting legislation put in place since got an almost ideal score of 4.9. As in many other countries, however, side by side with the flourishing private ⁵ media sector there is still the state controlled public broadcaster - whose "independence" was rated a mere 1.1.
- *South Africa*, the other model democracy, scored an overall 3.23, with top marks also in specific areas. The guarantee of freedom of expression and media freedom in the constitution

is regarded as exemplary worldwide and was given an ideal 5.0 - justifiably so. The promotion of community radio (stations run and operated by geographic or interest-based communities) scored highly (4.6) and so did the independence of broadcasting as guaranteed by law (4.3). But not everything is rosy in the new South Africa. When it comes to actually using their guaranteed freedom of expression “in many cases, people have to be brave or be heroes in order to express themselves ... there is the fear of being isolated and intimidated, fear of being labeled”. The score for this indicator, therefore, was a meagre 2.6. And the fear of expressing oneself freely extends to journalists as well: the indicator “journalists and editors do not practice self-censorship” was awarded a low 2.3.

- In *Ghana* there is no such “fear factor”. Since the introduction of multi-party democracy the newly found freedom of expression is being protected by the courts, the Human Rights Commission and the National Media Commission, and citizens do indeed seem to be actively using their right (the score of 4.8 was the highest for this indicator of all the countries surveyed). There appears to be no or hardly any self-censorship (3.7). The lowest mark, a mere 1.4, was given to broadcasting regulation, more precisely the awarding of licenses to radio and television operators which is still controlled by the Ministry of Communications. Ghana’s overall score is 3.2.

⁴ Methodologically, only the scores of sectors are completely comparable and allow for comparisons between countries. Comparing the average of sector scores of different countries („country scores“) with each other is to a certain extent problematic because the sectors unavoidably carry a different weight. Nevertheless, for the purpose of a *political* judgement a comparison of countries on this basis remains valuable to be able to judge developments over time. The methodological problem mentioned above is, by the way, common to nearly all indices that are in use internationally.

⁵ The full individual country reports can be found on the website of the FES Media Project (www.fesmedia.org.na).

⁶ The Senegal report was not yet finalised at the time this paper was written.

- *Kenya* similarly scores very badly (with the lowest possible figure of 1.0) on broadcasting regulation. The country's fourth position on the list of 16 (country score 2.73) is due to the positive assessment of its professional standards of journalism (3.2 for this sector as a whole): There is a functioning media council to deal with complaints from the public, the media cover the full spectrum of events and issues (4.4) and gender mainstreaming in the news rooms is progressing (3.8). As a result, the media business is profitable - private media "make good money".
- *Namibia* comes next, with a country score of 2.68. Citizens, it seems, are actively using their freedom of speech, for example in radio talk shows, even if the government appears to be getting increasingly intolerant of criticism (3.3). Private media operate efficiently and professionally (4.3) and working conditions and salaries in the industry are judged to be good so that - unlike in many other countries - there is no corruption among journalists. Again it is broadcasting legislation that scores lowest: continuing state control over the awarding of licenses and the public broadcaster resulted in an overall 2.0 for this sector.
- *Malawi*, one of the poorest countries in the sample, suffers from wide-spread corruption among media workers. The indicator "salary levels and general working conditions for journalists and other media practitioners are adequate to discourage corruption" is given a miserable 1.1, in other words not being met in any way: average salaries are below the minimum required to feed a family. The country scores better in other areas, for example regarding the protection of press freedom in the constitution (2.5), the economic professionalism of the media (3.7) or media diversity (2.6). The country score is 2.58.
- In *Tanzania* the "fear factor" is very prominent. The

country's one-party rule over decades, up until 1995, has left its mark: there is still said to be a "culture of silence" (the score for this indicator: 2.1). Repressive laws are still in force, newspapers are banned from time to time (1.6) and journalists need work permits from government. On the upside: Even though the public broadcaster is, on paper, still state controlled, journalists there seem to be using their own discretion quite successfully (the overall score for programming stands at 3.6). The country score is 2.38.

- *Botswana* - the much praised "cradle of democracy" in Africa - ranks eighth (with an overall score of 2.23), a result that may come as a surprise to some but certainly not the Botswana themselves: "There is a lot of fear among citizens", the AMB Botswana report says, "which is partly due to intimidating threats made by state operatives like the police, security officers and the army. ... There is general confusion ... between 'government' and 'public', with the two often taken to be one and the same thing: public interest equals government interest and vice versa - hence who is against government is against the public" (score: 1.9). The national broadcaster is directly controlled and run by the state (1.0). On the positive side it was noted that the country has a working media council as an instrument of self-control. Journalists have to declare gifts and the editor in chief decides on whether they will be allowed to keep them.
- *Madagascar* has an amazingly diverse media landscape: a dozen dailies, ten magazines, more than 200 radio and a dozen television stations are obviously managing to survive in the market - accordingly, the island meets many aspects of the respective indicators. The relatively low overall score of 2.2 is due, once again, to the fact that the state still controls the broadcasting licensing process and the public broadcaster.
- *Zambia* shares the same country score of 2.2, also mainly

because of its authoritarian broadcasting dispensation: Parliament did pass an exemplary democratic law already back in 2002, but the government has refused up to now to put it into practice. Positive features are the existence of a functioning press council and progress being made regarding gender mainstreaming in the media - still something of a rarity in Africa.

- *Mozambique* also owes its low country score of 2.03 to its undemocratic broadcasting legislation and continuing state control over the state owned newspapers. The freedom of the private media, on the other hand, is both guaranteed by law and protected and upheld in practice: there are no restrictive laws (apart from regulations regarding ‘national security’), which means that many aspects of the respective indicator are being met (3.3).
- *Swaziland* with an overall score of 1.98 (meets only few aspects of all indicators) is among the least free countries on the list. Even though a purportedly democratic constitution came into force in January 2006 there are still no less than 32 laws that restrict freedom of expression. The kingdom “is run on a dual system of governance: a one-party adaptation of Western-style parliamentary structures on the one hand, and a powerful traditional system of governance on the other. ... Journalists practice self-censorship due to a pervasive atmosphere of intimidation, state unpredictability and constant fear. ... Freedom of expression is not seen as a right but as a privilege.”
- *Angola* still suffers from the aftermath of its decades long civil war three years after the peace agreement. A relative diversity of media exists only in the capital Luanda. In the rural areas there are hardly any newspapers and the vast majority of people have to rely on state run short wave radio for their information. An existing media law does allow for private operators but the government has so far ignored all such applica-

tions: for the past 7 years not a single license has been issued. Country score: 1.93.

- *Lesotho* is ruled by fear: “People in authority feel threatened by the media and so, in turn, threaten the media”. Police brutality and torture are described as common, including even cases of death in custody (officially explained as suspects having been “exhausted by questioning”). Private media do exist but the state controlled broadcaster still has the largest reach and influence. Country score: 1.68.
- *Zimbabwe* - with an overall score of 1.5 - is the most unfree of all countries surveyed. “Even the supposedly private spheres are affected. Children cannot talk freely with their parents or adults, and women can also not freely express themselves to their husbands.” Media cannot report freely due to a plethora of restrictive and repressive laws and regulations, all journalists have to obtain work permits from the state, the state is the only provider of broadcasting services, critical newspapers are banned.

Focus on Public Broadcasting

A look at individual scores for sector 3 (broadcasting) across the board is particularly relevant. The average score for this sector is an extreme low of 2.0 - a clear indication that government control over the national broadcaster (with the exception of South Africa) is regarded as one of the main problem areas with the most urgent need for reform.

For organisations like MISA and FES this is the most worrying part of the results: It is especially national TV, but even more so the national radio, given their mandate, their geographic accessibility and their ability to overcome hurdles like illiteracy and low education and income levels, which make them the potentially most relevant communication carrier in terms of participatory development and

democratisation. Instead, the reports show that government control and the often lackluster quality of programming have led to a lack of credibility and therefore relevance of these vital media.

With all the wealth of information and insights produced in the process, the whole AMB exercise and the quantitative assessments made can, at this stage, only provide pointers to areas of concern and obvious deficits. This is merely a first analysis of the status quo. The AMB's relevance as a means of analysing the effect of reform efforts and interventions (impact assessment) will only become fully apparent once the repeat surveys in all countries have provided the necessary basis for comparisons. The first round of repetitions is due to start in 2007. It is only then that the comparison of data will become important tools for national, regional and international actors in the field of media development to evaluate the effectiveness of their work.

From description of individual cases to multi-national ranking

The quantitative assessment (scores) facilitates both, concentration in the discussion process as well as the description of trends in the country concerned. At the same time it makes comparisons across country borders possible.

The present ranking of the countries under review (according to averages of sector scores) looks like that:

AMB Scoring Categories	“Country Score“ Average of 4 Sectors	Ranking
Country meets all aspects of the indicator over time	5.0	-
Country meets most aspects of the indicator	4.0 3.38 3.23 3.20	Mali South Africa Ghana
Country meets many aspects of the indicator, but ...	3.0 2.73 2.68 2.58 2.49 2.38 2.23 2.20 2.20 2.03	Kenya Namibia Malawi Senegal Tanzania Botswana Madagascar Zambia Mozambique
Country minimally meets aspects of the indicator	2.0 1.98 1.93 1.68 1.50	Swaziland Angola Lesotho Zimbabwe
Country does not meet the indicator	1.0	-

Which (first) conclusions in terms of future areas of media reform efforts can be drawn from this list? In an attempt to answer this question the scoring results are clustered into three groups according to the identified status of free of expression and freedom of information, measured against the African consensus as laid down in the cited official documents:

The media landscape is

- largely free and independent
- deficient in some areas, in need of reform
- showing serious deficits, need for basic reform

For organisations like MISA and FES (and, of course, other actors in the field of media development) this cluster building process mainly serves the purpose of prioritising their areas of intervention.

Group One (*largely free and independent*)

This group entails those countries whose media landscape is, in the view of the local experts, largely free of serious defect and accordingly not a priority country for reform efforts. According to our assessment scheme this would apply to countries scoring a 4 or higher. None of the countries surveyed has reached this standard.

Regarding the partial assessment of *sector 1* (freedom of expression and the media) Mali scores best (4.0) with Ghana (3.7) following closely behind.

Regarding *sector 2* (diversity, independence) again only Mali (3.8) scrapes close to this category.

Regarding *sectors 3* (independent and public broadcasting) and 4 (professional standards) no country scores well enough to make it into this group.

Group Two (*some deficiencies in need of reform*)

Countries in this category show clear deficiencies which indicate the need for corrective actions. A closer look into the qualitative country reports helps to identify the deficit areas. In this group we find presently the first 3 countries of the ranking list, namely: Mali, South Africa and Ghana. After them, Kenya, Namibia and Malawi come closest to this standard.

Group Three (*serious deficiencies, need for basic reforms*)

In this category we find those countries whose media landscapes are characterised by serious deficiencies and whose media can not be generally described as free and independent. These countries show a clear need of fundamental reforms, at least in certain sectors. In this group we find the following 10 countries (in descending order): Botswana, Madagascar, Zambia, Mozambique, Swaziland, Angola, Lesotho and Zimbabwe. For the last 4 countries, which scored less than 2.0, the survey clearly indicates very severe threats to freedom of expression and information.

Reasons for despair or hope?

Overall, the results so far are both worrying and encouraging. They prove once again that - as is too often the case - the whole of Africa can not be tarred with the same brush. Country scores differ between 3.38 (country meets many aspects of indicators) for Mali and 1.50 (country does not meet indicators at all) for Zimbabwe - in other words between a state of relatively developed freedom of expression and the media on the one hand and dictatorial repression on the other. Mali scores highest on freedom of expression and the media (4.0) and on media diversity (3.8), South Africa in relation to its broadcasting legislation (3.5). Kenya comes first with regard to professional standards (3.2).

Both these rankings and the scores achieved are likely to change

after the second round. (Almost) everywhere in Africa there have already been successes on the long walk to freedom of expression and freedom of the media. In Botswana, for example, plans by government to push through a repressive media law were thwarted and an independent media council set up instead. In Ghana the possibility of imposing jail sentences for defamation was struck from the statute book. And a new broadcasting policy triggered a heated debate in parliament across the political divide. Even in Zimbabwe there is, at least, still a measure of solidarity among media workers: “If, for example, a journalist of a private newspaper has been arrested, the state newspapers will officially celebrate the downfall of this worker, but the journalists from both state and private media will flock to the court room to show their solidarity.”

The *AMB* is a means of support on the long walk that still needs to be undertaken. It helps to show up flaws and problem areas in media policies and the media landscapes in a systematic fashion and thus enables people to develop targeted plans of action. In Zambia, for example, panelists agreed at the conclusion of the meeting that it was high time to make a final and decisive push for the repeal of laws left over from the colonial era which run counter to the right of freedom of expression. In Namibia and Malawi existing media councils are now to be reinvigorated in order to improve the journalistic quality of newspapers. In Ghana, while members of the panel were pleased to see how well their country fares with regard to freedom and diversity of the media compared to others, they were ashamed by the degree of government control over broadcasting licensing and regulation (“and that almost 50 years after our independence”). They immediately set out on a lobbying campaign to change this. In South Africa, the statutory Human Rights Commission is now going to probe the “fear factor” in the hope that such an open debate could be a first step towards overcoming the fear.

Lastly, the project has also had another - unexpected - outcome. So far the various sectors of society have mostly addressed their specific concerns in isolation: academics dealing with their (insuffi-

cient) resources, trade unions with (bad) working conditions, women with women's rights - and media professionals with issues of media freedom. Often there was no or hardly any meaningful dialogue between them. In many countries knowledgeable personalities from the different groups of civil society have now been sitting round the same table for the first time - in order to draw up the *African Media Barometer*. For most of them this has been an eye opener. Media and civil society are experiencing how important it is for them to give each other mutual support: only together can they be strong and successful - in the interest of all citizens and their democratic freedoms.

⁷ Methodologically, only the scores of sectors are completely comparable and allow for comparisons between countries. Comparing the average of sector scores of different countries („country scores“) with each other is to a certain extent problematic because the sectors unavoidably carry a different weight. Nevertheless, for the purpose of a political judgement a comparison of countries on this basis remains valuable to be able to judge developments over time. The methodological problem mentioned above is, by the way, common to nearly all indices that are in use internationally.

ANNEXES

AMB Scores According to Countries and Sectors⁷

	SECTOR 1 Freedom of Expression	SECTOR 2 Diversity + Independence	SECTOR 3 Public Broadcasting	SECTOR 4 Professional Standards	Average of Sector Scores
Angola	2.4	1.5	1.6	2.2	1.93
Botswana	2.2	2.0	1.7	3.0	2.23
Ghana	3.7	3.1	3.0	3.0	3.20
Kenya	2.6	3.0	2.1	3.2	2.73
Lesotho	2.1	1.6	1.0	2.0	1.68
Madagascar	2.5	2.2	1.6	2.5	2.20
Malawi	2.9	2.4	2.3	2.7	2.58
Mali	4.0	3.8	2.7	3.0	3.38
Mozambique	2.8	1.7	1.5	2.1	2.03
Namibia	3.2	2.7	2.0	2.8	2.68
Senegal	3.0	2.5	1.8	2.6	2.49
South Africa	3.1	3.3	3.5	3.0	3.23
Swaziland	1.9	2.2	1.8	2.0	1.98
Tanzania	2.1	2.3	2.6	2.5	2.38
Zambia	2.3	2.3	1.7	2.5	2.20
Average of scores per sector	2.64	2.38	2.0	2.58	

AFRICAN MEDIA BAROMETER - Country Scores 2005/2006 according to Sectors:

Sector 1 - Freedom of Expression, including the Media

Mali 4.0	Ghana 3.7	Namibia 3.2	S.A. 3.1	Senegal 3.0
-------------	--------------	----------------	-------------	----------------

Malawi 2.9	Mosamb 2.8	Kenya 2.6	Madagas. 2.5	Angola 2.4
---------------	---------------	--------------	-----------------	---------------

Zambia 2.3	Botswana 2.2	Lesotho 2.1	Tanzania 2.1	Swaziland 1.9
---------------	-----------------	----------------	-----------------	------------------

Zimbabwe 1.4

Sector 2 - Diversity and Independence

Mali 3.8	S.A. 3.3	Ghana 3.1	Kenya 3.0	Namibia 2.7
-------------	-------------	--------------	--------------	----------------

Senegal 2.5	Malawi 2.4	Zambia 2.3	Tanzania 2.3	Madagas. 2.2
----------------	---------------	---------------	-----------------	-----------------

Swaziland 2.2	Botswana 2.0	Mosamb. 1.7	Angola 1.6	Lesotho 1.6
------------------	-----------------	----------------	---------------	----------------

Zimbabwe 1.4

Sector 3 - Public Broadcasting

S.A. 3.5	Ghana 3.0	Mali 2.7	Tanzania 2.6	Malawi 2.3
-------------	--------------	-------------	-----------------	---------------

Kenya 2.1	Namibia 2.0	Senegal 1.8	Swaziland 1.8	Botswana 1.7
--------------	----------------	----------------	------------------	-----------------

Zambia 1.7	Angola 1.6	Madagas. 1.6	Mosamb. 1.5	Simbabwe 1.1
---------------	---------------	-----------------	----------------	-----------------

Lesotho 1.0

Sector 4 - Professional Standards

Kenya 3.2	Botswana 3.0	Ghana 3.0	Mali 3.0	S.A. 3.0
--------------	-----------------	--------------	-------------	-------------

Namibia 2.8	Malawi 2.7	Senegal 2.6	Madagas. 2.5	Zambia 2.5
----------------	---------------	----------------	-----------------	---------------

Tanzania 2.5	Angola 2.2	Mosamb. 2.1	Zimbabwe 2.1	Lesotho 2.0
-----------------	---------------	----------------	-----------------	----------------

Swasiland 2.0

List of Indicators:

Sector 1: Freedom of expression, including freedom of the media, are effectively protected and promoted

1.1	Freedom of expression, including freedom of the media, is guaranteed in the constitution and protected by other pieces of legislation.	
1.2	The right to freedom of expression is practised and citizens, including journalists, are asserting their rights without fear.	
1.3	There are no laws restricting freedom of expression such as excessive official secret or libel acts, or laws that unreasonably interfere with the responsibilities of media.	
1.4	Entry into and practise of the journalistic profession is legally unrestricted.	

1.5	Protection of confidential sources of information is guaranteed by law.	
1.6	Public information is easily accessible, guaranteed by law, to all citizens, including journalists.	
1.7	Civil society in general and media lobby groups actively advance the cause of media freedom.	

Sector 2: The media landscape is characterised by diversity, independence and sustainability

2.1	A wide range of sources of information (print, broadcasting, internet) is available and affordable to citizens.	
2.2	Citizens' access to domestic and international media sources is not restricted by state authorities.	
2.3	Efforts are undertaken to increase the scope of circulation of the print media, particularly to rural communities.	
2.4	Broadcasting legislation has been passed and is implemented that provides for a conducive environment for public, commercial and community broadcasting.	
2.5	Community broadcasting enjoys special promotion given its potential to broaden access by poor and rural communities.	

2.6	The editorial independence of print media published by a public authority is protected adequately against undue political interference.	
2.7	Local or regional independent news agencies gather and distribute information for all media	
2.8	Media diversity is promoted through adequate competition regulation/legislation.	
2.9	Government promotes a political and economic environment which allows a diverse media landscape.	
2.10	Private media outlets operate as efficient and professional businesses.	
2.11	State print media are not subsidised with tax payers' money	
2.12	Government does not use its power over the placement of advertisements as a means to interfere with media content.	
2.13	The advertising market is large enough to maintain a diversity of media outlets.	

Sector 3: Broadcasting regulation is transparent and independent, the state broadcaster is transformed into truly public broadcaster

3.1	Broadcasting is regulated by an independent body adequately protected against interference, particularly of a political and economic nature.	
3.2	The appointments procedure for members of the regulatory body is open and transparent and involves civil society.	
3.3	The body regulates broadcasting in the public interest and ensures fairness and a diversity of views broadly representing society at large.	
3.4	The body's decisions on licensing in particular are informed by a broadcasting policy developed in a transparent and inclusive manner.	
3.5	The public broadcaster is accountable to the public through a board representative of society at large and selected in an independent, open and transparent manner.	
3.6	Persons who have vested interests of a political or commercial nature are excluded from possible membership in the board, i.e. office bearers with the state and political parties as well as those with a financial interest in the broadcasting industry.	

3.7	The editorial independence of the public broadcaster from commercial pressure and political influence is guaranteed by law and practised.	
3.8	The public broadcaster is adequately funded in a manner that protects it from arbitrary interference with its budget.	
3.9	The public broadcaster is technically accessible in the entire country.	
3.10	The public broadcaster offers diverse programming for all interests.	
3.11	The public broadcaster offers balanced and fair information reflecting the full spectrum of diverse views and opinions.	
3.12	The public broadcaster offers as much diverse and creative local content as economically achievable.	

Sector 4: The media practice high levels of professional standards

4.1	The media follow voluntary codes of professional standards which are enforced by self-regulatory bodies	
4.2	The standard of reporting follows the basic principles of accuracy and fairness.	

4.3	The media cover the full spectrum of events, issues and cultures, including business/ economics, cultural, local and investigative stories	
4.4.	Gender mainstreaming is promoted in terms of equal participation of both sexes in the production process.	
4.5	Gender mainstreaming is reflected in the editorial content.	
4.6	Journalists and editors do not practise self-censorship	
4.7	Owners of private media do not interfere with editorial independence	
4.8	Salary levels and general working conditions for journalists and other media practitioners are adequate to discourage corruption	
4.9	Training facilities offer formal qualification programmes for journalists as well as opportunities to upgrade their skills.	
4.10	Journalists and other media practitioners are organised in trade unions and/or professional associations.	



**FRIEDRICH
EBERT 
STIFTUNG**

P.O. Box 23652
Windhoek NAMIBIA
Tel: +264-61-237 438
Fax: +264-61-237 441
E-mail: fesmedia@fesnam.org.na
<http://www.fesmedia.org.na>