

DG Enlargement

Guidelines for EU support to media freedom and media integrity in enlargement countries, 2014-2020

1. FREEDOM OF EXPRESSION AND MEDIA

Freedom of expression is a fundamental right safeguarded by international law, including the European Convention on Human Rights, and forms an integral part of the functioning of a pluralistic democracy. It belongs to the values on which the European Union is founded (as referred to in Article 2, the Treaty on European Union). The respect of these values and commitment to promote them is the main criteria to assess the aspirations of a country to become a member of the Union (Article 49, *ibid.*). Thereafter freedom of expression is an intrinsic part of the Copenhagen political criteria for accession to the European Union.

It should be underlined that while being a fundamental human right, freedom of expression and media is often precondition for implementation of other rights and freedoms. Deprived of a free media, citizens are denied the right to balanced, factual and reliable information, without exposure to bias and propaganda that in turn is undermining democracy and the effectiveness of institutions. The pluralistic content in the media landscape serves to reveal the multifaceted nature of society and promotes dialogue and tolerance. Critical scrutiny by media of the political processes guarantees their transparency and ensures that governments adhere to predictable policies – free from the interests of narrow pressure groups. All in all this improves the governance in the given accession country, and thus creates confidence in future Member States.

2. THE ENLARGEMENT AGENDA FOR MEDIA FREEDOM AND MEDIA INTEGRITY

Free media come as the principal precondition for freedom of expression. Since the media and their markets are basically national in scope, there is little acquis at the EU level¹. However, in the context of the European Enlargement policy, the European Commission is obliged by the Copenhagen political criteria to make a full assessment and conclude if there is real respect and true commitment to promoting freedom of expression in the given aspiring country. The assessment should be comprehensive and the identified shortcomings should be addressed and corrected by the enlargement countries even if there is no EU regulation to align with and implement. The annual assessments of the situation regarding freedom of expression and media in individual enlargement countries are to be found in regular Progress Reports.

¹ The Audiovisual Media Services Directive; <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2010:095:0001:0024:EN:PDF>

Communication from the Commission on the application of State aid rules to public service broadcasting (Text with EEA relevance); [http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:52009XC1027\(01\):EN:NOT](http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:52009XC1027(01):EN:NOT)

A few years ago the economic crisis hit enlargement countries in the Western Balkans hard. It significantly weakened the financial positions² media and acted as a catalyst to bring to the surface diverse mechanisms used to exercise formal and informal pressure against critical media by political and business circles. The alarming deterioration of the situation advanced freedom of expression to one of the top priorities in the enlargement context and this was subsequently reflected in the annual Enlargement Strategy papers³.

With the goal of a thorough understanding of the systemic nature of the challenge facing freedom of expression in the Enlargement zone and elaborating adequate policy responses to it, the Commission organised two Speak-up! conferences (2011 and 2013) involving stakeholders from media community, their organisations in the Western Balkans and Turkey as well as decision makers from those countries. These two events and the following conclusions⁴ have become important reference points in addressing the issues of media freedom and integrity in the context of the enlargement policy.

On the political side, it was decided to make use of the full potential of accession negotiations in order to make progress on freedom of expression related issues. Particularly Chapter 23 (but also Chapter 10 and others as far as they touch on the subjects having an impact on the media sector) and the related action plan, should properly cover the field. (For the countries still on their way to open accession talks, the established forms of the high level political dialogue should be used to raise the subjects of concern regarding freedom of expression and find appropriate remedies).

There is a clear need for an engagement over a longer time period so that sustainable results can be achieved. To this end, the Commission committed itself to develop a long term (2014-2020) assistance approach which will be supported by a results` framework to back achieving the political goals in the fields of freedom of expression and integrity of media.

This strategic approach will be also pursued by financial and technical assistance through the Instrument for Pre-accession Assistance that will address three overarching areas: the enabling environment for free expression and media; strengthening journalists' and media professionals' organisations as the key drivers of the needed change; helping media outlets improve their internal governance, thus making them more resilient against external pressures and restoring audience's confidence in them.

2.1 Enabling environment for free expression and media

Putting in place legal, institutional and political conditions for creating an enabling environment for freedom of expression is a responsibility of the political and legislative power in the given accession country. In most of them the Parliaments are relegated to the role of rubber-stamping governments'

² The sector was among those to suffer most: according to various estimates the drop in commercial advertisement was around 40%

³ Enlargement Strategy and Main Challenges 2013-2014;
http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/key_documents/2013/package/strategy_paper_2013_en.pdf

⁴ http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/speak_up_2/20130801_speakup-conclusions.pdf

decisions. At the same time, the Members of Parliaments are elected directly and thereby bear the final responsibility for freedom of expression in their country. To this end, the Commission will encourage and assist them to live up to this responsibility; moreover it is one, up to now largely untapped potential, for accelerating the progress expected in these difficult issues.

The economic crisis is a significant factor responsible for a dramatic drop in professional and ethical standards in journalism. It has expanded clientelism and politicisation in media which has a direct bearing on the quality of the end product. Against this backdrop and in the absence of effective professional self-regulation in the sector, it is easy for politicians to use the state power – the judiciary - against critical journalism. Even though most of the enlargement countries have decriminalised defamation laws, developing appropriate judiciary practices (based on Article 10, ECHR, and the case law of ECtHR) in the cases involving journalists, will be a challenging task for a long time to come.

As to implementation and enforcement of the laws directly or indirectly affecting media, it should be consistent and without a shadow of “selective justice”. In this, the political independence and professionalism of the regulatory authorities play a crucial role. The guarantees for this should be provided for in law, but establishing a track-record is equally important.

Public Service Media (PSM) unlike other, commercial, media are established by a law or similar act. So formally, but also by their function, PSM belong to the enabling environment for freedom of expression. Moreover, they use public money to finance their activities. In this respect, PSM should not interfere with commercial broadcasting (as referred to in the *acquis*⁵) and, at the same time, they should ensure a real plurality of content (as is precisely defined by the law – public service remit) – which the commercial media are not obliged to. The current status of most of the PSBs in the region, as the governments exercise political and financial control over them, is clearly in contradiction to what is prescribed by the *acquis*. Comprehensive reform strategies – rooted in public service remit as reflected in law and ensuring autonomy of financing for the public broadcasting - should be developed and put in place.

2.2. Media outlets assuming responsibility for improved internal governance and production

The worsening economic conditions form a temptation for many media outlets to deviate from regular business practices. Often they step into the “grey zone” regarding tax or labour laws. There is a real risk that editorial policies and professional ethics could be compromised for the sake of obtaining public or commercial funding. As a result the confidence in traditional (off-line) media decreases.

Reversing this tendency is a serious challenge for editors and media owners. First and foremost it would mean adhering to clearly (and publicly) defined editorial and ethical codes. There should be effective mechanisms in place to deal honestly and transparently with readers/viewers complaints. All employees (including part-time and freelancers) at an outlet should be covered by proper work contracts that would clearly demonstrate that there is no room for self-censorship triggered by poor

⁵ Communication from the Commission on the application of State aid rules to public service broadcasting (Text with EEA relevance); [http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:52009XC1027\(01\):EN:NOT](http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:52009XC1027(01):EN:NOT)

labour relations. Opportunities for developing professional skills of journalists need to be present; especially in the view of learning to act in the currently changing media environment. All in all, these initiatives depend on the commitment of media owners and editors to professional, socially relevant, journalism.

2.3 increasing capacity and representativeness of journalist professional organisations

Many of the problems that the media encounter in the enlargement zone stem from the civic weakness of the media community in these countries. It is largely fragmented and politically polarised thereby giving ample space for clientelism and a decline in professional standards. Far too often the media professionals are not capable of transcending their political divides and affiliations for the sake of agreeing on common interests: be it insisting on proper labour relations, or on effective and representative self-regulation in the sector. The inability to exercise solidarity within the sector and defend labour rights has led to a situation of widespread self-censorship due to the exposure of journalists to their superiors – media owners and editors. Similarly, the media self-regulation which was meant to maintain ethical and professional standards cannot make progress exactly because of the fragmentation and polarisation of the media community. This serves as grounds (and sometimes a pretext) for the judiciary to interfere with critical journalism.

Most importantly, the journalists themselves need to be the key driver of the expected change regarding media freedom. Many solutions to the persisting problems – provided they are not covered by EU laws - should be found nationally, in a dialogue with national authorities. In those few cases where journalists' professional organisations in enlargement countries proved to be stronger and agreed on a common line concerning their professional interests, we could record a positive advancement on the freedom of expression agenda. Therefore the Commission will use its accumulated experience by supporting the development of Civil Society and its organisations in the Western Balkans and Turkey, and will assist also journalists' and media professional organisations.

3. EU SUPPORT

The Commission will offer a combination of political and financial support to meet these priorities, employing a more strategic, effective and results-focused approach to deliver maximum impact with the limited human and financial resources available.

In its political support the Commission will encourage enlargement countries to make legislation more supportive of the media. It will also promote the involvement of media and civil society in the pre-accession process, including in the formulation, implementation and monitoring of sector strategies for EU financial assistance which will be strengthened under IPA II.

The Commission's financial assistance will use an appropriate mix of funding instruments⁶ to respond to different types of needs and country contexts in a flexible, transparent, cost-effective and results

⁶ The Commission may consider all funding instruments and approaches provided for in the Financial Regulation. These include projects, programme funding, direct awards, pooled funding, follow-up grants, simplified calls and re-granting.

focused manner which also considers the administration burden for the Commission. This will include: aiming for longer term contracts, recognising that capacity building and advocacy work requires time and resources; moving away from project based support to a more flexible approach that fosters partnership and coalition building.

It must also be understood that accession-related EU funding is limited in volume and time. Although having been a major donor to Media and Civil Society, the EU cannot and should not aim to fill the funding gap left as other donors exit from the region. As the enlargement countries move towards accession, the Commission will support media organisations become less dependent on international donor funding, including funding from the EU.

The guidelines should be in place by March 2014 and will serve as a basis for supporting media at both levels – regional (multi-beneficiary) and individual countries. Once in place, the guidelines should become part of the IPA multi-country and country strategies and will inspire the programming for the period 2014-2020. As soon as the consultation process is finished, a first financing decision (2014-2015) will be prepared and adopted, with specific actions to support media freedom and media integrity both at country and multi-country level.

4. MEASURING RESULTS AND IMPACT

These guidelines are formulated in the form of a draft results framework. The framework contains goals and results to be achieved by developing and deploying multi-beneficiary and bilateral assistance programmes. Special attention is paid to the aspect of verification: measurable indicators (and benchmarks) are grouped according to particular results to be achieved and possible means of verification (MoV) are identified for each group of indicators. The selection of indicators and MoVs also take into consideration the cost-effectiveness and actual availability of data.

Monitoring the guidelines will be supervised by DG ELARG in collaboration with the EU Delegations in the region, international organisations and networks of CSOs already active in media freedom and integrity. The collection of data will include both qualitative and quantitative assessments and will be conducted by means of surveys, peer reviews, independent assessment, etc.

The results framework will allow for the measurement of progress at country level as well across the enlargement region. The monitoring and evaluation system will include a yearly (or biannual) regional meeting with the involvement of media organisations, CSOs and broadcasters to analyse the state of play and advancement towards targets. As this may serve as input into the annual progress reports, the Commission's political desks will be associated with it.

DRAFT RESULTS FRAMEWORK

The proposed results framework has been developed in line with the principles and objectives set out in the annual Enlargement Strategy Paper and other policy documents of DG Enlargement to support media freedom and integrity for the period 2014-2020. It has been conceived as a framework for the enlargement region as a whole and will provide the basis for a tailor-made approach at national level in accordance with the country context. Indicators are defined in consultation with media community stakeholders from the enlargement region and relevant international organisations. A brainstorming event, involving some of them, took place on 7-8 November, 2013 in Brussels. It was followed up with a broad online consultation concluded on 6 January, 2014.. The benchmarks and indicators are to be re-fined further considering them under the operational / easy-to-estimate point of view.

Objective	Result	Benchmark/Indicator	Means of Verification ⁷
Enabling environment and resulting responsibilities of main actors			
1. An enabling legal, regulatory and policy environment for the exercising rights of freedom of expression and media and media integrity.	<p>1.1. Parliaments (and governments) in Enlargement countries:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - conduct periodic assessments of the state of media freedom, measuring national laws and practice against a range of basic principles on the “quality of law” stated in ECtHR case-law and the indicators listed in the Council of Europe PA Resolution 1636 (2008). -put forward and adopt policy and legislative proposals in line with the EU law and above principles and indicators to 	<p>1.1.a. Annual assessments of existing legislation, other legal acts affecting media and factors influencing freedom of expression conducted.</p> <p>1.1.b. Extent (e.g. number of organisations, possibly, common Parliament/journalist working groups, commissions, etc.) to which journalist professional organisations, media interested NGOs and other relevant players (regulators, self-regulatory bodies, ombudsmen, etc.) are consulted in transparent manner and involved in preparing the Parliaments’ assessments and</p>	<p>Independent assessment by II.OO. and/or regional media CSOs</p> <p>Survey among media, journalists, Unions and CSOs.</p>

⁷ The column “Means of Verification” is largely open for time being. It should reflect how, in what form the indicators are to be measured to certify the implementation of the goals. One can imagine a diverse spectrum of means and actors involved. So, for example, if it is about quality assessment of the adopted laws, the European Commission might relay on the established cooperation with the Council of Europe and OSCE. When it is about assessing the assistance to journalist professional organisations by using the Civil Society Facility, most probably the verification means associated with this instrument will be used. Once there is a general agreement on the guidelines, the indicators and methods of verification will be further explored and fine-tuned with organisations and institutions having the experience in this regard (e.g. regional CSOs monitoring the media situation).

	<p>address the shortcomings.</p>	<p>follow-up proposals. Independent assessments by think-tanks, international institutes and similar (if available) published and form part of dialogue with Parliaments.</p> <p>1.1.c. Number of proposals (e.g. policy approaches/"strategies", draft laws) made and implemented as a result of the above assessment.</p>	
	<p>1.2. Judiciary acts in conformity with article 10 of the European Convention on Human Rights and applicable case law. Relevant case law from ECtHR (applying Art.10) translated, regularly updated and published. National curricula for judicial training developed and regularly updated on media freedom standards. Public officials refrain from laying charges against critical media (increased "tolerance threshold").</p>	<p>1.2.a. Numbers of judicial staff trained in applying ECtHR case law on freedom of expression; training covers also application of legislation affecting media in line with fundamental rights (including to free expression)⁸.</p> <p>1.2.b. Number of rulings related to media that are consistent with ECtHR case law.</p> <p>1.2.c. Dynamics in numbers of court cases (acquitted cases, convictions, levels of awarded damages and proportionality of other sanctions, etc.) where charges are pushed by public officials on grounds of media criticism (defamation and other laws).</p>	<p>Annual report by Supreme Courts and Judicial Academies, depending on the country.</p> <p>Peer reviews under Ch.23&24.</p>

⁸ By the way of an example: if the court case refers to , for instance, fiscal or economic aspects of a media outlet, the court should take into consideration the public significance of the given media for exercising freedom of expression.

	<p>1.3. State institutions and public authorities take positive actions to ensure and promote media pluralism and their independence.</p> <p>Law enforcement in media outlets (e.g. tax, labour and similar laws) leaves no impression of “selective justice”.</p> <p>Persisting restrictions to information on grounds of privacy or national security are proportionate.</p>	<p>1.3.a. Number of statements by public officials possibly having self-censorship effect on media.</p> <p>1.3.b. Number of physical attacks, threats and other forms of intimidation of media decreases. Such cases are dealt with by law enforcement and judiciary in timely manner.</p> <p>1.3.c. Rules on access to information are in place and being followed by authorities without delays (increase in number of replies complying with stipulated deadlines; decrease in complaints about incomplete, delayed or non-received answers).</p>	<p>Survey among media, journalists, Unions and CSOs.</p> <p>Monitoring reports realized by international and/or regional CSOs.</p>
	<p>1.4. Independent and professional regulators preserve media pluralism and prevent unfair competition in media market.</p>	<p>1.4.a. The legislation provides for independent and professional operation of regulatory authorities of the broadcasting sector without political or other interference. They work in a transparent and effective manner. Regulators (and sector) are consulted on regulation changes. Government/legislator refrains from actions that might be qualified as interference with regulators independence. Financial autonomy of regulators is secured; it is reflected in annual report by regulator on performing its key tasks. Track-record of regulators independence, transparency and professionalism established</p> <p>1.4.b. Regulators provide (annually) transparent, credible (in terms of real beneficiaries) and accessible records on media ownership. Economic performance/financial</p>	<p>Peer reviews under Ch.10 <i>Information society and media</i>.</p> <p>Sub-committee meetings Ch.10.</p> <p>Independent assessment by II.OO. and/or regional CSOs.</p>

		<p>statements of outlets are made available.</p> <p>1.4.c. Legislation against media monopolies and dominant market positions is in place and properly enforced (track-record). Fines are proportionate. Enforcement record is made public.</p> <p>1.4.d. "State advertising" and any other direct or indirect use of public money in media handled in accordance with good governance to guarantee fairness, neutrality and equal treatment (rules are in place and enforced by the competition authority or comparable). Volume and share of State advertising, other use of public money per media outlet is published.</p> <p>1.4.e. Transparency in dispatching adds by big state-owned companies. Their volume and share per outlet is made public.</p> <p>1.4.f. Public policies (e.g. on digitisation, dispatching of official publicity campaigns) and regulatory proposals are developed on the basis of sector analysis and verified audience measurement (implemented regularly).</p> <p>1.4.g. Responsible authorities (e.g. regulatory bodies) perform periodic sector analysis to disclose informal economic pressures on independent reporting (e.g. by adds agencies, media owners participating in public procurement, cross-ownerships, etc.). Legal checks are in place against these</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>pressures.</p> <p>1.4.h. Privatisation of state owned media carried out in transparent way and with due respect to fair competition.</p>	
	<p>1.5. Stimulate public's demand of quality journalism. Increase in media literacy and understanding of role of professional and ethical journalism in off-line and online media.</p>	<p>1.5.a. Public programmes to promote media literacy are in place.</p> <p>1.5.b. Internet remains free (regulation does not seek block or filter internet content, internet providers respect free access to web as public good) .</p> <p>1.5.c. Public authorities has developed strategies for supporting of "new"/online, local and alternative media (including definition of public responsibilities of internet service providers).</p>	<p>Independent assessment by regional CSOs.</p>
	<p>1.6. Public Service Media – ensure content pluralism in media environment in independent and accountable manner.</p> <p>Reform of Public Service Broadcaster – guided by Public Service remit and adequate budgeting - is implemented. PSB establish track-record of professionalism, transparency and independence.</p> <p>Digitisation of broadcasting implemented in transparent way that ensures media plurality and respects competition rules.</p>	<p>1.6.a. Public Service Media remit defined in law (as preceded by broad public consultation).</p> <p>1.6.b. Law provides for editorial independence and against politicisation of PSB. Representative (of society in large: minorities, NGOs, academia and similar) supervisory board in place.</p> <p>1.6.c. Sustainability and autonomy of PSB financing mechanism; sufficient funds to perform Public Service: degree of autonomy of financial sources (share of GDP, share of annual budget, forms of subscription fees and their collection rate, etc), their sufficiency to comply with PS remit</p> <p>1.6.d. PSB subscribe to</p>	<p>Independent assessment by II.OO. and/or regional CSOs.</p> <p>Ch.10 sub-committee meetings (as far as the legal side is concerned)</p>

		<p>accountability by publishing annual reports (including financial) according to Public Service Remit as provided for in law and annual work plans.</p> <p>1.6.e. Code of ethics and effective mechanism in place to deal with viewers' complaints.</p> <p>1.6.f. measuring dynamics of public's trust in PSB.</p>	
	1.7. Initiative and creativity by state institutions in using tools at their disposal to promote free speech and media diversity	1.7.a. Other actions undertaken by authorities and aimed at promoting free expression and media pluralism.	TBD
Advancing media to a modern level of internal governance			
2. Media outlets (owners/editors) assume responsibility for improved internal governance and production. Increased resilience of media against external pressures. Growing audience's confidence in them.	2.1. Media outlets voluntarily adhere to principles of transparency (as required by good governance). Professional associations of media owners/publishers established.	2.1.a. The share of media outlets that provide open access to key data about corporate governance and finances (e.g. ownership structure, income received from the state, financing sources, balance sheets, market share, etc.) .	Independent assessment by regional CSOs.
	2.2. Media outlets voluntarily subscribe to and implement adequate labour standards. Labour relations are not a factor for self-censorship anymore (see also 4.5.).	<p>2.2.a. Increased share of journalists (including part-time and freelance) reporting adequate working contracts with sufficient social protection.</p> <p>2.2.b (Number of) Signed collective agreements. Number and status of part-time and freelance staff.</p> <p>2.2.c Journalists do not report obstacles to freedom of association [in unions]. Internal code of conduct clearly spells out this right.</p>	<p>Survey among media, journalists, Unions and CSOs.</p> <p>Independent assessment by international and/or regional CSOs.</p>

	2.3. Self-enforcement of ethical norms and professional standards.	2.3.a. Share of media outlets with developed in-house codes (e.g., in line with European and International Federation of Journalists) and effective mechanisms to deal with readers/viewers complaints (e.g. ombudsman, readers editor). 2.3. Survey among media, journalists, Unions and CSOs.b. Number of dismissed journalists un grounds of critical reporting (which was consistent with editorial code).	Survey among media, journalists, Unions and CSOs.
	2.4. Structures strengthened for basic and continuous training and education of journalists and journalist students on professional standards, freedom of expression and media integrity. No legal restrictions to journalist profession. Fair, transparent and politically independent accreditation procedures in place.	2.4.a. Number of curriculums for journalist colleges/schools developed and implemented incorporating ethical codes and standards. 2.4.b. number of internships increased and professional journalists and publicists as resource persons in training programmes.	Independent assessment by regional CSOs.
	2.5. Media outlets promote professional training (including on professional ethics).	2.5.a. Professional development programmes are in place; average hours of training per employee defined by staff development policy (different categories).	Independent assessment by regional CSOs.
	2.6. Investment in professional management of company. Improved economic performance of the outlet in changing markets	2.6. Number/share of media outlets with well-defined business plans under implementation	TBD
	2.7. Regaining audience's confidence.	2.7.a. Quantitative and qualitative measurement of audience ratings for outlets embarking upon improved governance (including improved editorial policy).	Audience measurement.

<p>3. Qualitative and trustworthy investigative journalism available to citizens.</p>	<p>3.1. Improved conditions for quality investigative journalism (see also: 1.3.b; 4.5.a; 2.4.b) including modern/innovative approaches to increase quality and credibility of investigative journalism.</p> <p>Increased cooperation between journalists, their groups and CSOs for benefiting investigative journalism.</p> <p>Training programmes for modern analytical approaches in investigative journalism in place.</p>	<p>3.1.a. Number of joint – journalist/CSOs projects. Number of cooperative and regional teams dedicated to journalist investigation.</p> <p>3.1.b. Share of outlets’ (including PSM, local and online media) budget dedicated to investigative journalism. Share of air-time (“pages”) dedicated to investigative stories.</p> <p>3.1.c. public recognitions of quality investigative journalism.</p>	<p>TBD</p> <p>TBD</p> <p>Audience measurement.</p>
<p>Increasing capacity and representativeness of journalist professional organisations</p>			
<p>4. Representative media and journalist professional organisations capable of taking responsibility of sector relevant issues in dialogue with authorities as well as providing services to their members.</p>	<p>4.1. Regular dialogue within the media community established on press freedom and integrity issues. Broad platforms (journalist professional organisations, NGOs, think-tanks, editors and owners) formed.</p>	<p>4.1.a Frequency and productiveness of conducted meetings : number and significance of joint conclusions and actions at national and regional levels.</p> <p>4.1.b Media professionals and general public demonstrates awareness about freedom of expression issues.</p>	<p>Survey among media, journalists, Unions, CSOs (and general public – TBC).</p>
	<p>4.2. Media organisations/journalists associations act on basis of long-term vision and strategies to achieve impact. Productive dialogue with authorities established.</p>	<p>4.2. Media and journalist organisations engage into informed dialogue with authorities in coordinated manner. Increased respect to these organisations. It is reflected particularly in:</p> <p>a. increased capability of fundraising (to support implementation of long-term plans) and lasting financial self-sustainability</p> <p>b. number of advocacy actions organised and implemented</p> <p>c. number of joint policy actions (e.g. dialogue meetings with public authorities to suggest or influence upcoming policies or legislation); impact of these</p>	<p>Survey among media, journalists, Unions and CSOs.</p> <p>Independent assessment by regional CSOs.</p>

		<p>actions on adopted decisions</p> <p>d. number of members having benefited from free legal aid</p> <p>e. range of services made available to members</p> <p>f. dynamics in membership figures.</p>	
	4.3. Media organisations monitor and evaluate the results and impact of their own work.	4.3.a. Annual reports by media organisations that monitor and evaluate their projects and programmes using baselines and quality indicators. Share of media organizations publishing their reports.	Reports of media organizations.
	4.4. Platforms (journalist professional organisations, NGOs, media owners and editors) set up and actively promote professional standards and ethics.	<p>4.4.a. Presence of self-regulatory bodies with relevant representation from the media community(e.g. number of outlets, media market share covered by them), effectiveness of the agreed rules: number of decisions taken against their members and their implementation rate.</p> <p>4.4.b. Dynamics of financial contributions from media community, outlets and media owners to common self-regulatory body/-ies (e.g. a Press Council), indicating respect of the commonly agreed rules institutional sustainability.)</p> <p>4.4.c. Self-regulatory body interacts with and is available for advice to judiciary.</p>	Independent assessment by II.OO. and/or regional CSOs.
	4.5. Labour standards developed and adhered to.	<p>4.5.a. increased share of journalists reporting adequate working contracts with sufficient social protection (see also: 2.2)</p> <p>4.5.b. Trade unions recognised as partners in negotiating collective agreements. Number of media outlets where</p>	<p>Survey among media, journalists, Unions and CSOs.</p> <p>Independent assessment by regional CSOs.</p>

		<p>collective bargaining between trade unions and employers took place with a positive result. Quality of reached agreements (against the backdrop of labour standards).</p> <p>4.5.c Number of advocacy and lobbying activities by unions and other organisations regarding labour standards.</p> <p>4.5.d Quality and number of social services (e.g. level of social protection) for part-time and freelance journalists</p> <p>4.5.e Implementation of national labour laws (in media outlets) and their reflection in reached collective agreements.</p> <p>4.5.f Presence (or absence) of media owners/employers organisations. Their role in reaching satisfactory labour standards.</p> <p>4.5.g. (Dynamics in) Numbers of journalists associated in a journalist unions.</p> <p>4.5.h. Attempts of “unisation” (or “de-unisation”) at media outlets.</p>	
--	--	--	--