

Evaluation report on Medienhilfe network projects in Macedonia and Kosovo

By Dr Mark Thompson¹

Executive Summary

This report is the outcome of an independent evaluation of two projects run by Medienhilfe in south-eastern Europe, with funds from PD IV. These projects are networks of local television stations in the Republic of Macedonia, and radio stations in the province of Kosovo.

Macedonia

Progress in developing multiethnic cooperation is fragile and needs continuing protection, both in the media and in society at large. The two obvious benefits of the *Makedonija na dlanka* (MND) network are:

- i. to counteract negative ethnic stereotypes
- ii. to demonstrate that bi-ethnic collaboration is possible, and therefore – in principle – normal.

Potentially, a third benefit is:

- iii. to break significant news stories that could be taken up by bigger media outlets and raise the profile of MND.

I recommend that MND should revert to its former (pre-2006) timeslot, review the selection of topics, and improve the style of reporting.

Kosovo

The future of multiethnic (multilingual) broadcasting in Kosovo will continue to be a hostage to wider developments. As long as most people are *against* hearing the ‘other’ language in their radio programmes, broadcasters will have commercial as well as political disincentives to multiethnic activity. The size of the ethnic minorities means that minority-language stations are not commercially viable.

Multiethnic radio projects are still worth supporting, but on certain conditions:

- i. Such projects should benefit the wider community – by encouraging good interethnic relations, and serving the cause of good journalism.
- ii. They should possess an internal dynamic. In other words, they should not exist merely for the stations to get funds.

CerpiK (Cross-ethnic radio programming in Kosovo) satisfies the first of these conditions to some extent, and could do so more fully. As for the second condition: I cannot state confidently that CerpiK meets it. In principle, CerpiK is run by the stations, not by Medienhilfe. It is donor-funded without necessarily being donor-directed. This distinguishes CerpiK positively from other multiethnic projects. Yet Medienhilfe provides essential impetus, as well as nurturing.

I recommend that CerpiK should increase its territorial coverage; collaborate on marketing and publicity; review its criteria for selecting and treating topics; and clarify structural membership issues.

Overall

Even if interethnic relations in Macedonia and Kosovo make optimal progress over the next two years, these projects will remain relevant and valuable. Interethnic reconciliation is best tackled indirectly, by practical collaboration on a professional basis. These networks succeed in doing this, and also – because these are media projects – in demonstrating to a wide public that such collaboration should be something normal.

While we should not exaggerate their likely impact on wider interethnic relations in Macedonia and Kosovo, these projects could have continuing relevance – socially, politically, and also professionally, in terms of the development of broadcasting culture in Macedonia and Kosovo.

They are overtly political projects, intended to achieve benefits that are broadly political and social, rather than narrowly professional. However, their special virtue lies in the fact that these benefits can best be

¹ A short biography is attached at Annex A.

achieved by developing the professionalism of the projects. Steps to achieve this are recommended in this report.

Further training is now essential if years of partnership are to come to fruition. Matching funds should be found to pay for training, technical assistance and – in Kosovo – for structural (management) reforms. This would allow Medienhilfe to address directly the ability of the stations to deliver content that will raise the quality, visibility and reputation of the networks.

There is a healthy rapport between the stations and Medienhilfe, which is capable of sustaining long-term partnerships based on the partners' and their societies' interests, rather than – as is so common with foreign NGOs – on donors' preconceptions or directions. It certainly has the commitment and competence to help the networks to develop in this way. (Indeed, these recommendations are only feasible *with* Medienhilfe's close involvement.)

A. Introduction

This report is the outcome of an independent evaluation of two projects run by Medienhilfe in south-eastern Europe, with funds from PD IV in the Swiss FDA. These projects are networks of local television stations in the Republic of Macedonia, and radio stations in the province of Kosovo.

I was contracted to assess the quality, relevance and impact of these projects by analysing problems, drawing conclusions, and offering recommendations. In addition, I was requested to appraise Medienhilfe's effectiveness and efficiency in steering these projects.

Method of work

From 23 to 27 August, I travelled to Zurich where I spent a half-day with Ms Nena Skopljanac and Mr Roland Brunner of Medienhilfe. There was a separate meeting at Medienhilfe's office with Mr Roland Salvisberg of PD IV.

On 24 August, I travelled with Ms Skopljanac and Mr Brunner to Skopje, Macedonia, where we had discussions with three well-known media experts: Mr Roberto Belicanec of the Media Development Centre, Dr Vesna Sopar of the Institute for Sociological, Political and Legal Research, and Ms Violeta Gligoroska of the Open Society Institute. Subsequently we met a well-known independent political analyst and civil-society activist, Prof. Biljana Vankovska.

On 25 August, we attended an Evaluation Workshop on the Macedonian network project. (See section B. below.) On 26 August, we travelled to Pristina, Kosovo, where we attended an Evaluation Workshop on the Kosovo network project. (See section C. below.) The following day, we flew back to Zurich and I returned to the UK. I have watched a sample of the Macedonian network's TV programmes and listened to a sample of the Kosovo network's radio programmes. The full itinerary is attached at Annex 2.

Purpose of this evaluation

Apart from the meeting with Mr Salvisberg of PD IV, all my meetings were held jointly with Ms Skopljanac and Mr Brunner. For this was not a classical evaluation. It has been requested by Medienhilfe, not required by PD IV. I agree with Mr Salvisberg that this request demonstrated Medienhilfe's "exceptional maturity regarding evaluation and assessment".

Mr Brunner explained Medienhilfe's reasons for seeking this evaluation. Approaching the end of this funding term, they wish to stand back from the projects and consider some bigger questions:

- Are these two projects worth doing? Are there sound arguments for doing them? Should Medienhilfe be doing something else?
- Has Medienhilfe chosen the most appropriate partners and projects?
- Does society benefit from the projects?
- Do the partner stations benefit?
- Have the local (political, media) contexts changed in ways that affect the value and aims of the projects?
- Does Medienhilfe have healthy relationships with its partners (the broadcasters in the networks)? Do the partners feel there *is* a partnership?
- Does Medienhilfe have the proper tools, mechanisms and competences to steer these projects?

PD IV

Mr Salvisberg described PD IV's support for these projects, and explained its interest in the evaluation:

- Funding for these projects comes from the Political Division ("PD IV, Human Security") of the Federal Department for Foreign Affairs (FDA), i.e. the Swiss Foreign Ministry.
- PD IV has granted Medienhilfe funds in the region of €650,000 for its West Balkan Program over the two-year period of 2005 and 2006. MND received €5,000 and CerpiK received €30,000. Grants from other sources for these projects over this period were €48,800 for MND and €26,000 for CerpiK.
- Self-evidently, PD IV is a political organ, not a development agency. Its remit concerning media and conflict is to help media outlets to "increase people's understanding of the key aspects of a conflict and create the necessary conditions for dialogue both within and between the opposing parties."² This is done by promoting journalism that "focuses on the causes of conflicts, common interests and values of conflicting parties, and possible solutions".
- To this end, PD IV has supported "training courses for journalists, broadcasting of minority and multi-ethnic programmes, production of media reports on reconciliation work, and equipping of editorial offices and studios" as part of peace-building and conflict-transformation initiatives on three continents.³
- Media support in the context of Switzerland's foreign policy is further shaped by the thematic priority of "Dealing with the past". Practically, this entails support for pluralism of opinion and perspectives; for transitional justice; for the provision of balanced information on key events in the past and processes for dealing with the past (such as war crimes tribunals); for the inclusion of minorities in the media landscape; and for trans-border cooperation.
- Within the overall budget for "Swiss Peace Policy", the allocation to media is not very large: in 2005, it amounted to 4 per cent. ("Dealing with the past" had a separate allocation of 5 per cent.)
- Switzerland is planning to reduce commitments in south-eastern Europe in the coming years.

Regarding this evaluation:

- PD IV hopes for an appraisal of these two projects in the light of their high general aspirations stipulated in the project documents (bridging the interethnic divide and communication gap after violent conflict, building trust and mutual understanding, and contributing to peaceful interethnic cohabitation).
- PD IV would be glad to receive suggestions for improving the media's role in dealing with issues of *transitional justice*. How can media be helped to help society deal with the legacy of serious violations of human rights that the judicial system has not been able to tackle?⁴
- Finally, the FDA would welcome greater visibility from these projects.

B. "Macedonia in the Palm of your Hand" (Makedonija na dlanka, MND)

Introduction

The Republic of Macedonia is a small impoverished country (population: 2 m., average monthly income: €220) that confronts immense challenges to its stability and development. The key domestic political fact or issue is the relationship between the ethnic Macedonians (64 %) and the largest ethnic minority, which is Albanian (25 %). These groups are divided practically by language and psychologically by mutual fear and suspicion. In 2001, the country was rocked by an armed conflict between Albanian guerrillas and the Macedonian police and army. Although fewer than 200 people died, it was widely felt that the country stood on the brink of a bloodbath that might permanently shatter its unity.

Most adult Albanians have the advantage of understanding Macedonian-language media. On the other hand, they are poorly served by media in their own language.

² From the Bill to Parliament concerning funding allocations for conflict transformation and the promotion of human rights (2004-2007).

³ From a PD IV information sheet on "Media and conflict", FDA, dated May 2004, and also.

⁴ PD IV does support Medienhilfe projects on transitional justice, but this theme was not included in the terms of the present evaluation as approved by PD IV. Nor was the theme raised by any of the partners during the evaluation.

The media suffer from the usual problems of transitional, post-Yugoslav countries: over-politicisation, under-capitalisation, demoralisation, and ignorance (plus inexperience) of Western journalistic standards. There is still no real media market.

Like Serbia, Bosnia & Herzegovina and Kosovo, Macedonia has a super-saturated broadcasting sector. There are some 156 broadcasters: a national 'public service broadcaster', 29 local 'public service broadcasters' that are now due for privatisation, five national private TV stations, 56 local TV stations and 65 local radio stations.⁵ This number would be unsustainable in a much wealthier country. (Macedonia's per capita GDP is lower than Bulgaria, Romania, Turkey or even Belarus.)

The national private TV stations are owned by big business or controlled by political parties. Airwave and cable piracy is still widespread – something else that puts lawful media outlets at a disadvantage. There seems little if any prospect of early action under the new broadcasting law (2005) to close down irregular stations. Too many such stations enjoy political protection that will block any such action. In addition, every town is now served by cable networks that give access to 30 or more foreign channels. This further dilutes the audience (and advertising revenue) available for good local production.

A further blow to serious broadcasters was the closure of the 'Media Fund'. This pool of money, representing 10 % of the licence fee, was used to subsidise quality production. The final tender took place at the end of 2005.

Regarding cross-ethnic or bi-ethnic journalism: there is still very little. MRTV, the state ('public') broadcaster, has not established a long-promised "multiethnic newsroom". MRTV's programming in minority languages (Albanian, Roma, Turkish and Vlach) continues to be segregated rather than inter-ethnic and bi-lingual.

However, we were told that the atmosphere in the multiethnic areas in the centre and west of Macedonia has eased over the past year or so. Levels of suspicion have declined sharply. We heard that young Macedonians in Veles are starting to learn Albanian; that Macedonian media are less prone to produce negative stereotypes of Albanians; that influential Macedonian outlets have started to employ one or two Albanian journalists in prominent positions. Also, that one Albanian-language broadcaster, Alsat, now carries a prime-time news bulletin in Macedonian, produced by a multiethnic team of journalists. Reportedly, these positive developments have not provoked nationalist hostility, as would have occurred in the past.

Whether these signs amount to a trend of increasing inter-ethnic tolerance is still unclear. Some observers fear the real trend leads in the opposite direction – towards ever-greater segregation. On this interpretation, the lack of hostility to the developments mentioned above may reflect growing indifference rather than toleration. (Allegedly, ever-greater numbers of young Albanians see no reason to learn Macedonian; they can expect to spend their entire lives in Albanian-only environments, or abroad.) These observers claim that the process of ethnic segregation has been accelerated by the implementation of the internationally-brokered agreement – known as the Ohrid Accords – that ended the fighting in 2001. For example, the decentralisation provisions may well serve to reduce interaction between the ethnic groups.

In sum, it is still impossible to know whether Macedonia has turned the corner away from ethnic conflict towards civic politics, or whether communal links between the groups are coming further unstitched.

The project

"Macedonia in the Palm of your Hand" (*Makedonija na dlanka*, MND) is a network project to co-produce programmes by seven legally registered local TV stations from around Macedonia. They are: TV Art (Tetovo), TV Era (Skopje), TV Hana (Kumanovo), TV M, TV Tera, TV Vis, and TV Zdravkin (Veles). The first three of these stations broadcast in Albanian; the remaining four in Macedonian.

These stations collaborate in preparing a fortnightly 'magazine' programme of news items. Each station chooses its topic on the basis of commonly developed and defined criteria of relevance, and contributes the item in its own language, with subtitles in the other language.⁶

The consensus among people we met was that MND includes the best local-level broadcasters in the country.⁷ We were also told that MND is now Macedonia's only bi-ethnic broadcasting project with a regular output.⁸

⁵ The quotation marks around 'public service broadcaster' indicate that these entities do not operate as genuine PSBs and should not be mistaken for such, regardless of their legal or statutory titles.

⁶ As with CerpiK, Medienhilfe is involved with defining programme criteria with the partners, and reviews content post-facto; it does not interfere with the selection or treatment of topics.

Medienhilfe has sought to improve the quality of programming since 2003. Technological improvements in 2004 led to better production standards and improvements in distribution. During 2005, Medienhilfe worked with the partner stations on the criteria for the selection of topics. Ratings research during 2005 indicated that some of the partner stations had increased their popularity.

In 2005 and 2006, each station receives some €8,500 per annum from Medienhilfe, not including postproduction costs.⁹ (They also receive equivalent funds from other donors, including FOSI-M and NPA, to support their news output.) This sum represents significant income for only three stations: TV Art, TV Zdravkin, and TV Hana. For the others, with their bigger budgets and more secure finances, there is little if any financial incentive to participate in the project.

The stations' self-evaluation in the Workshop

Professionalisation: The stations' self-assessment was very positive about recent improvements to the programme in terms of appropriate topics, balanced coverage, and a broad range of interviewees. They believe the topics are sufficiently varied, providing 'something for everyone', with perspectives that are genuinely local.

Comment: See my remarks on 'The output', below.

Ratings: The stations plausibly claim to have achieved the target of 170,000 viewers per programme in 2005.

Comment: Medienhilfe suspects that ratings have fallen during 2006 – perhaps due to the current transmission time of 22:30 on Sundays. The stations agreed that this timeslot (introduced in January 2006) is not optimal.

Feedback: The stations claim that public feedback on MND programmes is positive.

Comment: While this is doubtless true, I have the impression that there is very little feedback of any kind.

Relationship with Medienhilfe: The stations assessed their relationship with Medienhilfe very favourably. They particularly appreciate the autonomy they enjoy within the project, receiving support and advice rather than directives.¹⁰

Comment: This autonomy is an achievement by all concerned. The relationship is apparently a healthy one.

Self-sustainability: The stations' target contribution to the cost of MND during 2005-2006 was 50 per cent. This has now been revised down to 40 per cent, and it is not at all certain that all local partners will achieve this lower level in the current funding period.

The stations had set themselves a target of increasing their total marketing revenue by 5 to 10 % year-on-year. This has not been achieved.

Comment: In spite of the difficulties stemming from the country's weak economy, with macro recovery slower than anticipated, the stations' effective contribution to covering the MND costs in 2005 was as planned: 35 %. As the planned increase to 50 % in 2006 would jeopardize the operation of the smaller stations in the project (Hana, Zdravkin and to a lesser extent M and Vis), it was decided to reduce the planned increase to 40 %.

Due to Macedonia's reduced overall media advertising spend, the planned increase in advertising revenue for each station could not be achieved. TV Zdravkin, which operates in Veles, the city with the biggest economic problems in Macedonia, could not increase its revenue at all. The biggest progress was recorded by TV Era and TV Tera (around 15 %), which operate on the biggest markets. Other stations (TV Hana, TV Vis, TV M, TV Art) achieved results as foreseen in the LOG-Frame.

⁷ Several favourable comments were also made about TV Menada, a Macedonian-language station in Tetovo that started operating in 2004. It would be positive if MND were to evolve in a way that allowed TV Menada to be invited to join.

⁸ There was a certain vogue for bi-ethnic media projects in the late 1990s and after the crisis of 2001. This vogue has passed. International donors, e.g. UNICEF, now pay for occasional one-off projects with a multilingual product, e.g. on AIDS awareness, but not for anything regular.

⁹ These costs amount to €20,125, paid to TV Tera (for the Macedonian-language version) and TV Era (for the Albanian-language version).

¹⁰ They compared this with a multiethnic broadcasting project, now defunct, that was run for a number of years by an international NGO, based in Brussels, called Search for Common Ground.

Looking ahead: The stations fell silent when Mr Brunner asked which steps they might take to develop the project. The same happened when they were asked to define project goals for the next two-year period.

Comment: This silence indicated the difficulty of forward thinking – let alone, forward planning – in a context that is politically volatile and economically stagnant. It is not surprising that the stations cannot envisage how they would respond to a significant upturn in Macedonia's economy or a sudden improvement in the broadcasting licensing regime, e.g. a clampdown on illegal stations and piracy. Their energy is devoted to surviving in present circumstances.

Also, the stations may well have believed that MND's current goals will remain fully appropriate in 2007-8. In other words, nothing has happened – and nothing *will* soon happen – to invalidate or supersede the goals of “bridging the communication gap between Macedonians and Albanians” and “increasing inter-ethnic tolerance and mutual understanding”.

As for the more concrete objectives for increased ratings and marketing revenue, the goals for 2006 might simply be rolled over into 2007.

The output

After watching more than a dozen programmes made earlier in 2006, I offer the following comments on the MND output:

- Most reports were on well-chosen topics, relevant to local communities. Broad themes included poverty, unemployment, marginal groups in society, education, decentralisation, and the quality of local services. A few items seemed too trivial to be of interest outside a small area.
- The programmes appear to be ethical, balanced, relevant, moderate.
- Most the reports were clearly structured. The presentation of the topics was sufficiently informative.
- The reports that contained interviews with ordinary people as well as with officials were particularly impressive. This combination gives a notable tension and texture.
- In general, however, the topics were handled in a rather traditional (conservative) journalistic style that favours officials. The camera respectfully – obediently – dwells on the faces of officials, never querying their statements. MND's style tends to reinforce civic passivity. To make the point strongly: the implication is that only the officials (typically, men in dark suits behind desks) have anything worth hearing about a problem.¹¹
- Some reports relied on too few images, using them over and over again in a space of several minutes.
- The stations underrate the power of simple montage to make a point through juxtaposition.
- The stations make very little use of their reporters, who are strictly excluded from the story, reduced to a nameless voice, an off-camera microphone. There is no *exchange* between interviewer and interviewee. This has serious implications: nothing on the topic needs to be uncovered, nothing relevant might be said that an official would be unwilling to say. In some cases this may be true; for example, an item about computers in a school. In other cases, it will not be true – and the public may not believe a report that pretends no investigation is needed to reach the truth.

Conclusions

There was a healthy rapport between the stations and Medienhilfe, at both workshops. There is mutual respect, good humour, and a sense of common purpose. Mr Brunner and Ms Skopljanac moderated with suitable doses of encouragement and admonition. Sometimes they needed to sound like schoolteachers, mildly frustrated by a class that hasn't finished its homework. This created no ill will. Probably the stations would be confused – even disappointed – if Medienhilfe did *not* try to inject extra energy and ideas into the partnership. Given their experience and expectations as both citizens and journalists, as well as the continuing challenges to interethnic collaboration, the stations should not be expected to take the initiative. They should, however, be expected to respond pro-actively, in a positive spirit, when Medienhilfe pushes.

Regarding Macedonia's wider political context, I agree with Mr Belicanec that progress in developing multiethnic cooperation is fragile and needs continuing protection. “The challenge for the next two years is to keep this trend going. The new government is young and inexperienced. It could easily blunder and

¹¹ I do not doubt Medienhilfe's assurance that progress has been made: “in the beginning there were almost no ordinary people at all in the reports. Now, 30 to 40 % of the stories do have them. Also, officials are now very rarely the only kind of interviewee. They are almost always combined with independent experts or NGO activists, if not ordinary people.”

set things back.” In the same spirit, Prof. Sopar cautioned against abandoning a project that is already underway. I would add that launching actual collaborative production on a regular basis is *extremely* difficult.

Given the lack of data for estimating the public, professional and political impact of MND’s programmes, my impression is that this impact is probably low. (I picked up no ‘buzz’ about the programmes.) Nobody should be discouraged by this situation. For MND remains politically significant, and there is no reason to think that it has begun to reach the maximum audience for its kind of programmes.

The two obvious benefits of MND are:

- i. to counteract negative ethnic stereotypes
- ii. to demonstrate that bi-ethnic collaboration is possible, and therefore – in principle – normal.

Potentially, a third benefit is:

- iii. to break significant news stories that could be taken up by bigger media outlets and raise the profile of MND.

The first two benefits may already be felt to some extent. In order for them to be fully realised, and for the third benefit to be realised at all, MND should now take feasible steps to attract more viewers.

Recommendations

Timeslot: MND’s current slot is not favourable. Unless the television-viewing pattern mapped in 2001 has changed completely, audience numbers are declining very steeply by 22:30, when MND now begins.¹² It should revert to its previous timeslot at 22:00 on Monday.

A further problem obviously is the change from a weekly to a fortnightly rhythm, due to a shortage of funding. This makes it much more difficult to win the viewers’ regular attendance. Medienhilfe and the project partners should seek additional funding to restore weekly programming.

Territorial coverage: Medienhilfe and its partner stations should investigate the possibility of leasing digital links from *Makedonska Radiodifuzija*, the state-owned entity that controls broadcast transmission infrastructure.¹³

Selection of topics: The trick is to identify *local* stories that can communicate something to people in *all* parts of Macedonia.

As well as local news stories, the stations might think of collaborating to examine a particular issue in their various regions. It could be fascinating – and highly newsworthy – to compare how Macedonian institutions deal with a certain problem in different parts of the country.

Looking further ahead, the stations might seek ways to *create* stories that expose the incompetence and unaccountability of institutions.

These more sophisticated reporting techniques would require special training.

Style: The stations should always weigh the following questions: Why should the public watch this report? How can we make this report more compelling to watch?

After improving the technical side of the productions and the choice of topics to be covered, the project should now pay attention to journalistic quality and post-production.

The time has come to bring the reporters into the stories. Although the anonymity of the stories simplifies production and standardises the reports, uniformity becomes monotonous. It makes the programmes *resemble* state broadcasting, rather than clearly providing a better *alternative*. The programmes would be nicer to watch and more attractive if the reporter is individuated, a real person interacting with the issue. If the story is about a bridge in a dangerous state of decrepitude, why not put the reporter on the bridge, speaking to camera?

Publicity: The stations might be funded and trained to prepare an advertisement about MND. The training alone would be valuable.

Feedback: The stations should keep logs of feedback to MND programmes.

¹² See *Television 2002 – International Key Facts* (RTL Group, November 2002), p. 405.

¹³ I understand that, under the terms of a Norwegian donation to develop digital links around Macedonia, *Makedonska Radiodifuzija* is obliged to grant fair terms for access by private media. Also, new broadcasting legislation allows local broadcasters to link up and function as a network in order to broadcast “joint programmes”, for up to 4 hours a day. (See Law on Broadcasting Activity (2005), Art. 79.)

C. “Cross-ethnic radio programming in Kosovo (CerpiK)”

Introduction

The political situation of Kosovo needs no introduction here. Relations between the majority (90 % +) Albanians and the Serb minority are a byword for reciprocal intolerance, prejudice and institutionalised hostility. These relations have slightly improved in the past year or two years – since the explosive violence of March 2004. Yet even today, there is not freedom of movement across the territory for all its citizens.

The province is now approaching the long-deferred decision on ‘final status’. The outcome will almost certainly formalise Serbia’s de facto loss of control over Kosovo since 1999, when NATO occupied the territory.

Since then, the UN and OSCE have sadly failed to impose an effective regulatory system on the broadcast media. This encouraged the establishment of a completely unsustainable number of outlets and a consequent shortage of quality local production. There are currently some 118 television and (mostly) radio stations for a population of some 2 million. Three broadcasters are Kosovo-wide TV stations. A “significant number” of the 93 (!) local or regional stations “survive only” because of donor support and KFOR, which pays them to carry its ‘psyops’ programmes. Two thirds of these radio stations apparently operate at a deficit.¹⁴

Regarding multiethnic radio: the most recent major survey of broadcasting in Kosovo states that multiethnic broadcasting is still “widely rejected and only accepted as donor-financed projects.”¹⁵ Moreover, some independent observers believe that, in the run-up to the UN Security Council’s decision on Kosovo’s final status, the international community has lost the will to confront powerful Kosovo Albanian interests. This would make the present moment particularly dangerous for multiethnic projects in civil society, including media projects.

There is only one Kosovo-wide radio station which carries news in Serbian and Turkish languages. Radio Blue Sky is the second channel of Radio Kosova, which is part of Radio-Television Kosovo (RTK), the province’s ‘public service broadcaster’.

Donors continue to push for multiethnic – especially Albanian-Serb – initiatives in the local media. Most recently, Radio Deutsche Welle (Germany), the Finnish Helsinki Committee for Human Rights, and People in Peril (Slovakia) have supported multiethnic ventures. Donor interest in such ventures is likely to fade after the final status decision is taken next year. One multiethnic venture was designed by a local radio station: Radio Vala Rinore started a project called “Radio Network for Human Rights”. This network produces fortnightly broadcasts on human rights themes. (The CerpiK stations are all involved.)

Under Kosovo’s new Law on Radio and Television (promulgated in April 2006), 5 % of licence fee revenue is set aside as a Minority Media Fund, to support “minority, multiethnic and disadvantaged media”. Several CerpiK stations responded to the first call for proposals, in May. One idea currently circulating in Kosovo is to use this Fund to establish the second channel of RTK as a minority channel.¹⁶ The OSCE Special Representative on Freedom of the Media has called for a “similar mechanism” to be designed for radio.¹⁷

Overall, the media have not fulfilled the requirements for multiethnic output that were outlined in the Kosovo Standards Implementation Plan of 2004.¹⁸ Nor have they been penalised for non-fulfilment.

The project

CerpiK (Cross-ethnic radio programming in Kosovo) is a network of 8 local or regional radio stations, developed with support by Medienhilfe and others since 2002. The number and selection of stations has changed over the years, and now includes Radio Kontakt Plus, Radio K, Radio Kamenica, Radio Kent FM, Radio Mitrovica, Radio Peja, Radio Vala Rinore, and Radio Yeni Donem. Of these stations, 4

¹⁴ Eberhard Laue, *Local Electronic Media in Kosovo*, OSCE Mission in Kosovo, August 2005, p. 12.

¹⁵ Laue, p. 12.

¹⁶ See The OSCE Special Representative on Freedom of the Media, “The State of Media Freedom in Kosovo. Observations and Recommendations”, 3 July 2006, p.5. Report available at http://www.osce.org/documents/rfm/2006/07/19767_en.pdf

¹⁷ Ibid.

¹⁸ Document available at

http://www.unmikonline.org/pub/misc/ksip_eng.pdf#search=%22kosovo%20standard%20implementation%20plan%22

broadcast primarily in Albanian (Kamenica, Mitrovica, Peja, Vala Rinore), 1 primarily in BCS (Kontakt Plus), 1 primarily in Turkish (Kent FM) while 2 are genuinely multilingual (Radio K, Yeni Donem).¹⁹ At its present level, CerpiK funding through Medienhilfe represents 4 to 10 per cent of these stations' annual income. The stronger stations are Kontakt Plus, Vala Rinore and Yeni Donem.

CerpiK's output is a fortnightly programme, between 30 and 45 minutes in length, on a single theme, in three languages (Albanian-BCS-Turkish), combining input from all of the partner stations. The stations air each programme simultaneously the first time, with several re-runs at different times during the week. The ethnic violence of March 2004 led the BCS stations to suspend cooperation. Six months later, CerpiK was back on air. According to Medienhilfe, "In 2004 a total of 40 broadcasts of 30 minutes each in three language versions (Albanian, Serbian and Turkish) were produced and aired. The topics were wide-ranging and included education, social life, human rights issues, politics and culture."²⁰

The quality of the programme was boosted in 2005 by three months of in-house training by Violeta Orosi, a well-respected local journalist who worked with the stations on improving programme structure and continuity. Not all of the stations welcomed the training equally, however. It can be difficult to admit shortcomings.

CerpiK is not legally registered as a legal entity. It has no secretariat. Basic coordination is carried out by Naim Breznica of Radio K.

The stations' self-evaluation in the Workshop

Professionalisation: Production quality has improved in line with logframe objectives. Partners believe that CerpiK output now gives a real picture of Kosovo society. Management has improved less.

Comment: See comments on Output, below.

Ratings: Negotiations have been opened with Radio Kosova 2 and several local stations over rebroadcasting the programmes. It was reported that one such station has agreed to rebroadcast.

Comment: A wider circle of rebroadcasters was planned to start from 2007. It is very positive that first contacts and agreements have already been reached in this respect.

Feedback: Feedback indicates that listeners enjoy hearing about situations in other parts of Kosovo.

Comment: As with MND, it is unclear how much feedback there is, of any kind.

Relationship with Medienhilfe: The stations agreed that on the whole, Medienhilfe has been a model of collaboration. These stations began cooperating thanks to Medienhilfe and this project. Over time, as the project strengthened and took on a life of its own, the stations cooperated on other projects as well. When pressed by Mr Brunner to identify shortcomings, one station half-humorously complained that communication with Zurich is occasionally too slow, or tactless. ("After sending no money for six months, Medienhilfe then sends a list of demands!") Another station complained that it had to wait three months for Medienhilfe to respond to an application.

It was also mentioned that cash flow has not always been well managed. Some stations can hardly afford the up-front expenses incurred by preparing programmes for CerpiK.

There was also a complaint about the rigidity of the requirements of the financial reporting, and the lead-time for preparing this report.

Comment: These grumbles point to familiar difficulties for donors in running projects in the Balkans. The partners are routinely late – sometimes very late – in preparing narrative and financial reports for Medienhilfe, and in submitting complete applications for continuing funds. They have also been very slow to apply to other funders, even when Medienhilfe has prepared the ground for them in advance. Only Kontakt Plus, Vala Rinore and Peja may be relied on to submit complete, accurate and timely reports. Significantly, the grumbles were voiced by stations that have been most problematic in meeting their reporting obligations.

On the other side of the table, Medienhilfe would like to see more ownership and pro-active project steering and decision-making by the CerpiK stations. Medienhilfe would prefer to be more of a coach and adviser, and less operationally involved with steering the project. This wish is understandable but not realistic at present – for reasons given above, in connection with MND.

¹⁹ "BCS" is "Bosnian-Croatian-Serbian", a formulation used in the Dayton Accords for Bosnia & Herzegovina.

²⁰ <http://www.medienhilfe.ch/en/nc/partners-projects/projects/b/27/?cHash=afe519f2f8> Accessed on 1 September 2006.

Self-sustainability: Self-sustainability indicators have not improved at all. Only a few stations have succeeded in boosting commercial revenue connected to CerpiK programmes, or in pooling their efforts in this direction.²¹

Comment: It is difficult to link up stations with such contrasting commercial profiles. According to Medienhilfe, all but two of the stations in CerpiK are struggling to exist. One of the two exceptions reportedly earns up to €5,000 per month in commercial revenue. Another station – one of the best, in terms of quality of output and commitment to CerpiK – can earn no more than €200 per month, due to the desperate economic situation in its area.

Looking ahead: As in Macedonia, the partners had little or nothing to say about the large general goals of the project.

Comment: The stations may have been silenced by Medienhilfe's large claims for the project's possible impact on Kosovo's macro-problems, and the practical impossibility of achieving measurable success, in terms of those claims, in the foreseeable future. This doesn't mean that the stations do not share the goals of the project.

The output

After listening to a sample of recent Serbian-language programmes, I offer these observations:

- Generically, these programmes offer *analysis* rather than *news*. They analyse a range of important political and social issues relevant to many or most people in Kosovo, regardless of their ethnic identity.
- The programmes lack clear examples of the daily effects on citizens of the problems being discussed. At worst, the programmes can sound like a linked series of soundbites by spokespeople from various organisations.
- The habit of paraphrasing the remarks of interviewees while introducing them – and then, in many cases, providing the remarks verbatim as well – encourages repetition.
- Aurally, the programmes could be enlivened by providing two more voiceover speakers: a female for the female interviewees, and a male for the male interviewees. It need not confuse listeners to have three different voices.
- There should be more 'vox-pops'. For example, one programme about children in the street opened vividly with the voice of a little girl in Mitrovica. More of this would be welcome.
- There is a general lack of *interpretation* by the journalist, and a lack of *engagement* with the opinions that are quoted. This makes the programmes sound like a neutral forum or 'Speakers' Corner'. There is no 'Q & A' format – no to-and-fro of question and answer and question. This has three drawbacks:
 - (i) the audience is deprived of the drama that is provided by dialogue
 - (ii) the 'culture of the monologue' (which is strong in all the countries of the former Yugoslavia except Slovenia) is perpetuated
 - (iii) the subject-matter is not deeply explored, or at least, the impression is given that 'difficult' aspects may be neglected.
- The anonymous narration can – at worst – be inert and boring. There is sometimes a feeling that the programme circles around a small core of subject-matter, rather than really uncovering it (let alone investigating it) for the benefit of the audience.
- My criticisms may be irrelevant if CerpiK *wants* to produce a seamless unity of journalist-presenter with interviewees. While this would be a valid aim, the resulting programmes will be dull unless the unity is used to reveal some new discovery or make a bold argument about the situation in Kosovo. The programmes that I heard do not try to do this; indeed, they seem to try hard not to say anything that might be disturbing. Perhaps I missed some controversial nuances.²²

²¹ A less obvious obstacle to raising commercial revenue was mentioned by one station at the Workshop. Local businesses that advertise on local broadcasters are liable to receive a visit from financial police or inspectors: 'if you've got money to spend on advertising, we want to see your books.'

²² Is this why international speakers are excluded: because they might say something tactless? Or is it that CerpiK wants to present Kosovo as fully self-governing and self-responsible? This would be an understandable principle, though it has the disadvantage of being untrue.

Conclusions

The future of multiethnic (multilingual) broadcasting in Kosovo will be as difficult as its past. It will continue to be a hostage to wider political or social developments. As long as most people are *against* hearing the 'other' language in their radio programmes, broadcasters will have commercial as well as political disincentives to operating in a multiethnic way. Moreover, the small size of the ethnic minorities means that minority-language stations are not commercially viable.

Given that the international community has placed such importance on providing tolerable conditions for minorities to live in Kosovo, much donor money has been spent on minority-language media and on multiethnic projects. Indeed, the number of Serbian-language broadcasters (34!) is wildly disproportionate to the number of Serbs actually living in Kosovo.²³ This does not advance the real interests of Kosovo Serbs as citizens or journalists. The Serbian-language broadcast sector needs to be rationalised and properly regulated, no less than the Albanian-language sector.

Then there is the delicate matter of the *credibility* of multiethnic outlets. It may be that the Serbian-language programmes on Radio Blue Sky possess as little credibility with Kosovo Serbs today as the Albanian-language programmes carried by Radio-Television Pristina possessed with Kosovo Albanians before Serbia lost control of the province in 1999.²⁴ More research would be needed for clear conclusions to be drawn.

The question remains: are multiethnic radio projects worth supporting? I believe they are, but on certain conditions:

- i. Such projects should benefit the wider community in Kosovo – by encouraging good interethnic relations, and by serving the cause of good journalism.
- ii. They should possess an internal dynamic. They should not, in other words, exist merely for the stations to get funds.

CerpiK satisfies the first of these conditions to some extent.²⁵ And it has the potential to fulfil this condition more fully (see Recommendations, below).

As for the second condition: I cannot state confidently that CerpiK meets it. In principle, CerpiK is run by the stations, not by Medienhilfe. It is donor-funded without necessarily being donor-directed. This distinguishes CerpiK positively from other multiethnic projects, with the possible exception of the Radio Network for Human Rights (mentioned above).

The potential tension in this arrangement is apparently defused by mutual trust and a sense of common purpose. Yet the fact is that, here as in Macedonia, Medienhilfe provides essential impetus, as well as nurturing. Given that the environment for multiethnic projects is even harsher in Kosovo, this impetus is probably still decisive.

Recommendations

Medienhilfe's role: When Medienhilfe asked how its relationship with the stations should be improved, two requests were made:

- Can Medienhilfe provide more training, especially in "more aggressive" reporting techniques?
- Can Medienhilfe provide more contact?

These are excellent suggestions, and should be acted on.

Territorial coverage: CerpiK should identify a suitable partner in the Gjilan /Gnjilane region, in order to ensure coverage of this area.

Marketing and publicity: While it is not realistic to expect much improvement in terms of the stations' self-sustainability, the stations should collaborate on marketing and publicity.

Issues vs. stories: The handbook of the Institute for War & Peace Reporting discusses the importance – and the difficulty – of distinguishing between a *story* and an *issue*.²⁶

A story may be about an issue. But an issue is in itself not a story.

²³ Laue, p.22.

²⁴ Radio-Television Pristina was the Kosovo branch of Radio-Television Serbia, the Serbian state broadcaster.

²⁵ One station said at the Workshop that CerpiK stations use each other to get access to particular officials. This is an excellent use of the network.

²⁶ Institute of War & Peace Reporting, *reporting for change: a handbook for local journalists in crisis areas* (London, 2004), p. 116.

In discussing story ideas, many reporters say that they are concerned about a subject in their community and want to write about it. This is very positive, but not enough. Poverty, education, security – these are subjects.

A journalist has to dig deeper to find an event, a development, perhaps a trend to be able to construct a narrative in which something distinct occurs.

Further training of CerpiK journalists might use these remarks to focus discussion of past and future programmes.

Structure: The coordinator among the partner stations is ‘primus inter pares’. This has the advantage of minimising potential rivalries or jealousies among the stations. The question now arises whether the further development of the project requires a more formalised leadership role for one station and formalised cooperation among the stations. Medienhilfe recently raised this matter this summer in a workshop that drafted a Mission Statement and some Rules of Cooperation for the network. CerpiK needs to register as legal entity (probably an NGO). One interesting idea is to establish two levels of membership: an inner circle or core group of the current members, who would generate the programmes, and an outer circle of stations that rebroadcast the programmes. Medienhilfe will need to be fully involved if these questions are to be carefully tackled and safely resolved.

D. Final remarks

Most people in Macedonia and Kosovo seem highly sceptical about – or even hostile to – external or international exhortations to overcome their differences with other ethnic group(s) in their country. Probably there are two reasons for this scepticism: (a) a natural dislike of outsiders telling them how to live; and (b) a feeling that ethnic differences are not so narrow that they can be bridged by ‘projects’.

This is why interethnic reconciliation is best tackled indirectly, by practical collaboration on a professional basis. These networks succeed in doing this, and also – because these are media projects – in demonstrating to a wide public that such collaboration should be something normal. In the light of its own priorities, PD IV can be assured that funds dedicated to these networks are well spent.

Assessing media impact is notoriously difficult and uncertain, more an art than a science even in societies where audiences are studied systematically – which is certainly *not* the case in Macedonia and Kosovo. While we should not exaggerate their likely impact on wider interethnic relations in Macedonia and Kosovo, I believe these projects could have continuing relevance – socially, politically, and also professionally, in terms of the development of broadcasting culture in Macedonia and Kosovo.

Even on the most optimistic prognosis, interethnic relations in these places will not make so much progress during the next two years that these two projects would become redundant. On the contrary.

However, the projects have reached a stage where further training is essential. Matching funds should be found to pay for training, technical assistance (as required for professionalisation), and structural (management) reforms. This would allow Medienhilfe to address directly the ability of the stations to deliver content that will raise the quality, visibility and reputation of the networks.

The Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC) would be an excellent source for matching funds. Apart from the potential advantages to be gained from intra-FDA cooperation, the SDC’s objectives in violence-prevention and conflict-transformation would be very well served by supporting the further evolution of these projects.²⁷ (By the way, the FDA’s wish for greater visibility should initially be met by increasing the visibility of these networks in their own societies, in the ways recommended here.)

Regarding Medienhilfe: it is very well suited to encouraging and developing these networks. Its regional experience, expertise and commitment are beyond question. This is why Medienhilfe has won and kept a reputation in the media-development world that is greater than its budget. Organisations with deeper pockets (such as the OSI’s Network Media Programme and Norwegian People’s Aid, to name but two NGOs) consider Medienhilfe to be a valued partner and source of wisdom on media development in the Balkans. Networking projects play to the organisation’s particular strengths – to its vision and resolve.

However, there is a possible weakness in the organisation’s approach to these projects. It may suffer from a temptation to overstate the partners’ readiness or ability to break with habits of work and outlook that

²⁷ Medienhilfe has already secured funds from the US National Endowment for Democracy (NED) for capacity-building in management and marketing at three stations (Contact Plus, K and Yeni Donem) from October 2006 through to March 2007. These funds provide a foundation on which to build a coherent plan to enhance the self-sustainability of all the CerpiK stations and hence of CerpiK itself. But it is no more than a foundation.

have formed in response to long-standing conditions in Macedonia and Kosovo. Concretely, I doubt that Medienhilfe can distance itself from operational involvement with these networks as quickly as it would wish. It must expect close involvement with project management to continue while the vital next phase of the networks' evolution is implemented. I urge PD IV (and the SDC) to ensure that Medienhilfe is funded on a scale, and in a rhythm, that allows such involvement.

ANNEX 1

Biography of the independent evaluator, Dr Mark Thompson

As an author:

He published *Forging War: the media in Serbia, Croatia, Bosnia & Herzegovina* (London, 1994 and 1999), a widely acclaimed analysis of the role that media played in the final crisis and breakdown of Yugoslavia. Research involved watching hundreds of hours of television news and current affairs programmes in the former Yugoslavia, as well as reading hundreds of newspapers and conducting dozens of interviews. The book was translated into Croatian and Serbian. The 1999 edition was chosen as one of the 'Books of the Year' in two British newspapers, *The Guardian* and *The Observer*.

In 1999, he wrote a long report for the Organisation for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) on international assistance to the media in former Yugoslavia. He presented the report to the OSCE Permanent Council in Vienna.

He also co-edited and co-authored *Forging Peace: intervention, human rights and the management of media space* (Edinburgh, 2002), the first full-length study of the roles that media can play in post-conflict reconstruction.

As a practitioner:

In 1994 and 1995, he directed the Media Analysis Unit within UNPROFOR, the UN mission to the former Yugoslavia – the largest UN peace operation in the world at that time. In 1998 and 1999, he was the first Spokesman and Director of Media Affairs within the enlarged OSCE Mission to Croatia.

In 2005, he was an expert witness on media at the trial of Momcilo Krajisnik, one of the wartime leaders of the Bosnian Serbs, at the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia. [See report at <http://www.senseagency.com/en/stream.php?sta=3&pid=6758&kat=3>]

Also in 2005, he directed a project for the Netherlands NGO, Press Now, to survey the media development activities of OSCE missions in the Balkans, the Caucasus, and Central Asia. [Available at http://www.pressnow.nl/download/Rapport_30062004.pdf#search=%22press%20now%20amsterdam%20media%20development%20by%20osce%20field%20missions%22] He moderated an international conference on this topic at the Netherlands Foreign Ministry. [See report at http://www.pressnow.org/upload/publications/Rapport_13102005.pdf#search=%22press%20now%20amsterdam%202005%20report%20on%20osce%20media%20field%20missions%22]

In recent years, he has worked as a freelance media-policy consultant for the Danish Foreign Ministry, the UK Foreign & Commonwealth Office, the UK Department for International Development, International Media Support (Denmark), International IDEA (Sweden) [see http://archive.idea.int/balkans/policy_brief_balkans_2.pdf], Article 19 (UK), the Open Society Institute (OSI, Budapest and London), and Press Now (Netherlands).

Annex 2: Evaluation plan for medienhilfe programme 2005/2006

Based on the discussion with the Political Division IV (Roland Salvisberg and Markus Heiniger) on April 6, the following program evaluation 2005/2006 is done.

Objectives of the evaluation

1. The quality, relevance and impact of the Swiss financed media projects is evaluated based on a relevant sample
2. The quality and relevance of medienhilfe's program steering (overall program) is evaluated
3. The evaluation establishes lessons learnt and contributes to the further programming, (in particular to the Swiss Government funded 07-08 program).

Travel Plan

August 23: Arrival of Consultant in Zurich, working session with medienhilfe
August 24: working session with medienhilfe
August 25: morning flight Zurich – Skopje (departure 07:30 / arrival 09:35h)
Workshop with mh-Partners (11-18h)
August 26: Travel to Prishtina (departure 07:30 / arrival 10:00h)
Workshop with mh-Partners (10:30-18:00h)
Travel to Skopje (18:30-21:00h)
August 27: Morning flight Skopje – Zurich (departure 09:45 / arrival 12:05h)
– on-flight for consultant

MACEDONIA: EVALUATION WORKSHOP OF THE PROJECT “MACEDONIA ON THE PALM OF YOUR HAND” (MoP)

Venue and Time: Skopje, TV Era, Friday, 25 August 2006, 11:00-17:30

Participants

Project Representatives: Avdula and Agron Memetaj, TV Era, Skopje
Irena Arnaudova, TV M, Ohrid
Aneta Sijakova and Stevo ??? (will check), TV Tera, Bitola
Hamit Hajrullai, TV Art, Tetovo
Selver Ajdini, TV Hana, Komanovo
Janko Micev, TV Vis, Strumica
Angel Zdravkin, TV Zdravkin, Veles

Local Expert: Prof. Dr. Vesna Sopar, Institute for Sociological, Political and Juridical Research

medienhilfe: Roland Brunner, Steering Board Member
Nena Skopljanac, Director

External Evaluator: Mark Thompson

EDA PD IV Representative: Armin Rieser

Program

time	Topic	How?	Who?
11:00	Opening Address medienhilfe Opening Address PD IV	Oral presentations about aims of the workshop	Roland Brunner Armin Rieser
11:10	Introduction of the external evaluator	Oral presentation	Mark Thompson
11:15	Introduction of the project representatives	Oral presentation	Project Representatives
11:20	Presentation of the Day's Programme	Handouts & beamer projection	Roland Brunner
11:25	Evaluation: Project Relevance		
11:25	Project relevance for the current social & media context	Oral presentation & beamer projection Presentation: 30 minutes Discussion: 30 minutes Conclusion: 5 minutes	Moderator: R. Brunner Presenter: Prof. Dr. Vesna Sopar Discussion: All
12:30	Evaluation: Project History & Effectiveness		
12:30	Brief project history: When was it started? Why? Main goal? Comparison with other similar projects.	Oral presentation & beamer projection	Moderator: R. Brunner Presenter: Ljubica Angelkova-Mangovska
12:45	Review of the project development 2003-2006 from mh perspective: process and phases, main problems and solutions, mh & partners' performance	Handouts & beamer projection Presentation: 5 minutes Discussion: 10 minutes	Moderator: R. Brunner Presenter: N. Skopljanac Discussion: All
13:00	Lunch Break		
14:00	Project evaluation 2005-06 based on objectives/indicators (= results)	Handouts & beamer projection Project Representatives' view: 15 minutes mh's view: 10 minutes Discussion: 30 minutes Conclusion: 5 minutes	Moderator: R. Brunner Presenters: Ljubica Angelkova-Mangovska, Nena Skopljanac Discussion: All
15:00	Current project SWOT-Analysis	Handouts & beamer projection	Moderator: R. Brunner All
15:25	Coffee Break		
15:40	Outlook: Strategic Orientation		
15:40	Project long-term perspective and partners' commitment		Moderator: R. Brunner All
16:00	Project LOF-Frame 2007-08: objectives, expected results, fields of activities, expectations and needs for mh inputs	Based on the SWOT-Analysis, results of the discussions on "effectiveness" and "relevance", the moderator stimulates the discussion towards conclusions Use mh instrument for LOG-Frame (handouts & beamer projection)	Moderator: R. Brunner All Nena Skopljanac (technical support)
17:30	End		

KOSOVO: EVALUATION WORKSHOP OF THE "CERPIK" PROJECT

Venue and Time: Prishtina, Hotel Iliria, Saturday, 26 August 2006, 10:30-17:00

Participants

Project Representatives: Mirjana Milutinovic, Radio Contact Plus, Mitrovica/e (northern)
 Naim Breznica, Radio K, Fushe Kosove / Kosovo Polje
 Ekrem Citaku, Radio Vala Rinore, Prishtine / Pristina
 Xhavit Husaj, Radio Peja, Peja / Pec
 Engin Begolli, Radio Kent FM, , Prishtine / Pristina
 Nexhmedin Spahiu, Radio Mitrovica, Mitrovica/e (southern)
 Bashkim Avdyli, Radio Kamenica, Kamenice/a

Local Experts: Violeta Oroshi

medienhilfe: Roland Brunner, Steering Board Member
 Nena Skopljanac, Director

External Evaluator: Mark Thompson

EDA PD IV Representative: Armin Rieser

Program

time	Topic	How?	Who?
10:30	Opening Address medienhilfe Opening Address PD IV	Oral presentations about aims of the workshop	Roland Brunner Armin Rieser
10:40	Introduction of the external evaluator	Oral presentation	Mark Thompson
10:45	Introduction of the project representatives	Oral presentation	Project Representatives
10:55	Presentation of the Day's Programme	Handouts & beamer projection	Roland Brunner
11:00	Evaluation: Project Relevance		
11:00	Project relevance for the current social & media context	Oral presentation & beamer projection Presentation: 30 minutes Discussion: 30 minutes Conclusion: 5 minutes	Moderator: R. Brunner Presenters: V. Oroshi, S. Maliqi Discussion: All
12:05	Evaluation: Project History & Effectiveness		
12:05	Brief project history: When was it started? Why? Main goal? Comparison with other similar projects.	Oral presentation & beamer projection	Moderator: R. Brunner Presenters: N. Breznica Discussion: All
12:20	Review of the project development 2002-2006 from mh perspective: process and phases, main problems and solutions, mh & partners' performance	Handouts & beamer projection Presentation: 10 minutes Discussion: 15 minutes	Moderator: R. Brunner Presenter: N. Skopljanac Discussion: All
12:45	Lunch Break		
13:45	Project evaluation 2005-06 based on objectives/indicators (= results)	Handouts & beamer projection Project Representatives' view: 15 minutes mh's view: 15 minutes Discussion: 40 minutes	Moderator: R. Brunner Presenters: M. Milutinovic, N. Skopljanac

		Conclusion: 5 minutes	Discussion: All
15:00	Current project SWOT-Analysis	Handouts & beamer projection	Moderator: R. Brunner Presenters: E. Citaku, N. Skopljanac Discussion: All
15:30	Coffee Break		
15:45	Outlook: Strategic Orientation		
15:45	Project long-term perspective and partners' commitment		All
16:00	Project LOG-Frame 2007-08: objectives, expected results, fields of activities, expectations and needs for mh inputs	Based on the SWOT-Analysis, results of the discussions on "effectiveness" and "relevance", the moderator stimulates the discussion towards conclusions Use mh instrument for LOG-Frame (handouts & beamer projection)	Moderator: R. Brunner All Nena Skopljanac (technical support)
17:30	End		