

Multilateral Journalism Index (MJl) Pilot Report 2026

International Geneva

Study Period: 9 June to 21 July 2026

Published: 21 September 2026



Prepared by

Geneva Center for Multilateral Journalism (GCMJ)

Authors

John Heilprin

Geneva Center for Multilateral Journalism / The Science Diplomat & Arete News

Sydney Wiser

Mount Holyoke College / University of Geneva / Smith College Junior Year Abroad Program

Acknowledgments and Project Credits

The Multilateral Journalism Index (MJl) Pilot Report 2026 was developed by the Geneva Center for Multilateral Journalism (GCMJ) as the inaugural application of a framework for assessing journalism covering international organizations and global governance. The project was directed by John Heilprin, co-founder and director of GCMJ.

Sydney Wiser, of Mount Holyoke College, conducted research, database development, coding, data collection, and analytical support through the University of Geneva / Smith College Junior Year Abroad Program. Her research, analytical insights, and journalistic contributions were central to the development of the pilot database, implementation of the coding framework, and preparation of both the MJl Pilot Index and this MJl Pilot Report.

The authors wish to acknowledge the essential support of the University of Geneva / Smith College Junior Year Abroad Program, particularly its program director, Dr. Geneviève Piron, and Smith faculty liaison, Professor Howard Gold, for facilitating the internship through which much of the pilot research was conducted.

The authors also thank Ronald Powers and Dr. Christoph B. Egger, co-founders of the Geneva Center for Multilateral Journalism, for their guidance, commitment, and support throughout the development of the project.

Table of Contents

1. Executive Summary	3
2. The Multilateral Journalism Index	5
3. Methodology	7
4. The International Geneva Media Ecosystem	10
5. Pilot Scorecard	12
6. Coverage of Multilateral Governance	14
7. Case Studies	16
8. Observations From the Field	19
9. Key Findings	21
10. Conclusion	23
11. Appendices	24

Chapter 1: Executive Summary



What Is the Multilateral Journalism Index?

The Multilateral Journalism Index (MJl) is a pilot effort to measure how effectively journalism explains international organizations, diplomacy, and global governance. The Multilateral Journalism Index was developed to explore whether these characteristics can be systematically observed, documented, and measured. While the MJl assesses the quality of journalism, it does so while acknowledging the broader multilateral information ecosystem in which journalism operates. That ecosystem includes institutional communications, official publications, specialist reporting, nonprofit journalism, newsletters, and other sources of public information that together shape public understanding of international governance.

The pilot does not attempt to rank journalists or determine which organizations perform best. Its purpose is methodological: to test whether a structured framework can help describe and analyze the journalism ecosystem surrounding global governance.

Why This Pilot Matters

Global governance is becoming more important at the same time that many news organizations face shrinking resources, declining foreign coverage, and growing economic pressures. At the same time, little systematic evidence exists about the journalism ecosystem responsible for covering international institutions. The inaugural pilot applies the MJl framework to International Geneva, establishing a baseline for measuring journalism covering multilateral governance while testing a methodology that will continue to evolve through future editions.

Headline Findings

Several principal findings emerged from the pilot:

- The pilot documented 247 coverage records, of which 230 contained complete numeric values across all four core dimensions used to calculate the Core MJl Score.
- The pilot generated an overall Multilateral Journalism Index score of 67.4 out of 100.
- Substance was the strongest-performing core dimension (75.3), followed by Public Understanding (72.7) and Governance Literacy (69.5). Source Diversity (52.0) represented the greatest opportunity for improvement.
- The pilot documented 27 multilateral events, 8 direct observations, 31 organizations, 71 media outlets, and 91 journalists, providing a broad evidence base for the inaugural assessment.
- Artificial intelligence and technology emerged as the largest thematic category within the pilot sample.
- The pilot demonstrated that journalism covering multilateral institutions can be assessed systematically through a framework combining structured content analysis, direct observation, and ecosystem mapping.
- Coverage generally explained issues more effectively than the institutional processes through which multilateral decisions are reached, reinforcing the importance of governance literacy as a core dimension of the MJl.
- Distribution reach and explanatory quality emerged as distinct characteristics, suggesting that the most widely circulated stories are not necessarily those providing the greatest explanatory value. Distribution Reach was therefore retained as a supplemental indicator rather than incorporated into the Core MJl Score.

Evolution of the Index

Several observations emerged that were not anticipated at the outset of the project. Perhaps the most significant was the extent to which the journalism ecosystem itself became an object of study. The pilot began as an effort to examine coverage. It quickly became apparent that understanding journalistic outputs requires understanding of the

professional environment in which those outputs are produced. Questions concerning reporter attendance, institutional access, specialization, continuity of coverage, newsroom resources, information flows, and briefing dynamics frequently proved as important as the content of individual stories.

The pilot also highlighted the growing diversity of information producers participating in the multilateral information ecosystem. Traditional news organizations now operate alongside specialist publications, nonprofit journalism organizations, newsletters, institutional communications offices, research institutions, advocacy organizations, and independent publishers. Understanding how these different forms of reporting interact—and what distinctive contribution independent journalism makes within this broader information environment—may become one of the central questions for future editions of the MJJ.

The pilot reinforced the continuing importance of international wire services. Despite significant changes in the media landscape, news agencies continue to play a disproportionate role in shaping how global governance reaches wider audiences through syndication, amplification, and agenda-setting. Finally, the project revealed how little systematic information currently exists about the multilateral journalism ecosystem itself. Establishing that baseline may ultimately become one of the MJJ's most important long-term contributions.

What Comes Next

This report should be viewed as a pilot rather than a final assessment. Its objective is to test concepts, identify methodological challenges, and establish a foundation for future work. Several priorities will guide the next phase of development. The coding framework will continue to be refined and tested. Additional work will strengthen consistency across evaluations and improve reliability. The database will expand to include additional coverage, events, direct observations, and expanded ecosystem mapping. Future editions will also incorporate structured qualitative interviews and may examine longer periods of time, additional institutions, and other centers of multilateral governance.

Visual Journalism and Distribution Reach will continue to be evaluated as supplemental indicators. Additional testing will determine whether these dimensions should eventually become part of the Core MJJ Score. Future editions will also place greater emphasis on longitudinal analysis. The greatest value of the MJJ may emerge not from a single year's score, but from its ability to document change over time.

One of the principal questions for future editions concerns the evolving relationship between journalism and the wider multilateral information ecosystem. As international organizations become significant producers of public information, the MJJ will continue to examine the distinctive contribution of independent journalism through verification, scrutiny, context, explanation, and accountability.

The Multilateral Journalism Index is intended as a practical tool for journalists, editors, researchers, educators, public institutions, philanthropic organizations, and others seeking to strengthen public understanding of multilateral governance. By providing a consistent framework for assessing journalism covering international organizations, the MJJ aims to contribute to better reporting, greater institutional literacy, and a deeper understanding of the systems that shape international cooperation.

Chapter 2: The Multilateral Journalism Index

Why Measure Multilateral Journalism?

Unlike national politics, which is usually organized around elections, legislatures, political parties, and identifiable leaders, multilateral governance operates through committees, negotiations, conferences, technical bodies, expert groups, working papers, and consensus-building processes that can unfold over months or years. The resulting decisions may have significant consequences, but the pathways through which they emerge are often difficult for the public to see.

Why International Geneva?

The pilot was conducted in International Geneva because few places in the world offer a comparable concentration of international institutions. This concentration makes Geneva a uniquely valuable pilot laboratory for testing and refining the MJJ framework. A relatively short period of observation can capture activity across a wide range of institutions, policy domains, journalists, and information producers.

What the MJJ Measures

The MJJ evaluates characteristics of journalism rather than the performance of institutions. The framework evaluates journalism, not institutional performance, public policy outcomes, or the effectiveness of multilateral organizations themselves. The framework focuses on a straightforward question: How effectively does journalism help audiences understand global governance? To answer that question, the pilot examines several aspects of reporting, including explanation, institutional context, sourcing, depth, and accessibility.

The framework is built around four core dimensions that can be evaluated across different forms of journalism and different subject areas. The objective is not to reward any particular style of reporting. Short news stories, investigations, newsletters, feature articles, explanatory pieces, multimedia projects, and specialist reporting can all contribute to public understanding. The framework instead examines whether journalism provides information that helps readers understand what is happening, why it matters, who is involved, and how decisions are made.

What the MJJ Does Not Measure

The MJJ does not evaluate the effectiveness of international organizations. A high score does not imply that an institution performed well. Likewise, a low score does not imply institutional failure. The framework also does not evaluate political viewpoints. Coverage may present different interpretations of events, policies, or institutions. The purpose of the Index is to assess the quality of explanation and reporting. The MJJ is not a measure of popularity, audience size, commercial success, or public influence. A story can be widely read while providing limited explanatory value. Conversely, a highly informative piece may reach only a specialized audience.

Finally, the pilot should not be understood as a ranking exercise. The purpose of the project is to identify patterns, test methods, and develop a deeper understanding of how journalism communicates global governance.

Core Dimensions

Together, the four Core Dimensions evaluate complementary aspects of explanatory journalism. Public Understanding assesses whether readers can grasp the significance of an issue. Substance examines the reporting value of the story itself. Governance Literacy considers whether institutions and institutional decision processes are explained clearly. Source Diversity evaluates the breadth of perspectives represented. Although each dimension is assessed separately, they are intended to work together as a single framework for understanding how journalism explains multilateral governance.

Public Understanding

Public Understanding measures whether coverage helps a reasonably informed non-specialist understand the significance of an issue. Stories that explain why an event matters, identify relevant context, clarify consequences, and connect developments to larger governance processes generally score higher than stories that assume extensive prior knowledge. The objective is not simplification. The objective is explanation. Complex issues may remain complex. The question is whether readers leave with a clearer understanding than they had before.

Substance

Substance measures the depth and reporting value of a story. Coverage that moves beyond announcements and event summaries generally provides greater value to audiences. This may include original reporting, contextual information, competing viewpoints, accountability reporting, analysis, or examination of consequences. Substance does not depend on article length. A short article may contain substantial reporting. A long article may contain very little. The dimension evaluates the information provided rather than the format through which it is delivered.

Governance Literacy

Governance Literacy measures how effectively journalism explains institutions and institutional decision processes. Many governance outcomes cannot be understood without understanding the organizations responsible for them. Readers often need information about mandates, procedures, negotiations, voting arrangements, technical bodies, legal authorities, and implementation mechanisms. Stories that explain these structures help audiences understand not only what happened but how and why it happened. This dimension is one of the defining features of the MJJ because institutional understanding lies at the heart of multilateral journalism.

Source Diversity

Source Diversity evaluates the breadth of perspectives included in coverage. The strongest reporting often draws on multiple forms of expertise and experience. Depending on the subject, this may include officials, diplomats, researchers, civil society representatives, affected communities, industry representatives, independent experts, or other knowledgeable sources. The objective is not numerical balance. The objective is to determine whether audiences receive a sufficiently broad range of information to understand an issue from more than one perspective.

Supplemental Indicators

The pilot also introduces two additional indicators that are being tested for future development.

Visual Journalism

Governance reporting often involves complex institutions, lengthy negotiations, technical concepts, and procedural details. Visual tools can help readers understand those subjects. Maps, diagrams, timelines, graphics, photographs, data visualizations, and other visual elements may improve comprehension by presenting information in forms that are easier to absorb than text alone. The pilot tracks Visual Journalism separately while the framework continues to develop. Future editions will determine whether visual elements should become part of the Core MJJ Score.

Distribution Reach

Metric	Value
Mean	2.1
Median	1

One of the most important methodological developments during the pilot was the introduction of Distribution Reach. Traditional evaluations of journalism often focus on content quality while devoting less attention to how information moves through the broader information ecosystem. Yet reach matters. Some stories are published once and remain largely confined to their original audience. Others are republished, syndicated, quoted, translated, shared, and amplified through multiple channels. Distribution Reach measures this circulation.

The pilot found that distribution reach and explanatory quality often describe different characteristics. Some of the strongest explanatory journalism reached relatively limited audiences, while some widely distributed stories contained comparatively little institutional explanation. For that reason, Distribution Reach is reported separately from the Core MJJ Score. The indicator does not attempt to determine whether wide circulation is inherently good or bad. Nor does it assume that highly distributed content is necessarily better journalism. Instead, it recognizes that quality and reach describe different characteristics of information.

Future editions will continue evaluating whether Distribution Reach should remain a standalone indicator or become part of a broader framework examining journalism's public impact.

A Framework Under Development

This pilot represents the first stage of a longer process. The framework presented here should be understood as a working model rather than a finished product. The goal is to develop a practical, transparent, and evidence-based framework that can evolve through continued testing. Future editions will refine the methodology, expand the evidence base, strengthen reliability, and make it possible to measure change over time. The 2026 pilot establishes the foundation on which that longer-term effort will be built.

Chapter 3: Methodology

An "Ice Core" of International Geneva

The Multilateral Journalism Index (MJl) Pilot 2026 examines a six-week period in the life of International Geneva, from 9 June to 21 July 2026. The project adopts what GCMJ describes as an "ice core" approach. Just as climate scientists analyze a limited section of an ice sheet to identify broader environmental patterns over time, the MJl examines a bounded period of journalistic activity to better understand how international organizations and global governance are reported. Rather than attempting to observe every institution, journalist, event, and publication over an extended period, the pilot examines a defined slice of time in depth. The objective is not comprehensive coverage but systematic observation.

By documenting institutions, events, journalists, publications, and information flows within a clearly defined period, the project seeks to identify recurring patterns that help explain how international organizations become visible—or remain relatively invisible—to broader public audiences. The pilot therefore functions as an observational baseline rather than a comprehensive census of multilateral journalism.

Study Period

The study period coincided with an unusually active sequence of major governance events in International Geneva. These included the G7 Summit, U.S.–Iran diplomatic talks, the United Nations secretary-general candidates' debate, sessions of the Human Rights Council, meetings of the United Nations High-level Scientific Panel on AI, the AI for Good Global Summit, World Health Organization negotiations, and numerous diplomatic, humanitarian, scientific, and technical meetings. Together these activities generated sustained reporting across multiple institutions, policy areas, and journalistic formats.

The six-week period provided an opportunity to observe how different governance processes were covered by different forms of journalism. It also allowed comparison among organizations with varying levels of media attention, institutional complexity, and public visibility. The study period should not be interpreted as representative of an entire year of International Geneva activity. Instead, it provides a concentrated observation period through which broader characteristics of the journalism ecosystem can be examined.

Sampling Approach

The pilot employed purposeful sampling. Organizations, events, media outlets, journalists, and published stories were selected because they represented important components of the International Geneva information environment during the study period.

The finalized pilot database includes:

- 247 coverage records
- 230 scored coverage records
- 27 multilateral events
- 8 direct observations
- 31 organizations
- 71 media outlets
- 91 journalists
- 240 records coded for Distribution Reach

The project sought analytical representativeness—a dataset broad enough to capture variation across institutions, policy domains, reporting styles, publication models, and information producers.

Selection decisions were guided by:

- Institutional significance
- Expected media attention
- Topical diversity
- Geographic relevance
- Practical feasibility within the study period

Particular attention was given to governance processes that generated sustained journalistic activity, including diplomatic negotiations, governing-body meetings, public conferences, technical consultations, scientific discussions, and major institutional events. The resulting dataset was designed to capture a meaningful cross-section of multilateral journalism as it was practiced during the observation period.

Organizations Examined

The pilot examined reporting associated with a broad range of international organizations, diplomatic processes, and governance forums active during the study period. Organizations were selected because they generated significant journalistic activity or occupied important positions within the International Geneva ecosystem. The sample includes

institutions working in diplomacy, public health, human rights, humanitarian affairs, science, technology, trade, intellectual property, labour, migration, standards-setting, and international cooperation.

Organizations were not evaluated or compared against one another. Instead, they served as observation points through which patterns of journalistic attention, institutional explanation, and information flow could be examined. A complete list of organizations is provided in the appendices.

Media Outlets Examined

The pilot examined a diverse range of information producers representing different reporting models and editorial approaches.

These include:

- International wire services
- Newspapers
- Broadcasters
- Specialist publications
- Nonprofit journalism organizations
- Independent journalists
- Professional newsletters
- Institutional publications

The objective was to capture the diversity of reporting active within International Geneva during the observation period. A complete list of outlets examined is provided in the appendices.

Coding Framework

Published journalism constituted the principal evidence base for the pilot. Coverage was evaluated using the Multilateral Journalism Index framework described in Chapter 2.

Each scored record was assessed across four Core Dimensions:

- Public Understanding
- Substance
- Governance Literacy
- Source Diversity

The pilot also recorded two Supplemental Indicators:

- Visual Journalism
- Distribution Reach

Each story was reviewed using standardized coding criteria designed to support comparison across reporting formats, institutions, policy domains, and publication types. The purpose of the framework is to identify characteristics associated with explanatory journalism covering international organizations and multilateral governance. Detailed coding procedures, scoring criteria, and category definitions are provided in the appendices.

Direct Observation

Published journalism captures only part of the reporting environment. Many factors influencing coverage—including institutional accessibility, briefing practices, journalist specialization, continuity of attendance, information flows, and newsroom resources—are not visible in published stories. To complement content analysis, the pilot incorporated structured direct observation of the International Geneva reporting environment. Observations were conducted during routine reporting activities by an accredited journalist and a dedicated researcher participating in the study. The objective was to document observable characteristics of the journalism environment itself.

Areas of observation included:

- Attendance at press briefings and public events
- Continuity of coverage
- Journalistic specialization
- Institutional accessibility
- Questioning patterns
- Information flows
- Sources of expertise

These observations provide contextual evidence about the conditions that shape reporting before publication.

Future Qualitative Research

Future editions of the Multilateral Journalism Index will incorporate structured interviews with journalists, editors, communications professionals, researchers, and officials working within the multilateral information ecosystem. These interviews will complement content analysis and direct observation by providing additional insight into reporting practices, institutional accessibility, professional specialization, newsroom constraints, and changes in the journalism

environment over time. The pilot establishes the quantitative and observational framework upon which this qualitative component can be developed.

Methodological Limitations

The pilot covers only a six-week observation period and therefore captures a limited segment of a much larger reporting environment. The sample was selected purposefully rather than randomly and should not be interpreted as statistically representative of all multilateral journalism. Although the coding framework demonstrated that journalism covering multilateral institutions can be assessed systematically, the framework remains under development and will continue to evolve through future editions. Inter-coder reliability testing was not completed during the pilot and represents an important priority for future development.

Some observations reflect conditions specific to International Geneva and may not apply directly to other centers of multilateral governance. Finally, no widely accepted methodology currently exists for systematically examining journalism covering international organizations. One objective of the pilot is therefore methodological: to determine whether such a framework can be developed, applied consistently, and refined over time.

Chapter 4: The International Geneva Media Ecosystem



Historical Context

International Geneva has long supported one of the world's most distinctive communities of journalists covering international affairs. Historical accreditation records reviewed during the pilot indicate that during the early 2010s the Geneva press corps included well over one hundred accredited journalists representing international wire services, national newspapers, broadcasters, specialist publications, trade media, and regional news organizations from around the world.

The reporting community reflected the extraordinary diversity of institutions based in Geneva. Correspondents routinely covered public health, humanitarian affairs, trade, human rights, science, migration, intellectual property, labour, diplomacy, standards-setting, and development. Many spent years following the same organizations and policy domains, developing deep institutional expertise and extensive professional networks. The ecosystem was notable not only for its size but also for its diversity. Commercial media, public-service broadcasters, specialist publications, nonprofit journalism organizations, and independent correspondents all maintained a presence.

This pilot does not attempt to reconstruct the historical Geneva press corps or measure long-term trends in accreditation. Historical records are presented primarily as context. They suggest that International Geneva has historically supported a larger, more specialized, and more internationally diverse reporting community than is often recognized.

The Contemporary Information Ecosystem

That ecosystem included:

- independent journalism;
- international wire services;
- specialist publications;
- nonprofit journalism organizations;
- institutional communications offices;
- newsletters;
- research institutions;
- and other organizations producing public information about global governance.

A relatively small number of journalists appeared responsible for covering a remarkably large share of governance activity. Coverage frequently depended upon individuals possessing broad institutional knowledge and the ability to move quickly across subjects. The pilot also observed substantial variation in media attention. Some organizations generated sustained reporting and active journalist participation. Others received comparatively little attention despite addressing issues with potentially significant international consequences. These observations suggest that public visibility depends not only upon institutional importance but also upon the availability of specialist journalists capable of interpreting complex governance processes.

Who Produces Information About International Geneva?

One of the pilot's most significant observations concerns the diversity of information producers operating within International Geneva. Independent journalism remains central to public understanding. However, it no longer operates alone. The MJI therefore evaluates journalism while recognizing that journalism functions within a broader system of information production.

International Wire Services

International wire services remain among the most influential institutions within the Geneva reporting environment. Reuters, Agence France-Presse, and The Associated Press continue to provide reporting that reaches audiences far beyond Geneva itself. A single wire story may be republished, translated, adapted, quoted, or redistributed by hundreds of news organizations worldwide.

Wire reporting frequently establishes the first broadly distributed account of major international developments and therefore shapes how subsequent reporting evolves. Despite major changes in the media industry, the pilot suggests that wire services continue to perform a uniquely important agenda-setting function within multilateral journalism.

Specialist Journalism

Some of the strongest explanatory reporting observed during the pilot came from specialist publications. Rather than competing for the largest possible audience, these organizations frequently serve professional communities concerned with public health, humanitarian affairs, science, technology, trade, development, human rights, migration, or diplomacy. Specialist reporters often follow the same institutions over many years, developing substantial institutional knowledge and continuity of coverage. As resources devoted to foreign correspondence have declined elsewhere, specialist journalism appears to function as an important repository of institutional memory.

Nonprofit Journalism

Nonprofit journalism organizations have become a visible component of International Geneva. Many focus on explanatory reporting, accountability journalism, and sustained coverage of governance processes extending over months or years. In policy areas receiving relatively limited commercial coverage—including humanitarian affairs, migration, development, and international cooperation—nonprofit organizations frequently provide continuity that might otherwise be absent. Their emergence reflects broader changes in journalism economics while helping sustain reporting on institutions whose work rarely generates large commercial audiences.

Institutional Self-Reporting

One of the pilot's most important observations concerns the changing role of international organizations themselves. International organizations have become major producers of public information through websites, livestreams, newsletters, podcasts, reports, social media, video, digital archives, and online documentation. These resources have dramatically improved public access to official information. They also change the environment within which journalism operates. Institutional communication and journalism perform different functions. Organizations explain their activities, priorities, decisions, and official positions.

Journalism independently verifies information, asks questions, provides external scrutiny, introduces competing perspectives, and evaluates institutional claims. The pilot suggests that contemporary multilateral journalism operates alongside institutional self-reporting rather than replacing it. One of the central questions for future editions of the MJJ will be how journalism's distinctive contribution evolves within an information environment in which institutions themselves have become major producers of public information.

Emerging Business Models

Traditional foreign correspondence remains important, but many news organizations now operate with substantially fewer international reporting resources than in previous decades. At the same time, specialist publications, nonprofit journalism organizations, subscription-supported newsletters, podcasts, audience-supported journalism, and independent reporting initiatives have become significant participants within the Geneva ecosystem.

Accessibility and Information Flows

The pilot found that public understanding of global governance depends heavily upon the movement of information between institutions, journalists, and audiences. Institutional accessibility varied considerably during the observation period. Some organizations maintained regular briefings, responsive communications teams, accessible documentation, and well-established media procedures. Others appeared considerably less visible. Journalist participation also varied substantially. Some briefings generated active questioning and sustained engagement. Others attracted only a handful of reporters. One recurring observation was that institutional importance and media visibility do not always align.

Some organizations attracted extensive coverage because they addressed conflict, crisis, or immediate political developments. Others conducted highly consequential technical, scientific, legal, or governance work that received comparatively little coverage. This distinction may represent one of the defining challenges of multilateral journalism. The institutions that shape global governance are not always the institutions that attract sustained public attention.

The pilot therefore suggests that public understanding depends not only upon the quality of journalism itself but also upon the accessibility of information, the availability of specialist reporters, and the ability of information to move from highly specialized governance processes into broader public debate.

Chapter 5: Pilot Scorecard

Overview

The Multilateral Journalism Index (MJl) Pilot 2026 applied the Version 1.0 framework to 230 scored coverage records drawn from a database of 247 records collected during the six-week observation period. The purpose of the scorecard is not to rank journalists, news organizations, or international institutions. Rather, it examines whether journalism covering multilateral governance exhibits measurable differences across a common set of explanatory characteristics.

Across the sample, stories varied substantially in their ability to explain institutions, governance processes, decisions and policy significance. Some combined substantive reporting, institutional understanding, accessible explanation, and diverse sourcing. Others performed strongly in one dimension while providing relatively little context or institutional explanation in others. The scorecard therefore provides a baseline against which future editions of the MJl can measure change over time.

Overall Pilot Score

Overall MJl Score: 67.4

Core Dimension Scores

Core Dimension	Mean Score
Substance	75.3
Public Understanding	72.7
Governance Literacy	69.5
Source Diversity	52.0

Distribution Reach

Metric	Value
Mean	2.1
Median	1

Visual Journalism remains a supplemental indicator under development. Distribution Reach remains outside the Core MJl Score because dissemination and explanatory quality measure different characteristics.

Overall Interpretation

Substance received the highest average score, suggesting that many journalists covering International Geneva provide reporting that extends beyond official announcements by incorporating context, explanation, and analysis. Public Understanding also scored relatively strongly, indicating that many stories successfully explain why developments matter, although performance varied considerably across topics and reporting formats. Governance Literacy scored somewhat lower. While many stories explained institutional outcomes, fewer consistently explained the governance processes that produced those outcomes.

Source Diversity represented the lowest-scoring core dimension. Many stories relied primarily on institutional or official sources while incorporating fewer independent experts, civil society representatives, researchers, or affected communities. The results suggest that explanatory journalism covering multilateral governance is strongest when all four dimensions reinforce one another rather than when any single dimension dominates.

Public Understanding

Average score:

72.7

Public Understanding evaluates whether journalism helps readers understand why an issue matters. Coverage generally performed well when it identified the broader significance of an issue, explained institutional context, and connected individual developments to larger governance processes. Lower-scoring stories frequently assumed substantial prior knowledge of organizations, negotiations, or technical terminology. The results reinforce the importance of explanation as one of journalism's principal public functions within multilateral governance.

Substance

Average score:

75.3

Substance was the strongest-performing core dimension. Many stories moved beyond announcements by incorporating historical context, policy implications, institutional background, competing viewpoints, or original

reporting. The findings suggest that substantive reporting remains one of the defining strengths of journalists covering International Geneva.

Governance Literacy

Average score:

69.5

Governance Literacy measures whether journalism explains how institutions reach decisions. Many stories reported outcomes effectively but devoted comparatively less attention to institutional procedures, mandates, negotiations, voting arrangements, or implementation mechanisms. The pilot suggests that governance literacy remains one of the defining challenges of journalism covering multilateral organizations. Because institutional understanding lies at the heart of the MJJ framework, future editions will continue refining this dimension.

Source Diversity

Average score:

52.0

Source Diversity was the weakest-performing core dimension.

Of the 230 fully scored records, 122 (53.0%) received a Source Diversity score of 1 or 2. Coverage often relied heavily on official institutional voices while incorporating comparatively fewer independent experts, civil society organizations, affected communities, or other external perspectives. Performance varied considerably across reporting formats and subject areas. The pilot suggests that broader sourcing can contribute to richer explanation and stronger public understanding.

Visual Journalism (Supplemental)

Visual Journalism remains a supplemental indicator under development. The pilot observed relatively limited use of explanatory diagrams, timelines, institutional maps, governance graphics, and other visual tools that could help audiences understand complex multilateral processes. Future editions will continue testing this dimension before determining whether it should become part of the Core MJJ Score.

Distribution Reach (Supplemental)

Distribution Reach was coded for 240 coverage records.

Metric	Value
Mean	2.1
Median	1

Most coded records remained close to their original outlet: 132 were coded at reach level 1, while 47 were coded at level 5. The pilot found that distribution reach and explanatory quality often describe different characteristics. Some of the strongest explanatory journalism reached comparatively small audiences, while some widely distributed stories contained relatively limited institutional explanation. Distribution Reach therefore remains a supplemental indicator rather than a component of the Core MJJ Score.

Source-Type Comparison

** Based on a small sample and should be interpreted cautiously.*

The comparison shows different explanatory profiles across source types. Among fully scored records, journalism and institutional self-reporting were similar on Substance (74.2 and 75.2) and Public Understanding (72.9 and 70.3). Institutional reporting scored higher on Governance Literacy (76.6 versus 67.7), while journalism scored substantially higher on Source Diversity (54.6 versus 32.4).

Source Type	Overall	Public Understanding	Substance	Governance Literacy	Source Diversity
Third-Party	83.2*	—	—	—	—
Journalism	67.3	72.9	74.2	67.7	54.6
Institutional	63.6	70.3	75.2	76.6	32.4
Corporate / Official	52.1	—	—	—	—

Chapter 6: Coverage of Multilateral Governance



This chapter draws primarily on the coded media coverage collected during the six-week study period. The pilot found no shortage of reporting activity. The finalized database contains 247 coverage records spanning diplomacy, human rights, humanitarian affairs, public health, trade, artificial intelligence, climate, science, and other areas of global governance. The more significant question, however, is not how much journalism was produced, but what kind of journalism audiences received.

Coverage by Topic

The pilot classified each of the 247 coverage records under one primary topic. The categories below are mutually exclusive and therefore total 247 records; “Other” includes records that did not fit one of the ten named categories.

Topic	Coverage Records
AI / Technology	72
Human Rights	38
Peace & Security	31
Other	30
Humanitarian	23
Climate	21
Trade / Economics	13
Development	8
Global Health	7
Governance Process	3
Science Diplomacy	1

Artificial intelligence and technology emerged as the largest thematic category during the observation period. This reflects both the unusually active governance calendar and the growing prominence of AI within international policymaking. Human rights and peace and security also generated substantial coverage, while several technically significant areas—including governance processes themselves—received comparatively limited direct attention. It is important to acknowledge that the prevalence in coverage of these categories also coincides with several large events that occurred during the six-week period, including the AI for Good Summit, the U.S.-Iran talks, and the 62nd Human Rights Council.

Visibility

One of the clearest findings of the pilot was the uneven distribution of public visibility across international organizations and governance processes. Organizations associated with active negotiations, political disputes, leadership contests, crises, or major public events consistently attracted sustained media attention. Institutions

operating in more technical or specialized areas frequently received substantially less coverage despite addressing issues with potentially significant international consequences.

Visibility could be influenced by several factors, including the perceived news value of an event, the availability of journalists with relevant expertise, institutional accessibility, and the extent to which developments could be translated into narratives recognizable to general audiences.

Depth

Reporting depth varied considerably across outlets, reporting models, and subject areas. Many stories successfully communicated the basic facts of meetings, announcements, negotiations, or institutional decisions. Fewer consistently explained the broader institutional context surrounding those developments. Coverage tended to be deepest when produced by journalists or publications with sustained engagement in a particular field. Reporters who regularly covered public health, humanitarian affairs, trade, human rights, or technology governance were generally better positioned to provide historical context, institutional background, procedural explanation, and policy significance.

The coding process found numerous examples of reporting that extended beyond immediate developments to explain how decisions were made, who held authority, what procedures governed outcomes, and why particular developments mattered. Other coverage focused primarily on immediate events while providing comparatively limited institutional context. The findings suggest that reporting depth depends less upon article length than upon sustained institutional knowledge. Journalists who regularly follow particular organizations or governance processes appear better able to explain why developments matter and how decisions are reached.

Explanatory Journalism

Reporting on international organizations frequently involves institutions, procedures, governance structures, and technical subjects that can be unfamiliar to many audiences. The pilot suggests that explanation may represent journalism's most distinctive public contribution within the multilateral information ecosystem. While international organizations explain their own activities, journalism contributes independent verification, scrutiny, context, competing perspectives, and explanation that helps audiences understand institutions.

Process Versus Event Reporting

A recurring pattern observed throughout the pilot involved the relationship between events and processes. Many governance outcomes emerge from negotiations, consultations, technical discussions, committee meetings, and institutional procedures unfolding over months or years. Public attention, however, frequently concentrates on discrete events: treaties are signed, resolutions adopted, negotiations collapse, leaders elected, or crises emerge. As a result, audiences often encounter the outcome of governance without seeing much of the process that produced it. Reporting centered on events remains essential. However, this approach alone often provides only a partial understanding of how governance systems actually function.

Some of the strongest reporting observed within the timeframe of the pilot followed governance processes over extended periods. These stories tracked negotiations, examined institutional dynamics, identified competing interests, and explained the mechanisms through which decisions ultimately emerged. Governance is fundamentally procedural. Journalism therefore faces a structural challenge: audiences are naturally drawn to events, while institutions derive much of their authority from processes that unfold gradually and often invisibly.

Audience Accessibility

Many international organizations communicate through specialized terminology, technical language, legal frameworks, and procedural concepts that are unfamiliar to many readers. Journalism plays a critical role in translating these systems into language broader audiences can understand. The pilot found substantial variation in audience accessibility. Some stories clearly identified institutions, explained acronyms, defined technical terminology, and provided sufficient context for readers unfamiliar with the subject. Others assumed a level of prior institutional knowledge that many audiences were unlikely to possess.

This challenge was particularly evident in reporting on artificial intelligence governance, telecommunications standards, intellectual property, trade negotiations, and certain public health processes. Accessibility is therefore not simply a matter of writing style. It is an essential component of public understanding. Journalism cannot effectively explain multilateral governance if audiences cannot understand the institutions, procedures, or technical concepts being described.

Chapter 7: Case Studies



The purpose of these case studies is to illustrate broader patterns identified elsewhere in the pilot, including visibility, governance literacy, explanatory reporting, source diversity, institutional accessibility, and the relationship between events and governance processes. Each example was selected from major governance activities observed during the study period and demonstrates how the Multilateral Journalism Index framework can be applied to real-world reporting.

UN Secretary-General Candidates' Debate

The 9 June 2026 United Nations secretary-general candidates' debate provided one of the clearest opportunities during the study period to examine how journalism covers institutional governance. The event attracted substantial public interest and participation beyond traditional diplomatic and media circles. Field observations noted significant attendance by younger audiences, including student journalists, participating in post-debate discussions. The debate itself was highly visible. The governance system behind it was considerably less so.

Coverage frequently focused on candidates, leadership priorities, campaign themes, and political implications. Less visible was the institutional process through which a secretary-general is ultimately selected, including the central role of the Security Council, regional political dynamics, informal diplomatic negotiations, and the General Assembly's appointment process. The debate illustrates one of the MJI's central observations: high public visibility does not necessarily produce high governance literacy. Journalism often explained the candidates more effectively than it explained the institutional mechanisms through which leadership decisions are ultimately made.

Patterns Illustrated

- Governance literacy
- Public understanding
- Process versus event reporting

G7 Summit and U.S.-Iran Nuclear Talks

The G7 Summit and renewed U.S.-Iran nuclear negotiations illustrate how multilateral governance frequently extends beyond the formal boundaries of International Geneva while remaining closely connected to its institutions, diplomatic networks, and reporting community. Although the G7 Summit took place in nearby Évian and the nuclear talks were held at Bürgenstock, both generated substantial reporting activity in Geneva. Demonstrations connected to the G7 occurred in the city, while discussions surrounding Iran's nuclear program remained closely linked to Geneva-based diplomatic and technical institutions.

The role of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) provided a particularly useful example. Reporting required journalists to integrate political negotiations, nuclear verification, scientific expertise, and international diplomacy into coherent accounts of rapidly evolving events. This case demonstrates that multilateral journalism often requires reporting across institutions rather than within them. International governance operates through interconnected networks of diplomacy, science, technical expertise, and international organizations rather than through single institutions acting alone.

Patterns Illustrated

- Multi-institutional reporting

- Process continuity
- The intersection of science and diplomacy
- International visibility

Human Rights Council

The United Nations Human Rights Council provides a useful illustration of the relationship between institutional importance and media visibility. During the study period, reporting focused primarily on country situations, resolutions, investigations, and political disagreements among member countries. These developments generated identifiable news events and attracted substantial media attention. Much of the Council's work, however, occurs through less visible procedures, including Special Rapporteur mandates, investigative mechanisms, reporting requirements, implementation processes, and continuing oversight.

The Council therefore serves as an important test of governance literacy. Understanding its significance requires explaining not only what happened but also how the institution functions and how its decisions are implemented. The case illustrates a broader finding emerging from the pilot: institutional influence frequently derives from continuing procedural activity rather than singular headline events.

Patterns Illustrated

- Institutional complexity
- Visibility
- Explanatory reporting

AI Governance

Artificial intelligence governance emerged during the study period as one of the clearest examples of a rapidly evolving governance system operating without a single governing authority. On 1 July 2026, the United Nations' Independent International Scientific Panel on Artificial Intelligence released its first preliminary assessment, immediately preceding the AI for Good Global Summit and related meetings in Geneva. Together these events concentrated international attention on questions of AI governance at a moment of accelerating technological change.

Unlike many established governance systems, AI governance remains institutionally fragmented. Authority is distributed across governments, international organizations, standards-setting bodies, scientific institutions, technology companies, researchers, and civil society organizations. This fragmentation creates distinctive challenges for journalism. AI is often covered as a technology, business, or geopolitical story, while the emerging governance architecture remains more difficult to explain.

The evolving nature of AI governance demonstrated within the pilot's timeframe illustrates one of the pilot's most significant observations: influence within global governance frequently derives from expertise, scientific assessment, standards development, and convening power before formal regulatory authority exists. The case therefore demonstrates that journalism faces the challenge of explaining governance while governance itself is still evolving.

Patterns Illustrated

- Governance through expertise
- Institutional fragmentation
- Governance literacy
- Visibility versus governance significance

WHO Pandemic Agreement

The WHO Pandemic Agreement illustrates one of the central challenges of multilateral journalism: some of the most consequential governance processes unfold through extended negotiations rather than dramatic public events. The agreement emerged from years of negotiation following the COVID-19 pandemic. Much of that work occurred through drafting sessions, technical consultations, committee meetings, and sustained diplomatic negotiations that rarely generated headline coverage. This creates a structural challenge for journalism. The most consequential developments are often procedural rather than dramatic, making them more difficult to communicate to broader audiences.

The case demonstrates that sustained reporting on negotiation processes may represent one of journalism's greatest contributions to public understanding of global governance.

Patterns Illustrated

- Process journalism
- Governance literacy

- Specialist reporting

Climate Governance

The June 2026 Bonn Climate Change Conference provides one of the clearest examples from the study period of governance operating through process rather than events. Although held in Bonn rather than Geneva, the meetings illustrate a broader characteristic of the International Geneva reporting environment. Journalists covering global governance routinely follow negotiations occurring simultaneously across multiple international institutions and diplomatic venues. The Bonn meetings served as an important negotiating session ahead of the next Conference of the Parties (COP). Reporting tracked discussions concerning adaptation, finance, implementation, and other technical aspects of climate governance.

Unlike annual COP summits, however, the Bonn negotiations attracted comparatively limited media attention despite their significance within the negotiating process. The case reinforces one of the pilot's central observations: governance significance and media visibility frequently diverge. The meetings that shape future agreements often receive less attention than the conferences at which those agreements are formally announced.

Patterns Illustrated

- Process versus event reporting
- Visibility
- Climate governance complexity

Chapter 8: Observations From the Field



In addition to published journalism, which reveals what audiences ultimately see, direct observation provides insight into how that journalism is produced. Throughout the six-week study period, the pilot incorporated structured observation of press briefings, conferences, debates, negotiations, governing-body meetings, and other public events across International Geneva. These observations complement the content analysis presented elsewhere in the Report by documenting characteristics of the reporting environment that are often invisible in published stories.

Rather than evaluating individual journalists or institutions, the observations aimed to identify recurring patterns in attendance, information flows, institutional accessibility, journalistic practice, and the broader conditions under which multilateral journalism is produced.

Attendance Patterns

Reporters attending United Nations press briefings also appeared at Human Rights Council sessions, AI governance meetings, diplomatic conferences, humanitarian events, and other governance-related activities. This pattern suggests that a relatively small number of journalists are responsible for covering a remarkably broad range of institutions and policy areas within the International Geneva reporting environment. Attendance varied considerably by event.

High-profile public events generally attracted larger media contingents than technical consultations, committee meetings, or procedural negotiations. The United Nations secretary-general candidates' debate, for example, drew broad participation that extended beyond the traditional diplomatic press corps, including student journalists and younger audiences. These observations reinforce one of the pilot's central findings: continuity of coverage often depends upon a relatively small community of specialist correspondents.

Questioning and Institutional Engagement

Direct observation provided opportunities to examine how journalists engage with institutions during press briefings, public discussions, and official events.

Levels of engagement varied substantially. Some briefings generated sustained exchanges between journalists and officials, while others involved relatively limited questioning despite the significance of the issues under discussion. International wire service correspondents frequently posed the most detailed and technically informed questions during regular press briefings. Their questioning often reflected long-term familiarity with institutions, policy issues, and previous developments.

The observations also suggest that subject-matter specialization influences the quality of questioning. Journalists who regularly covered particular institutions frequently demonstrated greater familiarity with governance processes, institutional history, and technical issues than those attending occasional events. The pilot additionally documented occasions in which formal media access was limited while informal engagement with delegates, experts, and participants remained possible outside official proceedings. These observations illustrate the importance of professional networks and institutional familiarity within multilateral journalism.

Continuity of Coverage

Many of the most significant governance stories observed during the pilot extended well beyond individual announcements or meetings. The United Nations secretary-general selection process, AI governance discussions, Human Rights Council proceedings, WHO negotiations, climate diplomacy, and developments concerning Iran's nuclear program all unfolded across multiple meetings, institutions, and locations over extended periods. These

observations reinforce one of the report's recurring conclusions: governance reporting often requires sustained attention rather than isolated event coverage.

Journalists following these stories over time were generally better positioned to explain institutional developments, identify changes in negotiations, and provide historical context than those reporting individual events in isolation. Continuity therefore appears to be an important contributor to explanatory journalism.

Institutional Communication Practices

Institutional communication practices varied considerably across organizations observed during the pilot. Some institutions maintained regular press briefings, predictable communication schedules, accessible documentation, responsive communications teams, and well-established media procedures. Others appeared considerably less visible within the reporting environment. These differences affected how easily journalists could obtain information, identify relevant experts, follow negotiations, and understand institutional developments.

The observations suggest that institutional accessibility influences reporting opportunities without determining reporting quality. Accessible institutions do not automatically receive better journalism, but accessibility can facilitate deeper and more continuous coverage.

Information Bottlenecks

Several governance processes observed during the pilot involved substantial technical, procedural, scientific, or legal complexity. Understanding these developments frequently required familiarity with institutional mandates, negotiation procedures, specialized terminology, scientific concepts, or regulatory frameworks. These characteristics create information bottlenecks affecting both journalists and public audiences. The pilot also observed that some governance activities attracted relatively limited media attention despite considerable institutional significance. This reinforces a recurring finding throughout the Report: governance significance and public visibility do not necessarily coincide.

Emerging Trends

Several broader themes emerged repeatedly during the observation period. The first was the increasing integration of science, technology, and governance. Artificial intelligence, climate negotiations, nuclear verification, telecommunications, and public health all required journalists to explain technical evidence alongside political negotiation. The second was the continuing importance of explanatory journalism. Many governance processes involved institutions, procedures, and decision-making mechanisms that remain unfamiliar outside specialist communities. Journalism that successfully translated those systems into accessible language consistently ranked higher in public understanding.

The third was the interconnected nature of governance reporting. Many stories extended simultaneously across multiple organizations, countries, policy domains, and international meetings rather than remaining confined to a single institution. Finally, the observations suggest that journalism covering multilateral governance requires specialist knowledge, institutional continuity, and the ability to integrate information originating from multiple organizations into coherent explanations of complex international processes.

Chapter 9: Key Findings

The MJJ pilot identified recurring patterns across content analysis, direct observation, and ecosystem mapping. Together, these findings provide an initial picture of how multilateral journalism functions within the International Geneva ecosystem.

Finding 1: Coverage capacity is concentrated among a relatively small number of journalists.

The same journalists appeared repeatedly across multiple institutions, policy areas, and events. Coverage of international organizations and global governance appears to depend heavily on a relatively small group of specialist and wire-service reporters who follow developments across institutional boundaries.

Evidence: Observation and attendance records.

Finding 2: Institutional importance and media visibility do not always align.

Several highly consequential governance processes received limited public attention, while more visible political events often generated disproportionate coverage. Media visibility is therefore not always a reliable indicator of governance significance.

Evidence: Content analysis, case studies, and observation.

Finding 3: Explanatory reporting is a key differentiator.

The strongest reporting went beyond describing events to explain institutions, decision-making processes, authority structures, and governance mechanisms. Coverage providing this context generally scored more strongly in Public Understanding and Governance Literacy.

Evidence: Content analysis.

Finding 4: Governance processes are harder to cover than governance events.

Many important developments occurred through negotiations, consultations, technical discussions, scientific assessments, and procedural work rather than headline-generating events. These characteristics create structural challenges for journalists seeking to explain governance systems to broader audiences.

Evidence: Observation, content analysis, and case studies.

Finding 5: Specialist knowledge supports deeper reporting.

Journalists with sustained experience covering particular institutions, policy domains, or governance processes were often better positioned to explain complex developments and place them in context.

Evidence: Observation and content analysis.

Finding 6: Multilateral journalism increasingly crosses institutional boundaries.

Artificial intelligence governance, climate governance, pandemic preparedness, and nuclear diplomacy all involved multiple organizations, forums, and decision-making processes and could not be understood through a single institution.

Evidence: Case studies, observation, and content analysis.

Finding 7: Public understanding depends on governance literacy.

Readers are often asked to understand decisions without sufficient explanation of how those decisions were made. Coverage explaining institutional roles, procedures, and sources of authority generally provided greater public understanding than coverage focused primarily on outcomes.

Evidence: Content analysis.

Finding 8: Information accessibility shapes coverage.

Institutional communication practices, documentation, transparency, media engagement, accreditation, and live web streams influenced how easily journalists could access information, follow developments, and explain governance processes to public audiences.

Evidence: Observation.

Finding 9: Technical and scientific subjects account for a substantial share of governance reporting.

Artificial intelligence governance, climate negotiations, pandemic preparedness, and nuclear diplomacy all involved significant scientific or technical dimensions. Scientific and technical issues, including science diplomacy, now occupy a substantial place within multilateral journalism.

Evidence: Case studies, observation, and content analysis.

Finding 10: Continuity matters.

Many governance processes unfold over months or years rather than days or weeks. Coverage following negotiations and institutional processes over time generally provided greater context and explanatory value than coverage focused solely on individual events.

Evidence: Observation and case studies.

Chapter 10: Conclusion

What the Pilot Revealed

The Multilateral Journalism Index Pilot 2026 was conceived as an exploratory effort to better understand how journalism covering international organizations and global governance is produced, explained, and communicated within the International Geneva ecosystem.

Perhaps most importantly, the pilot reinforces the idea that journalism covering global governance differs from many other forms of reporting. International organizations frequently operate through negotiations, scientific assessments, technical standards, committee work, regulatory procedures, and other institutional processes that remain largely invisible outside specialist communities. Explaining these systems requires continuity of coverage, institutional knowledge, and sustained subject-matter expertise.

Why the Ecosystem Matters

International organizations influence decisions affecting public health, scientific cooperation, trade, telecommunications, artificial intelligence, humanitarian action, human rights, climate policy, migration, and international security. Reporting emerges from a broader multilateral information ecosystem composed of journalists, editors, international organizations, communications professionals, researchers, scientific experts, civil society organizations, and public audiences. Information moves through this ecosystem before reaching the public.

Why Measurement Matters

Multilateral journalism is frequently discussed but has rarely been examined through a structured analytical framework.

International organizations routinely measure their own activities. News organizations monitor audiences, subscriptions, and engagement. Considerable research exists concerning media systems, press freedom, and journalism economics. Far less attention has been devoted to understanding journalism covering international organizations itself. The Multilateral Journalism Index attempts to address that gap. Measurement cannot capture every dimension of journalism, nor should it replace editorial judgment. Its value lies in creating a transparent framework through which recurring patterns can be observed, compared, discussed, and refined using evidence rather than assumption.

The pilot suggests that dimensions such as Public Understanding, Governance Literacy, Substance, and Source Diversity provide useful indicators for examining how effectively journalism explains complex systems of global governance. Equally important, systematic measurement helps identify areas that remain comparatively underreported, insufficiently explained, or poorly understood.

Future Development of the MJJ

This report documents Version 1.0 of the Multilateral Journalism Index framework.

Questions concerning reporting capacity, institutional accessibility, governance literacy, specialist expertise, information flows, and public understanding deserve continued examination over longer periods and across additional centers of multilateral governance.

Final Reflection

The purpose of this pilot was to determine whether the journalism surrounding international organizations could itself become the subject of systematic observation and evidence-based analysis. The findings presented in this report suggest that it can. The pilot establishes an initial baseline for understanding how journalism explains global governance, how reporting capacity is distributed, where explanatory strengths and weaknesses emerge, and how the broader multilateral information ecosystem is evolving. Like the governance systems it examines, the Multilateral Journalism Index is intended to develop incrementally through continued observation, testing, refinement, and comparison over time.

If future editions contribute to better reporting, greater institutional literacy, more informed public understanding, and deeper knowledge of the journalism that connects international institutions with global audiences, the objectives of this inaugural pilot will have been fulfilled.

Chapter 11: Appendices

Data Availability

The MJI Pilot Report is based on the MJI Master Database v4.3. Aggregate data underlying the findings are reported in the Pilot Report and Pilot Index. The record-level research database is maintained by the Geneva Center for Multilateral Journalism and is not publicly released.

Appendix A

Organizations and Governance Processes Examined

The pilot examined journalism associated with 31 international organizations, governance processes, and multilateral events active during the observation period.

Examples include:

United Nations System

- United Nations Office at Geneva (UNOG)
- Human Rights Council (HRC)
- Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR)
- World Health Organization (WHO)
- International Telecommunication Union (ITU)
- United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD)
- World Meteorological Organization (WMO)
- International Labour Organization (ILO)
- International Organization for Migration (IOM)
- United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR)
- United Nations Office for Disarmament Affairs (UNODA)

Other International Organizations

- International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA)
- International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC)
- International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC)
- World Trade Organization (WTO)
- World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO)
- Geneva Science and Diplomacy Anticipator (GESDA)

Governance Processes and Major Events

- United Nations Secretary-General selection process
- Human Rights Council session
- AI governance
- AI for Good Global Summit
- WHO Pandemic Agreement negotiations
- Bonn Climate Change Conference
- U.S.-Iran nuclear diplomacy
- G7 Summit

A complete reference table of organizations is maintained in the MJI master database.

Appendix B

Media Outlets Examined

The pilot examined journalism produced by 71 media organizations representing multiple reporting models.

Examples from the sample include:

International Wire Services

- Reuters
- Agence France-Presse (AFP)
- Associated Press (AP)

- Deutsche Presse-Agentur (dpa)
- Agencia EFE
- Keystone-SDA
- Kyodo News

International and National News Organizations

- BBC
- Al Jazeera
- The Guardian
- Le Temps
- Swiss Broadcasting Corporation (SRF)
- Blick
- The New York Times
- Financial Times

Specialist Publications

- Geneva Solutions
- PassBlue
- Health Policy Watch
- Climate Home News
- Devex
- Science|Business
- Nature
- Science

Independent and Newsletter-Based Publications

- Arete News
- The Science Diplomat

Institutional Publications

Institutional newsrooms and official communications channels were also tracked for comparative purposes but were analyzed separately from independent journalism. A complete alphabetical outlet register is maintained in the MJJ master database.

Appendix C

Pilot Research Summary

Observation Period

9 June to 21 July 2026

Pilot Dataset

Component	Total
Coverage records	247
Scored records	230
Organizations	31
Media outlets	71
Journalists	91
Events observed	27
Direct observations	8
Distribution Reach coded	240

Evidence Streams

- Structured content analysis
- Direct observation
- Case studies
- Ecosystem mapping

Appendix D

Multilateral Journalism Index Version 1.0

Core Dimensions

Public Understanding Measures how effectively reporting enables audiences to understand institutions, governance processes, decisions, and their significance.

Primary indicators include:

- Institutional explanation
- Accessibility
- Context
- Relevance

Substance

Measures reporting depth and informational value.

Primary indicators include:

- Contextual reporting
- Historical background
- Supporting evidence
- Analytical explanation

Governance Literacy

Measures how effectively reporting explains governance systems.

Primary indicators include:

- Institutional roles
- Decision-making mechanisms
- Authority
- Accountability
- Procedural explanation

Source Diversity

Measures the breadth of perspectives represented.

Primary indicators include:

- Official sources
- Independent experts
- Researchers
- Civil society
- Affected communities
- Multiple viewpoints

Supplemental Indicators

Visual Journalism

Evaluates explanatory visual material, including:

- Photographs
- Charts
- Graphics
- Timelines
- Explanatory diagrams

Distribution Reach

Metric	Value
Mean	2.1
Median	1

Provides an indication of potential audience exposure. Distribution Reach is reported separately from the Core MJJ Score because audience reach and explanatory quality measure different characteristics.

Appendix E

Methodological Summary

Observation Period

9 June to 21 July 2026

Sampling Strategy

The pilot employed purposeful sampling.

Selection criteria included:

- Institutional significance
- Expected media attention
- Topical diversity
- Geographic relevance
- Practical feasibility during the observation period

The objective was analytical representativeness, not statistical representativeness.

Principal Evidence Streams

- Structured content analysis
- Direct observation
- Case studies
- Ecosystem mapping

Limitations

- Six-week observation period
- Purposeful rather than random sample
- International Geneva focus
- Version 1.0 methodology
- Evolving coding framework

These limitations are consistent with the exploratory nature of the inaugural pilot.

Appendix F

Future Development

Future editions of the Multilateral Journalism Index may include:

- Longer observation periods
- Expanded media samples
- Additional governance centres
- Improved inter-coder reliability testing
- Qualitative interviewing
- Longitudinal analysis
- Comparative international studies
- Enhanced visualization and interactive reporting

The pilot establishes a baseline rather than a completed methodology.

Appendix G

About the Multilateral Journalism Index

The Multilateral Journalism Index (MJl) is a research initiative of the Geneva Center for Multilateral Journalism (GCMJ). Its purpose is to improve understanding of journalism covering international organizations and global governance through systematic observation and evidence-based analysis. The Index does not rank journalists, media organizations, or international institutions.

Instead, it provides a structured framework for examining characteristics associated with explanatory multilateral journalism, including:

- Public Understanding
- Substance
- Governance Literacy
- Source Diversity

Version 1.0 represents the inaugural pilot of an evolving research framework. Future editions will refine the methodology, expand the evidence base, strengthen comparative analysis, and examine changes in the multilateral information ecosystem over time.