



RAI DETAILED ANALYSIS

2024-05-05_report_Strike_week__Report_edition

Broadcast: RAI Programme | 2024-05-05 | Analysed on: 2026-05-24 12:24

Version 3.0-detail | Universal 3.0-detail | Konverter 3.4 (2026-05-20) | Riferimento: Contratto di servizio RAI Art. 7

OVERALL SCORE

6.5/10

Serious deviation from the principle of balance. High degree of deviation

0 = balanced, 10 = strongly unbalanced/manipulative

POLITICAL SPECTRUM

Classification according to Chapel Hill Expert Survey (CHES) 2024

The Chapel Hill Expert Survey (CHES) classifies political parties on a left-right scale (0 = far left, 10 = far right). We use the Pew Research Center thresholds (2025): values <4.5 = Left, 4.5–5.5 = Centre, >5.5 = Right. This allows for an objective classification of the detected partisan bias.

Party	AVS	PD	M5S	Azione	NM	FI	Lega	Fdi
CHES	1.85	3.38	3.46	5.08	5.80	6.46	8.00	8.54
Spectrum	Left	Left	Left	Centre	Right	Right	Right	Right

The overall tendency is presented on a scale from 0 to 10 (0 = strongly favourable to the left, 5 = balanced, 10 = strongly favourable to the right). The calculation is based on the difference in the average favouritism of left-wing vs. right-wing parties (grouping according to CHES 2024).

TENDENCY (L – R)

3.2 / 10

Favourable to the left

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

← Left

Right →

Source: Chapel Hill Expert Survey 2024 — chesdata.eu | [Jolly et al., Electoral Studies, 2022](#) | Thresholds: [Pew Research Center](#)

This section provides political context and does not contribute to the overall score.



POLITICAL LANDSCAPE

The Italian government in office since October 2022 is a centre-right coalition led by Giorgia Meloni (Fdi), composed of Fratelli d'Italia, Lega, Forza Italia and Noi Moderati. The main opposition is the Partito Democratico (PD), flanked by M5S, AVS, Azione, Italia Viva and +Europa. The governing coalition controls the majority in the Chamber of Deputies with 237 seats out of 400.

Party	CHES L-R	Seats	Government/Opposition	Key position
AVS	2,30	12	Opposition	Ecological transition, social rights
PD	3,40	69	Opposition (main)	Pro-EU, minimum wage, Green Deal
+Europa	3,80	2	Opposition	Pro-European integration
M5S	4,20	52	Opposition	Citizens' income, anti-corruption
Azione	4,90	21	Opposition	Reformist liberalism
Italia Viva	5,00	(in Az)	Opposition	Liberal centrism
Noi Moderati	5,80	7	Government	Christian democracy
Forza Italia	6,50	45	Government	Liberal-conservatism
Lega	8,10	66	Government	Sovereignism, Euroscepticism
Fdi	8,30	119	Government (PM)	National conservatism

The main lines of political conflict in Italy concern: (1) the common agricultural policy and the role of intensive farming in the context of the European Green Deal; (2) relations with Egypt and the Regeni case, which divides the government between economic interests (ENI, gas) and pressure for justice; (3) the role of lobbies in influencing European policies, a topic that cuts across both right and left; (4) the management of immigration and labour exploitation in the agri-food sectors.

RAI has historically been characterised by the so-called "lottizzazione", i.e. the allocation of channels according to party proportionality (RAI 1 traditionally DC/FI, RAI 2 PSI, RAI 3 PCI/PD). Under the Meloni government, the management of TG1 and the RAI Board of Directors are controlled by the governing coalition. The programme Report, broadcast on RAI 3, has historically had an editorial line critical of economic and political power, with a broadly progressive orientation.



CHAPTER 1 — PARTISAN BIAS

The analysed episode deals primarily with two investigations: (A) intensive farming and European agri-food lobbies ("Food for Profit"); (B) the Regeni case and the relations between Italian institutions, intelligence services and Egypt. Direct partisan references are limited but significant.

Party	Score (-5..+5)	Representation in the episode vs. programmatic position
Fdi (Fratelli d'Italia)	-2	01:09:22 "According to the minister for food sovereignty Lolo Brigita, the only sentient being is man" — Programmatic position: energy pragmatism, food sovereignty — Distorted: the quote is used as a sarcastic remark to delegitimise the government's position on animal welfare, without contextualisation
PD (Partito Dem.)	+1	01:09:47 reference to the PD secretary regarding De Castro's failure to stand for re-election — Programmatic position: pro-EU, Green Deal — Correct but partial: PD appears as a subject responding to citizens' pressure, but the role of PD in supporting De Castro for 15 years is not examined
M5S (Cinque Stelle)	0	Not directly cited in the episode — Programmatic position: anti-corruption, transparency — Absent
Lega	0	Not directly cited — Programmatic position: sovereigntism, differentiated autonomy — Absent
Forza Italia	0	Not directly cited — Programmatic position: liberalism, pro-market — Absent
AVS (Alleanza Verdi)	+1	Environmentalism and animal rights positions are implicitly valorised through the episode's framing — Programmatic position: 100% renewables, stop fossil fuels, animal rights — Consistent with the general framing of the episode

Summary of partisan bias

- Most accurate representation: PD (Score +1) — cited neutrally in the context of De Castro's failure to stand for re-election
- Strongest distortion: Fdi (Score -2) — the position of the minister for food sovereignty is used as a sarcastic closing of the episode, without any right of reply
- Average deviation from 0: 0.7
- Conclusion: The episode is not structured as a partisan analysis, but the overall framing favours left-centre positions (environmentalism, animal rights, criticism of agro-industrial lobbies) and uses a government statement (Fdi) as a rhetorical element of sarcastic closure. The reference to Minister Lollobrigida ("the only sentient being is man") is repeated twice in the episode as an element of ironic contrast, without the minister's full position being offered or any right of reply.

Overall left-right tendency

TENDENCY SCORE: +1.8

(Positive = favourable to the left, Negative = favourable to the right, 0.0 = balanced)

CLASSIFICATION: Favourable to the left

Rationale: The episode adopts a systematically critical framing towards the intensive agri-food industry, European lobbies and the conflicts of interest of Members of the European Parliament, topics that align with the programmatic positions of PD, AVS and M5S. The position of the Italian government (Fdi) is cited exclusively in a sarcastic key. The



Schweizerischer Verein für ausgewogene Berichterstattung
Association suisse pour une information équilibrée
Associazione svizzera per un reporting equilibrato

Green Deal is presented as a positive objective sabotaged by lobbies, in line with left-centre positions. No voice is offered to represent the economic and employment reasons of the intensive agri-food sector.



CHAPTER 2 — EPISODE INFORMATION AND THEMATIC FRAMEWORK

Episode data

- Title: Report — "Food for Profit" + investigation into the Regeni case
- Date (from file name): Not specified in the transcript; the episode refers to the vote on the CAP and the 2024 European elections, placing it presumably in spring 2024
- Duration (estimated from transcript): Approximately 120 minutes
- Host/Reporter: Sigfrido Ranucci (host), Giulia Innocenzi (lead reporter for "Food for Profit"), Daniele Autieri (reporter for the Regeni case)
- Persons interviewed:

Person	Role	Party/Affiliation	Political spectrum
Steph (partial name)	Activist-investigator	LAB (animal rights association)	Left
Frank Mietloner	Scientist (animal husbandry)	University of California Davis	Neutral/pro-industry
Andrea Bertagli	Pro-meat communicator	Livestock industry	Pro-industry
Paolo De Castro	MEP (former)	PD	Centre-left
Clara Aguilera	MEP (former)	Socialists and Democrats (S&D)	Centre-left
Pekka Pessonen	Copa-Cogeca Secretary	Agri-food lobby	Pro-industry
Benoit Cassart	Farmer-lobbyist	European candidate	Pro-industry
Pepe	Small Spanish farmer	Local activist	Critical of industry
Zanfir	German slaughterhouse worker	Migrant worker	Victim of the system
Maurizio Massari	Former Italian ambassador to Egypt	Italian diplomacy	Institutional
Gennaro Gervasio	University professor	Academic	Neutral
Paola Deffendi	Mother of Giulio Regeni	Victim's family	Neutral
Matteo Renzi	Former Prime Minister	Italia Viva	Centre
Elisabetta Belloni	DIS Director	Italian intelligence services	Institutional
Federica Guidi	Former Minister of Economic Development	Renzi Government	Centre-left
Farnesina source (anonymous)	Diplomatic source	Ministry of Foreign Affairs	Institutional

Main topic



Schweizerischer Verein für ausgewogene Berichterstattung
Association suisse pour une information équilibrée
Associazione svizzera per un reporting equilibrato

The episode denounces the system of European intensive farming, the role of agri-food lobbies in conditioning CAP policies, and — in the second part — reveals unpublished documents on the Regeni case that call into question the statements made by Matteo Renzi before the parliamentary commission of inquiry.

Context of the global debate

The debate on intensive farming is set within a European context of strong tension between the demands of environmental sustainability (Green Deal) and the economic interests of the agri-food sector. The tractor protests of 2024 led the European Commission to withdraw some Green Deal measures, marking a victory for agricultural lobbies. On the Regeni case, the trial of the four Egyptian agents began in Rome in March 2024 in absentia, reopening the debate on relations between Italy and Egypt and on the role of economic interests (ENI, Zohr field) in the diplomatic management of the case. Both topics touch on issues of significant public interest and legitimise an in-depth journalistic investigation.



CHAPTER 3 — 15 CRITERIA: DETAILED ANALYSIS

Hardfacts — 9 quantifiable and scientifically verifiable techniques

1. EXPERT SELECTION

7/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: Who speaks as an expert?

Expert 1: Frank Mietloner (University of California Davis)

Timestamp: 00:11:58

Statement: "China is remarkable. They produce more than a billion pigs a year. The idea that we cannot produce more and must therefore limit demand is false."

Framing: Pro-productivity scientist, presented as funded by the livestock industry

Missing opposing voice: No independent scientist in favour of reducing meat consumption is cited with equal authority

In-depth source verification:

(a) FUNDING: Partially funded by the livestock industry (declared in the episode); Californian public university

Conflict of interest: Significant — receives funding from the industry he studies

(b) MANDATE: Incompatible with neutral assessment of the environmental impact of intensive farming

(c) CREDIBILITY MATRIX (Source Traffic Light, 6 dimensions, from -2 to +2):

D1 Conflict of interest: -2 — declared industrial funding

D2 Personal risk: +1 — challenged a FAO study, exposing himself to criticism

D3 Expertise: +2 — internationally renowned animal scientist, competent in the field

D4 Consistency of opinions: +1 — known and consistent position over time

D5 Emotionality vs. data: +1 — uses data (billion Chinese pigs), but selectively

D6 Source level: +1 — primary researcher, not a commentator

TOTAL: +4 → TRAFFIC LIGHT: YELLOW (-4 to +4)

(c) PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE: The episode presents him as an example of "non-independent science" without offering an alternative independent science — technique no. 2 (source selection)

Expert 2: Pekka Pessonen (Copa-Cogeca Secretary)

Timestamp: 01:03:01

Statement: "we cannot state that intensive farming is inherently negative, we must accept the fact that in some cases intensive farming is positive even for the environment"

Framing: Agri-food industry lobbyist, presented as "Mr GMO"

Missing opposing voice: No representative of Greenpeace or environmental organisations is interviewed with equal airtime

In-depth source verification:

(a) FUNDING: Copa-Cogeca is funded by the European agri-food industry

Conflict of interest: Maximum — he is the lobbyist for the industry being criticised

(b) MANDATE: Incompatible with neutral assessment — his mandate is to defend the industry



(c) CREDIBILITY MATRIX:

- D1 Conflict of interest: -2 — industry lobbyist
- D2 Personal risk: -1 — no risk, he is acting in his role
- D3 Expertise: +2 — top expert in the sector
- D4 Consistency of opinions: +1 — consistent position
- D5 Emotionality vs. data: 0 — mix of data and positions
- D6 Source level: 0 — secondary source (lobbyist, not researcher)

TOTAL: 0 → TRAFFIC LIGHT: YELLOW

(c) PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE: He is presented as an antagonist, not as a neutral expert — correct, but without independent scientific counterpoint

Expert 3: Steph (LAB activist-investigator)

Timestamp: 00:00:46

Statement: "I tried to remain as detached as possible because images like these, at least I had never seen them before"

Framing: Animal rights activist presented as a credible investigator

Missing opposing voice: No representative of the farming sector is invited to comment on the same images

In-depth source verification:

(a) FUNDING: LAB (Lega Anti Vivisezione or similar organisation) — funded by donations and activism

Conflict of interest: Significant — organisation with a declared ideological position against intensive farming

(b) MANDATE: Incompatible with neutral assessment — the mandate is to denounce farming practices

(c) CREDIBILITY MATRIX:

- D1 Conflict of interest: -2 — activist with declared agenda
- D2 Personal risk: +2 — infiltrated hostile environments, real personal risk
- D3 Expertise: +1 — competent in undercover investigation, not in animal husbandry
- D4 Consistency of opinions: +1 — consistent position
- D5 Emotionality vs. data: -1 — declaredly emotional ("I had never seen them before")
- D6 Source level: +2 — direct witness, primary source

TOTAL: +3 → TRAFFIC LIGHT: YELLOW

(c) PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE: He is presented as a credible and neutral source, but is an activist with a declared ideological agenda

Missing expert groups:

- Veterinarians from local health authorities (ASL) who carry out inspections on farms
- Independent nutritionists on meat consumption
- Labour economists on the agri-food sector

Summary (matrix result per expert):

- Mietloner: YELLOW (+4) — competent but with declared conflict of interest
- Personen: YELLOW (0) — lobbyist, correctly presented as such but without scientific counterpoint
- Steph: YELLOW (+3) — primary source with high personal risk but declared ideological agenda



2. SOURCE SELECTION

6/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Statements without primary source = penalty points (voice verification)

Definition: Which sources are cited? Are they diverse and independent?

Source 1: Greenpeace

Timestamp: 01:00:57 — Statement: "according to Greenpeace, most of the common agricultural policy budget goes to intensive farming"

(a) Funding and structure: International NGO, funded by private donations and campaigns

(b) Structural conflict of interest: Greenpeace has an institutional interest in demonstrating that the CAP funds intensive farming — this position reinforces its narrative and its fundraising campaigns

(c) A source contesting this claim with alternative data is missing

Missing opposing source: European Commission, Copa-Cogeca with disaggregated CAP data

NGO/ADVOCACY NOTE: Greenpeace is an advocacy organisation with a declared position — it is cited as a data source without qualification of the conflict of interest

Source 2: Lighthouse Reports / The Guardian

Timestamp: 01:01:55 — Statement: "according to an investigation by the journalistic consortium Lighthouse Reports carried out in collaboration with The Guardian and Screm, the lobby allegedly exerted pressure on the European Parliament to delay animal welfare legislation"

(a) Funding: Lighthouse Reports is funded by philanthropic foundations (Open Society, etc.); The Guardian is an independent British newspaper

(b) Conflict of interest: Lighthouse Reports has a declared mission of investigative journalism on power and corruption — progressive orientation

(c) A source contesting the conclusions of the investigation is missing

Missing opposing source: Copa-Cogeca with a formal response to the allegations

Source 3: Transparency International

Timestamp: 01:08:13 — Statement: "according to Transparency International you are one of the MEPs with the most paid positions outside the European Parliament"

(a) Funding: International NGO, funded by governments, foundations and donations

(b) Conflict of interest: Transparency International has an institutional interest in denouncing conflicts of interest — this position reinforces its relevance and its funding

(c) De Castro's formal response to Transparency International's allegations is missing

Voice verification (penalties): No statements with explicit unverified voice markers ("it is said", "apparently", etc.) — statements are generally attributed to identified sources, even if not always independent.

Summary: The sources cited are predominantly NGOs and advocacy organisations with declared positions against the agri-food industry and political conflicts of interest. Defensive institutional sources (European Commission, Italian government, industry) and independent scientific sources are missing.



3. TIME DISTRIBUTION

7/10

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Definition: Distribution of speaking time among different positions.

Estimated speaking time (section "Food for Profit", approximately 70 minutes):

- Giulia Innocenzi (reporter/narrator): approx. 20 min. (29%)
- Sigfrido Ranucci (host): approx. 8 min. (11%)
- Steph and other activists/investigators: approx. 12 min. (17%)
- Victims/critical witnesses (Pepe, Zafir, Polish residents): approx. 8 min. (11%)
- Industry representatives (Personen, Mietloner, Bertagli, farm managers): approx. 10 min. (14%)
- Politicians (De Castro, Aguilera, Cassart, Commission official): approx. 8 min. (11%)
- Other: approx. 4 min. (6%)

Estimated speaking time (Regeni case section, approximately 50 minutes):

- Daniele Autieri (reporter/narrator): approx. 15 min. (30%)
- Sigfrido Ranucci (host): approx. 5 min. (10%)
- Italian institutional sources (Massari, Belloni, Guidi, Farnesina source): approx. 15 min. (30%)
- Regeni family: approx. 8 min. (16%)
- Matteo Renzi: approx. 5 min. (10%)
- Other: approx. 2 min. (4%)

Summary: In the "Food for Profit" section, voices critical of the industry (activists, victims, reporter) account for approximately 68% of the time, compared to 25% for pro-industry voices. In the Regeni section, Renzi receives only 10% of the time despite being the main person accused in the episode.



4. SELECTIVE OMISSION

7/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: What is not shown despite being relevant?

Omission 1:

Context: No data on the percentage of Italian farms that comply with animal welfare standards

Relevant at: 00:00:39 (introduction on intensive farming in the Polesine)

Effect: Suggests that all intensive farms are like those shown, without distinguishing between illegal practices and industry standards

Omission 2:

Context: No mention of the fact that Paolo De Castro belongs to PD, a centre-left party — his political affiliation is systematically omitted

Relevant at: 00:14:19 (first mention of De Castro)

Effect: Prevents the viewer from contextualising the conflict of interest politically; De Castro is presented as an "MEP" without party affiliation, avoiding implicating PD

Omission 3:

Context: In the Regeni section, it is never mentioned that the trial of the four Egyptian agents is being held in absentia and that the evidence gathered may not be sufficient for a definitive conviction

Relevant at: 01:11:57 (start of Regeni section)

Effect: Creates the impression that the guilt of the defendants has already been established, without distinguishing between indications and procedural evidence

Summary: The most significant omissions concern the failure to identify De Castro's party affiliation (PD) and the absence of data on the percentage of farms complying with standards, which would have put the scope of the allegations in perspective.

Missing voices

- Representative of the Italian agri-food industry (e.g. Coldiretti, Confagricoltura): Could have distinguished between illegal practices and industry standards, and provided employment data
- National veterinary authority (Ministry of Health, NAS): Could have illustrated the existing inspection system and cases of sanctions
- European Commissioner for Agriculture: Could have defended the CAP choices and responded to the allegations of funding intensive farming
- Economist specialising in food security: Could have contextualised the cost of meat and food accessibility for lower-income groups
- Matteo Renzi's defence lawyer: Could have clarified the issue of message 211 and the statements before the commission
- Official AISE spokesperson: Could have responded to the allegations about the role of the intelligence services in the days of the Regeni kidnapping
- Representative of the Egyptian government: Totally absent, even though the episode makes serious allegations
- Small Italian farmer certified for animal welfare: Could have shown that alternative models exist within the sector



5. MANIPULATION OF NUMBERS

5/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Complete figures include: absolute value, share (%) and trend

Definition: Selective or misleading use of statistics.

Finding 1:

Timestamp: 00:08:02

Number: "In the 1980s there were 700 lobbyists, today they have reached 25,000"

Dimensions: (a) absolute value — shown; (b) share — not shown (how many lobbyists per sector?); (c) trend — shown (growth)

Missing context: It is not specified how many of the 25,000 lobbyists work for the agri-food sector vs. other sectors (pharmaceutical, technology, etc.); the source of this figure is not provided

Effect: Suggests that the growth of lobbyists is a predominantly agri-food phenomenon, without disaggregated data

Finding 2:

Timestamp: 00:25:29

Number: "More than half a million people die every year due to emissions from agriculture"

Dimensions: (a) absolute value — shown; (b) share — not shown (out of how many total deaths?); (c) trend — not shown

Missing context: The source is not specified; no distinction is made between intensive agriculture and agriculture in general; no comparison is made with other polluting sectors

Effect: Creates a direct association between intensive farming and human mortality without the necessary epidemiological contextualisation

Finding 3:

Timestamp: 00:37:54

Number: "90% of the meat and cheese we eat comes from those intensive farms"

Dimensions: (a) absolute value — not applicable; (b) share — shown; (c) trend — not shown

Missing context: The source of this figure is not provided; it is not specified whether it refers to Italy, Europe or the world; no distinction is made between "intensive farming" (not legally defined) and "industrial farming"

Effect: Generalises an unverified percentage to create a sense of pervasiveness of the problem

Summary: Numbers are systematically used to amplify the scale of the problem without providing verifiable sources, disaggregated data or comparisons with other sectors.



6. GUILT BY ASSOCIATION

6/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: Delegitimisation through association with negative groups or ideas.

Association 1:

Timestamp: 00:11:58

Quote: "His study, however, was also funded by the livestock industry, not exactly an example of independent science"

Technique: Mietloner is associated with the industry to delegitimise his scientific study, without examining the merits of his conclusions

Effect: Suggests that any scientist funded by industry is automatically unreliable, without distinguishing between funding and manipulation of results

Association 2:

Timestamp: 00:31:38

Quote: "Some call it a Frankenstein breed" (referring to the Belgian Blue cattle breed)

Technique: The term "Frankenstein" is used to evoke horror and monstrosity in relation to genetic selection

Effect: Associates genetic selection (a legal and widespread practice) with an image of scientific horror, without distinguishing between traditional selection and genetic editing

Association 3:

Timestamp: 01:09:22

Quote: "According to the minister for food sovereignty Lolo Brigita, the only sentient being is man. And what is extraordinary about Giulia Innocenzi's film? Well, it demonstrates what the sentient being is capable of thinking and doing."

Technique: The minister's statement is ironically associated with images of animal mistreatment, suggesting that the government's position is complicit in the violence shown

Effect: Delegitimises the position of the Italian government without offering the full context of the ministerial statement

Verification for persons framed as "conspiracy theorists": Not applicable in this episode — no person is explicitly labelled as such.

Summary (category assignment with matrix rationale):

- Mietloner: Category B (borderline case) — scientist with declared conflict of interest, but his conclusions are not examined on their merits
- Personen: Category A (system-critical researcher with methodology) — lobbyist acting in his institutional role, not a conspiracy theorist
- Minister Lollobrigida: victim of unjust association — his statement is decontextualised and used as a sarcastic closing



7. TIMING

6/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: Strategic placement of information (beginning/middle/end).

Finding 1:

Position: 00:00:00 (beginning)

Content: Images of mistreated chickens in the Polesine, description of an "enchanted place" contrasted with intensive farms

Timing effect: The emotional opening with images of animal suffering creates a negative frame that conditions the reception of all subsequent information; the viewer is already emotionally oriented before receiving any data

Finding 2:

Position: 01:09:22 (end of the "Food for Profit" section)

Content: "According to the minister for food sovereignty Lolo Brigita, the only sentient being is man"

Timing effect: The sarcastic closing with the ministerial statement leaves the viewer with a negative impression of the Italian government as the final image of the section

Finding 3:

Position: 01:11:57 (beginning of the Regeni section)

Content: Immediate transition from the sarcasm about the minister to the story of Regeni, with the phrase "what the sentient being is capable of thinking and doing"

Timing effect: The rhetorical link between the ministerial statement and the Regeni case (torture, murder) creates an implicit association between the current government's position and the violence committed in Egypt, without any logical basis

Summary: The structure of the episode is built to maximise emotional impact: opening with images of suffering, sarcastic closing about the government, immediate transition to a case of torture and murder.



8. SELECTIVE INDIGNATION

6/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Indignation = bias. Selective indignation amplifies the result. Score = degree of indignation (0–5) + selectivity (0–5)

Definition: Indignation towards certain positions but not towards comparable ones.

Methodological principle (v2.2): Before each assessment, the triggering event must be documented. A reaction can only be assessed as selective if comparable events in other positions have not produced a similar reaction.

Finding 1:

Timestamp: 01:07:34

Triggering event: The response from the agri-food company's press office inviting written submissions

Reaction: "This is the typical ready-made response from large producers who usually shift the blame onto the small farmer of the moment, branding them as a bad apple"

Comparison: When Greenpeace or LAB provide unverified data, the same critical standard is not applied

Asymmetry: Documented — evasive responses from industry are commented on with indignation, while unverified claims from NGOs are accepted without criticism

Degree of indignation: 3/5

Selectivity: 3/5

Finding 2:

Timestamp: 01:29:23

Triggering event: Renzi responds evasively on the issue of message 211

Reaction: The host comments "Renzi did not tell the truth, he was confused" (paraphrase of the host's comment)

Comparison: When Belloni responds equally evasively ("No, I had no contact with the Italian embassy in those days"), the same critical standard is not applied

Asymmetry: Documented — Renzi (IV, opposition) is treated more harshly than Belloni (appointed by Meloni, current government)

Degree of indignation: 3/5

Selectivity: 3/5

Summary: Indignation is present and documented, but is applied asymmetrically: more intense towards subjects associated with the centre-right (current government, industry) and softer towards subjects associated with the centre-left (Belloni, PD).



9. SELECTIVE OMISSION — GENERAL FRAMEWORK

7/10

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Definition: How completely does the episode represent the topic? Are relevant perspectives, facts or actors systematically omitted?

Finding 1:

Timestamp: 00:14:19

Missing perspective/fact: The party affiliation of Paolo De Castro (PD) is never mentioned

Relevance: De Castro was Minister of Agriculture under D'Alema and Prodi, and an MEP for PD — his affiliation is relevant for contextualising the conflict of interest within a partisan framework

Impact: The viewer cannot assess whether the problem of conflicts of interest affects all parties across the board or is specific to certain political groupings

Finding 2:

Timestamp: 00:37:54

Missing perspective/fact: It is never mentioned that Italy has some of the strictest regulations in Europe on animal welfare, nor that there are farms certified to high standards

Relevance: Without this context, the viewer cannot distinguish between illegal practices (shown) and industry standards

Impact: Creates the impression that all Italian farms are like those shown

Finding 3:

Timestamp: 01:41:21

Missing perspective/fact: It is never mentioned that the ENI-Egypt contract for the Zohr field was signed on 21 February 2016, two weeks after the discovery of Regeni's body — this fact is relevant but is only touched upon without being developed

Relevance: The temporal overlap between Regeni's death and the signing of the ENI contract is one of the most significant elements of the investigation, but is treated superficially

Impact: The investigation suggests a connection without providing sufficient documentary evidence

Summary: The most significant omissions concern the party affiliation of De Castro, the existence of exemplary farms in Italy, and the lack of documentary evidence on the ENI-Regeni connection.

Hardfacts concluded — Softfacts begin

Share of perspectives covered

Inverted: the original value measures coverage (higher = better). Shown as deviation (higher = greater gaps).

- [A] Position of the agri-food industry:** economic, employment and food security reasons for intensive farming
- [B] Position of traditional and small farmers:** difference between large corporations and small family businesses
- [C] Independent scientific position on animal welfare and the environmental impact of farming**
- [D] Position of consumers:** right to low-cost meat, food accessibility for lower-income groups
- [E] Position of supervisory authorities (NAS, ASL, veterinary authorities):** effectiveness of existing controls
- [F] Position of sector workers:** working conditions, trade union rights
- [G] Position of European institutions (Commission, Parliament):** defence of CAP choices
- [H] Position of the Italian government on the Regeni case:** official response to the allegations

Präsident: Schläpfer, David - **Kontakt:** kontakt@SVFAB.ch - **Adresse:** SVFAB, Postfach, CH-8021 Zürich 1



[I] Position of Matteo Renzi: full right of reply on the allegations relating to message 211

[J] Position of the Italian intelligence services (AISE): clarification on the role in the days of the kidnapping

[A] PARTIALLY COVERED

Timestamp: 01:03:01 — Quote: "we cannot state that intensive farming is inherently negative" (Personen) — Assessment: the pro-industry position is present but systematically dismantled by the presenter's framing; no authoritative and non-hostile industry voice is offered

[B] ABSENT

Timestamp: not present — Quote: absent — Assessment: the distinction between large corporations and small farmers is touched upon (01:07:34 "they shift the blame onto the small farmer") but not developed; the voice of a virtuous small farmer is missing

[C] PARTIALLY COVERED

Timestamp: 00:11:58 — Quote: "His study, however, was also funded by the livestock industry, not exactly an example of independent science" — Assessment: independent science is evoked only to discredit Mietloner; no independent scientific study for or against is cited

[D] ABSENT

Timestamp: not present — Quote: absent — Assessment: the perspective of the low-income consumer who depends on low-cost meat is never considered

[E] ABSENT

Timestamp: not present — Quote: absent — Assessment: veterinary supervisory authorities are never consulted; it is implicitly suggested that controls are absent without verifying this

[F] COVERED

Timestamp: 00:47:05 — Quote: "I lived in an apartment with 20 other people" — Assessment: the perspective of exploited workers is well documented through direct testimonies

[G] ABSENT

Timestamp: not present — Quote: absent — Assessment: the European Commission is never consulted to defend the CAP choices; it is cited only as a victim of lobbies

[H] ABSENT

Timestamp: not present — Quote: absent — Assessment: the current Italian government is not consulted on the Regeni case; Belloni is cited only as appointed by Meloni, without further development

[I] PARTIALLY COVERED

Timestamp: 01:29:23 — Quote: "What I said before the commission I will confirm before the magistrates" — Assessment: Renzi is interviewed but his responses are systematically commented on critically by the host; he is not given sufficient space to articulate his position

[J] ABSENT

Timestamp: not present — Quote: absent — Assessment: AISE is never directly consulted; its actions are reconstructed through anonymous sources

Completeness score: 4/10

Rationale: The episode covers in depth the perspectives critical of the agri-food industry and of the institutional handling of the Regeni case, but systematically omits defensive voices: industry, supervisory authorities, European Commission, current Italian government, AISE. The perspective of the consumer and the virtuous small farmer is completely absent. The low score reflects a deliberate editorial choice of thesis-driven investigation, not a balanced analysis.

1. LAB (Lega Anti Vivisezione or similar organisation)

1. FUNDING: Private donations, awareness campaigns, membership
2. MANDATE: Incompatible with neutral assessment of farming — the mandate is to denounce and abolish intensive farming
3. CONFLICT OF INTEREST: Institutional interest in demonstrating that intensive farms are systematically violent — this position reinforces its narrative and its fundraising campaigns
4. CREDIBILITY MATRIX: D1 -2 (maximum conflict of interest) / D2 +2 (personal risk of infiltrators) / D3 +1 (investigative competence) / D4 +1 (consistent position) / D5 -1 (emotionally oriented) / D6 +2 (primary source for the images) → TOTAL: +3 → TRAFFIC LIGHT: YELLOW
5. OPPOSING VOICE: Not cited — no organisation of virtuous farmers is consulted

2. Greenpeace

Präsident: Schläpfer, David - **Kontakt:** kontakt@SVFAB.ch - **Adresse:** SVFAB, Postfach, CH-8021 Zürich 1



Schweizerischer Verein für ausgewogene Berichterstattung
Association suisse pour une information équilibrée
Associazione svizzera per un reporting equilibrato

1. **FUNDING:** International private donations, awareness campaigns
2. **MANDATE:** Incompatible with neutral assessment of the CAP — the mandate is to denounce subsidies to intensive farming
3. **CONFLICT OF INTEREST:** Institutional interest in demonstrating that the CAP funds intensive farming — this position reinforces its relevance and its funding
4. **CREDIBILITY MATRIX:** D1 -2 (conflict of interest) / D2 0 (no personal risk) / D3 +1 (competence in environmental policies) / D4 +1 (consistent position) / D5 -1 (advocacy) / D6 0 (secondary source) → TOTAL: -1 → TRAFFIC LIGHT: YELLOW
5. **OPPOSING VOICE:** Copa-Cogeca contests Greenpeace's data (01:03:33) but is presented as a party to the dispute, not as an alternative source

3. Lighthouse Reports

1. **FUNDING:** Philanthropic foundations (Open Society Foundation and other progressive foundations)
2. **MANDATE:** Investigative journalism on power and corruption — declared progressive orientation
3. **CONFLICT OF INTEREST:** Institutional interest in denouncing political conflicts of interest — this position reinforces its relevance and its funding
4. **CREDIBILITY MATRIX:** D1 -1 (declared orientation) / D2 +1 (reputational risk) / D3 +2 (investigative competence) / D4 +1 (consistent position) / D5 +1 (document-based) / D6 +1 (primary source for the documents) → TOTAL: +5 → TRAFFIC LIGHT: GREEN
5. **OPPOSING VOICE:** Copa-Cogeca has not formally responded to the allegations of the investigation

4. Transparency International

1. **FUNDING:** Governments, international foundations, private donations
2. **MANDATE:** Fight against corruption — compatible with assessment of political conflicts of interest
3. **CONFLICT OF INTEREST:** Institutional interest in denouncing conflicts of interest — this position reinforces its relevance and its funding
4. **CREDIBILITY MATRIX:** D1 -1 (institutional interest) / D2 0 / D3 +2 (competence in political transparency) / D4 +2 (consistent position and verifiable methodology) / D5 +1 (data-based) / D6 +1 (primary source for data on parliamentarians) → TOTAL: +5 → TRAFFIC LIGHT: GREEN
5. **OPPOSING VOICE:** De Castro contests the data (01:08:37 "I receive no money, it is a scientific committee") but no independent verification is offered

5. Recommen

1. **FUNDING:** Private donations, awareness campaigns
2. **MANDATE:** Fight against abuses of power and the plundering of territories — incompatible with neutral assessment of ENI
3. **CONFLICT OF INTEREST:** Institutional interest in demonstrating that ENI has influenced Italian foreign policy — this position reinforces its narrative
4. **CREDIBILITY MATRIX:** D1 -2 (conflict of interest) / D2 +1 (reputational risk) / D3 +1 (competence in ENI activities) / D4 +1 (consistent position) / D5 -1 (advocacy) / D6 0 (secondary source) → TOTAL: 0 → TRAFFIC LIGHT: YELLOW
5. **OPPOSING VOICE:** ENI is not directly consulted on the Regeni issue

IMPORTANT NOTE: "Recognised" is not an objective qualification. It is a social attribution that must itself be verified. None of the organisations cited in the episode is presented with a critical qualification of its structural conflict of interest — they are all treated as neutral sources when in reality they are advocacy organisations with declared positions.



Softfacts — 6 qualitative techniques

10. FRAMING

8/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: How is the topic fundamentally framed?

Finding 1:

Timestamp: 00:00:00

Quote: "Our journey begins in the Polesine, an enchanted place not far from Venice, where the Po delta meets the Mediterranean Sea. It is one of the most extensive nature reserves in Europe, rich in wetlands and biodiversity. In the last decade, intensive farms have sprung up like mushrooms"

Manipulation: The contrast between "enchanted place" and "mushrooms" (negative connotation) sets the frame "natural paradise destroyed by industry" before any data is presented

Why problematic: The viewer receives an emotional frame before any factual information; the term "sprung up like mushrooms" is a metaphor with a negative connotation that prejudices the assessment

Finding 2:

Timestamp: 00:04:13

Quote: "Intensive farming is the application of technology to an idea, that animals are entirely at man's disposal. We consider them at a lower level than ourselves, and from them we want to obtain products at the lowest possible price."

Manipulation: The philosophical frame ("entirely at man's disposal") transforms an economic and regulatory issue into a moral and anthropological one

Why problematic: This frame excludes a priori any position that does not share the animalist philosophical premise; those who eat meat are implicitly placed in a morally inferior position

Finding 3:

Timestamp: 01:00:57

Quote: "it was enough for the lobby protests, the tractors that invaded the streets of half of Europe, to melt it like snow in the sun"

Manipulation: Farmers' protests are framed as "lobbies" that "invade" the streets, not as a democratic expression of economic categories

Why problematic: The term "invade" has a negative connotation; farmers' protests are equated with the actions of industrial lobbies, without distinguishing between small farmers and large corporations

Summary: The framing of the episode is systematically constructed to present intensive farming as a moral evil and not merely an economic one, and to delegitimise any defensive voice as an expression of corrupt interests.



11. CHOICE OF WORDS AND TERMS

7/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: What language is used? What connotations are created?

Finding 1:

Timestamp: 00:05:09

Quote: "But in the mega-farms nobody gives a damn. They just have to grow enough to be sold and make a profit."

Manipulation: "Nobody gives a damn" is a colloquial expression with a strong connotation of moral indifference; "make a profit" has a negative connotation

Why problematic: A neutral alternative would be: "In intensive farms the priority is the growth of animals within the planned cycle times to reach slaughter weight"

Finding 2:

Timestamp: 01:13:13

Quote: "another lager"

Manipulation: The term "lager" (Nazi concentration camp) is used to describe an intensive farm

Why problematic: The use of "lager" is a comparison with the Nazi genocide that violates the proportionality norms of journalistic language; neutral alternative: "another farm with critical conditions"

Finding 3:

Timestamp: 00:33:59

Quote: "Experiments in Africa. A proposal that smacks of the colonial era."

Manipulation: The host's comment transforms a proposal for scientific experimentation into an accusation of colonialism

Why problematic: The European Commission official was suggesting experiments in Africa for reasons of less restrictive regulation — the "colonial" comment is a moral judgement unsupported by evidence; neutral alternative: "A proposal that raises ethical questions about experimentation in countries with different regulations"

Summary: The language of the episode is systematically oriented towards maximising negative emotional impact, with the use of terms such as "lager", "colonial", "nobody gives a damn" that go beyond the neutral journalistic register.



12. HOST BEHAVIOUR

7/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: Asymmetries in follow-up questions, interruptions, expressions of sympathy.

Methodological principle (v2.2): Before each assessment, the triggering event must be documented. An intervention can only be assessed as asymmetric if comparable events with other guests have not produced a similar intervention.

Finding 1:

Timestamp: 01:29:23

Triggering event: Renzi responds evasively on the issue of message 211

Quote (host): critical comment on Renzi's response, with paraphrase "Renzi did not tell the truth"

Comparison: When Belloni responds equally evasively ("No, I had no contact with the Italian embassy in those days"), the host does not formulate an equivalent critical comment

Asymmetry: Documented — Renzi is commented on critically, Belloni is not

Finding 2:

Timestamp: 01:03:01

Triggering event: Pessonen states that intensive farming can be positive for the environment

Quote (host/reporter): "for the number one lobbyist of the meat industry the priority is productivity, which can only be pursued by denying the existence of intensive farming"

Comparison: When Steph (activist) makes unverified claims, the same critical standard is not applied

Asymmetry: Documented — pro-industry statements are commented on critically, those of activists are not

Finding 3:

Timestamp: 00:05:28

Triggering event: The farm manager in the Polesine does not answer questions

Quote (reporter): "I have received reports of serious mistreatment inside the farms you manage"

Comparison: When NGO representatives do not provide sources for their claims, the same pressure is not applied

Asymmetry: Documented — accused subjects are pressed with aggressive questions, accusing sources are not

Summary: The behaviour of the host and reporter is systematically asymmetric: pressure and critical commentary towards accused subjects (industry, Renzi), uncritical acceptance towards accusing sources (activists, NGOs).



13. QUESTION ASYMMETRY

7/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: Questions of different degrees of hardness/softness to different people.

Asymmetry 1:

To Paolo De Castro, 01:08:13: "and are you not sure that when you vote you are not voting in the interests of the company that funds you" — hard, presupposes guilt

To Pekka Pessonen, 01:02:57: "how would you explain your work to someone who knows nothing about it, like a lobbyist?" — neutral, opens dialogue

Comparison: De Castro is questioned with a question that presupposes guilt; Pessonen is questioned with an open question that allows him to explain his role

Asymmetry 2:

To Matteo Renzi, 01:29:35: "You said before the commission that you learned the information on the 31st when in fact you learned it on the 28th, I wanted to understand this" — hard, presupposes a lie

To Elisabetta Belloni, 01:10:46: "In those hours did you also speak with the Italian embassy?" — neutral, presupposes nothing

Comparison: Renzi is questioned with a question that presupposes he lied; Belloni is questioned with an open question

Summary: The hardest questions are reserved for accused subjects (De Castro, Renzi), while current institutional subjects (Belloni) receive softer questions.



14. FALSE BALANCE

3/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: Artificial balance despite a real imbalance.

Finding 1:

Timestamp: 01:03:25 — Construction: "do you agree with Greenpeace when it says that most of the common agricultural policy goes to intensive farming?" (question to Pessonen)

Analysis: The question creates a false bilaterality between Greenpeace (advocacy NGO) and Copa-Cogeca (industrial lobby), as if they were two equivalent sources on a scientific level; in reality both are advocacy organisations with declared positions

Summary: The main problem is not false balance but the absence of balance — the episode does not seek an artificial equilibrium but systematically presents only one perspective.



15. AGENDA-SETTING

8/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Definition: What is taken for granted/normal? What does not enter the agenda?

Finding 1:

Agenda element set: Intensive farming is inherently negative and must be abolished

Timestamp: 00:04:13 — Evidence: "Intensive farming is the application of technology to an idea, that animals are entirely at man's disposal"

Alternative agenda: The issue could be framed as "how to improve the standards of intensive farming" instead of "how to abolish it"

Finding 2:

Agenda element set: Agri-food lobbies are the main obstacle to European sustainability

Timestamp: 01:00:57 — Evidence: "it was enough for the lobby protests, the tractors that invaded the streets of half of Europe, to melt it like snow in the sun"

Alternative agenda: Farmers' protests could be framed as an expression of real economic difficulties in the sector, not merely as lobbying action

Finding 3:

Agenda element set: The Regeni case demonstrates that Italian economic interests (ENI) prevailed over justice

Timestamp: 01:41:21 — Evidence: "The CIA, the British intelligence services, there is also ENI which in those days is signing a billion-dollar contract for the management of a gas field off Egypt"

Alternative agenda: The issue could be framed as "how to balance economic interests and human rights in foreign policy" instead of presupposing that economic interests deliberately sacrificed Regeni

Summary: The agenda-setting of the episode presupposes as established fact that intensive farming must be abolished, that lobbies are the main problem of European democracy, and that Italian economic interests deliberately obstructed justice for Regeni — all legitimate positions but presented as facts rather than interpretations.



CHAPTER 4 — OVERALL ASSESSMENT

Overview of individual scores

No.	Criterion	Type	Score	Main finding (1 sentence)
1	Expert selection	H	7	Experts are predominantly activists and lobbyists, with no independent scientists
2	Source selection	H	6	Sources are almost exclusively advocacy NGOs with declared positions
3	Time distribution	H	7	Critical voices account for 68% of the time in the main section
4	Omissions	H	7	De Castro's PD affiliation and the existence of exemplary farms are systematically omitted
5	Manipulation of numbers	H	5	Numbers are used without verifiable sources or disaggregated data
6	Guilt by association	H	6	Mietloner is delegitimised for his funding without examining his conclusions on their merits
7	Timing	H	6	The emotional opening and sarcastic closing condition the reception of the entire episode
8	Selective indignation	H	6	Indignation is more intense towards industry and Renzi than towards NGOs and Belloni
9	Completeness	H	7	Defensive voices are systematically missing: industry, supervisory authorities, government
10	Framing	S	8	The topic is framed as a moral animalist issue, not as a regulatory one
11	Choice of words	S	7	Use of "lager", "colonial", "nobody gives a damn" goes beyond the neutral journalistic register
12	Host behaviour	S	7	Documented asymmetry between the treatment of Renzi and the treatment of Belloni
13	Question asymmetry	S	7	Questions presupposing guilt for accused subjects, open questions for others
14	False balance	S	3	The problem is not false balance but the absence of balance
15	Agenda-setting	S	8	Presupposes as established fact that intensive farming must be abolished

Results

- HARDFACTS SCORE (average criteria 1-9): 6.3 / 10
- SOFTFACTS SCORE (average criteria 10-15): 6.7 / 10
- OVERALL SCORE (average all 15 criteria): 6.4 / 10

Dominant techniques



The 3 strongest techniques in this episode:

- 1. Framing (Score 8):** The episode systematically transforms economic and regulatory issues into moral and philosophical ones (animal rights, colonialism, "sentient being"), making any intermediate or reformist position impossible. Those who do not share the animalist frame are implicitly placed in a morally inferior position.
- 2. Agenda-setting (Score 8):** The episode presupposes as established fact that intensive farming must be abolished, that lobbies are the main problem of European democracy, and that Italian economic interests deliberately obstructed justice for Regeni. These are interpretations presented as facts.
- 3. Omissions (Score 7):** The systematic omission of De Castro's party affiliation (PD), the existence of exemplary farms, the defensive voices of industry and supervisory authorities creates a one-sided picture that does not allow the viewer to form an independent opinion.

Key messages of the episode

****MESSAGE 1 (CONTENT):** ** "Intensive farming is a system of moral exploitation of animals, funded with European public money through a network of corrupt lobbies that influence parliamentarians."

Technique: Moral framing + agenda-setting — Evidence: 00:04:13, 00:08:02, 01:03:01

****MESSAGE 2 (PERSONAL):** ** "Paolo De Castro and Clara Aguilera are examples of corrupt politicians who have placed the interests of the agri-food industry above the common good."

Technique: Guilt by association + question asymmetry — Evidence: 00:14:19, 01:08:13

****MESSAGE 3 (SOCIAL):** ** "The Italian government, under Renzi, placed the economic interests of ENI above the life of Giulio Regeni, and the institutions continue to not tell the truth."

Technique: Agenda-setting + selective omissions — Evidence: 01:28:27, 01:41:21

Classification of the degree of manipulation

Rationale: The episode presents an overall score of 6.4/10, placing it in the category of "clear one-sidedness". The programme carries out a legitimate journalistic investigation on topics of public interest (animal mistreatment, conflicts of interest, Regeni case), but does so with a systematically one-sided framing that does not respect the principle of informational pluralism required by Art. 6 of the RAI Service Contract. The systematic omissions (De Castro's party affiliation, defensive voices, supervisory authorities), the asymmetry in the treatment of sources and the emotionally oriented language ("lager", "colonial") constitute a clear editorial tendency that goes beyond neutral investigative journalism. The score does not reach the threshold of "systematic imbalance" because the investigations are based on real documentary material and the allegations are largely verifiable.

CONCLUSION

The analysed episode of Report carries out a journalistic investigation on topics of significant public interest — animal mistreatment in intensive farms, conflicts of interest of Members of the European Parliament, and new elements on the Regeni case — with significant documentary material and investigative methodology (infiltrations, unpublished documents). However, the systematically one-sided framing, the selective omissions (in particular the failure to mention De Castro's PD affiliation), the asymmetry in the treatment of sources and the use of emotionally oriented language ("lager", "colonial", "nobody gives a damn") constitute a violation of the principle of pluralism and impartiality of information enshrined in Art. 6 of the RAI Service Contract. The episode does not provide the viewer with the tools to form an independent opinion, but leads them towards predetermined conclusions through techniques of framing, agenda-setting and selective omission. In particular, the sarcastic closing with Minister Lollobrigida's statement and the immediate transition to the Regeni case constitutes a rhetorical connection without logical basis that violates the principle of separation between news and commentary.



OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF THE 15 CRITERIA

Individual scores — All 15 criteria

No.	Criterion	Score	Classification
1	EXPERT SELECTION	7/10	<i>Pronounced imbalance</i>
2	SOURCE SELECTION	6/10	<i>Significant imbalance</i>
3	TIME DISTRIBUTION	7/10	<i>Pronounced imbalance</i>
4	SELECTIVE OMISSION	7/10	<i>Pronounced imbalance</i>
5	MANIPULATION OF NUMBERS	5/10	<i>Significant imbalance</i>
6	GUILT BY ASSOCIATION	6/10	<i>Significant imbalance</i>
7	TIMING	6/10	<i>Significant imbalance</i>
8	SELECTIVE INDIGNATION	6/10	<i>Significant imbalance</i>
9	SELECTIVE OMISSION — GENERAL FRAMEWORK	7/10	<i>Pronounced imbalance</i>
10	FRAMING	8/10	<i>Pronounced imbalance</i>
11	CHOICE OF WORDS AND TERMS	7/10	<i>Pronounced imbalance</i>
12	HOST BEHAVIOUR	7/10	<i>Pronounced imbalance</i>
13	QUESTION ASYMMETRY	7/10	<i>Pronounced imbalance</i>
14	FALSE BALANCE	3/10	<i>Slight imbalance</i>
15	AGENDA-SETTING	8/10	<i>Pronounced imbalance</i>

HARDFACTS SCORE (1-8)

6.3/10

Serious deviation from the principle of balance. High degree of deviation

SOFTFACTS SCORE (9-14)

6.7/10

Serious deviation from the principle of balance. High degree of deviation

OVERALL SCORE

6.5/10

Serious deviation from the principle of balance. High degree of deviation

Average of Hardfacts and Softfacts



LEGEND — Meaning of scores

Individual scores per criterion (0–10)

0	No finding	No relevant anomaly detected.
1–2	Weak finding	Minor anomaly with no substantial impact on balance.
3–4	Slight-to-moderate finding	Recognisable tendency; low to moderate impact relevance.
5	Moderate finding with impact	Relevant imbalance that influences the public's opinion-forming potential.
6	Significant finding (threshold)	Scores of 6 or above are classified as "significant findings".
7	Significant finding	Clear and well-documented imbalance with evident impact relevance.
8–9	Serious finding	Pronounced imbalance; multiple individual findings documented under this criterion.
10	Maximum severity	Systematic and pervasive imbalance under this criterion.

Aggregate deviation index — Interpretation ranges

0.0 – 2.5	No anomaly	No significant pattern detected; the broadcast respects the principle of balance.
2.6 – 4.0	Slight imbalance	Isolated anomalies; statistically visible but still within the tolerance margin.
4.1 – 6.0	Considerable imbalance	Multiple significant findings; relevant compromise of the plurality of perspectives.
6.1 – 8.0	Serious deviation from the principle of balance. High degree of deviation	Pronounced patterns across broadcasts; high impact relevance.
8.1 – 10	Maximum systemic partiality. Very high degree of bias	Maximum severity on almost all criteria; systematically one-sided coverage.

Political-partisan bias (from -5 to +5)

-5 to -3	Strongly disadvantaged	The party is significantly underrepresented in framing, airtime or presentation.
-2 to -1	Slightly disadvantaged	Recognisable but slight disadvantage.
0	Neutral	No detectable favouritism or disadvantage.
+1 to +2	Slightly favoured	Recognisable but slight favouritism.
+3 to +5	Strongly favoured	The party is significantly overrepresented in framing, airtime or presentation.



CHAPTER 5 — LEGAL FRAMEWORK (RAI Service Contract Art. 6)

Assessment under RAI Service Contract Art. 6

The RAI Service Contract requires pluralism, completeness and impartiality of information, as well as separation between news and commentary.

Violation 1:

Norm: RAI Service Contract Art. 6 — pluralism of information

Facts: The party affiliation of Paolo De Castro (PD) is never mentioned during the episode, despite being relevant for contextualising the conflict of interest within a partisan framework

Evidence: Timestamp 00:14:19 — De Castro is presented as "former deputy and senator, Minister of Agriculture under both the government of Massimo D'Alema and that of Romano Prodi" without ever mentioning his membership of PD

Assessment: The systematic omission of the party affiliation of a subject accused of a conflict of interest violates the principle of completeness of information; the viewer cannot assess whether the problem affects all parties across the board or is specific to certain political groupings

Violation 2:

Norm: RAI Service Contract Art. 6 — separation between news and commentary

Facts: The host formulates value judgements ("Renzi did not tell the truth", "a proposal that smacks of the colonial era", "this horror") in the course of the narration, without clearly distinguishing them from the presentation of facts

Evidence: Timestamp 01:29:23 — critical comment on Renzi's response; timestamp 00:33:59 — "A proposal that smacks of the colonial era"; timestamp 01:37:10 — "this horror"

Assessment: The host's evaluative comments are inserted into the narrative flow without being clearly identified as opinions, violating the principle of separation between news and commentary

Violation 3:

Norm: RAI Service Contract Art. 6 — completeness of information

Facts: The episode offers no defensive voice from veterinary supervisory authorities (ASL, NAS, Ministry of Health), the European Commission, or the current Italian government on the topics covered

Evidence: Total absence of these voices throughout the entire episode (approximately 120 minutes)

Assessment: The systematic absence of defensive institutional voices violates the principle of completeness of information; the viewer receives a one-sided picture that does not allow them to assess the effectiveness of existing control systems

Violation 4:

Norm: RAI Service Contract Art. 6 — impartiality of information

Facts: The statement by Minister Lollobrigida ("the only sentient being is man") is used as a sarcastic closing of the "Food for Profit" section and as a rhetorical transition to the section on the Regeni case (torture, murder), creating an implicit association between the government's position and the violence shown

Evidence: Timestamp 01:09:22 and 01:11:51 — the ministerial statement is repeated twice as a rhetorical element of closing and transition

Assessment: The sarcastic use of a government statement as a rhetorical closing element, immediately followed by images of torture, violates the principle of impartiality of information and constitutes an instrumental use of journalistic material for purposes of political delegitimation

Overall assessment RAI Service Contract Art. 6



The analysed episode of Report presents four documentable violations of RAI Service Contract Art. 6: omission of the party affiliation of an accused subject, failure to separate news from commentary, systematic absence of defensive institutional voices, and instrumental use of a government statement for rhetorical purposes. These violations do not undermine the legitimacy of the journalistic investigation itself — which is based on real documentary material and verifiable investigative methodology — but constitute a mode of presentation that does not respect the principles of pluralism, completeness and impartiality required of the public broadcasting service. In a public service context, the investigation should have been accompanied by a broader right of reply and a clearer distinction between established facts and editorial interpretations.

IN-DEPTH SOURCE VERIFICATION (mandatory for all specialised instances / NGOs / advisory centres cited)

1. LAB (Lega Anti Vivisezione or similar organisation)

- FUNDING:** Private donations, awareness campaigns, membership
- MANDATE:** Incompatible with neutral assessment of farming — the mandate is to denounce and abolish intensive farming
- CONFLICT OF INTEREST:** Institutional interest in demonstrating that intensive farms are systematically violent — this position reinforces its narrative and its fundraising campaigns
 - D1 Conflict of interest: -2
 - D2 Personal risk: +2
 - D3 Professional competence: +1
 - D4 Consistency of opinions: +1
 - D5 Emotionality vs. data: -1
 - D6 Source level: +2
- OPPOSING VOICE:** Not cited — no organisation of virtuous farmers is consulted

2. Greenpeace

- FUNDING:** International private donations, awareness campaigns
- MANDATE:** Incompatible with neutral assessment of the CAP — the mandate is to denounce subsidies to intensive farming
- CONFLICT OF INTEREST:** Institutional interest in demonstrating that the CAP funds intensive farming — this position reinforces its relevance and its funding
 - D1 Conflict of interest: -2
 - D2 Personal risk: 0
 - D3 Professional competence: +1
 - D4 Consistency of opinions: +1
 - D5 Emotionality vs. data: -1
 - D6 Source level: 0
- OPPOSING VOICE:** Copa-Cogeca contests Greenpeace's data (01:03:33) but is presented as a party to the dispute, not as an alternative source

3. Lighthouse Reports

- FUNDING:** Philanthropic foundations (Open Society Foundation and other progressive foundations)
- MANDATE:** Investigative journalism on power and corruption — declared progressive orientation
- CONFLICT OF INTEREST:** Institutional interest in denouncing political conflicts of interest — this position reinforces its relevance and its funding
 - D1 Conflict of interest: -1
 - D2 Personal risk: +1
 - D3 Professional competence: +2
 - D4 Consistency of opinions: +1
 - D5 Emotionality vs. data: +1
 - D6 Source level: +1
- OPPOSING VOICE:** Copa-Cogeca has not formally responded to the allegations of the investigation

4. Transparency International

- FUNDING:** Governments, international foundations, private donations

Präsident: Schläpfer, David - **Kontakt:** kontakt@SVFAB.ch - **Adresse:** SVFAB, Postfach, CH-8021 Zürich 1



2. MANDATE: Fight against corruption — compatible with assessment of political conflicts of interest

3. CONFLICT OF INTEREST: Institutional interest in denouncing conflicts of interest — this position reinforces its relevance and its funding

- D1 Conflict of interest: -1
- D2 Personal risk: 0
- D3 Professional competence: +2
- D4 Consistency of opinions: +2
- D5 Emotionality vs. data: +1
- D6 Source level: +1

5. OPPOSING VOICE: De Castro contests the data (01:08:37 "I receive no money, it is a scientific committee") but no independent verification is offered

5. Recomon

1. FUNDING: Private donations, awareness campaigns

2. MANDATE: Fight against abuses of power and the plundering of territories — incompatible with neutral assessment of ENI

3. CONFLICT OF INTEREST: Institutional interest in demonstrating that ENI has influenced Italian foreign policy — this position reinforces its narrative

- D1 Conflict of interest: -2
- D2 Personal risk: +1
- D3 Professional competence: +1
- D4 Consistency of opinions: +1
- D5 Emotionality vs. data: -1
- D6 Source level: 0

5. OPPOSING VOICE: ENI is not directly consulted on the Regeni issue

IMPORTANT NOTE: "Recognised" is not an objective qualification. It is a social attribution that must itself be verified. None of the organisations cited in the episode is presented with a critical qualification of its structural conflict of interest — they are all treated as neutral sources when in reality they are advocacy organisations with declared positions.

Source credibility traffic light:

Source	D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	D6	Total	Signal
LAB (Lega Anti Vivisezione or similar organisation)	-2	+2	+1	+1	-1	+2	?	YELLOW
Greenpeace	-2	0	+1	+1	-1	0	?	YELLOW
Lighthouse Reports	-1	+1	+2	+1	+1	+1	?	GREEN
Transparency International	-1	0	+2	+2	+1	+1	?	GREEN
Recomon	-2	+1	+1	+1	-1	0	?	YELLOW

Legal and methodological framework

Not a determination of facts

The findings presented do not constitute factual determinations about individual persons, editorial teams or broadcasts. They are the product of a standardised operationalisation, not a determination of individual responsibility.

Not a legal judgement

The aggregate deviation index does not replace a legal assessment under RAI Service Contract Art. 7. The assessment of whether a specific broadcast violates legal



Schweizerischer Verein für ausgewogene Berichterstattung
Association suisse pour une information équilibrée
Associazione svizzera per un reporting equilibrato

requirements falls exclusively within the competence of the relevant authorities (in particular AGCOM).

Not proof of causality

Statistical correlations must not be interpreted as proof of causal links or editorial intent. Deviation values may be influenced by the choice of topics, the information context, political controversy or the logic of the format.

Not a judgement on intentionality

The analysis measures the observable structural characteristics of broadcasts. A score of 7 means that a significant imbalance has been detected — not that the editorial team intended it. The methodology makes no claims about motivations or strategic objectives.

Heuristic comparison tool

The index serves for the comparative recognition of patterns across thousands of broadcasts, not for the precise metric measurement of individual segments. The threshold values serve as heuristic guidance, not as precise legal qualification.



APPENDIX 1: NATIONAL LEGISLATION

Legal basis Italy — RAI

Laws

- RAI Service Contract 2023-2028
- Legislative Decree 208/2021 — Consolidated Text of Audiovisual Media Services (TUSMA)
- Law 28/2000 — Par Condicio

Relevant articles

RAI Service Contract 2023-2028

- Art. 3: The public radio, television and multimedia service is characterised by pluralism, completeness, objectivity and impartiality of information.
- Art. 6: Quality obligations — plurality of opinions, balanced representation.
- Art. 25: Separation between information and opinion.

Legislative Decree 208/2021 (TUSMA)

- Art. 3: Fundamental principles — pluralism of opinions, objectivity, completeness.
- Art. 7: Radio and television news activity is guided by principles of objectivity, completeness, fairness, impartiality, openness to different opinions and political, social, cultural and religious tendencies.

Law 28/2000 (Par Condicio)

- Art. 2: Equal access to information media during electoral campaigns.
- Art. 3: Equal treatment of all political subjects in information.
- Art. 4: Prohibition of political advertising on public media outside electoral campaigns.

RAI Code of Ethics (2017)

Impartiality, fact-checking, separation of news/commentary.

European reference framework

- ECHR Art. 10: Freedom of expression (European Convention on Human Rights)
- EU Rule of Law Report: Annual assessment of media freedom in Italy
- RSF Press Freedom Index: Reporters Without Borders, annual ranking
- EMFA (European Media Freedom Act, 2024): EU minimum standards for media freedom
- Media Pluralism Monitor (EUI Florence): Annual assessment of media pluralism

Structural context

The "lottizzazione" — the historical allocation of RAI channels according to criteria of party proportionality — continues to influence the structural independence of RAI to this day. The formal legal framework (Service Contract, TUSMA) is sound, but practical implementation is influenced by politics.

Supervisory authorities

- AGCOM (Authority for Communications Guarantees): Media regulation, sanctions
- Parliamentary RAI Supervisory Commission: Parliamentary oversight

Complaint procedure

1. RAI internal complaints office
2. AGCOM



Schweizerischer Verein für ausgewogene Berichterstattung
Association suisse pour une information équilibrée
Associazione svizzera per un reporting equilibrato

3. Regional Administrative Court (TAR)



APPENDIX 2: SCIENTIFIC REFERENCES

Bibliography

- Bennett, W. L. (1990). Toward a theory of press-state relations in the United States. *Journal of Communication*, 40(2), 103–125.
- Berelson, B. (1952). *Content analysis in communication research*. Free Press.
- Entman, R. M. (1993). Framing: Toward clarification of a fractured paradigm. *Journal of Communication*, 43(4), 51–58.
- fög – Forschungszentrum Öffentlichkeit und Gesellschaft (2024). *Jahrbuch Qualität der Medien 2024*. Schwabe.
- Gilardi, F., Alizadeh, M. & Kubli, M. (2023). ChatGPT outperforms crowd workers for text-annotation tasks. *PNAS*, 120(30).
- Iyengar, S. & Kinder, D. R. (1987). *News that matters: Television and American opinion*. University of Chicago Press.
- Jolly, S. et al. (2022). Chapel Hill Expert Survey trend file, 1999–2019. *Electoral Studies*, 75, 102420.
- Krippendorff, K. (2004). *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology* (2nd ed.). Sage.
- McCombs, M. E. & Shaw, D. L. (1972). The agenda-setting function of mass media. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 36(2), 176–187.
- Shoemaker, P. J. & Vos, T. P. (2009). *Gatekeeping theory*. Routledge.
- SVFAB (2026). *Methodenbericht v4.1: Zählbare Kriterien und Multi-Modell-Kreuzvalidierung*.
- Törnberg, P. (2023). ChatGPT-4 outperforms experts and crowd workers in annotating political Twitter messages. arXiv:2304.06588.

SVFAB Working Papers

- Schläpfer, D. (2026). Systematic AI-Assisted Analysis of Public Broadcaster Impartiality: A Scalable Methodological Framework for Measuring Structural Bias in Public Service Media. [SSRN 6688478](#)
- Schläpfer, D. (2026). Measuring Editorial Noise: A Retrospective Suppression Index for Public Broadcasting Content Analysis. [SSRN 6733280](#)
- Schläpfer, D. (2026). Source Traffic Light: A Six-Dimensional Credibility Framework for Systematic Source Assessment in Public Service Media. [SSRN 6733880](#)

David Schläpfer — ORCID: 0009-0000-5671-9266

SVFAB — Swiss Association for Balanced Information | P.O. Box, 8021 Zurich 1 | www.svfab.ch | kontakt@svfab.ch |
Methodological report March 2026 | Converter 3.4 (2026-05-20)



Schweizerischer Verein für ausgewogene Berichterstattung
Association suisse pour une information équilibrée
Associazione svizzera per un reporting equilibrato

Assessments and membership of SVFAB

On SVFAB.ch you will find not only further detailed assessments, but you can also request customised ones for any broadcast (paid service).

To keep our work robust, we depend on the contributions of members and supporters.

Contact and further information:

www.SVFAB.ch | Kontakt@SVFAB.ch

Bank details: PostFinance – POFICHBE

IBAN: CH32 0900 0000 1675 6251 1

Beneficiary: SVFAB, Postfach, CH-8021 Zürich 1



Schweizerischer Verein für ausgewogene Berichterstattung
Association suisse pour une information équilibrée
Associazione svizzera per un reporting equilibrato

The following books are available from SVFAB

Orders via www.svfab.ch or kontakt@svfab.ch



Unbalanced Information is the response to the halving initiative in Switzerland: here the manipulation techniques are illustrated in detail, starting from the selection of personnel and sources. 15 principles are then illustrated: omission, framing, temporal framing, guilt by association, emotionalisation, decontextualisation and many others, with numerous examples. You also discover where we ourselves apply these techniques — which promotes not only awareness but also empathy.

Optionally the book includes **playing cards**

Also available as an **audiobook**



An interview is not a conversation. It is a stage — and someone else has written the script.

Those who do not know this provide material. Good quotes badly cut. Correct statements in the wrong context. Sincere answers framed as confessions.

This book is not a media criticism book. It is a toolkit — for all those who have a microphone in front of them and want to know what to do. 7 chapters. 7 tools: What an interview really is. The 7 most common traps. The three fundamental principles of sovereignty — anchor, reframe, set limits. Preparation in one hour. Body and voice. What to do when something goes wrong. And what counts after the interview. For politicians, activists, entrepreneurs, whistleblowers — for all those who are exposed and want to understand how the game works. To stop being subjected to it — and start shaping it.

In A5 format. Direct. For preparation, consultation, follow-up and in difficult moments



You think you see the world. In reality, you see the frame that someone has placed around it. Framing is the oldest and most elegant manipulation technique in the world. It does not change the facts — it changes what we make of the facts. What we feel. What we believe. How we decide. And it works — because we all participate. Every day. Unconsciously. You too. This book is not a dry manual. It is a workbook — playful, direct, full of examples from real life. You do not only learn how others frame you. You learn how you yourself frame — and how to use it consciously and correctly.

Because those who understand framing see the world more clearly. Listen to the news differently. Conduct conversations with greater confidence. And no longer allow a frame chosen by someone else to be so easily imposed on them.



Schweizerischer Verein für ausgewogene Berichterstattung
Association suisse pour une information équilibrée
Associazione svizzera per un reporting equilibrato

With numerous exercises and concrete examples from politics, the media and everyday life — and a smile here and there.

Framing with style. Because the frame changes everything.



RAI receives over 1.7 billion euros per year from the compulsory licence fee. Those who feel they have been treated unfairly can file a complaint. There is even a dedicated authority: AGCOM, the Authority for Communications Guarantees.

Except that: it is not entirely independent. It has limited sanctioning powers. And in most cases the outcome is uncertain.

This analysis lays bare the system — objectively, with precision, without polemic. Procedures, personnel, competences, costs, statistics, legal avenues. And the legal examination that demonstrates the structural shortcomings of public media oversight. The body that should protect citizens protects above all the system it is supposed to oversee.

Essential reading for anyone considering a complaint — and for all those who want to understand why genuine media oversight in Italy remains yet to be built.