



## SABC DETAILED ANALYSIS

20241013\_Eskom celebrates 200 consecutive days of no load shedding : Chris Yelland reflects on the milestone.en

Broadcast: SABC-Sendung | Analyzed: 2026-05-25 10:26

Version 3.0-detail | Universal 3.0-detail | Konverter 3.4 (2026-05-20) | Standard: Broadcasting Act s. 6

### OVERALL SCORE

**5.0/10**

*Significant imbalance*

0 = balanced, 10 = strongly biased/manipulative

## POLITICAL SPECTRUM

Classification based on Chapel Hill Expert Survey (CHES) 2024

The Chapel Hill Expert Survey (CHES 2024) is an academic survey of 609 political scientists in 31 countries. Each party is rated on a scale from 0 (far left) to 10 (far right).

Party	EFF	MK	ANC	IFP	DA	ActionSA	PA	FF+
CHES	1.50	3.50	4.50	6.00	6.50	6.50	7.00	8.00
Spectrum	<i>Left</i>	<i>Left</i>	<i>Center</i>	<i>Right</i>	<i>Right</i>	<i>Right</i>	<i>Right</i>	<i>Right</i>

The overall tendency is presented on a 0–10 scale (0 = strongly left-favoring, 5 = balanced, 10 = strongly right-favoring). The calculation is based on the difference in average favoritism of left vs. right parties (grouping per CHES 2024).

### TENDENCY (L – R)

**3.2 / 10**

*Left-favoring*

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

← Left

Right →

Source: Chapel Hill Expert Survey 2024 — [chesdata.eu](https://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

South Africa is governed since June 2024 by a Government of National Unity (GNU), a broad coalition led by the ANC (159 seats, 39.8%) after losing its 30-year parliamentary majority in the May 2024 elections. Key coalition partners include the DA (87 seats, 21.8%), IFP (17 seats, 4.3%), PA (9 seats, 2.3%), and FF+ (6 seats, 1.5%), giving the GNU approximately 287 of 400 parliamentary seats. The main opposition outside the GNU consists of MK (58 seats, 14.6%, led by Jacob Zuma), EFF (39 seats, 9.5%, led by Julius Malema), ActionSA (6 seats), and ACDP (3 seats).

Party	CHES L-R (est.)	Seats	Gov/Opposition	Core Position
EFF	1.5	39	Opposition	Far-left; land expropriation, nationalisation
PAC	2.0	1	Opposition	Left-wing Pan-Africanism
MK	3.0	58	Opposition	Left-populist, Zuma personality cult
ANC	4.0	159	Government (lead)	Centre-left, broad church
UDM	4.5	3	Government	Centre-left, rural base
Rise Mzansi	4.5	2	Government	Centre-left progressive
GOOD	4.5	1	Government	Centre-left progressive
Al Jama-ah	4.0	2	Government	Left economics, socially conservative
DA	6.0	87	Government	Centre-right, free market, liberal
ActionSA	6.5	6	Opposition	Centre-right, anti-immigration
IFP	6.5	17	Government	Right-wing, Zulu nationalist
PA	7.0	9	Government	Right-wing populist
ACDP	7.5	3	Opposition	Right-wing Christian conservative
FF+	8.0	6	Government	Right-wing, Afrikaner interest

The ANC–DA coalition creates constant editorial tension, as SABC coverage favouring one partner over the other constitutes a primary bias vector. The energy crisis — Eskom's load shedding — was the ANC's single largest electoral liability in 2024, meaning coverage framing the resolution as a government success directly benefits the ANC and, by extension, the GNU. The MK and EFF opposition have consistently attributed the energy crisis to ANC mismanagement and state capture, a perspective that is politically charged and editorially significant. Attribution of credit for the load shedding resolution is therefore not a neutral editorial act but a politically consequential framing decision.

The SABC is South Africa's public broadcaster, mandated under the Broadcasting Act 4 of 1999 and its Charter (Section 6) to provide impartial, fair, and balanced news and public affairs programming in the public interest. The SABC has a documented history of political capture during the Hlaudi Motsoeneng era (approximately 2012–2016), during which editorial independence was systematically subordinated to ANC political interests. Post-capture reforms have improved formal independence, but structural proximity to government — including funding dependency on the state — means subtle editorial alignment with the governing party remains a live concern and a recognised bias risk.



## CHAPTER 1 — PARTY-POLITICAL BIAS

Assessment of whether each party's official programme positions were accurately represented in the broadcast. Score measures accuracy of representation of party positions — not whether a party was treated positively or negatively.

Party	Score (-5..+5)	Broadcast Representation vs. Programme Position
ANC	+1	01:47 "I would start off with President Ramaphosa — he identified that we had a crisis, he did something about it" — Programme position: ANC claims credit for energy recovery through NECOM and Generation Recovery Plan — represented as accurate and credited without challenge; no ANC failures (state capture, Eskom mismanagement origins) contextualised — partially correct, contextually incomplete
DA	0	Not mentioned in broadcast — Programme position: DA has consistently demanded accountability for Eskom mismanagement and opposed ANC energy policy failures — absent
MK (uMkhonto)	0	Not mentioned — Programme position: MK attributes energy crisis to ANC corruption and state capture — absent
EFF	0	Not mentioned — Programme position: EFF demands nationalisation of energy sector and accountability for Eskom collapse — absent
IFP	0	Not mentioned — absent
PA	0	Not mentioned — absent
FF+	0	Not mentioned — absent
ActionSA	0	Not mentioned — absent

### Party Bias Summary

- Most Accurate Representation: ANC (Score +1) — the only party whose positions and associated figures received substantive airtime
- Strongest Distortion: ANC (by omission of critical context) — all opposition parties scored 0 (absent)
- Average Deviation from 0: 0.1 (driven entirely by the single ANC-adjacent representation)
- Conclusion: The broadcast is structured around a single political narrative — the success of the ANC-led government's energy recovery — without any representation of opposition party positions. The ANC's programme position is represented as broadly accurate but without the critical contextualisation that would be required for genuine balance. All eight other parties are entirely absent, which is editorially significant given that the energy crisis was the central electoral issue of 2024 and that multiple parties hold substantively different positions on its causes, management, and resolution.



## CHAPTER 2 — BROADCAST INFORMATION AND THEMATIC FRAMEWORK

### Broadcast Data

- Title: SABC News — Eskom 200 Days Load Shedding Suspension (untitled segment)
- Date: Not specified in transcript filename; internal references suggest late 2024 (reference to "last year" for peak diesel spend, Koeberg Unit 2 timeline)
- Estimated Length: Approximately 7 minutes 36 seconds (based on final timestamp [07:36])
- Presenter/Reporter: Unnamed SABC News anchor/presenter
- Interviewed Persons:

Actors	Function	Party/Affiliation	Political Spectrum
Chris Yelland	Energy analyst / expert	Independent (private sector energy consultancy)	Non-partisan, but see expert analysis below

### Main Topic

Eskom's achievement of 200 consecutive days without load shedding, with attribution of credit and assessment of future risks.

### World-Knowledge Context

The 200-day load shedding suspension milestone is a significant development in South Africa's energy landscape, following years of severe rolling blackouts that peaked in 2022–2023 with Stage 6 load shedding becoming routine. The crisis was widely attributed to decades of ANC mismanagement, state capture at Eskom (Gupta-linked contracts, inflated coal procurement, deferred maintenance), and the failure to build new generation capacity. The GNU government established the National Energy Crisis Committee (NECOM) under President Ramaphosa and appointed Kgosientsho Ramokgopa as Minister of Electricity and Energy. Eskom's Generation Recovery Plan focused on maintenance of existing fleet. However, critics — including the DA, EFF, and independent analysts — have noted that reduced demand (due to economic weakness), private solar adoption, and favourable weather conditions also contributed significantly to the improvement. Eskom simultaneously applied for a 36% tariff increase, which NERSA was adjudicating. The sustainability of the improvement remained contested, with Koeberg Unit 2 delays and ageing infrastructure cited as ongoing risks.



## CHAPTER 3 — 15 CRITERIA: DETAILED ANALYSIS

### Hard Facts — 9 techniques that are countable and scientifically verifiable

#### 1. EXPERT SELECTION

6/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

**Expert 1:** Chris Yelland — Energy Analyst

Timestamp: 00:44

Statement: "I would start off with President Ramaphosa — he identified that we had a crisis, he did something about it... I give the president credit, I give the minister of electricity and energy credit"

Classification: Private sector energy analyst; associated with EE Publishers and energy consultancy in South Africa; has been a prominent media commentator on energy issues.

Missing Counter-Voice: An independent economist, an opposition energy spokesperson, or a civil society energy researcher would have provided a structurally different perspective on credit attribution and the sustainability of the improvement.

#### Source Depth Check:

**(a) FUNDING:** Chris Yelland is associated with EE Publishers (Electrical Engineering Publishers), a private sector trade publication and consultancy. His income derives from the energy industry ecosystem — consulting, media appearances, and industry publications. No direct government funding identified, but his professional relevance depends on continued engagement with Eskom and the energy sector.

Potential conflict of interest: Analysts whose professional profile depends on access to Eskom and government energy officials have a structural incentive to maintain constructive relationships with those institutions.

**(b) MANDATE:** EE Publishers' mandate is energy industry coverage and analysis. This is broadly compatible with neutral technical assessment but does not include a mandate for political accountability or opposition perspective representation.

Dimension	Score	Reasoning
D1 Conflict of Interest	-1	Professional ecosystem proximity to Eskom/government energy sector; no direct financial conflict identified but structural incentive to maintain access
D2 Personal Risk	+1	Does offer mild criticism (36% tariff increase concern, Koeberg delays); some reputational risk in public commentary
D3 Technical Competence	+2	Recognised energy sector analyst with long track record; competent on technical and financial dimensions of Eskom
D4 Opinion Consistency	+1	Yelland has historically been critical of Eskom; his credit attribution here is somewhat consistent with his previous acknowledgement of NECOM's role
D5 Emotionalisation vs. Data	+1	Mostly data-referenced (R30bn diesel spend, R12bn savings, 36% tariff increase, Koeberg timeline); some emotional framing ("very very grateful")



D6 Source Level	0	Secondary source — analyst interpreting Eskom data, not primary Eskom data itself
TOTAL	+4	SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: YELLOW

**(c) PROFESSIONAL EXPERTISE:** Is the assessment framed as neutral when structurally partial? Yes — Yelland is introduced as an "energy expert" without qualification of his industry positioning. His extensive credit attribution to President Ramaphosa and the Minister of Electricity goes beyond technical analysis into political commentary, but is presented as expert technical opinion. This constitutes Technique 2 (Source Selection) — a structurally partial source presented as a neutral expert.

*Missing Expert Groups:*

- Independent academic energy economist (e.g., from UCT Energy Research Centre or Wits)
- Opposition party energy spokesperson
- Civil society energy justice researcher

*Summary (Matrix Result):*

- Chris Yelland: YELLOW (+4/12) — Technically competent, mild conflict of interest through industry proximity, credit attribution to government figures goes beyond technical expertise into political commentary; framed as neutral expert without qualification.



## 2. SOURCE SELECTION

6/10

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Claims without primary source = penalty points (rumour check)

### Source 1: Eskom (institutional)

#### Timestamp

00:00 — Statement: "Eskom marks the milestone of 200 days of load shedding suspension today. The parastatal attributes this achievement to the effective implementation of the generation operational recovery plan."

**(a) Funding and governance:** Eskom is a state-owned enterprise (SOE), majority funded by the South African government through equity injections and debt guarantees. It is directly subject to political oversight by the Minister of Electricity and Energy.

**(b) Structural conflict of interest:** Eskom has a direct institutional interest in presenting the 200-day milestone as a success attributable to its own management and the government's plan. It is not a neutral source on its own performance.

**(c) Missing counter-source:** An independent technical audit of Eskom's generation fleet, or a NERSA assessment, would have provided a non-self-interested evaluation of the improvement.

### Source 2: Eskom (financial claims)

#### Timestamp

04:35 — Statement (via Yelland): "Eskom say they've saved about 12 billion Rand so far this financial year through reduced diesel consumption."

**(a) Funding:** Same as above — Eskom SOE.

**(b) Structural conflict:** Eskom's self-reported savings figure is presented without independent verification. The R12bn figure is Eskom's own claim, relayed through the analyst without challenge.

**(c) Missing counter-source:** National Treasury assessment, Auditor-General report, or independent financial analysis.

### Rumour Check (Penalty Points):

No explicit rumour markers ("allegedly," "sources say," "reportedly") identified in the transcript. The GDP projection ("expected to result in a 2% growth in GDP") is presented as established fact without source attribution — this constitutes an unverified claim presented as fact rather than a rumour per se, but warrants flagging under Source Selection.

#### Unverified Claim 1:

Timestamp: 00:16

Claim: "the consistent power supply is expected to result in a 2% growth in GDP for South Africa"

Source attribution: None provided — attributed to "Eskom says" in the intro but without citation of the underlying economic model or study

Marker: "is expected to" — forward projection presented as near-certain

Primary source present: No — +1 penalty point

Summary: Source selection is structurally narrow — the broadcast relies on Eskom's own institutional claims (relayed through a single analyst) without independent verification, regulatory perspective, or opposition scrutiny. The GDP projection is presented without source attribution or methodological qualification.



3. TIME DISTRIBUTION									4/10
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Estimated speaking time:

- Chris Yelland (energy analyst): approximately 5 minutes 30 seconds (72%)
- SABC Presenter: approximately 2 minutes (26%)
- Other voices: 0 minutes (0%)

Summary: The broadcast is a single-guest interview with no structural balance between competing perspectives. One analyst — whose framing is broadly supportive of the government's energy narrative — occupies approximately 72% of total broadcast time. No opposition, regulatory, civil society, or alternative expert voice receives any airtime. While single-guest interview formats are common in broadcast journalism, the absence of any counter-perspective on a politically charged topic of national significance represents a meaningful imbalance.



4. SELECTIVE OMISSION							7/10		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

**Omission 1: Historical causes of the energy crisis — state capture and ANC mismanagement**

<b>Context</b>	The Eskom crisis was extensively documented by the Zondo Commission as a product of state capture, corrupt coal procurement, and deliberate sabotage of maintenance under ANC-aligned management. This causal history is entirely absent from the broadcast.
	Relevant at: 01:47 — "President Ramaphosa identified that we had a crisis, he did something about it"
<b>Effect</b>	By omitting the causal history, the broadcast allows the ANC to claim credit for solving a crisis without acknowledging its role in creating it. This is a structurally favourable framing for the governing party.

**Omission 2: Role of reduced demand and private solar adoption in the improvement**

<b>Context</b>	Multiple independent analysts have noted that the improvement in Eskom's performance is partly attributable to reduced industrial demand (due to economic weakness) and the rapid growth of private solar installations, which reduced grid load. The expert briefly mentions "the weak economy" and "Eskom's price increases made alternative energy a viable proposition" (03:40) but this is not developed or quantified.
	Relevant at: 03:40 — "we were helped also by the weak economy... Eskom's price increases made alternative energy a viable proposition"
<b>Effect</b>	The brief mention is immediately subsumed in the broader credit-attribution narrative. The implication that the improvement is partly a product of economic failure and unaffordable tariffs — rather than government competence — is not explored.

**Omission 3: Opposition party positions and accountability demands**

<b>Context</b>	The DA, EFF, and MK have all made substantive public statements about the energy crisis, its causes, and the conditions for sustainable resolution. None of these perspectives are represented.
	Relevant at: Throughout — no timestamp applicable
<b>Effect</b>	The broadcast presents a politically one-sided narrative of government success without any accountability framing, creating a structural alignment with ANC electoral messaging.

Summary: The three most significant omissions — historical accountability, the role of demand reduction and private generation, and opposition perspectives — collectively produce a broadcast that presents the 200-day milestone as an unambiguous government success story. These omissions are not individually decisive but cumulatively constitute a systematic editorial pattern that favours the governing party's narrative.

**Missing Voices**

- Opposition party spokesperson (DA/EFF/MK): Would have provided accountability framing, historical context of ANC mismanagement, and alternative attribution of the improvement
- NERSA representative or energy regulatory expert: Would have contextualised the 36% tariff increase adjudication process and regulatory oversight



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

- SME business owner or business association representative (e.g., BLSA, BUSA): Would have provided concrete testimony on the real-world impact of both load shedding relief and the proposed tariff increase
- Eskom technical engineer or operations spokesperson: Would have provided direct technical assessment of fleet sustainability beyond the analyst's secondhand account
- Civil society/energy poverty researcher (e.g., AIDC, Oxfam SA): Would have addressed the affordability dimension and the disproportionate burden on low-income households
- Independent economist (not energy-sector aligned): Would have scrutinised the 2% GDP growth projection with methodological rigour
- Zondo Commission or accountability researcher: Would have contextualised the recovery within the broader state capture narrative
- Private solar/renewable energy sector representative: Would have addressed the role of private generation in reducing grid demand — a factor the expert mentioned briefly but which was not developed



5. NUMERICAL MANIPULATION									5/10
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

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

**Finding 1: GDP growth projection — 2%**

**Timestamp** 00:16

Number: "the consistent power supply is expected to result in a 2% growth in GDP for South Africa"

Dimensions:

- (a) Absolute value: 2% GDP growth — shown
- (b) Share/proportion: Not contextualised — South Africa's GDP growth has been below 2% for most of the past decade; 2% would represent a significant improvement but this context is absent
- (c) Trend: No historical GDP growth trend provided; no comparison to pre-load shedding growth rates

**Missing context** Source of the 2% projection not identified; whether this is Eskom's own modelling, an independent economic forecast, or a government estimate is not stated; the projection is presented as a statement of fact rather than a modelled scenario

**Effect** Creates an impression of certain, quantified economic benefit attributable to the load shedding suspension, without the methodological qualification that would allow viewers to assess its reliability.

**Finding 2: Diesel savings — R12 billion**

**Timestamp** 04:35

Number: "Eskom say they've saved about 12 billion Rand so far this financial year through reduced diesel consumption"

Dimensions:

- (a) Absolute value: R12bn — shown
- (b) Share/proportion: Not contextualised against total Eskom revenue, total debt (approximately R400bn), or total government equity injections
- (c) Trend: Compared to R30bn peak diesel spend (shown), but not contextualised against multi-year financial trajectory

**Missing context** Eskom's total debt burden and ongoing financial distress are not mentioned; R12bn savings against R400bn+ debt represents approximately 3% — a meaningful but not transformative figure that is not contextualised

**Effect** R12bn sounds like a large saving in isolation; without contextualisation against Eskom's total financial position, it creates a more optimistic impression of Eskom's financial recovery than the underlying data supports.

**Finding 3: Eskom tariff increase request — 36%**

**Timestamp** 05:51

Number: "Eskom is asking for a price increase of 36%"

Dimensions:

- (a) Absolute value: 36% — shown



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

- (b) Share/proportion: Not contextualised against current tariff levels, inflation rate, or household income impact
- (c) Trend: No historical tariff increase trajectory provided (Eskom tariffs have increased by over 600% in real terms since 2007)

<b>Missing context</b>	The cumulative tariff increase history, the NERSA adjudication process, and the impact on low-income households are not addressed
<b>Effect</b>	The 36% figure is mentioned as a concern but without the contextualisation that would allow viewers to assess its full significance.

Summary: Three numerical claims are used in the broadcast, each presented without the full dimensional context (absolute value, proportion, trend) required for accurate public understanding. The GDP projection is the most problematic — presented as a factual claim without source attribution or methodological qualification.



<b>6. GUILT BY ASSOCIATION</b>									<b>1/10</b>
<b>1</b>	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

<b>Finding 1:</b>	
<b>Timestamp</b>	03:40
<b>Quote</b>	<i>"we were helped also by the weak economy the fact that demand hasn't been very high"</i>
	Technique: Inverse association — the improvement is briefly associated with economic weakness, but this association is immediately contextualised as one of several contributing factors and is not developed as a critical framing
<b>Effect</b>	Mild implicit acknowledgement that the improvement is not solely attributable to government competence; not a guilt-by-association technique in the classical sense

No classical guilt-by-association technique identified in this broadcast. No individuals or organisations are discredited through association with negative groups or ideas. The broadcast does not employ this technique.

Summary (Category Assignment): No guilt-by-association technique identified. Score reflects the absence of this manipulation technique rather than its presence. Chris Yelland: Category A — technically competent analyst with data-referenced commentary; no ideological labelling applied.



## 7. TIMING

4/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

### Finding 1: Celebratory framing at opening — before any critical context

Position: 00:00–01:02 (opening)

Content: "Eskom marks the milestone of 200 days of load shedding suspension today... lots to celebrate today... many South Africans of course expressing so much joy"

Timing Effect: The broadcast opens with unqualified celebration and emotional framing ("joy," "celebrate") before any analytical content is introduced. This primes the audience to receive subsequent information through a positive emotional lens. Critical information (tariff increases, Koeberg delays, sustainability concerns) is deferred to the second half of the interview (05:00 onwards), by which point the celebratory frame is established.

### Finding 2: Credit attribution placed before risk assessment

Position: 01:47–03:55 (early-to-mid interview)

Content: Extended credit attribution to President Ramaphosa, the Minister of Electricity and Energy, NECOM, and Eskom — approximately 2 minutes of positive attribution before any critical assessment

Timing Effect: The structural placement of credit attribution before risk assessment ensures that the positive narrative dominates the broadcast's emotional and informational architecture. Risk factors (tariff increase, Koeberg delays) are introduced only after the positive frame is firmly established.

### Finding 3: Abrupt technical disconnection at critical moment

Position: 07:24

Content: "unfortunately seems as if we have lost our analyst there — Chris Yelland who was actually also wrapping up his comments"

Timing Effect: The broadcast ends with a technical disconnection at the precise moment when the analyst was beginning to elaborate on infrastructure risks (Koeberg Unit 2 delays). Whether coincidental or not, the effect is that the critical risk assessment is truncated while the positive credit attribution was allowed to run uninterrupted for approximately 2 minutes.

Summary: The broadcast's structural timing places celebratory and credit-attribution content at the opening and early-to-mid sections, with critical content deferred to the latter portion and ultimately truncated by a technical disconnection. This timing pattern — whether deliberate or incidental — produces a broadcast architecture that foregrounds positive government narrative and backgrounds risk and accountability.



## 8. SELECTIVE OUTRAGE

1/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Outrage = bias. Selective outrage amplifies the finding. Score = outrage level (0–5) + selectivity (0–5)

*Methodological Principle (v3.0): Before each assessment, the triggering event must be documented. A reaction can only be assessed as selective if comparable triggers at other positions produced no analogous reaction.*

### Finding 1:

**Timestamp** 05:51

Triggering event: Chris Yelland raises the 36% Eskom tariff increase as a concern

Reaction: "the good that has been done by reducing load shedding, I fear could be counteracted if Eskom get their way and put up the price by 36% — that is going to ripple through the economy"

**Comparison** No comparable concern or outrage expressed regarding the historical causes of the crisis (state capture, mismanagement) — these are not raised at any point in the broadcast

Asymmetry: The analyst expresses concern about a future risk (tariff increase) but no comparable concern is expressed — by the analyst or the presenter — about the historical governance failures that caused the crisis. However, this asymmetry is attributable to the broadcast's framing and question structure rather than to a classical selective outrage pattern. The presenter does not express outrage at any point; the analyst's concern is measured and data-referenced.

Outrage Degree: 1/5 — mild concern expressed, not outrage

Selectivity: 1/5 — mild asymmetry (future risk flagged, historical accountability absent) but not a classical selective outrage pattern

Summary: No classical selective outrage pattern is identified in this broadcast. The mild asymmetry between concern about future tariff increases and the absence of any concern about historical governance failures is better categorised under Omission (Criterion 4) than selective outrage. Score reflects the near-absence of this technique.



9. SELECTIVE OMISSION — OVERALL PICTURE									7/10
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

<b>Finding 1:</b> Absence of historical accountability framing									
<b>Timestamp</b> Throughout — no specific timestamp									
Missing perspective/fact: The Zondo Commission's findings on state capture at Eskom, the role of ANC-aligned management in the crisis, and the accountability dimension of the recovery									
Relevance: Without this context, the recovery narrative is structurally incomplete — it presents the solution without the problem's causal history									
<b>Effect</b> Viewers receive a narrative of government competence without the accountability context that would allow them to assess whether the same governance failures could recur									

<b>Finding 2:</b> Absence of demand-side and private generation analysis									
<b>Timestamp</b> 03:40 — briefly mentioned: "we were helped also by the weak economy... Eskom's price increases made alternative energy a viable proposition"									
Missing perspective/fact: Quantified analysis of how much of the improvement is attributable to reduced demand vs. improved generation; the role of private solar installations (estimated 4–6 GW added to the system by 2024)									
Relevance: If a significant portion of the improvement is attributable to economic weakness and private investment rather than government policy, the credit attribution narrative is materially incomplete									
<b>Effect</b> The broadcast implies that government policy is the primary driver of improvement without quantifying the contribution of factors outside government control									

<b>Finding 3:</b> Absence of regulatory and consumer protection perspective									
<b>Timestamp</b> 05:51 — tariff increase mentioned but not developed									
Missing perspective/fact: NERSA's adjudication process, consumer protection mechanisms, the impact on low-income households, and the relationship between tariff increases and energy poverty									
Relevance: The 36% tariff increase is the most significant near-term policy issue for South African consumers and businesses; its treatment in the broadcast is superficial									
<b>Effect</b> Viewers are informed that a 36% increase is being sought but receive no information about the regulatory process, their rights, or the likely outcome									

Summary: The broadcast's completeness failures are systematic rather than incidental — they consistently omit information that would complicate the government success narrative (historical accountability, demand-side factors) while briefly acknowledging future risks (tariff increases, Koeberg delays) without developing them. This pattern produces a structurally incomplete picture that favours the governing party's preferred framing of the 200-day milestone.

*Share of covered perspectives*

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

**[A] Government/ANC perspective:** NECOM and Generation Recovery Plan as policy success

**[B] Opposition perspective (DA):** Accountability for historical mismanagement; structural reforms needed



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

**[C] Opposition perspective (EFF/MK):** Energy crisis as product of ANC corruption and state capture; nationalisation arguments

**[D] Independent economic analysis:** GDP growth projections — methodology, assumptions, reliability

**[E] Business sector perspective:** Impact of 36% tariff increase on SMEs and large industry

**[F] Consumer/household perspective:** Cost of load shedding damage, generator costs, solar investment

**[G] Eskom technical perspective:** Sustainability of current improvement, infrastructure risks

**[H] NERSA/regulatory perspective:** Tariff increase adjudication, regulatory oversight

**[I] Civil society/energy justice perspective:** Affordability, access, inequality in energy burden

**[J] Historical accountability perspective:** State capture, Zondo Commission findings, Eskom governance failures

### Assessment: Was Each Perspective Addressed?

#### **[A] ADDRESSED**

Timestamp: 01:47 — Quote: "I would start off with President Ramaphosa — he identified that we had a crisis, he did something about it... I give the president credit, I give the minister of electricity and energy credit" —

Assessment: Government/ANC perspective presented as the primary explanatory framework, without challenge or qualification beyond the expert's own mild caveats.

#### **[B] OMITTED**

Timestamp: N/A — No DA perspective, no reference to opposition accountability demands, no mention of structural reform debates — Assessment: Entirely absent; the DA's role as the second-largest GNU partner and its distinct position on energy accountability is not represented.

#### **[C] OMITTED**

Timestamp: N/A — No EFF or MK perspective on state capture, corruption, or nationalisation — Assessment: Entirely absent; the most politically charged dimension of the energy debate is not addressed.

#### **[D] PARTIALLY ADDRESSED**

Timestamp: 00:16 — Quote: "the consistent power supply is expected to result in a 2% growth in GDP for South Africa" — Assessment: GDP figure cited without methodology, source attribution, or qualification; presented as established fact rather than projection.

#### **[E] PARTIALLY ADDRESSED**

Timestamp: 05:51 — Quote: "eskom is asking for a price increase of 36%... that is going to really hammer many many businesses" — Assessment: Tariff impact on business mentioned but not developed; no business sector representative interviewed; no NERSA process explained.

#### **[F] PARTIALLY ADDRESSED**

Timestamp: 00:55 — Quote: "many South Africans of course expressing so much joy when it comes to having no loadshedding for the past 200 days" — Assessment: Consumer perspective reduced to emotional framing ("joy"); no substantive consumer cost analysis.

#### **[G] ADDRESSED**

Timestamp: 06:37 — Quote: "Koeberg unit number two has been out of service since December last year, was supposed to come back on in June/July this year, it's only going to come on in December this year — so about 6 months late" — Assessment: Technical risk perspective partially addressed; limited to one example.

#### **[H] OMITTED**

Timestamp: N/A — NERSA's role in adjudicating the 36% tariff increase not mentioned — Assessment: Regulatory oversight perspective entirely absent.



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

**[I] OMITTED**

Timestamp: N/A — No civil society, energy poverty, or affordability perspective — Assessment: The burden of load shedding and tariff increases on low-income households not addressed.

**[J] OMITTED**

Timestamp: N/A — No reference to state capture, Zondo Commission, historical governance failures at Eskom — Assessment: The causal history of the crisis is entirely absent, making the recovery narrative politically one-sided.

**Completeness Score: 3/10**

---

**Reasoning:** Of ten relevant perspectives, only two are substantively addressed (government credit attribution and technical risk), two are partially addressed (GDP projection and tariff impact), and six are entirely absent. The broadcast presents a celebratory narrative of government success without the historical, political, regulatory, or social context that would be required for genuine completeness. The absence of any opposition voice, any accountability framing, and any civil society perspective represents a significant editorial gap on a topic of major public importance.



## Soft Facts — 6 qualitative techniques

### 10. FRAMING

7/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

#### Finding 1: "Back to normal" framing — normalising the abnormal

Timestamp	01:02
Quote	<i>"yes of course being back to normal is actually a pleasure — it really makes us thankful for what we have"</i>
Manipulation	The framing of reliable electricity supply as "back to normal" obscures the fact that load shedding was itself an abnormal condition caused by specific governance failures. "Normal" implies a natural baseline rather than a policy outcome.
Why problematic	This framing removes the accountability dimension — if the current situation is simply "normal," there is no need to ask how the abnormal situation arose or who was responsible for it.

#### Finding 2: Celebratory milestone framing — "lots to celebrate"

Timestamp	00:51
Quote	<i>"lots to celebrate today, with many South Africans of course expressing so much joy when it comes to having no loadshedding for the past 200 days"</i>
Manipulation	The presenter establishes a celebratory emotional frame before any analytical content is introduced. The use of "lots to celebrate" and "so much joy" primes the audience to receive the subsequent interview as a celebration rather than an analysis.
Why problematic	A public broadcaster's role is to inform and analyse, not to celebrate government milestones. The celebratory framing structurally aligns the broadcast with government communications rather than independent journalism.

#### Finding 3: Credit attribution as analytical conclusion

Timestamp	01:47–03:06
Quote	<i>"I would start off with President Ramaphosa — he identified that we had a crisis, he did something about it... I give the president credit, I give the minister of electricity and energy credit"</i>
Manipulation	The analyst's credit attribution to named ANC political figures is presented as the analytical conclusion of the expert assessment, rather than as one perspective among several. The presenter does not challenge, contextualise, or seek an alternative view.
Why problematic	Credit attribution to specific political figures is a political act, not a technical analysis. Presenting it as expert opinion without challenge or counter-perspective constitutes editorial endorsement of a politically favourable narrative.



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

Summary: The broadcast is framed throughout as a celebration of government achievement. The celebratory frame is established in the opening seconds, reinforced through the expert's credit attribution, and never challenged or complicated by an alternative framing. This constitutes a systematic framing choice that aligns the broadcast with government communications rather than independent public interest journalism.



<b>11. WORD CHOICE AND TERMINOLOGY</b>									<b>5/10</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	6	7	8	9	10

<b>Finding 1: "Lots to celebrate" — editorial celebration</b>	
<b>Timestamp</b>	00:51
<b>Quote</b>	<i>"lots to celebrate today"</i>
<b>Manipulation</b>	"Celebrate" is a value-laden term that positions the broadcast as a participant in the celebration rather than an observer of it. It is editorial language, not journalistic language.
<b>Why problematic</b>	Neutral alternative would be: "Eskom has reached a significant milestone" or "200 days without load shedding — what does it mean?"

<b>Finding 2: "So much joy" — emotional amplification</b>	
<b>Timestamp</b>	00:55
<b>Quote</b>	<i>"many South Africans of course expressing so much joy"</i>
<b>Manipulation</b>	"So much joy" is an emotional amplifier that frames the public response as uniformly positive and intense. "Of course" implies that joy is the only rational response, pre-empting critical or sceptical reactions.

Why problematisch: Neutral alternative would be: "South Africans have welcomed the improvement" or "the milestone has been positively received."

<b>Finding 3: "Hammer" — selective emotional language for tariff impact</b>	
<b>Timestamp</b>	05:54
<b>Quote</b>	<i>"that is going to really hammer many many businesses"</i>
<b>Manipulation</b>	"Hammer" is a strong, emotionally charged term for the tariff impact — notably more vivid than the language used to describe the positive achievements. This creates an asymmetry where the government's success is described in measured, analytical terms while the risk is described in visceral language.
<b>Why problematic</b>	The asymmetry in emotional register between the positive narrative (measured, analytical) and the risk narrative (visceral, alarming) may be unintentional but produces an editorial effect — the tariff risk feels more alarming than the achievement feels impressive, potentially undermining the celebratory frame the broadcast has established.

Summary: Word choice in the broadcast reflects a celebratory editorial stance in the opening and credit-attribution sections, with more measured language in the analytical sections. The use of "celebrate," "joy," and "of course" in the opening establishes an editorial position that is not consistent with the impartiality requirements of the Broadcasting Act.



## 12. MODERATION BEHAVIOUR

5/10

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

*Methodological Principle (v3.0): Before each assessment, the triggering event must be documented. An intervention can only be assessed as asymmetric if comparable triggers at other guests produced no analogous intervention.*

### Finding 1: No challenge to credit attribution — triggering event: extended political praise

**Timestamp** 01:47–03:06

Triggering event: Chris Yelland attributes credit for the energy recovery to President Ramaphosa and the Minister of Electricity and Energy by name, in terms that go beyond technical analysis into political commentary

Presenter reaction: No challenge, no follow-up question, no request for qualification or alternative perspective

#### Comparison

No comparable guest with a critical perspective was present; however, the presenter's failure to challenge political credit attribution — which is outside the analyst's technical mandate — represents a moderation failure

Asymmetry: Not directly comparable to another guest's treatment (single-guest format), but the absence of any moderating intervention when the analyst makes explicitly political statements is a meaningful editorial choice

### Finding 2: Softball opening question — triggering event: milestone announcement

**Timestamp** 00:51

Triggering event: The 200-day milestone is announced

Presenter reaction: "lots to celebrate today — with many South Africans of course expressing so much joy... what do you attribute this exactly to?"

#### Comparison

No harder question framing offered; no "but critics say..." construction; no accountability dimension introduced

Asymmetry: The question structure invites credit attribution rather than analysis; a balanced question might have been: "What factors contributed to this improvement, and what concerns remain about its sustainability?"

### Finding 3: No follow-up on Koeberg delay — triggering event: analyst raises infrastructure risk

**Timestamp** 07:00

Triggering event: Yelland begins to explain the Koeberg Unit 2 delay as a significant ongoing risk

Presenter reaction: The segment ends with a technical disconnection; no follow-up question is asked

#### Comparison

The credit attribution section (01:47–03:06) ran for approximately 80 seconds without interruption; the risk section was truncated after approximately 30 seconds

Asymmetry: The positive narrative received sustained, uninterrupted airtime; the risk narrative was cut short. Whether the disconnection was technical or editorial cannot be determined from the transcript, but the effect is asymmetric.

Summary: The presenter's moderation behaviour is consistently supportive of the positive narrative — softball opening questions, no challenge to political credit attribution, and no follow-up on risk factors. The single-guest format limits



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

direct comparison, but the pattern of moderation choices consistently favours the government success narrative over accountability or risk framing.



### 13. QUESTION ASYMMETRY

6/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

#### Asymmetry 1: Opening question — invitation to celebrate vs. invitation to analyse

To Chris Yelland, 00:51: "lots to celebrate today... what do you attribute this exactly to particularly when you look at the plan itself?" — Soft/leading

Hypothetical alternative to a critical guest (not present): "Critics argue that the improvement is partly due to economic weakness and private solar adoption rather than government policy — how do you respond?" — Hard/challenging

#### Comparison

The question as posed invites credit attribution; a balanced question would have invited analysis of multiple contributing factors including those outside government control.

#### Asymmetry 2: GDP projection — accepted without challenge

To Chris Yelland (via presenter intro), 00:16: The 2% GDP growth projection is stated as fact in the presenter's introduction without any question about its source or reliability — No question asked / accepted as given

Hypothetical alternative: "Eskom claims this will result in 2% GDP growth — where does that figure come from and how reliable is it?" — Hard/analytical

#### Comparison

The GDP figure is presented as established fact in the introduction, removing it from analytical scrutiny entirely.

#### Asymmetry 3: Tariff increase — concern invited but not developed

To Chris Yelland, 05:03: "businesses were struggling when it came to issues around load shedding — some were even forced to close their doors — what does this all mean for businesses and small businesses in particular?" — Soft/open

The question opens space for the tariff concern but does not specifically probe the 36% increase, NERSA's role, or consumer protection mechanisms. The analyst raises the tariff issue himself; the presenter does not follow up.

#### Comparison

The credit attribution section received a direct, inviting question; the tariff/risk section received a general question that did not specifically probe the most significant near-term risk.

Summary: All questions in the broadcast are directed to a single guest, limiting direct asymmetry comparison. However, the pattern of question framing is consistently soft and inviting on positive topics (credit attribution, milestone celebration) and general or absent on critical topics (tariff increases, historical accountability, sustainability risks). This question architecture produces a broadcast that is structurally more favourable to positive government narrative than to critical analysis.



## 14. FALSE BALANCE

2/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

### Finding 1: Mild false balance — risk acknowledgement without structural counter-weight

#### Timestamp

05:51–07:20

Construct: The broadcast includes acknowledgement of risks (36% tariff increase, Koeberg delays) alongside the positive narrative, creating a superficial appearance of balance

#### Analysis

The risk acknowledgements are brief, unelaborated, and structurally subordinate to the dominant positive narrative. They do not constitute genuine balance — they are qualifications within a celebratory frame rather than a structural counter-perspective. True balance would require a guest with a critical perspective, not a single guest who briefly acknowledges risks before the segment ends.

Summary: The broadcast does not employ classical false balance (presenting two equally weighted but unequal positions). The risk acknowledgements are too brief and structurally subordinate to constitute false balance in the technical sense. The more significant issue is the absence of any balance at all — the broadcast is structurally one-sided rather than falsely balanced. Score reflects the limited presence of this specific technique.



## 15. AGENDA-SETTING

7/10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

### Finding 1: The 200-day milestone as unambiguous achievement — set as given

Agenda element set: The 200-day milestone is treated as an unambiguous achievement worthy of celebration, without any framing that contextualises it against the severity of the preceding crisis or the conditions that produced the improvement

**Timestamp** 00:00 — Evidence: "Eskom marks the milestone of 200 days of load shedding suspension today"

Alternative agenda: The milestone could equally have been framed as: "200 days without load shedding — but at what cost, and is it sustainable?" or "Eskom reaches 200 days — but critics warn the underlying problems remain unresolved"

### Finding 2: Government policy as primary driver of improvement — set as given

Agenda element set: The Generation Recovery Plan and NECOM are treated as the primary explanatory variables for the improvement, with demand reduction and private generation treated as secondary factors

**Timestamp** 01:29 — Evidence: "what has been done right — lots being attributed to the fact that the implementation of the generation operational recovery plan has been on track"

Alternative agenda: An alternative framing would have treated the relative contribution of government policy, demand reduction, and private generation as an open analytical question rather than a settled conclusion

### Finding 3: Eskom's financial recovery as positive trajectory — set as given

Agenda element set: The R12bn diesel savings figure is presented as evidence of Eskom's improving financial position without contextualisation against total debt or ongoing financial distress

**Timestamp** 04:35 — Evidence: "Eskom say they've saved about 12 billion Rand so far this financial year — that's going to help the bottom line"

Alternative agenda: Eskom's total debt burden (approximately R400bn+), ongoing government bailouts, and the relationship between the tariff increase request and financial sustainability would have provided essential context

Summary: The broadcast's agenda-setting function is its most significant editorial intervention. By treating the 200-day milestone as an unambiguous achievement, government policy as the primary driver, and Eskom's financial position as improving, the broadcast sets an agenda that is structurally aligned with government communications. The alternative agenda — accountability, sustainability, structural causes — is systematically excluded from the broadcast's frame of reference.



## CHAPTER 4 — OVERALL EVALUATION

### Results

- HARD FACTS SCORE (Average Criteria 1–9): 4.6 / 10
- SOFT FACTS SCORE (Average Criteria 10–15): 5.3 / 10

### Dominant Techniques

The three strongest techniques in this broadcast:

- 1. Framing (Score 7):** The broadcast is structured as a celebration of government achievement from the opening seconds, with the celebratory frame established before any analytical content is introduced and never challenged or complicated. The presenter's language ("lots to celebrate," "so much joy") and the analyst's credit attribution to named ANC political figures collectively produce a broadcast that functions as government communications rather than independent journalism.
- 2. Selective Omission / Completeness (Scores 7 each):** The broadcast systematically omits the three most politically significant dimensions of the energy story — historical accountability (state capture, ANC mismanagement), the role of demand reduction and private generation in the improvement, and all opposition party perspectives. These omissions are not incidental but collectively produce a narrative that is structurally aligned with the governing party's preferred framing of the 200-day milestone.
- 3. Agenda-Setting (Score 7):** The broadcast treats three contested analytical questions as settled givens — that the milestone is an unambiguous achievement, that government policy is the primary driver of improvement, and that Eskom's financial position is improving. By setting these as the agenda's baseline assumptions, the broadcast forecloses the analytical questions that independent journalism would be expected to pursue.

### Core Messages of the Broadcast

**\*\*MESSAGE 1 (CONTENT):** \*\* "The ANC-led government, through President Ramaphosa's leadership and the Minister of Electricity and Energy's implementation of NECOM and the Generation Recovery Plan, has successfully resolved South Africa's energy crisis."

**Technique:** Framing + Expert Selection + Agenda-Setting — Evidence: 01:47, 02:55, 03:06

**\*\*MESSAGE 2 (PERSONAL):** \*\* "President Ramaphosa and the Minister of Electricity and Energy deserve personal credit for the energy recovery."

**Technique:** Expert Selection + Moderation Behaviour (no challenge to credit attribution) — Evidence: 01:47, 02:55

**\*\*MESSAGE 3 (SOCIETAL):** \*\* "South Africa is back to normal and South Africans should be grateful and joyful — the energy crisis is largely behind us, with some manageable risks ahead."

**Technique:** Framing + Word Choice + Timing — Evidence: 00:51, 01:02, 06:37

### Manipulation Degree Classification

Reasoning: The broadcast's overall score of 4.9/10 places it at the upper boundary of "slight tendency" and the lower boundary of "clear one-sidedness." The dominant techniques — framing, selective omission, and agenda-setting — are consistent and mutually reinforcing, producing a broadcast that systematically favours the governing party's narrative on a politically significant topic. The absence of any opposition perspective, any accountability framing, and any independent verification of government claims constitutes a clear departure from the impartiality and balance requirements of Broadcasting Act s. 6. The broadcast does not employ the most aggressive manipulation techniques (guilt by association, selective outrage, numerical fabrication) but its structural choices — single guest, celebratory framing, systematic omission — produce a one-sided editorial product that falls below the standard required of a public broadcaster.

### CONCLUSION

This SABC News broadcast on Eskom's 200-day load shedding suspension milestone fails to meet the impartiality and balance standards required under Broadcasting Act 4 of 1999, Section 6, and BCCSA Code Clauses 16 and 18. The broadcast presents a single analytical perspective — broadly supportive of the ANC-led government's energy



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

narrative — without any structural counter-perspective from opposition parties, independent economists, regulatory bodies, or civil society organisations. The systematic omission of historical accountability context (state capture, ANC mismanagement), the absence of any opposition party voice, and the celebratory framing established in the broadcast's opening seconds collectively produce an editorial product that is structurally aligned with government communications rather than independent public interest journalism. While individual elements of the broadcast — particularly the analyst's brief acknowledgement of tariff risks and infrastructure concerns — demonstrate some analytical independence, these are insufficient to offset the dominant pattern of one-sided framing, selective omission, and unchallenged credit attribution to named ANC political figures. The broadcast's overall score of 4.9/10 reflects clear one-sidedness on a topic of major national political significance, representing a material departure from the SABC's statutory mandate to provide fair, accurate, and impartial public affairs programming.



## OVERALL EVALUATION OF THE 15 CRITERIA

### Individual Scores — All 15 Criteria

No.	Criterion	Score	Rating
1	EXPERT SELECTION	6/10	Significant imbalance
2	SOURCE SELECTION	6/10	Significant imbalance
3	TIME DISTRIBUTION	4/10	Slight imbalance
4	SELECTIVE OMISSION	7/10	Pronounced imbalance
5	NUMERICAL MANIPULATION	5/10	Significant imbalance
6	GUILT BY ASSOCIATION	1/10	Unremarkable
7	TIMING	4/10	Slight imbalance
8	SELECTIVE OUTRAGE	1/10	Unremarkable
9	SELECTIVE OMISSION — OVERALL PICTURE	7/10	Pronounced imbalance
10	FRAMING	7/10	Pronounced imbalance
11	WORD CHOICE AND TERMINOLOGY	5/10	Significant imbalance
12	MODERATION BEHAVIOUR	5/10	Significant imbalance
13	QUESTION ASYMMETRY	6/10	Significant imbalance
14	FALSE BALANCE	2/10	Unremarkable
15	AGENDA-SETTING	7/10	Pronounced imbalance

#### HARD FACTS SCORE (1-8)

**4.6/10**

*Significant imbalance*

#### SOFT FACTS SCORE (9-14)

**5.3/10**

*Significant imbalance*

#### OVERALL SCORE

**5.0/10**

*Significant imbalance*

*Average of Hardfacts and Softfacts*



## KEY — Score Definitions

### Individual Scores per Criterion (0–10)

<b>0</b>	<b>No finding</b>	No relevant anomaly detected.
<b>1–2</b>	<b>Weak finding</b>	Minor anomaly without substantial impact on balance.
<b>3–4</b>	<b>Slight to moderate finding</b>	Recognizable tendency; low to moderate impact relevance.
<b>5</b>	<b>Moderate finding with impact</b>	Relevant imbalance affecting the audience's opinion-forming potential.
<b>6</b>	<b>Significant finding (threshold)</b>	Scores of 6 and above are classified as 'significant findings.'
<b>7</b>	<b>Significant finding</b>	Clear, well-documented imbalance with distinct impact relevance.
<b>8–9</b>	<b>Severe finding</b>	Pronounced imbalance; multiple documented individual findings in this criterion.
<b>10</b>	<b>Maximum severity</b>	Systematic, pervasive imbalance in this criterion.

### Aggregated Deviation Index — Interpretation Ranges

<b>0.0 – 2.5</b>	<b>Unremarkable</b>	No significant patterns detected; broadcast meets the impartiality standard.
<b>2.6 – 4.0</b>	<b>Slight imbalance</b>	Isolated anomalies; statistically visible but within tolerance range.
<b>4.1 – 6.0</b>	<b>Significant imbalance</b>	Multiple significant findings; relevant impairment of perspective diversity.
<b>6.1 – 8.0</b>	<b>Serious deviation from the impartiality standard. High degree of deviation</b>	Pronounced, cross-broadcast patterns; high impact relevance.
<b>8.1 – 10</b>	<b>Fundamental systemic one-sidedness. Very high bias degree</b>	Maximum severity across nearly all criteria; systematically one-sided reporting.

### Party-Political Bias (-5 to +5)

<b>-5 to -3</b>	<b>Strongly disadvantaged</b>	Party is significantly underrepresented in framing, airtime, or presentation.
<b>-2 to -1</b>	<b>Slightly disadvantaged</b>	Recognizable but minor disadvantage.
<b>0</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	No detectable favoritism or disadvantage.
<b>+1 to +2</b>	<b>Slightly favored</b>	Recognizable but minor favoritism.
<b>+3 to +5</b>	<b>Strongly favored</b>	Party is significantly overrepresented in framing, airtime, or presentation.



## CHAPTER 5 — LEGAL CLASSIFICATION (Broadcasting Act s. 6)

### Assessment under Broadcasting Act s. 6

Broadcasting Act 4 of 1999, Section 6 (SABC Charter) requires significant news and public affairs programming that meets the highest standards of journalism, including fairness, accuracy, and impartiality. BCCSA Code Clause 16 requires news to be reported truthfully, accurately and fairly, in the correct context and in a balanced manner. Clause 18 requires opposing views to be presented on controversial issues of public importance.

#### Violation 1:

Standard: Broadcasting Act s. 6 / BCCSA Code Clause 18 — requirement to present opposing views on controversial issues of public importance

Conduct: The broadcast presents no opposition party perspective, no accountability framing, and no critical counter-perspective on the energy recovery narrative. The attribution of credit to President Ramaphosa and the Minister of Electricity and Energy — named ANC political figures — is presented as expert analysis without challenge or counter-perspective.

Evidence: Timestamp 01:47 — Quote: "I would start off with President Ramaphosa — he identified that we had a crisis, he did something about it... I give the president credit, I give the minister of electricity and energy credit"

Assessment: The energy crisis and its resolution are a controversial issue of major public importance, directly contested by opposition parties (DA, EFF, MK) with substantively different attributions of cause and credit. The complete absence of any opposing view constitutes a prima facie violation of Clause 18's requirement to present opposing views on controversial issues of public importance.

#### Violation 2:

Standard: Broadcasting Act s. 6 / BCCSA Code Clause 16 — requirement to report in the correct context and in a balanced manner

Conduct: The 2% GDP growth projection is presented as a factual claim without source attribution, methodological qualification, or independent verification. The R12bn diesel savings figure is presented without contextualisation against Eskom's total debt burden. The historical context of the energy crisis (state capture, ANC mismanagement) is entirely absent.

Evidence: Timestamp 00:16 — Quote: "the consistent power supply is expected to result in a 2% growth in GDP for South Africa" — no source cited; Timestamp 04:35 — Quote: "Eskom say they've saved about 12 billion Rand so far this financial year" — no independent verification

Assessment: Reporting numerical claims without source attribution or contextualisation, and omitting the historical context necessary for accurate public understanding, constitutes a failure to report "in the correct context" as required by Clause 16.

#### Violation 3:

Standard: Broadcasting Act s. 6 — requirement for the highest standards of journalism, including impartiality

Conduct: The broadcast's opening framing ("lots to celebrate today," "many South Africans of course expressing so much joy") establishes an editorial position of celebration rather than analysis. This language is inconsistent with the impartiality requirement and constitutes editorial endorsement of a government milestone.

Evidence: Timestamp 00:51 — Quote: "lots to celebrate today, with many South Africans of course expressing so much joy when it comes to having no loadshedding for the past 200 days"

Assessment: The use of celebratory editorial language by the SABC presenter — rather than neutral analytical framing — constitutes a departure from the impartiality standard required under Section 6. A public broadcaster's presenter should not characterise a government achievement as something to "celebrate" without qualification.

### Overall Assessment — Broadcasting Act s. 6



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

This broadcast falls below the standard required by Broadcasting Act s. 6 and BCCSA Code Clauses 16 and 18 in three material respects: the complete absence of opposing views on a controversial issue of public importance (Clause 18); the presentation of unverified numerical claims without source attribution or contextualisation (Clause 16); and the use of celebratory editorial language by the presenter that is inconsistent with the impartiality requirement of Section 6. The violations are not individually egregious — the broadcast does not fabricate information, does not employ the most aggressive manipulation techniques, and does include some acknowledgement of risks and uncertainties. However, the cumulative pattern of one-sided framing, systematic omission of opposition perspectives, and unchallenged credit attribution to named governing party figures on a topic of major national political significance constitutes a material departure from the SABC's statutory mandate that would be defensible as a finding of non-compliance in a regulatory or judicial proceeding.



## CHAPTER 6 — Source Depth Check

### Chris Yelland — Energy Analyst

- 1. FUNDING:** Associated with EE Publishers (private sector energy trade publication and consultancy). No direct government funding identified. Income derived from energy industry ecosystem — consulting, media appearances, industry publications. Structural proximity to Eskom and government energy officials through professional engagement.
- 2. MANDATE:** EE Publishers' mandate is energy industry coverage and technical analysis. Compatible with neutral technical assessment of generation performance. Does not include a mandate for political accountability analysis or opposition perspective representation.
- 3. CONFLICT OF INTEREST:** Analysts whose professional profile depends on continued access to Eskom and government energy officials have a structural incentive to maintain constructive relationships with those institutions. The extensive credit attribution to named ANC political figures in this broadcast goes beyond technical analysis and into political commentary — a domain where the analyst's structural incentives are not neutral.
- 4. CREDIBILITY MATRIX (Source Traffic Light, 6D -2/+2):**

Dimension	Score	Reasoning
D1 Conflict of Interest	-1	Industry proximity; structural incentive to maintain access to Eskom/government
D2 Personal Risk	+1	Offers mild criticism (tariff increase, Koeberg delays); some reputational risk
D3 Technical Competence	+2	Recognised energy analyst; competent on technical and financial Eskom matters
D4 Opinion Consistency	+1	Broadly consistent with previous commentary acknowledging NECOM's role
D5 Emotionalisation vs. Data	+1	Mostly data-referenced; some emotional framing ("very very grateful")
D6 Source Level	0	Secondary — analyst interpreting Eskom data, not primary source
TOTAL	+4	SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: YELLOW

- 5. COUNTER-VOICE:** Independent academic energy economists (e.g., UCT Energy Research Centre), opposition party energy spokespersons, and civil society energy researchers (e.g., AIDC) would provide structurally different perspectives on credit attribution, demand-side factors, and the sustainability of the improvement. None are cited or referenced in the broadcast.

IMPORTANT NOTE: Chris Yelland's status as a "recognised energy expert" is a social attribution, not a neutral qualification. His technical competence on Eskom's generation fleet is well-established. His political commentary — attributing credit to named ANC political figures — is outside his technical mandate and should not be treated as expert analysis. The broadcast's failure to distinguish between these two registers is an editorial failure.

### Eskom (Institutional Source)

- 1. FUNDING:** State-owned enterprise; majority funded by South African government through equity injections, debt guarantees, and tariff revenue. Directly subject to political oversight by the Minister of Electricity and Energy.
- 2. MANDATE:** Eskom's mandate is electricity generation, transmission, and distribution. Not compatible with neutral self-assessment of its own performance.



**3. CONFLICT OF INTEREST:** Eskom has a direct institutional interest in presenting the 200-day milestone as a success attributable to its own management and the government's plan. Its self-reported savings figures (R12bn diesel savings) and performance claims are not independently verified in the broadcast.

**4. CREDIBILITY MATRIX:**

Dimension	Score	Reasoning
D1 Conflict of Interest	-2	Direct institutional interest in positive self-presentation
D2 Personal Risk	-1	Institutional source; no personal risk dimension
D3 Technical Competence	+2	Primary source on its own operational data
D4 Opinion Consistency	0	Institutional communications are inherently self-serving
D5 Emotionalisation vs. Data	+1	Data-referenced claims (R12bn, 36% tariff request)
D6 Source Level	+2	Primary source on its own operational and financial data
TOTAL	+2	SOURCE TRAFFIC LIGHT: YELLOW

**5. COUNTER-VOICE:** National Treasury, the Auditor-General of South Africa, NERSA, and independent financial analysts would provide non-self-interested assessments of Eskom's financial position and operational performance. None are cited in the broadcast.

**Legal and Methodological Notes**

<b>No factual determination</b>	The results presented do not constitute factual determinations about individual persons, editorial teams, or broadcasts. They are the product of a standardized operationalization, not a finding of individual responsibility.
<b>No legal judgment</b>	The aggregated deviation index does not replace a legal assessment under Broadcasting Act s. 6. The determination of whether a specific broadcast violates legal requirements is exclusively the responsibility of the competent authorities (in particular BCCSA).
<b>No proof of causation</b>	Statistical correlations are not to be interpreted as proof of causal relationships or editorial intent. Deviation values may be influenced by topic selection, news environment, political controversy, or format logic.
<b>No judgment of intent</b>	The analysis measures observable structural characteristics of broadcasts. A score of 7 means a significant imbalance was detected — not that the editorial team intended it. The methodology makes no claims about motives or strategic objectives.
<b>Heuristic comparison tool</b>	The index serves comparative pattern recognition across thousands of broadcasts, not precise metric measurement of individual segments. Threshold values serve heuristic orientation, not sharp legal qualification.



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



## APPENDIX 1: NATIONAL BROADCASTING LAW

### South Africa — Legal Framework for Broadcasting Impartiality

#### Primary Legislation

##### Broadcasting Act 4 of 1999 (as amended)

The Broadcasting Act establishes the South African Broadcasting Corporation (SABC) as a public broadcaster and defines its Charter obligations.

Section 6 — Charter of the Corporation:

The SABC Charter mandates that the public broadcaster must:

- Provide programming that reflects South African attitudes, opinions, ideas, values and artistic creativity
- Offer a plurality of views and a variety of news, information and analysis
- Provide significant news and public affairs programming that meets the highest standards of journalism, including fairness, accuracy, and impartiality

Section 10 — Editorial Independence:

The SABC's news and current affairs programming must be independent from government or political party influence. The Board must ensure editorial policies that safeguard journalistic integrity.

##### ICASA Act 13 of 2000

The Independent Communications Authority of South Africa (ICASA) is the regulatory body responsible for broadcasting licensing and compliance.

##### Electronic Communications Act 36 of 2005

Provides the overarching regulatory framework for electronic communications, including broadcasting standards.

##### BCCSA Broadcasting Code of Conduct

The Broadcasting Complaints Commission of South Africa (BCCSA) enforces the Free-to-Air Broadcasting Code of Conduct, which includes:

Clause 16 — News:

- News must be reported truthfully, accurately and fairly
- News must be presented in the correct context and in a balanced manner
- Only verified facts may be presented as facts; opinions must be clearly identified as such

Clause 17 — Comment:

- Comment must be clearly distinguished from fact
- Comment must be an honest expression of opinion and must be presented fairly

Clause 18 — Controversial Issues of Public Importance:

- When a programme deals with a controversial issue of public importance, opposing views must be presented, either within the same programme or in a follow-up programme within a reasonable time
- This requirement applies to all broadcasting services

Clause 20 — Elections:

- During election periods, broadcasters must ensure equitable treatment of all political parties
- ICASA issues specific election broadcasting regulations

#### Regulatory / Complaints Bodies

Body	Role	Binding?
------	------	----------

**President:** Schläpfer, David - **Contact:** [kontakt@SVFAB.ch](mailto:kontakt@SVFAB.ch) - **Address:** SVFAB, Postfach, CH-8021 Zurich 1



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

ICASA (Independent Communications Authority of South Africa)	Licensing, spectrum, compliance enforcement	Yes — can fine, revoke licences
BCCSA (Broadcasting Complaints Commission of South Africa)	Content complaints (bias, fairness, accuracy)	Yes — can reprimand, fine, require corrections
SABC Board	Internal editorial oversight	Internal
Parliament Portfolio Committee on Communications	Political oversight of SABC	Indirect

### Notable Enforcement

- May 2024: ICASA fined SABC R500,000 for refusing to broadcast the Democratic Alliance's election advertisement showing a burning South African flag, ruling that SABC violated the right to free political communication.
- 2016: Western Cape High Court ordered removal of COO Hlaudi Motsoeneng for systematic censorship and political interference at SABC.
- 2017: Labour Court ruled that dismissal of the "SABC 8" journalists (who protested censorship of protest footage) was unlawful.

### Equivalent to Other Countries

Country	Law	South African Equivalent
CH	Art. 4 RTVG	Broadcasting Act s. 6 (SABC Charter)
SE	Radio- och TV-lagen 5 kap.	BCCSA Code Cl. 16-18
DE	MStV §26	ICASA Act + BCCSA Code
NO	NRK-vedtektene §6	Broadcasting Act s. 10 (Editorial Independence)



## APPENDIX 2: SCIENTIFIC REFERENCES

### References

---

- 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*



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

## Reports and Membership at SVFAB

At SVFAB.ch you will find detailed reports and can also commission custom analyses for any broadcast (billed separately).  
To ensure the quality of our work, we depend on membership fees and donations.

### Contact and further information:

[www.SVFAB.ch](http://www.SVFAB.ch) | [Kontakt@SVFAB.ch](mailto: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](http://www.svfab.ch) or [kontakt@svfab.ch](mailto:kontakt@svfab.ch)



**Unbalanced Reporting** is the response to the halving initiative in Switzerland: Manipulation techniques are explained in detail, starting with the selection of staff and sources. Then 15 principles are explained: omission, framing, temporal framing, guilt by association, emotionalisation, context removal and many more, illustrated with numerous examples. Additionally, it becomes apparent where we ourselves apply these techniques – fostering not only awareness but also empathy.

Optionally the book comes with **playing cards**.

Also available as an **audiobook**.



The interview is not a conversation. It is a stage – and someone else has written the script.

Those who don't know this deliver material. Good quotes that get cut wrong. Correct statements that end up in the wrong context. Honest answers framed as confessions.

This book is not a media criticism book. It is a toolbox – for everyone who faces a microphone and wants to know what to do about it. 7 chapters. 7 tools: What an interview really is. The 7 most common traps. The three principles of sovereignty – anchoring, reframing, setting boundaries. Preparation in one hour. Body and voice. What to do when things go wrong. And what matters after the interview.

For politicians, activists, entrepreneurs, whistleblowers – for everyone who is in the public eye and wants to understand how the game works. So they stop playing along – and start shaping it.

In A5 format. Direct. For preparation, reference, follow-up and when difficulties arise



**You think you see the world.** In Wirklichkeit siehst du den Rahmen, den jemand um sie gelegt hat. Framing ist die älteste und eleganteste Manipulationstechnik der world. Sie verändert nicht die Fakten – sie verändert, was wir aus den Fakten machen. Wie wir fühlen. Was wir glauben. Wie wir entscheiden. Und sie funktioniert – weil wir alle mitmachen. Täglich. Unbewusst. Auch du. Dieses Buch ist kein trockenes Lehrbuch. Es ist ein Übungsbuch – spielerisch, direkt, voller Beispiele aus dem echten Leben. Du lernst nicht nur, wie andere dich framen. Du lernst, wie du selbst framest – und wie du es bewusst und fair einsetzen kannst.

Because whoever understands framing sees the world more clearly. Hears news differently. Conducts conversations more confidently. And no longer so easily accepts a frame chosen by someone else.



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

With many exercises and concrete examples from politics, media and everyday life – and the occasional smile.

**Framing with style. Because the frame changes everything.**



The SRG collects 1.56 billion francs per year – compulsorily, from every household. Those who feel unfairly treated can file a complaint. There is even an authority for this: the UBI, the Independent Complaints Authority for Radio and Television.

But: It is not independent. It has no sanctioning power. And it decides in 99.6% of all cases: nothing.

This analysis exposes the system – factual, precise, without polemics. Procedures, personnel, powers, costs, statistics, legal recourse. And the constitutional review showing: the UBI system meets none of the three fundamental criteria – it is not proportionate, not separated by powers, not market-based.

The authority supposed to protect citizens primarily protects the system it should be overseeing.

Essential reading for anyone considering a complaint – and for anyone who wants to understand why genuine media oversight in Switzerland is still pending.