



ADJUDICATION NO: 05/A/2026

NAME OF PROGRAMME:	ZIMOJA NEWS
DATE AND TIME OF BROADCAST:	5 FEBRUARY AT 14:00
BROADCASTER:	MULTICHOICE CHANNEL 157
COMPLAINANT:	MOSIA

COMPLAINT

Complaint that the broadcast amounted to advocacy of hatred based on ethnicity and constituted incitement to cause harm.

APPLICABLE CLAUSES

BCCSA Code of Conduct for Subscription Broadcasting Service Licensees are

10.3 A subscription broadcasting service licensee may not knowingly broadcast material which, judged within context, advocates hatred that is based on race, ethnicity, gender or religion and which constitutes incitement to cause harm.

11. Clauses 9 and 10 do not apply to –

11.1...

11.2...

11.3 broadcasts which amount to a bona fide discussion, argument or opinion on a matter of public interest.

ADJUDICATION

[1] A complaint was lodged with the BCCSA against the broadcast of Zimoja Daily on Moja Love (Multichoice Channel 157). The complaint concerns an episode of Zimoja Daily broadcast on 5 February 2026 on Moja Love (Channel 157), in which the host of the programme made statements about Dr Martin Nsibirwa. The complainant submits that the broadcast amounted to advocacy of hatred based on ethnicity and constituted incitement to cause harm.

[2] **The complaint reads as follows:**

"I would like to report Zimoja Daily on Moja love / the program aired on Five February 2026 at 14:00.

The segment repeated through out the day /at the top of the hour.

I would like to also report Zimoja for being in contravention of Section 10.3 of the Code of Conduct for Broadcasting Services as mandated by section 56(1) of the IBA Act. 'A subscription Broadcasting service licensee may not knowingly Broadcast material which, judged within the context advocates for hatred that is based on race, ethnicity, gender, or religion and which constitutes incitement to cause harm.

The following was said on on the Zimoja Daily segment

Do you know that the Head of Research at the south African human rights commission isn't someone from South Africa? Yes! Dr Martin Nsibirwa is Ugandan. The South African human rights commission is the chapter nine institution and their job is to enforce the law and the rights that favours the South African people. So how are we trusting a Ugandan to do such a job?"

The host went on further to say "Then it got tense! Three senior researchers quit their jobs. Because how do you hire a foreign national for such a position yet they are there? Ohno. Do you remember people in the townships chasing away illegal foreign nationals in hospitals and in clinics? Huh? Here is Dr Martin. Listen to what he says. Dr Martin in the clip said "It is unlawful to prevent anyone, either documented or undocumented, from accessing health care. Every child, whether documented or undocumented, have the right to access education. They've the right to access Healthcare. The host of Zimoja thereafter says "Did you hear him? This man does not care about the rights of South Africans, do you hear me.

Do you know what? This has nothing to do with being xenophobic. There are many educated people here in South Africa, are you saying you couldn't find even a single person to do Dr Martin's job? And Dr Martin is earning one million South African rands every single year with your Tax funds.

Whose rights is he focused on? Exactly! It's not known. Goodness, South Africa is in trouble!:

At some point in the segment, the question "IS SAHRC AGAINST SOUTH AFRICANS?.. below the picture of Dr Martin.

I'm writing this because I'm shocked and sadden that discriminatory commentary aired on a channel that's broadcasted nationally. In the article, Understanding the South African Human Rights Commission Law (Department of Justice and Constitutional Development, 2026) it is said that .. The South African Human Rights Commission is the national institution established to support constitutional democracy.

It is committed to promote respect for, observance of and protection of human rights for everyone without fear or favour ... The host of Zimoja misleads the audience when she say the SAHRC is meant for South African citizens only. That is opposite of what the article by the Department of Justice and Constitutional Development says. The host incites harm against foreign nationals by targeting the Ugandan national who isn't from one of South Africa ethnic groups and concluding that he is anti south Africans for his condemnation of the removal of illegal immigrants from health facilities. Also for stating the human rights that are afforded to documented or undocumented immigrants, such as the right to health and education.

The host targets the Ugandan national based his nationality. He didn't say South African citizens are not deserving of the rights to access Healthcare and education.

Yet the host says that Dr Martin doesn't care for the rights of South Africans. He said every child documented or undocumented has the right to health care and education. The host further stated that South African tax payers pay money, for the someone who it's not known whose rights he is focused on and further concluded that South Africa is in trouble because of this.

As a peace loving and all human beings human rights supporter. I can't in good faith ignore this conduct that seeks to incite violence against Dr Martin because he isn't a ethnic South African he is a Ugandan national ... Injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere.- Dr Martin Luther King jr

[3] The Broadcaster responded as follows:

Complainant: N Mosia

Channel: Siyaya Free-to-Air TV (Pty) Ltd, Channel Moja Love ("the Broadcaster")

Programme: Zimoja Daily

Episode/Broadcast Date: 5 February 2026

INTRODUCTION

The Broadcaster hereby responds to the complaint lodged in respect of an episode of *Zimoja Daily*, produced under the Aubrey Tau Foundation.

1. Nature of the Broadcast

1.1. Production and Editorial Responsibility

The programme *Zimoja Daily* is produced by the Aubrey Tau Foundation.

1.2. Nature of the Programme

Zimoja Daily is not a conventional news bulletin. It is an opinion-based commentary programme designed to reflect and interrogate prevailing public sentiments, views and debates within South African society. The format permits robust discussion, rhetorical questioning and strong personal viewpoints from the host and contributors.

1.3. Context of the 5 February 2026 Broadcast

- 1.3.1. The segment in question addressed a public appointment at the South African Human Rights Commission (SAHRC). During the discussion, reference was made to the SAHRC's publicly stated positions regarding the rights to healthcare and education for all persons within South Africa, including documented and undocumented individuals.
- 1.3.2. The host expressed strong views questioning the appointment of Dr Martin Nsibirwa as Head Researcher and raised whether the role constitutes a scarce skill within South Africa, and whether no suitably qualified South African citizen could have filled the post. This constitutes a legitimate public policy debate concerning appointments to key constitutional institutions and the allocation of taxpayer funds.

2. Constitutional and Legal Context

- 2.1 The programme referenced rights enshrined in the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, including:
 - 2.1.1. Section 27, which provides that “everyone” has the right to access healthcare services and that no one may be refused emergency medical treatment; and
 - 2.1.2. Section 29, which guarantees every child the right to basic education.
- 2.2 These provisions have been interpreted by courts and relevant authorities as extending to non-citizens and undocumented persons. The broadcast did not dispute the existence of these rights but reflected public debate regarding their practical implications and prioritisation.

3. Alleged Contravention of Clause 10.3 of the BCCSA Code (the “Code”)

- 3.1. Clause 10.3 of the Code of Conduct for Subscription Broadcasting Services prohibits the knowing broadcast of material that advocates hatred based on race, ethnicity, gender or religion and that constitutes incitement to cause harm.
- 3.2. The February 5th episode did not advocate hatred against Dr Nsibirwa or any group, nor did it call for violence or harm. The host's rhetorical questions and expressions of frustration—such as statements that “South Africa is in trouble”—constitute opinion and commentary rather than incitement. While the programme aired and reflected concerns prevalent in segments of public discourse, including anxieties around immigration and employment, these were presented as topics for discussion rather than endorsements of hatred.

4. Freedom of Expression Considerations

The South African constitutional framework protects freedom of expression, particularly in matters of public interest and political debate. Opinion-based programming on a subscription broadcasting platform is entitled to engage in robust, even controversial discourse provided it does not cross the threshold into advocacy of hatred coupled with incitement to cause harm.

5. Conclusion

5.1. In light of the above, the content of the 5th February broadcast does not meet the threshold for contravention of Clause 10.3. The segment constituted protected opinion and commentary on a matter of public interest, without advocating hatred or inciting harm.

5.2. Accordingly, it is submitted that the complaint should not be upheld."

[4] **The Complainant replied as follows:**

Im writing this email in response to Siya Media Network's response to my complaint that I wrote to the Bccsa in relation to the Zimoja's 5 February 2026 episode.

The strong views that were expressed by the Zimoja Dail host include the false representation of the objective of the South African Human Rights Commission , that is " The South African Human Rights Commission is the chapter nine institution and their job is to enforce the law and the rights that favours the South African people". This is not true because as I quoted in my from the Department of Justice and Constitutional Development in my original complaint , the South African Human Rights Commission is committed to promote respect for, observance of and protection of human rights for everyone without fear or favour. Misrepresenting the functions of an important chapter 9 institution's objective and making it exclusive to the South African citizens , does not constitute a legitimate public policy debate. The host futher asked " Do you remember people in the townships chasing away illegal foreign nationals in hospitals and clinics? Huh? Here is Dr Martin. Listen to what he says. ". She subsequently posted a clip on Dr Martin wherein he says "It is unlawful to prevent anyone , either documented or undocumented , from accessing health care. Every child , whether documented or undocumented , have the right to access education. They have the right to access to health care". The host subsequently says " Did you hear him? This man does not care about the rights of South Africans, do you hear me ?". In *Kopanang Africa Against Xenophobia and others v Operation Dudula and Others (2023/044685) [2025] ZAGPJHC 1102 (paragraph 137(1))* the court held that " It be and is hereby declared that only an immigration officer has the power in terms of the Immigration Act 13 of 2002 to demand that another private person produce his / her passport or other identity documents to demonstrate her / his right to be in the Republic of South Africa and that no person has the power to do so unless expressly so authorised by the law". The court in the Kopanang case(paragraph 137 (3)(c)) also restrained and interdicted Operation Dudula , Zandile Dabula and Dan Radebe from interfering with the access that foreign nationals have to health care services , and or their rights to access health care. In terms of the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, 1996 , section 2 " This Constitution is the supreme law of the Republic; law or conduct inconsistent with it is invalid , and the obligations imposed by it must be fulfilled. The hosts concludes that the ethnic Ugandan Dr Martin does not care about the rights of South African citizens , after playing a clip of him stating everyone's constitutional rights ,in response to illegal foreign nationals being removed from health care institutions. How is a legitimate public policy debate concerning the appointments to key constitutional institutions and the allocation of taxpayer funds constituted , if it makes no reference to the Constitution , case law or correctly states the objectives of chapter 9 institutions. It is important to remeber that South Africa is a constitutional democracy and all conduct and law that is in consistant with it is invalid. Regardless of the nationality of the Head Researcher the Constitutional of the Republic of South Africa will remain and it will be supreme . Even a South African citizen will be mandated to abide by the law and even the South African Human Rights Commission's objectives will include everyone , not just South African Citizens.

The broadcast concluded from Dr Martin stating the rights enshrined in the Constitution of the Republic ,that he did not care for the rights of South Africans and even concluded that it is not

known who rights he is focused on . I quote her words " This man does not care about the rights of South Africans, do you hear me?". As also she stated " Whose rights is he focused on ? Exactly! It is not known". The broadcast reflected the host's conclusion on DR Martin and his stance on the rights of South Africans.

The 5 February 2026 episode of Zimoja Daily did contravene code or section 10.3 of the BCCSA's code of conduct for subscription broadcasting service licensee , because the show knowingly broadcasted material which , judged within context adocated hatred that is based Dr Martin's ethnicity and which constitutes incitemnet to cause harm. The host incorrectly states that the SAHRC's job is to enforce the law and the rights that favours the South African people. She follows up the statement by asking how we are trusting a Ugandan to do such a job. In no way can this be dismissed as just a rhetorical question. This centers an ethnic Ugandan national's capabilities to fulfill what's demand from his role as the SAHRC head research aside and places his ethnicity as the reason , he must suspiciously be trusted to "enforce the law and rights that favours the South African people" . The host further concluded that Dr Martin does not care about the rights of the south african citizens , after he said " It is unlawful to prevent anyone, either documented or undocumented , from accessing healthcare. Dr Martin also mentioned rights that are enshrined in the constitution. The host also said it is unknown whose rights Dr Martin is focused on . The broadcast advocated for hatred based on ethnicity of Dr Martin as an ethnic Ugandan , because he is not enforcing the " the law and the rights that favours the South African people" as said by the host , in relation to what job the SAHRC is supposed to do. This is further seen by the host saying he does not care about the rights South Africans, after he highlighted the unlawfulness of preventing documented or undocumented people from accessing health care facilities and the other constitutional rights of everyone. Haterd of the ethnic Ugandan is further fueled by the host stating that " Dr Martin is earning one million South African rands every single year with your tax funds". Love is not spread by stating that an ethnic Ugandan is earning South African tax payer money , when he does not care about the rights of South African citizens and it is not known whose rights is Dr Martin focused on . The expression of frustration " South Africa is in trouble " is the flowers and it is rooted in the host advocating for hatred based on ethnicity in relation to Dr Martin, his higlighting of the rights enshrined in the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa and the host's incorrect belief by that SAHRC's job is to enforce the law and the rights that favours the South African people.

In terms of section 16(2)(c) of the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, 1996 " The right in subsection (1) does not extend to advocacy of hatred that is based on race , ethnicity , gender or religion , and that constitutes inciteman to cause harm". The South African Constitutional framework does not offer unlimited protection to freedom of expression. My complaint should accordingly be upheld.

Bibilography

Constitution of the Republic of South Africa,1996

Kopanang Africa Against Xenophobia and others v Operation Dudula and Others (2023/044685) [2025] ZAGPJHC 1102"

EVALUATION

[5] I have considered the complaint, the broadcaster's response and the complainant's reply. I have also had regard to the contextual information concerning the nature and purpose of Zimoja Daily, the mandate of the SAHRC as

set out in section 184 of the Constitution¹, and the relevant case law, *including Kopanang Africa Against Xenophobia and Others v Operation Dudula and Others*².

- [6] Clause 10.3 deals with advocating war, violence or hatred based on inter alia ethnicity. As was confirmed in *Polakow v Radio Islam*³, this clause requires that both elements mentioned must be complied with. That is, the material must advocate hatred based on race, ethnicity, gender or religion, and it must constitute incitement to cause harm. I deal with each in turn.
- [7] On the first element, I find that the impugned segment advocated hatred based on ethnicity. The host singled out Dr Nsibirwa by name, showed his photograph, mentioned his Ugandan nationality, framed his ethnicity as a reason to distrust his fitness for his role, attributed to him a disregard for South African citizens' rights, and invited viewers to question whose interests he serves, all while noting that he earns approximately one million rands of taxpayer money annually. These statements, read cumulatively and within their full context, do not amount to commentary on an institutional appointment policy. They construct a narrative in which an ethnic outsider is portrayed as an adversary of South African citizens, which constitutes advocacy of hatred based on ethnicity within the meaning of Clause 10.3.
- [8] On the second element, incitement to cause harm, I have regard to the full context of the segment. The host herself invoked the memory of "people in the townships chasing away illegal foreign nationals in hospitals and clinics" immediately before presenting Dr Nsibirwa's clip. This reference to a well-documented pattern of xenophobic violence in South African healthcare settings, followed directly by the presentation of a named ethnic Ugandan official as someone who does not care about South Africans' rights and whose appointment

1 Act 108 of 1996

2 (2023/044685) [2025] ZAGPJHC 1102 (4 November 2025)

3 (28/A/2023)

is suspicious, creates an association that is, judged within context, reasonably capable of inciting harm against Dr Nsibirwa personally. The presenter's disclaimer that the commentary "has nothing to do with xenophobia" does not neutralise this effect; if anything, it draws attention to the very association it purports to disavow. I am satisfied that the second element of Clause 10.3 is also met.

- [9] The broadcaster submits that Zimoja Daily is an opinion-based commentary programme and that the impugned segment constitutes a *bona fide* opinion on a matter of public interest, protected by the exemption in Clause 11.3 of the Subscription Code. I accept that the appointment of senior officials at Chapter 9 constitutional institutions, and the allocation of public funds in that regard, are matters capable of forming the subject of legitimate public opinion and debate. However, Clause 11.3 requires not merely that the subject matter be one of public interest, but that the opinion expressed be *bona fide*. For reasons set out below, I am not persuaded that this requirement is met in the present case.
- [10] The presenter stated that the SAHRC's function is "to enforce the law and the rights that favour the South African people," and on this basis questioned how a Ugandan national could be trusted to perform that role. This characterisation of the SAHRC's mandate is factually incorrect. Section 184 of the Constitution establishes the SAHRC as an institution committed to the promotion, protection and attainment of human rights for everyone, without qualification as to nationality or citizenship. An opinion built upon a materially false factual premise, and presented to viewers as fact, cannot, in my view, qualify as *bona fide* for purposes of Clause 11.3.
- [11] The position is materially compounded by the misattribution of words to Dr Nsibirwa. The segment featured two separate yet edited clips from two different speakers. Dr Nsibirwa's clip contained a statistical breakdown of SAHRC complaints data only; he made no statement about the rights of documented or

undocumented persons. It was Prof Tshepo Madlingozi who stated that it is unlawful to prevent anyone, documented or undocumented, from accessing healthcare. The condemnation of Dr Nsibirwa's character and professional orientation was thus founded on words he never uttered. The facts on which the presenter's comments are supposedly based are not truly stated. Whether this misattribution was deliberate or reckless, it defeats any claim that the opinion expressed was *bona fide*.

- [12] The Clause 11.3 exemption is accordingly not available. A comment that rests on a false factual premise, attributes to a named individual words he did not speak, invokes the spectre of xenophobic violence directed at him, and presents ethnicity as the basis for institutional distrust cannot be characterised as a *bona fide* opinion on a matter of public interest.

[13] **The complaint is upheld. The Broadcaster contravened Clause 10.3 of the BCCSA Code of Conduct for Subscription Broadcasting Service Licensees.**

- [14] The Broadcaster and the Complainant were each invited to respectively make submissions in mitigation and aggravation of a sanction:

Complainant: "I submit that the bccsa should sanction multichoice channel 157 by reprimanding them as Zimoja or they have contravened clause 10.3 of the BCCSA Code of Conduct for Subscription Broadcasting Service Licensees.

Amongst other things the BCCSA should also direct Zimoja or Moja love to make a correction of the findings of Tribunal be broadcasted by the respondent in such a manner as maybe determined by the Adjudicator by broadcasting a segment where they make corrections of their original broadcast. So **that the** audience which saw the original broadcast, can be informed of the objectives of the SAHRC as defined by section 184 of the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, 1996. They can also correct, the misattribution of words to Dr Martin Nsibirwa, and properly inform the audience that " The segment featured two separate yet edited clips from two different speakers". They can point out that it was Prof Tsepo Madlingozi who spoke of the rights of the documented and undocumented people's right to access Healthcare services. The original broadcast was repeated throughout the day that it was aired on Five February 2026. It's only fair that a broadcast of correction is broadcasted to correct Zimoja's contravention 10.3 of the bccsa code of Conduct for Subscription Broadcasting Service Licensees."

The Broadcaster: “SUBMISSIONS IN MITIGATION ON SANCTION

IN THE MATTER BEFORE THE Broadcasting Complaints Commission of South Africa

Broadcaster: MultiChoice (Pty) Ltd

Channel: Moja Love Channel 157

Programme: Zimoja Daily

Broadcast Date: 5 February 2026

Finding: Contravention of Clause 10.3 of the Code

Adjudicator: Adv. RT Makoanyana

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1. The Channel notes the ruling of the Adjudicator that the broadcast of Zimoja Daily on 5 February 2026 contravened Clause 10.3 of the Code of Conduct for Subscription Broadcasting Service Licensees.
- 1.2. These submissions are made in mitigation of sanction and without repeating the arguments previously made on the merits.

2. NATURE OF THE BROADCAST AND ABSENCE OF INTENT

- 2.1. The impugned segment formed part of an opinion-based current affairs programme which permits robust commentary on matters of public interest, including public institutions, constitutional rights, and issues relating to immigration and the allocation of public resources.
- 2.2. The Channel submits that there was no intention to advocate hatred or to incite harm against any individual or group.
- 2.3. The content was produced within a format that allows strong personal viewpoints and rhetorical questioning.
- 2.4. The Channel notes the finding that the threshold in Clause 10.3 was crossed but submits that this occurred without malice and without any deliberate attempt to promote hostility or violence.

3. ISOLATED INCIDENT

- 3.1. The Channel produces a substantial volume of local programming across multiple formats and genres.
- 3.2. Findings of contraventions of Clause 10.3 are not characteristic of the Channel's general editorial standards.
- 3.3. The present matter should therefore be regarded as an isolated incident rather than evidence of a pattern of non-compliance.

4. STEPS TAKEN BY THE CHANNEL

- 4.1. Following the complaint and the ruling, the Channel engaged internally with the production team responsible for the programme.
- 4.2. Editorial oversight measures have been reinforced, particularly in relation to the following:
 - 4.2.1. commentary involving nationality, ethnicity or immigration;
 - 4.2.2. verification of factual statements in opinion-based programming;
 - 4.2.3. avoiding content that may reasonably be interpreted as encouraging hostility or harm.

- 4.3. These steps demonstrate the Channel's good faith and commitment to compliance with the Code.

5. APOLOGY

- 5.1. Without derogating from the submissions previously made on the merits, the Channel regrets that the broadcast was found to have contravened Clause 10.3 of the Code.
- 5.2. The Channel apologises to affected parties who may have been offended by the content of the segment.
- 5.3. The Channel confirms that it does not condone xenophobia, discrimination, or hatred based on nationality or ethnicity.
- 5.4. The Channel remains committed to broadcasting in a manner consistent with the Constitution and the Code.

6. PROPORTIONALITY OF SANCTION

- 6.1. The Commission has a range of sanctions available, including reprimand, broadcast of a summary of the ruling, broadcast of a response, apology, or the imposition of a fine.
- 6.2. The Channel respectfully submits that a monetary penalty would be disproportionate in the circumstances, having regard to the following:
 - 6.2.1. the absence of intent to incite harm;
 - 6.2.2. the opinion-based nature of the programme;
 - 6.2.3. the fact that the contravention arose in the course of commentary on a matter of public interest;
 - 6.2.4. the remedial steps taken by the Channel;
 - 6.2.5. the apology tendered above; the absence of repeated violations of a similar nature.
- 6.3. The Channel submits that, should the Commission deem a sanction necessary, an order directing the broadcast of an apology or correction would be sufficient to meet the purposes of the Code.
- 6.4. The Channel reiterates its respect for the authority of the Commission and its commitment to the standards set out in the Code.
- 6.5. In the circumstances, the Channel respectfully requests that the Commission impose the least severe sanction it considers appropriate, alternatively a reprimand or directive short of a monetary fine."

[16] SANCTION

I have considered the submissions of both parties on sanction. The Complainant requests a formal reprimand and an order directing the broadcast of a correction, so that the audience which viewed the original broadcast may be informed of the true objectives of the SAHRC as defined by section 184 of the Constitution, be made aware of the misattribution of words to Dr Nsibirwa, and be informed that the segment featured two separate yet edited clips from two different speakers,

including that it was Prof Tsepo Madlingozi who spoke of the rights of documented and undocumented persons to access healthcare.

[17] The contravention established in this matter is serious. The broadcast combined a materially false characterisation of a constitutional institution's mandate, the misattribution of words to a named individual on the basis of his ethnic identity, and an implicit invocation of prior xenophobic violence. These elements, taken together, are not merely editorial shortcomings.

[18] A formal reprimand combined with a corrective statement is warranted to mark the contravention of clause 10.3 of the Code.

[19] The Broadcaster is hereby reprimanded for contravening Clause 10.3 of the BCCSA Code of Conduct for Subscription Broadcasting Service Licensees, and is further directed to broadcast a corrective statement on Zimoja Daily on Moja Love (Channel 157) within two (2) days of the date of this adjudication, during a time slot equivalent to or comparable to that of the original broadcast on 5 February 2026, so as to reach substantially the same audience.

[20] **The corrective broadcast shall be in the following terms:**

The Broadcasting Complaints Commission of South Africa found that the presenter's allegations regarding the SAHRC and Dr Martin Nsibirwa, the Head of Research at the South African Human Rights Commission on the Zimoja Daily broadcast on 5 February 2026, constituted a contravention of Clause 10.3 of the BCCSA Code of Conduct for Subscription Broadcasting Service Licensees. The allegations, when judged within context, advocated hatred based on ethnicity which constituted incitement to cause harm. Moja Love does not condone advocacy of hatred based on nationality or ethnicity. We apologise for any unintended harm this broadcast may have caused

[21] Prior to the broadcast of the correction, the Broadcaster is directed to notify the Registrar of the BCCSA in writing of the date and time at which the corrective broadcast will be aired, so that the Registrar may in turn inform the Complainant,

who may wish to view it. The Broadcaster is further directed to submit a recording of the corrective broadcast to the BCCSA within twenty-four (24) hours of the date of its broadcast, as proof of compliance.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'ADV RT Makoanyana', written in a stylized, cursive manner.

ADV RT MAKOANYANA
COMMISSIONER: BROADCASTING COMPLAINTS COMMISSION
ADJUDICATION DATE: 07 APRIL 2026