

<b>COMPLAINT NUMBER</b>	21/532
<b>ADVERTISER</b>	Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet
<b>ADVERTISEMENT</b>	Unite Against COVID-19, YouTube video
<b>DATE OF MEETING</b>	29 November 2021
<b>OUTCOME</b>	No Grounds to Proceed

**Advertisement:** The Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet video on YouTube is part of the NZ vaccine facts series and is titled, 'Are vaccines safe?'. It shows a cartoon family travelling to the beach, likening their fast route to the quick development of the COVID-19 vaccine. The video shows a map of a direct route to convey how the testing was "streamlined". The video ends with the family at the beach.

**The Chair ruled there were no grounds for the complaint to proceed.**

**Complaint [summarised]:** The Complainant is concerned that statements made by the Advertiser about the safety and efficacy of the vaccine are false and unsubstantiated. The Complainant states that "[n]one of those claims are made by the manufacturer". The manufacturer highlights "missing information" which point to unknown safety risks, therefore the Complainant believes that it is "grossly irresponsible to claim these inoculations are "safe"". The Complainant also states that this messaging is "fuelling an environment of hostility, contempt, abuse, and ridicule against uninoculated persons" by "relentlessly insinuating that uninoculated persons are a source of disease... are a threat to public and personal health and safety... are selfish, irresponsible..." etc.

**The relevant provisions were Advertising Standards Code – Principle 1, Rule 1(c), Principle 2, Rule 2(b), Rule 2(e).**

**Principle 1: Social Responsibility:** Advertisements must be prepared and placed with a due sense of social responsibility to consumers and to society.

**Rule 1(c) Decency and Offensiveness:** Advertisements must not contain anything that is indecent, or exploitative, or degrading, or likely to cause harm, or serious or widespread offence, or give rise to hostility, contempt, abuse or ridicule.

**Principle 2: Truthful Presentation:** Advertisements must be truthful, balanced and not misleading.

**Rule 2(b) Truthful Presentation:** Advertisements must not mislead or be likely to mislead, deceive or confuse consumers, abuse their trust or exploit their lack of knowledge. This includes by implication, inaccuracy, ambiguity, exaggeration, unrealistic claim, omission, false representation or otherwise. Obvious hyperbole identifiable as such is not considered to be misleading.

**Rule 2(e) Advocacy advertising:** Advocacy advertising must clearly state the identity and position of the advertiser. Opinion in support of the advertiser's position

must be clearly distinguishable from factual information. Factual information must be able to be substantiated.

### **About Advocacy Advertising under the Advertising Standards Code**

The Chair confirmed the advertisement from the New Zealand Government on matters relating to the COVID-19 vaccination programme was advocacy advertising under the Advertising Standards Code.

Complaints about advocacy advertising are considered differently to complaints about advertising for products and services.

In assessing whether an advocacy advertisement complies with the Advertising Standards Code, the freedom of expression provisions under the Bill of Rights Act 1990 must also be considered.

Section 14 of the Act says: “Everyone has the right to freedom of expression, including the freedom to seek, receive, and impart information and opinions of any kind in any form.” This freedom of expression supports robust debate on current issues in a democracy.

The Chair observed that in a free and democratic society, issues should be openly debated without undue hindrance or interference from authorities such as the Advertising Standards Authority (ASA), and it should not unduly restrict the Government’s role in communicating public health information to the public.

Complainants sometimes ask the ASA to in effect decide which side in an advocacy debate is correct, but the Advertising Standards Complaints Board has consistently declined to have a view. The ASA is not an arbiter of scientific fact. The Complaints Board’s only role is to determine whether there has been a breach of the ASA Codes taking into account the Advocacy Principles. In the first instance the Chair’s role is to decide if there are any grounds for the complaint to proceed.

Under Rule 2(e) Advocacy advertising in the Advertising Standards Code:

- The identity of the advertiser must be clear
- Opinion must be clearly distinguishable from factual information, and
- Factual information must be able to be substantiated.

If the identity and position of the Advertiser is clear, a more liberal interpretation of the Advertising Standards Code is allowed.

### **Application of the identity requirements of the Advertising Standards Code**

The Chair confirmed the Advertiser’s identity was clear. The advertisement included logos for the New Zealand Government and the Unite against COVID-19 campaign seen throughout the pandemic response. The position of the Advertiser was also clear. The advertisement promotes the vaccine rollout by providing information on the safety and development of the vaccine. The Chair said the advertisement complied with the identity requirements of Rule 2(e) of the Advertising Standards Code.

The Chair noted the advertisement was from the New Zealand Government. The Chair confirmed the agencies supporting the Government’s COVID-19 approach included the Department for the Prime Minister and Cabinet. The role and jurisdiction of the ASA in advertising from expert bodies was addressed in *Electoral Commission v Cameron* [1997] 2 NZLR 421. In accordance with the findings of the Court of Appeal, the Advertising Standards Authority was required to “tread carefully” and ensure that it did not substitute its opinion for that of the expert body.

### **Application of the Advertising Standards Code to this advocacy advertisement**

In reviewing the complaint about this advertisement, the Chair took into account the role of advocacy advertising, the liberal interpretation of the Codes required by the [Advocacy Principles](#), the application of *Cameron*, the likely consumer takeout, and the context for the advertising; the New Zealand Government's response to the COVID-19 pandemic with an audience of all New Zealanders. The Chair also noted the large amount of information available from a variety of sources about COVID-19, including the Government, the science community, news media and interest groups.

**The Chair** acknowledged that the Complainant was concerned that the advertisement makes unsubstantiated claims about the safety and efficacy of the vaccine and fuels discrimination towards unvaccinated people.

The Chair examined the relevant claims in the advertisement:

- “Speeding up the vaccine’s development doesn’t mean that important steps have been missed, it just means the way the vaccines are tested has been streamlined, while still meeting strict safety and quality standards”;
- “Even though they’re available at a much faster rate than usual, the vaccines have been thoroughly assessed for safety and effectiveness by our own Medsafe experts”;
- “Evidence shows that if you get a double dose, you’re far less likely to get seriously sick and pass the virus on to others”.

The Chair considered the Complainant’s concern that the claims about the safety of the vaccine were unsupported by the vaccine’s manufacturer, Pfizer. The Complainant states that the vaccine has only been given provisional consent by the Government due to the missing safety information, such as long-term safety data.

The Chair stated the safety and efficacy of the vaccine itself and the approval process followed by the Government regulator is not a matter the ASA can adjudicate on. She noted the [Datashheet](#), which provides relevant information about the vaccine, was available on the Medsafe website, in addition to information about [Medsafe’s approval process](#) and [approval of COVID-19 vaccines](#).

The Chair then turned to the Complainant’s concern that the advertisement encourages hostility and discrimination towards unvaccinated people. Rule 1(c) of the Advertising Standards Code required the Chair to consider whether the advertisement was likely to cause serious or widespread offence in light of generally prevailing community standards. The Chair examined the advertisement and noted that there were no direct references to vaccinated or unvaccinated people. She said that the advertisement contained statements about the timeframe for the vaccine’s development and its safety, in order to support the vaccine rollout. She did not consider the advertisement made statements to provoke hostility, contempt, abuse or ridicule towards unvaccinated people.

The Chair said the advertisement had been prepared with the due sense of social responsibility and was not in breach of Principle 1, Rule 1(c) Principle 2, Rule 2(b) or Rule 2(e) of the Advertising Standards Code.

The Chair ruled there were no grounds for the complaint to proceed.

**Chair’s Ruling:** Complaint **No Grounds to Proceed**

**APPEAL INFORMATION**

According to the procedures of the Advertising Standards Complaints Board, all decisions are able to be appealed by any party to the complaint. Information on our Appeal process is on our website [www.asa.co.nz](http://www.asa.co.nz). Appeals must be made in writing with notification of the intent to appeal lodged within 14 calendar days of receipt of the written decision. The substantive appeal application must be lodged with the ASA within 21 calendar days of receipt of the written decision.