



Ad Standards Community Panel
PO Box 5110, Braddon ACT 2612
P (02) 6173 1500 | F (02) 6262 9833

AdStandards.com.au

Ad Standards Limited
ACN 084 452 666

Case Report

1. Case Number :	0159-20
2. Advertiser :	Bali Body Co
3. Product :	Toiletries
4. Type of Advertisement/Media :	Internet - Social - Instagram
5. Date of Determination	13-May-2020
6. DETERMINATION :	Dismissed

ISSUES RAISED

AANA Code of Ethics\2.7 Distinguishable advertising

DESCRIPTION OF ADVERTISEMENT

This Instagram advertisement contains two posts.

Image one depicts a woman in a black sports bra and black tracksuit pants taking her photo in a mirror. The product is visible in the lower left corner. The caption is "Bye summer 🌞🌞 got my fav fav @balibody ultra dark tan to keep me glowy and golden 🌟"

Image two depicts a woman in a white top holding a bottled product. The caption is "🌸🌸 sending virtual hugs to you all, I hope you are all staying safe 🤍 times like these calls for a little bit of extra self care at home - I've got my favourite @balibody face tan to keep me feeling glowy ✨"

THE COMPLAINT

A sample of comments which the complainant/s made regarding this advertisement included the following:

The content is in breach of the newly introduced provisions under clause 2.7 of the AANA Code of Ethics which states Advertising or Marketing Communication must be clearly distinguishable as such to the relevant audience.

The conduct is misleading and deceptive to followers of this advertiser/influencer on the basis that the posts do not clearly present themselves as paid sponsorships or advertisements, rather the posts attempt to portray genuine and authentic endorsement of the products by the advertiser. This is even more relevant in the context of the target audience / following of this advertiser on the basis that they are



a particularly young demographic who are impressionable, susceptible to influence to a higher degree and are less likely to possess the requisite analytical / critical skills to discern advertised posts where such advertisement is not made clear to them. In the interests of making advertising clearly distinguishable to this particularly young and impressionable audience and to avoid undue influence being exerted over a vulnerable target audience, there should not be any doubt as to whether these sponsored posts by advertisers / influencers (in contravention of clause 2.7 of the Code) are in fact sponsored, which is clearly the case in respect of this advertiser.

THE ADVERTISER'S RESPONSE

Comments which the advertiser made in response to the complainant/s regarding this advertisement include the following:

Advertiser did not provide a response.

THE DETERMINATION

The Ad Standards Community Panel (the Panel) considered whether this advertisement breaches Section 2 of the AANA Code of Ethics (the Code).

The Panel noted the complainant's concerns that the advertisement is not clearly distinguishable as such to the relevant young audience.

The Panel viewed the advertisement and noted the advertiser did not provide a response.

The Panel considered whether the advertisement complied with Section 2.7 of the Code which requires that "Advertising or Marketing Communications shall be clearly distinguishable as such to the relevant audience."

The Panel noted that it must consider two matters:

- Does the material constitute an 'advertising or marketing communication', and if so
- Is the advertising material clearly distinguishable as such to the relevant audience?

With respect to the first question, the Panel noted the definition of advertising in the Code means:

"any material which is published or broadcast using any Medium or any activity which is undertaken by, or on behalf of an advertiser or marketer,

- over which the advertiser or marketer has a reasonable degree of control, and
- that draws the attention of the public in a manner calculated to promote or oppose directly or indirectly a product, service, person, organisation or line of conduct".



With regards to whether or not the post was promoting a product, the Panel considered that the clear placement of the product in the advertisement and the tagging of the brand in the caption did amount to material which would draw the attention of the public in a manner designed to promote the brand.

The Panel then considered whether the material was published 'on behalf of an advertiser; and whether the advertiser 'had a reasonable degree of control' over the published material.

The Panel noted that the advertiser had not provided a response and it was not known what kind of arrangement existed between Ms Batzloff and the brand. The Panel noted that in case 0160-20 it had considered other posts by Ms Batzloff, and in this case the advertiser had acknowledged a commercial arrangement between the influencer and the brand. The Panel noted that Ms Batzloff was a client of an influencer management agency and that it was reasonable to assume that this post had been created as part of a commercial agreement.

The Panel determined that the two Instagram posts did constitute an advertisement. The Panel then considered whether the advertising material was clearly distinguishable as such to the relevant audience.

The Panel noted that the Sophie Batzloff account has over 150,000 followers on Instagram, and considered that she is a recognised influencer. The Panel noted that her contact information on her page indicated that she was represented by an influencer management agency. The Panel considered that followers of the Sophie Batzloff account would recognise that as an influencer many of her posts and stories would be sponsored content.

The Panel considered that the photographs in the two posts were highly stylised and professional looking with a focus on the woman's tanned skin. The Panel noted that the product bottle had been carefully positioned so as to be visible in the posts. The Panel noted that the brand was tagged prominently in the caption for both posts. The Panel considered that the focus on the product and the inclusion of the brand tag would make it clear to the relevant audience of Sophie Batzloff followers that this was sponsored content.

In the Panel's view the advertisement was clearly distinguishable as such to the relevant audience and did not breach Section 2.7 of the Code.

Finding that the advertisement did not breach the Code on other grounds, the Panel dismissed the complaint.