

## **Section 2 Definitions does not define the terms “false” or “misleading”**

I strongly recommend the words “false” and “misleading” be included in Section 2 and defined to:

- Give them a meaning which is consistent with everyday expectations
- Make it clear who (person, body, institution or other body) can determine whether or not information is “false or misleading”
- Impose the obligation on the those who may classify the information as “false or misleading” to provide the content creator with the justification for the classification
- provide a mechanism by which the creators of the information may challenge the classification.
- Provide a mechanism to allow periodic review and reclassification to recognise that information may at an initial point be classified as “false or misleading” but subsequent events or further information may provide that initial classification to be incorrect.

## **Section 2 Definitions defines “excluded content”**

### **Section 6 defines Excluded services for misinformation purposes**

It is unclear if “excluded content” (which is acceptable under the proposed Act) is still acceptable under the proposed Act if it appears on a “service” which is classified as a “non excluded” service in section 6.

I strongly recommend a wording amendment to make it clear that “Excluded Content” is always excluded and will remain excluded under the proposed Act regardless of the “Service” or “Medium” on which it is made visible or promulgated.