

COMPLAINT NUMBER	17/048
COMPLAINANT	P Rea
ADVERTISER	Vodafone NZ Ltd
ADVERTISEMENT	Vodafone NZ Ltd, Website
DATE OF MEETING	22 February 2017
OUTCOME	Settled

Advertisement: The advertisement on the website www.vodafone.co.nz promoted an iPhone 7 from \$399 upfront, on a \$99.99 Red+ Essentials, 24 month term plan.

Complainant P Rea said: “Just writing to highlight some very misleading information on Vodafone that I found when trying to purchase a new phone.

I wanted to resign for another 24 months on a \$99 red plan and get the iPhone 7... so selected it as such- and all good so far see below screenshots from both your mobile and website. It clearly shows from \$399 on my selected specific plan (\$99.00 Red + Essentials).

So I've then proceeded to next step– still shows \$800 discount and a monthly cost of \$99 but its now changed plan to the Red + plan which costs \$129 yet clearly shows monthly cost of \$99?

Now I totally accept advertising a phone with terms saying “starting at / or from a certain price” However when you select a specific priced plan and it confirms you've selected a plan costing \$XX and the phone will cost \$XXX only to then try to charge \$200 more!!! when actually purchasing seems quite deliberately misleading and potentially a way of catching out people.?”

The Chair ruled the complaint was Settled.

The relevant provisions were Code of Ethics, Basic Principle 4, Rule 2.

The Advertiser, Vodafone, said, in part:

Vodafone is very sorry to hear of the difficulties P Rea has experienced in attempting to purchase a new phone. They contacted us on the Friday 3 February 2017 by email to notify us of the issue. On receipt of this complaint, a member of our Customer Care team contacted P Rea by phone, made note of the online error and processed the order as requested. P Rea submitted this complaint to the ASA the following day on Saturday 4 February 2017.

We understand that, at a later stage of the online order process, our website's "Product Detail" page included reference to a higher value plan than the one P Rea had originally selected. Although the 'default' plan description was incorrect, we can confirm that if P Rea had proceeded to checkout, they would have been charged for the selected \$99.99 per month plan.

We have investigated the matter fully and can confirm that P Rea's experience was the result of a technical website error. We have now rectified the issue and removed all reference to the default plan.

The Chair noted that the Advertiser had investigated the complaint, identified the problem with the website, had resolved the issue and taken steps to ensure it does not occur again.

Noting the self-regulatory actions of the Advertiser, the Chair said it served no further purpose to place the matter before the Complaints Board for consideration and she ruled the matter was Settled.

Chair's Ruling: Complaint **Settled**