

<b>COMPLAINT NUMBER</b>	17/142
<b>COMPLAINANT</b>	R McDonald
<b>ADVERTISER</b>	Tourism New Zealand
<b>ADVERTISEMENT</b>	Tourism New Zealand Digital Marketing
<b>DATE OF MEETING</b>	8 May 2017
<b>OUTCOME</b>	No Grounds to Proceed

**Advertisement:** The Tourism NZ website, [www.newzealand.com](http://www.newzealand.com), "100% Pure New Zealand" to promote New Zealand as a tourist destination. The website contains information and associated imagery that showcases the landscape and activities of New Zealand.

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

**Complainant, R McDonald, said:** Claims that New Zealand is "100% PURE", which according to all recent research is patently untrue and is therefore false advertising.

**The relevant provisions were Code of Ethics - Basic Principle 4, Rule 2; Code for Environmental Claims - Principle 1, Principle 2.**

**The Chair** noted the Complainant's concern that the "100% Pure New Zealand" is misleading, in light of recent research.

In considering the issue raised by the Complainant regarding the 100% pure slogan, the Chair referred to a precedent ruling - Decision 13/100. That decision considered the same advertising campaign and was Not Upheld by the Complaints Board.

That decision said in part:

"...The Complaints Board said there were no environmental claims made about the environments shown in the advertisements, nor did the advertisements imply that the environments featured were 100% pure but rather these were the scenes and places that were part of the unique New Zealand visitor experience. In the absence of an environmental statement or promise about New Zealand's environmental purity in the advertisements, the Complaints Board ruled the Code for Environmental Claims was not applicable to the complaint before it. Therefore, the Complaints Board agreed the complaint would only be considered under the Code of Ethics.

After confirming the websites were advertisements, the Complaints Board disagreed with the Complainant's interpretation of the advertisement that the 100% Pure New Zealand brand was "inextricably bound to environmental factors.

When considering whether the use of the expression "100% Pure New Zealand" was misleading, the Complaints Board was of the view that, in the context of promoting New Zealand as a tourist destination, the descriptor "pure" was interchangeable with the word "unique" insofar as the landscape and New Zealand experience could only be found New Zealand. Therefore, the Complaints Board considered the expression "100% Pure New

Zealand” to be a positioning statement used by the Advertiser to promote the unique experience New Zealand offered international tourists rather than an absolute claim about New Zealand’s environmental purity or implying New Zealand’s environment was 100% pure.

The Complaints Board found that the advertisements did not deceive or mislead the consumer about the unique experiences available in New Zealand and as such, had been prepared with a due sense of social responsibility required to consumers and to society...”

The Chair confirmed that this decision applied to the complaint before her and ruled the advertisement was not misleading. It had been prepared with a high standard of social responsibility to consumers and there was no apparent breach of the Code of Ethics.

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

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