

<b>COMPLAINT NUMBER</b>	17/449
<b>COMPLAINANT</b>	P Hanlon
<b>ADVERTISER</b>	Trivago New Zealand
<b>ADVERTISEMENT</b>	Trivago, New Zealand, Television
<b>DATE OF MEETING</b>	18 December 2017
<b>OUTCOME</b>	No Grounds to Proceed

**Advertisement:** The television advertisement for the Trivago hotel search site shows a woman walking along an oversized map and said in part... “on a lot of websites you can only see results for the exact location you search for. Well Trivago does it differently. On Trivago you can simply use the map – explore the whole area and as you move along, Trivago keeps showing you all the hotels that match your search criteria. And that’s one more way Trivago helps you find your ideal hotel for the best price.”

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

**Complainant, P Hanlon, said:** Trivago are stating that they list all accommodation and you can explore their site to ascertain exact locations.

The facts are:

Their NZ geographical knowledge is not up to scratch as they are listing properties for accommodation in the wrong towns and in some cases the wrong island.

Trivago are on their website listing properties without the owner’s consent.

This is very harmful to the tourism industry as it is leaving travellers with no accommodation. We know as we have had several bookings for rooms at our property from travellers who have used Trivago and think we are in Queenstown when in fact we are located in Takapau Central Hawkes Bay.

**The relevant provisions were Code of Ethics - Basic Principle 4, Rule 2;**

**The Chair** noted the Complainant’s concern that the Advertiser’s website was identifying incorrect geographical locations when visitors to the site were using the map function to search for hotels.

The Chair confirmed that the role of the Complaints Board was to consider the likely consumer takeout of the advertisement and concerns relating to the functionality of Advertiser’s website technology were outside its jurisdiction.

The Chair said the advertisement before her was not intentionally misleading consumers and was not in breach of Rule 2 of the Code of Ethics and had been prepared with a due sense of social responsibility to consumers and society required by Basic Principle 4 of the Code of Ethics. Accordingly, the Chair ruled the complaint had no grounds to proceed.

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