

COMPLAINT NUMBER	18/250
COMPLAINANT	S Johnstone + 4 others
ADVERTISER	NZTA
ADVERTISEMENT	NZTA, Television
DATE OF MEETING	11 September 2018
OUTCOME	Not Upheld

SUMMARY

The television advertisement for the New Zealand Transport Agency has a specific goal to “significantly reduce the incidence of alcohol and drug impaired driving”. It is set at a rural shed party. When “Jonno” goes to leave the party, his friend asks: “You sweet to drive cuz?” and then turns to his other friend and says: “Imagine if Jonno kooks it on his way home?” The other friend replies “Who’d get us through Mad Micks to Boneyards?” (Boneyards is their favourite surfing spot, accessible only through Mad Mick’s property). Next there is a dream sequence where the two friends review the possible replacements for Jonno: Sebastian, Sick Frederick, Jonno’s brother, The Nek Minnit and finally Jason Gunn. Each of these possible replacements is portrayed attempting to get past Mad Mick, to get access to Boneyards, and each is unsuccessful. Once the friends realise this, they run out to where an obviously intoxicated Jonno is about to get into his car, and they take his keys off him. There is a brief shot of the three friends happily surfing together. The final shot shows Jonno walking back to the party, arm in arm with his friend.

The Complainants, S Johnstone and four others, were concerned the advertisement: promotes partying, drinking alcohol and getting drunk, shows an actor giving the fingers, shows a half-naked man standing on the bonnet of a moving car, shows an actor saying "Piss Off", portrays violence for no reason (when an actor physically slaps the face of another), has images of people fighting, shows a jeep with an offensive image of a naked bottom, farting, implies you should only stop your friends from drink driving if you can use them to your advantage and wasn't suitable viewing for children.

The Advertiser said this advertisement is a quirky piece which is designed to appeal to a hard-to-reach group, which still chooses to ignore the risks of drink driving. The advertisement uses humour and shows a realistic portrayal of the behaviour the Advertiser is hoping to change. The Advertiser said the advertisement does not encourage drunkenness or portray drinking as a glamorous activity.

The Complaints Board agreed the advertisement before it fell into the category of advocacy advertising. It noted the importance of the use of humour in portraying a situation the target audience could relate to.

The Complaints Board agreed the advertisement, in both the AO and the GXC versions, did not reach the threshold to cause serious or widespread offence or to lend support to unacceptable violent behaviour.

The Complaints Board ruled the complaint was Not Upheld.

[No further action required]

Please note this headnote does not form part of the Decision.

COMPLAINTS BOARD DECISION

The Chair directed the Complaints Board to consider the advertisement with reference to Basic Principle 4 and Rules 4, 5, 7 and 11 of the Code of Ethics. Principle 4 required the Complaints Board to consider whether the advertisement was prepared with a due sense of social responsibility to consumers and to society. Rule 4 required the Board to consider whether the advertisement contained anything which clearly offends against prevailing community standards taking into account the context, medium, audience and product. Rule 5 required the Board to consider whether it contained anything which, in the light of generally prevailing community standards, was likely to cause serious or widespread offence taking into account the context, medium, audience and product. Rule 7 required it to consider whether the advertisement lends support to unacceptable violent behaviour. Rule 11 allows for expression of opinion in advocacy advertising, provided that the expression of opinion is robust and clearly distinguishable from fact. The identity of the advertiser must be clear.

The Complaints Board ruled the complaint was Not Upheld**The Complaints**

The Complainants were concerned the advertisement: promotes partying, drinking alcohol and getting drunk, shows an actor giving the fingers, shows a half-naked man standing on the bonnet of a moving car, shows an actor saying "Piss Off", portrays violence for no reason (when an actor physically slaps the face of another), has images of people fighting, shows a jeep with an offensive image of a naked bottom, which is farting, implies you should only stop your friends from drink driving if you can use them to your advantage and wasn't suitable viewing for children.

The Advertiser's response

The Advertiser said the New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA) is funded to deliver advertising campaigns which positively influence desired user behaviour within the transport system to contribute to a reduction in road trauma.

The Advertiser said most people are aware of the risks associated with drinking and driving, however, there is a hard-to-reach group, which still chooses to ignore the risks.

The Advertiser said the target audience for this advertisement is males who are 20 – 29 years old, who predominantly live in rural and provincial parts of New Zealand, and who have developed a level of complacency towards drink-driving.

The Advertiser said this advertisement is a quirky piece which is designed to appeal to the target audience by using humour and portraying a situation they are familiar with.

The Advertiser said there are two different versions of the advertisement, the AO (Adults Only) version, which is aired after 8.30pm, and shows Mad Mick giving the three boys the fingers, while the GXC (General Except Children) version is aired pre-8.30pm and shows him pointing his fingers to his eyes in an "I'm watching you" gesture. In the AO version Mad Mick says "Piss off" to Sebastian, while in the GXC version he says "Rack off"

The Advertiser responded to the specific issues raised by the complainants with the following:

- None of the test audience that saw the advertisement said they thought it promoted drinking and drunkenness
- Mad Mick, the farm owner who does the fingers and says “piss off” in the AO version of the advertisement is not portrayed as a likeable character
- The advertisement does not encourage drunkenness in any way or portray it as glamorous or appealing
- The car bonnet The Nek Minnit stands on is not moving and the engine is not on
- Mad Mick, (the character who slaps Jonno’s brother and wrestles with Jason Gunn) is not portrayed as a likeable person. The Advertiser is not implying that his behaviour is okay or encouraging people to be like him. Instead they are using this character to appeal to the audience’s sense of humour through the hyperbolic nature of the different “gate” scenes
- The fart image on the jeep was chosen to appeal to the target audience

The Media’s response

The Media, the Commercial Approvals Bureau (CAB), said there are multiple advertisements within this campaign, and variations that have ratings according to their expected audience.

The Media said the CAB worked with the agency over a number of weeks ensuring that the contents of each version would be appropriately rated and played at the appropriate times.

The Media said none of the NZTA advertisements can play in children’s viewing time, and none of them have.

Complaints Board Discussion

The Complaints Board agreed the advertisement before it fell into the category of advocacy advertising and noted the requirements of Rule 11 of the Code of Ethics which allows for expression of opinion in advocacy advertising. The Complaints Board noted Rule 11 allowed for a more liberal interpretation of the Code provided the identity of the advertiser is clear. The Complaints Board said the identity of the Advertiser, the New Zealand Transport Agency was identified through the “Safer Journeys Together” and the New Zealand Government logos.

The Complaints Board noted the Advocacy Principles, developed by the Complaints Board in previous decisions for the application of Rule 11 were also relevant. These said:

- 1 That section 14 of the Bill of Rights Act 1990, in granting the right of freedom of expression, allows advertisers to impart information and opinions but that in exercising that right what was factual information and what was opinion, should be clearly distinguishable.
2. That the right of freedom of expression as stated in section 14 is not absolute as there could be an infringement of other people’s rights. Care should be taken to ensure that this does not occur.
3. That the Codes fetter the right granted by section 14 to ensure there is fair play between all parties on controversial issues. Therefore, in advocacy advertising and particularly on political matters the spirit of the Code is more important than technical breaches. People have the right to express their views and this right should not be unduly or unreasonably restricted by Rules.

4. That robust debate in a democratic society is to be encouraged by the media and advertisers and that the Codes should be interpreted liberally to ensure fair play by the contestants.
5. That it is essential in all advocacy advertisements that the identity of the advertiser is clear.

The Complaints Board accepted the advertisement was targeting 20–29year olds, who predominantly live in rural and provincial parts of New Zealand, and who have developed a level of complacency towards drink-driving.

The Complaints Board noted there were two versions of the advertisement, one which is AO and one which is GXC. The GXC version used “rack off”, not “piss off” and the “eyes watching you” gesture, not “the fingers”.

The Complaints Board considered the content of the five complaints and reviewed the advertisement under six different headings:

1. The overall message
2. The portrayal of partying and drunkenness
3. The use of “the fingers” and “piss off”
4. The use of violence (slapping and wrestling)
5. The half-naked man on the bonnet of the car
6. The image of farting on Sick Frederick’s jeep

The overall message

The Complaints Board agreed the consumer takeout of the advertisement was ‘Stop mates from drinking and driving’ and ‘Look out for your mates - mates can’t be replaced’.

The Complaints Board noted the importance of the use of humour in the advertisement and portraying a situation the target audience can relate to.

The Complaints Board noted that when the friends realised Jonno couldn’t be easily replaced they found the motivation to get up and stop him from driving home while intoxicated.

The portrayal of partying and drunkenness

The Complaints Board noted the Advertiser’s intention to make an advertisement that would appeal to the target audience and show a realistic setting where young people are drinking and would possibly consider drink driving. The Complaints Board agreed the portrayal of partying and drunkenness did not encourage drunkenness or portray it as glamorous or appealing, and it did not reach the threshold to cause serious or widespread offence.

The use of “the fingers” and “piss off”

The Complaints Board agreed the Mad Mick character wasn’t particularly threatening or scary, he was just a cantankerous old man and his behaviour was consistent with his personality. The Complaints Board agreed the use of “the fingers” and “piss off” did not reach the threshold to cause serious or widespread offence in the context of the advertisement.

The use of violence (slapping and wrestling)

The Complaints Board agreed the scene where Mad Mick slapped Jonno’s brother was not strictly necessary in the narrative but the execution and advocacy context meant it did not reach the threshold to lend support to unacceptable violent behaviour.

The Complaints Board noted the humour in the scene where Mad Mick wrestled with Jason Gunn. The Complaints Board acknowledged that while this sense of humour would not

appeal to all tastes, this scene did not reach the threshold to lend support to unacceptable violent behaviour.

The half-naked man (The Nek Minnit) on the bonnet of the car

The Complaints Board noted that The Nek Minnit doesn't usually wear a shirt, and the car he is standing on is stationary. The Complaints Board agreed that standing on the bonnet of a car was not ideal, but the car was not moving and the shirtless man did not reach the threshold to cause serious or widespread offence.

The image of farting on Sick Frederick's jeep

The Complaints Board agreed the use of the image of farting bottom on the side of Sick Frederick's jeep was appropriate in the overall content of the advertisement and did not reach the threshold to cause serious or widespread offence.

Overall view

The Complaints Board then looked at the advertisement as a whole, taking into account each of the above comments, in the context of advocacy advertising.

Does the advertisement contain anything which is likely to cause serious or widespread offence?

The Complaints Board agreed the advertisement, in both the AO and the GXC versions, did not reach the threshold to cause serious or widespread offence.

Does the advertisement contain anything which lends support to unacceptable violent behaviour?

The Complaints Board agreed the advertisement, in both the AO and the GXC versions, did not reach the threshold to lend support to unacceptable violent behaviour.

The Complaints Board ruled the advertisement observed a due sense of social responsibility and was not in breach of Basic Principle 4 and Rules 4, 5, 7 of the Code of Ethics.

Accordingly, the Complaints Board ruled the complaint was Not Upheld.

DESCRIPTION OF ADVERTISEMENT

The television advertisement for the New Zealand Transport Agency has a specific goal to "significantly reduce the incidence of alcohol and drug impaired driving". It is set at a rural shed party. When "Jonno" goes to leave the party, his friend asks: "You sweet to drive cous?" and then turns to his other friend and says: "Imagine if Jonno kooks it on his way home?" The other friend replies "Who'd get us through Mad Micks to Boneyards?" (Boneyards is their favourite surfing spot, accessible only through Mad Mick's property). Next there is a dream sequence where the two friends review the possible replacements for Jonno: Sebastian, Sick Frederick, Jonno's brother, The Nek Minnit and finally Jason Gunn. Each of these possible replacements is portrayed attempting to get past Mad Mick, to get access to Boneyards, and each is unsuccessful. Once the friends realise this, they run out to where an obviously intoxicated Jonno is about to get into his car, and they take his keys off him. There is a brief shot of the three friends happily surfing together. The final shot shows Jonno walking back to the party, arm in arm with his friend.

COMPLAINT FROM S JOHNSTONE

The NZ Governments Ad "Stop A Mate Driving Drunk". This advertisement has many issues : 1. Promotes partying & drinking alcohol & getting DRUNK

2. Shows actor giving the fingers to people in the car
3. Shows drunk people
4. Actor half naked standing on the bonnet of a moving car
5. Actor says "Piss Off"
6. Actor physically slaps face of another, and has images of people fighting
7. Jeep has offensive image of naked bottom, farting

Aired during daytime, when watching programs on demand - what kind of NZ society are the Government showing images on TV ? Drunk, fighting, drinking, partying, giving the fingers, offensive language, doing unsafe acts - standing on moving car bonnet. These are not appropriate images to be broadcasting, and what effect will it have on young impressionable minds, not to mention as an adult I do not want to see this kind of advertisement over and over again.

COMPLAINT FROM L CASWELL

This is in regards to the new "stop a mate driving drunk, legend" ad. These are normally on the mark but I believe the latest one actually promotes a poor message. I refer to the ad in which a mate is leaving the party planning to drive home drunk. His friends sit on the sofa and talk about what would be able to get them to their favourite surf spot if their friend dies driving drunk. Only after running through all options do they realise their friend is the only one that can access their favourite surf spot, and it is this that motivates them to take his keys from him. It comes across strongly that the friends would not have stopped their friend if they had known someone else who could take them surfing. Unlike other safety ads, this one implies that you should stop your mate only because they are useful, not because it's the right thing to do. This new ad campaign has only just begun but I have already had two people bring it up in conversation with me, and they are of the same opinion as me: the message of this ad completely misses the mark, is hard to understand, and sends a message that you should only stop your friends if you can use them to your advantage. The ad implies that if the friend who was going to drive drunk hadn't been the only person who could get them to their surf spot, the other two wouldn't have stopped him from driving.

I hope you can understand I have nothing against the other safety ads in fact I support them. But I am just one of many people that I know of who are discussing the inappropriate message being conveyed in this ad.

COMPLAINT FROM L COLLINS

This advertisement showed a man slapping another person across the face at 7pm. This is a time when children are viewing. I feel it is not suitable for viewing at this time.

COMPLAINT FROM M COE

The scene where the male driver tries to get through the gate and is slapped by the old man. This is violence for no reason. This scene needs to be deleted as the intention is to show the dilemma to get their mate to not drive drunk. Not to show violence.

COMPLAINT FROM R ALLANSON

Latest advertisement called "Dilemmas" is a very dark drunken party scene that is not suitable for young children. It has caused my 3 year old night terrors and she screams and runs from the room when it comes on at our dinner time. Can it be shifted to viewing after 8.30pm please as it is having moral impact on her.

CODES OF PRACTICE

CODE OF ETHICS

Basic Principle 4: All advertisements should be prepared with a due sense of social responsibility to consumers and to society.

Rule 5: Offensiveness - Advertisements should not contain anything which in the light of generally prevailing community standards is likely to cause serious or widespread offence taking into account the context, medium, audience and product (including services).

Rule 7: Violence - Advertisements should not contain anything which lends support to unacceptable violent behaviour.

Rule 11: Advocacy Advertising - Expression of opinion in advocacy advertising is an essential and desirable part of the functioning of a democratic society. Therefore such opinions may be robust. However, opinion should be clearly distinguishable from factual information. The identity of an advertiser in matters of public interest or political issue should be clear.

RESPONSE FROM ADVERTISER, NZTA

Thank you for your email of 10 August 2018 in which you ask for the NZ Transport Agency's response to a complaint about our drink driving advertisement *Dilemmas*.

You have indicated that the concerns of the complainant fall under four sections of the Code of Ethics:

Code of Ethics – Basic Principle 4: Social Responsibility; Rule 11: Advocacy; Rule 5: Offensiveness; and Rule 7: Violence

The NZ Transport Agency is funded to deliver advertising campaigns, on behalf of the sector, which positively influence desired user behaviour within the transport system to contribute to a reduction in road trauma. The programme is working towards the Government's Road Safety Strategy 2010 to 2020, *Safer Journeys*, which has a long term goal set out in its vision: *A safe road system increasingly free of death and serious injury*.

Drink driving is a problem on NZ roads and is a high priority for road safety in Safer Journeys, which has a specific goal to "significantly reduce the incidence of alcohol and drug impaired driving". Most people are aware of the risks associated with drinking and driving. However, there is a hard-to-reach group, often young, who still choose to ignore them. Each year, around 90 people are killed and 400 seriously injured in alcohol-related crashes. Crash and casualty numbers involving young adult (20-29 year olds) alcohol-affected drivers have remained consistent in recent years, with around 170 fatal and serious injury crashes each year.

The primary audience is young males, 20 – 29 years old, who predominantly live in rural and provincial parts of NZ. These guys have developed a level of complacency towards drink-driving – it is commonplace, habitual and acceptable. They know what the limits are and that drinking increases their chances of having a crash. They also know the likelihood of being stopped by Police, but they continue to drive after drinking, and often after drinking a lot. They've been drinking and driving for years, as their families and friends have done before them. They know how to have fun, and socialising and drinking is a big part of their lives. The benefits of driving after drinking, such as freedom of mobility or getting home to their own bed, outweigh any risks they see.

They live to get out with their mates doing the things they love - hunting, fishing, surfing etc. This ad complements our existing ad *Legends*, and plays on the insight that good mates protect their mates. Rather than targeting the drinking driver directly, this campaign targets

the driver's mates, and gets them to question their apathy toward letting their mates drive drunk.

Qualitative research that we commissioned in 2016 showed that these guys can find it awkward to face their mate with the idea that he may be too drunk to drive. While they may have attempted to intervene in the past, the stories shared were more often about their failures than their successes, e.g. *"There was a chance for me to stop him and I tried to take the keys off him, and then I gave them back to him"; "I saw my mate die in front of me, yeah that impacts me, that hit me hard, I tried to take his keys off him, I regret that I gave them back to him."* Ultimately stopping a mate from driving after drinking becomes too hard, and often very confrontational and aggressive; it's easier to give in. Our ad had to break through this barrier, and talk to the audience in a way that helped them see the benefits of stepping in and holding their ground, no matter how confrontational it gets.

Consequently this campaign aims to give these young guys a very blatant reason to feel okay about stepping in and stopping their mate from driving drunk. It acknowledges that it's never going to feel particularly easy or great, but irrespective of any awkwardness, it's worth it. Ultimately, the campaign aims to show that intervening makes them a really good mate – true mates don't let mates drive drunk.

But to develop a campaign which communicates this message in a relevant and meaningful way for this tough audience, we have to create an entertainment piece that they want to view and share. So we deliberately created a quirky piece which appeals to their sense of humour. Strong imagery and emotions are foundations of our road safety advertising, whether they be horror, grief, humour or anger, and we've found that creating memorable moments in our advertising is crucial to the success of our campaigns. This ad tries to do just that.

Our development process involves two testing rounds with the specific audience to ensure that both the concept, and then the finished product, are achieving the advertising objectives. This particular concept was chosen over the other three that were tested because it had high likeability and self-relevance scores, with the target audience saying it was the kind of ad they would listen to or watch a lot.

We tested the ad again, after production was completed, to ensure that we hadn't strayed off the mark during the development process. The respondents were rural, provincial males from Whangarei, Te Puke / Tauranga and Nelson, all aged 25-30 years of age. They spend a lot of their spare time hanging out with mates, whether drinking or other activities. They admit to a tendency of driving after drinking, and some have either been involved in a drink driving crash before or know someone who has. Testing showed the ad to be highly relevant for them (86% total relevance), highly likeable (86% total likeability), with 76% finding the ad compelling and 89% feeling the ad talked about issues important to them. These are really pleasing scores for us, because as our audiences become harder to engage, it is becoming more difficult to maintain the interest and relevance of the don't drink and drive message. Even a highly visible and memorable advertisement like *Ghost Chips* was relevant to 65% of its target audience, and they were not nearly as difficult to engage as this audience.

Testing also showed the ad had a strong message takeout of 'stop mates from drinking and driving' – specifically, they could clearly see the reasons to step in and stop a mate from driving drunk i.e. 'look out for your mates - mates can't be replaced'.

The complainant has raised a number of specific issues with the ad that I have responded to below:

1. Promotes partying and drinking alcohol and getting drunk

For us to create advertising that is relevant and meaningful for our target audience we do need to portray and situation that they are familiar with. Our audience for this campaign is young males, 20 – 29 years old, who predominantly live in rural and provincial parts of NZ. Socialising and drinking with their mates is a big part of their lives, so our aim was to create a scene that they could relate to.

Testing with the audience showed that this scene was indeed recognisable for the audience, with comments such as, *“First I thought there’s my bro’s because they looked like they were at a homestead enjoying some brews after a good day surfing. I also get a sense of feeling like a local and many of the actors felt like people I have come across in my life”*; *“Definitely has hit the target age group”*; and *“How they have presented the scenes makes it look like a proper NZ shed party which is cool because it’s familiar”*. There were no comments that it promoted drinking and drunkenness, rather that it was a realistic portrayal of a familiar drinking scenario.

2. Shows actor giving the fingers to people in the car

The ad portrays the farm owner, Mad Mick, as someone who doesn’t get along with many people – he’s a difficult character who’s not intended to come across as anyone who’s particularly likeable. There are two different versions of the ad portraying Mad Mick doing, and saying, different things depending on the time the ad is aired. The AO (Adults Only) version is aired after 8.30pm, and shows Mad Mick giving the three boys the fingers, while the GXC (General Except Children) version is aired pre-8.30pm and shows him pointing his fingers to his eyes in an “I’m watching you” gesture.

In the AO version we also hear Mad Mick saying “Piss off” to Sebastian, while in the GXC version he says “Rack off”.

The AO rating was based off these two factors only – Mad Mick’s use of the fingers and his language when responding to Sebastian.

3. Shows drunk people

The ad does not encourage drunkenness in any way. Rather, it portrays a realistic drinking scene that the audience can relate to, but it does not show it as glamorous or particularly appealing.

In our road safety advertising we’re encouraging people to change their behaviour to be legal and/or safe on our roads. To achieve this we generally need to portray the behaviour that we’re hoping to change, and in this case that behaviour is driving after drinking. Our research shows that drinking and driving is not unusual for this specific audience, and they actually drink a great deal before driving. To develop a campaign that is realistic and relevant to this audience we have to portray a scenario that they are familiar with – in this case that’s drinking, a lot, before one of them gets up to drive. If we soften this by only portraying them having a couple of drinks before they drive, the ad immediately loses its impact and relevance with this very specific audience – they don’t think we’re talking to them so they switch off.

4. Actor half naked standing on the bonnet of a moving car

The car is in no way moving and does not have its engine on – you can see that one of the boys is leaning against the car with the door open.

5. Actor says “Piss Off”

As explained earlier in point 2 there are two different versions of the ad portraying Mad Mick saying and doing different things depending on the time the ad is aired. In the AO version we

hear Mad Mick saying “Piss off” to Sebastian, while the GXC version he says “Rack off”. The AO version is only aired after 8.30pm. Our Media Agency has checked this to ensure there have been no errors in the placement of the AO version, and have confirmed that all placements have been correct.

6. Actor physically slaps face of another, and has images of people fighting

Mad Mick is portrayed as someone who is not a particularly nice or likeable character and is difficult to deal with. As well as the slap, Mad Mick is accused of being a wife stealer by Sick Fred; he gives the boys the fingers; he uses unattractive language; and he physically fights with Jason Gunn. We’re not implying that Mad Mick’s behaviour is OK and we’re certainly not encouraging people to be like him, but we are using his character to appeal to the audience’s sense of humour through the hyperbolic nature of the different ‘gate’ scenes.

Each one of these scenes shows Jonno’s two friends imagining who else might gain them access through Mad Mick’s property to Boneyards, their favourite surf spot. The boys even consider two NZ personalities, Nek Minnit and Jason Gunn, as possible options for getting through Mad Mick’s property. It’s a dream sequence, and uses hyperbole to highlight the difficulty they could face if they let Jonno drive drunk. It’s deliberately showing that none of the options are easy, just as it’s not easy to step in and stop a mate from driving drunk.

This scene is never shown in isolation – it is only ever seen in the context of the entire ad. We’re not being ridiculous or sensational for the sake of it but rather signalling to the audience we get their world. Testing showed the ad to be seen as entertaining and highly relevant for the target audience. And the social media response has reinforced this with 94% positive sentiment (positive reactions, shares, comments) based on a reach of 523,264 as at 15 August 2018.

7. Jeep has offensive image of naked bottom, farting

Again, this image was deliberately chosen to appeal to the target audience. The image is cartoon-like and not at all realistic – in fact it shows lightning bolts! The ratings for the different versions of the ad are AO and GXC, so it is not placed in any children’s programming.

I note that the complainant viewed the ad during daytime when watching programmes on-demand. Our on-demand strategy was to target AO programming, specifically targeting males aged 25-54.

I also note a separate complainant is concerned that the ad comes across strongly that friends would not have stopped their friend if they had known someone else who could take them surfing. This outtake has certainly not come through in our audience testing, which showed the strong focus in the following areas:

- Stop mates / friends from drinking and driving – 62 % of all messages the respondents gave
- Look out / look after your mates / mates can’t be replaced – 41%
- People need to stop driving drunk / don’t drink and drive – 41%
- Being responsible – 19%
- Making the right decisions – 16%

Neither did this outtake come through in the many verbatim comments that were given by the test audience.

RESPONSE FROM MEDIA, COMMERCIAL APPROVALS BUREAU

NZTA TELEVISION ADVERTISEMENT**COMPLAINT: 18/1250 RATING: GXC through to ADULTS ONLY**

We have been asked to respond to this complaint under the following codes:

Code of Ethics – Basic Principle 4, Rule 11, Rule 5, Rule 7;

It is important to note: there are multiples ads within this campaign, and variations that have ratings according to their expected audience.

CAB worked with the agency for these advertisements over a number of weeks ensuring that the contents of each version would be appropriately rated.

Complainants in this case have identified different versions playing at different times. CAB notes that in each instance the rating is appropriate for the content – i.e. versions suitable for adults play in adult programming.

None of these NZTA advertisements can play in children's viewing time, and none of them have.

APPEAL INFORMATION

According to the procedures of the Advertising Standards Complaints Board, all decisions are able to be appealed by any party to the complaint. Information on our Appeal process is on our website www.asa.co.nz. Appeals must be made in writing via email or letter within 14 days of receipt of this decision.