



## **CASE REPORT**

1. Complaint reference number	577/09
2. Advertiser	Coca Cola South Pacific (mission impossible)
3. Product	Food & Beverage
4. Type of advertisement	TV
5. Nature of complaint	Health and safety – section 2.6
6. Date of determination	Wednesday, 9 December 2009
7. DETERMINATION	Dismissed

## **DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT**

This television advertisement depicts a young woman and man in the bedroom. As the woman gets out of the bed she says to the man, I am going to take a shower, .... The room is depicted with clothes and books strewn everywhere and the room is very messy. The man (our hero) grabs a coke and then there is a doorbell ring. The man goes to the door and notices by looking through the keyhole that there is an older man (her daddy) at the door. The man quickly drinks his coke drink and the voiceover says coke the impossible made possible. The next scene depicts special operations officers coming in and cleaning the house. As the man is about to leave - he is depicted wearing a harness and leaving via the window. He motions that he will call her.

## **THE COMPLAINT**

A sample of comments which the complainant/s made regarding this advertisement included the following:

*Yet another add that portrays a stupid/dupe-able father, and encourages deceit and disrespect within families.*

## **THE ADVERTISER'S RESPONSE**

Comments which the advertiser made in response to the complaint/s regarding this advertisement included the following:

*We appreciate the opportunity to respond to the complaint the bureau has received regarding our latest television advertisement for Coca-Cola Zero.*

*In essence the complaint contends that the advertisement encourages deceit and disrespect in families. We respectfully disagree that the ad encourages this behavior and assert that it does not breach section (2) two of the Code of Ethics.*

*The spot is simply a light-hearted fantasy that is inspired by the Coke Zero position of the impossible made possible i.e. the impossible made possible is being able to have real Coke without the sugar. It is our position that the ad is clearly having a little tongue in cheek fun with this positioning and certainly does not promote disrespect for the family generally or fathers specifically. We believe the intention of our ad is clear, to portray a harmless fantasy with the impossible made possible concept.*

*We maintain that nothing in this ad is inherently offensive or in contravention of common community standards, and submit that it does not breach section two of the code.*

## **THE DETERMINATION**

The Advertising Standards Board (“Board”) considered whether this advertisement breaches Section 2 of the Advertiser Code of Ethics (the “Code”).

The Board noted the complainant's concern that the advertisement promotes deceit and disrespect amongst families by depicting the father coming around to check-up on his daughter.

The Board noted the advertiser's response and viewed the advertisement. The Board considered whether the advertisement was in breach of section 2.6 of the code. Section 2.6 of the Code states that:

*"Advertising or Marketing Communications shall not depict material contrary to prevailing community standards on health and safety".*

The Board noted that the advertisement was for the sale of Coca Cola and that the product was targeted to a young male market. The Board considered that the advertisement was simulating a scene from an action movie that would appeal to a younger market and that the young man in the advertisement was clearly harnessed and appeared to be safely leaving the apartment after cleaning the room for his girlfriend. The Board found that the advertisement was not in breach of prevailing community standards in relation to health and safety and was not in breach of section 2.6 of the Code.

The Board noted that the depiction of the father was that of a father coming to visit his daughter. The Board considered that the depiction is intended to be a humorous depiction of parents showing up at the wrong time as their daughter is with a man. The Board considered that the depiction was clearly humorous and made no disparaging depiction or reference to parents or fathers in particular and that it merely represented a situation where people drop-in unexpectedly at an inconvenient moment.

Finding that the advertisement did not breach the Code on other grounds, the Board dismissed the complaint.