



Case Report

1	Case Number	0115/12
2	Advertiser	GoDaddy.com
3	Product	Professional services
4	Type of Advertisement / media	TV
5	Date of Determination	11/04/2012
6	DETERMINATION	Dismissed

ISSUES RAISED

- 2.4 - Sex/sexuality/nudity S/S/N - general
- 2.2 - Objectification Exploitative and degrading - women

DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

A Colombian model is being painted by Danica Patrick, a famous American race car driver, and Jillian Michaels, a celebrity fitness expert. The words painted on the model and the spoken lines in the commercial promote Go Daddy's offering of .CO domain names.

THE COMPLAINT

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

I am highly offended that this ad is on free to air TV at all and particularly in the afternoon when many young girls and boys will be watching the Aussies play Sri Lanka in the One Day Tri Series of 2012.

The ad clearly is designed to lure people to go to the advertised website to view pornographic material. I think it is a disgrace that Channel 9 is complicit with a) The pornographic industry and b) The sex-ploitation and objectification of women available for the sexual gratification of the male species.

THE ADVERTISER'S RESPONSE

Comments which the advertiser made in response to the complainant/s regarding this advertisement include the following:

Thank you for forwarding complaint number 0115/12 and providing GoDaddy.com, LLC ("Go Daddy") an opportunity to respond.

The lodged complaint alleges that Go Daddy is involved in the pornographic industry and that our ad was designed to lure people to our website to view pornographic material. Godaddy.com is not a pornographic website, offers absolutely no pornography for viewing, nor is Go Daddy involved in the pornographic industry.

Go Daddy (www.godaddy.com) is an Internet company that offers everything needed to create a presence on the Internet, from domain names and website builders to complete eCommerce solutions. We are currently the World's largest domain name registrar, Web hosting provider, and net-new SSL certificate provider. We deliver world-class products at competitive prices and support them with industry-best customer service, delivered 24/7/365. We proudly serve over 10 million customers from locations around the World, including Australia.

The television commercial that is the subject of the above-referenced complaint is entitled "Body Paint," and was one of two commercials created and broadcast in the United States during the 2012 Super Bowl. In "Body Paint," a Colombian model is being painted by Danica Patrick, a famous American race car driver, and Jillian Michaels, a celebrity fitness expert. The words painted on the model and the spoken lines in the commercial both clearly promote Go Daddy's offering of .CO domain names, which are country code top-level domain names assigned to the Republic of Colombia. A .CO domain name can be registered by anyone in the world and serves as a great alternative when the most popular .COM extension is not available for registration.

Go Daddy employs an International Standards Approval and Electronic Commercial Delivery company, AdStream, who submits all of our television commercials to CAD for approval prior to airing in Australia. "Body Paint" was submitted to CAD (Reference Number MVM28CBF), received an M rating, and was approved for airing without any request for revision or changes to the commercial.

The specific complaint received regarding Go Daddy's "Body Paint" commercial is as follows:

The ad clearly is designed to lure people to go to the advertised website to view pornographic material. I think it is a disgrace that Channel 9 is complicit with a) the pornographic industry and b) the sex-ploitation & objectification of women, available for the sexual gratification of the male species.

As stated above, www.godaddy.com does not contain any pornographic material and Go Daddy is not affiliated with the pornographic industry in any manner. Nor does the commercial violate any of the provisions contained in Section 2 of the AANA Code of Ethics. Each Section is addressed below:

2.1 The commercial does not discriminate or vilify any group of people. Only women appear in the commercial, they are all smiling, having fun and present by their own volition, and there is no humiliation or ridicule involved in the commercial. According to the AANA 2012 Code of Ethics Practice Note ("Practice Note"), portraying women as attractive does not of itself constitute discrimination or vilification of women.

2.2 The portrayal of the Colombian model in "Body Paint" does not employ sexual appeal in any exploitative or degrading manner. While the model may be scantily clad, [n]ot all images of people who are scantily clad will be unacceptable under this section."

[Practice Note, p. 5]. The painting on the model is an artistic method of promoting Go Daddy's product. All three women in the commercial are enjoying themselves, and are not engaging in any abusive or degrading behaviour.

2.3 There is no violence in "Body Paint," so this Section should not apply.

2.4 There is no sex, sexuality or nudity in this commercial. In fact, if a television viewer followed the instructions at the end of the commercial and went to Godaddy.co to "See More," he/she would have seen that the model was wearing a bikini. Although the model appears scantily clad, nothing is shown on television other than isolated shots of her head, neck/shoulders/upper chest, legs, and torso. Furthermore, none of the words painted on the model, facial expressions, body language, spoken lines or images are sexually suggestive in any way. All substantive content in this commercial promotes .CO domain names.

2.5 There is no inappropriate language in "Body Paint," so this Section should not apply.

2.6 There are no health or safety issues involved in "Body Paint," there are no children in the commercial and the commercial is not directed toward children, so this Section also should not apply.

Based on the foregoing, Go Daddy believes that its "Body Paint" commercial does not run afoul of any section of the AANA Code of Ethics and respectfully requests that the Board return a determination in Go Daddy's favour. Please feel free to contact the undersigned if you have any further questions.

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 concerns that the advertisement is offensive and objectifies women.

The Board reviewed the advertisement and noted the advertiser's response.

The Board considered whether the advertisement complied with Section 2.2 of the Code which states, "Advertising or Marketing Communications should not employ sexual appeal in a manner which is exploitative and degrading of any individual or group of people."

The Board noted the advertisement features two women painting words and logos on another woman's body who appears to be naked. The two women painting are discussing the benefits of godaddy.com as a domain host.

The Board considered that the Go Daddy business (www.godaddy.com) is a legitimate Internet company that offers services related to domain names and other internet solutions, and is not linked to pornography or the sex industry. The Board considered that the use of attractive women in an advertisement is not in itself exploitative or degrading.

The Board noted that there was a clear connection between the discussion by the women and the voiceover as well as the words they were painting on the model. The Board noted that the

two women painting were not referring negatively to the model and there are no sexualized images of breasts or genitals.

The Board determined that the advertisement did not employ sexual appeal in a manner which is exploitative and degrading and did not breach Section 2.2 of the Code.

The Board then considered whether the advertisement was in breach of Section 2.4 of the Code. Section 2.4 of the Code states: “Advertising or Marketing Communications shall treat sex, sexuality and nudity with sensitivity to the relevant audience”.

The Board considered that while the advertisement does depict a naked woman being painted, her legs and arms and midriff are exposed but the advertisement does not expose any inappropriate parts of the woman. The Board noted that the pose of the model is mildly sexually suggestive but not to the point that would make it unacceptable for a broad audience.

The Board noted that the women painting the model are suitably impressed by how attractive she is and that this appeal would draw the attention of people interested in the web company. The women are not mean or derogatory toward the model.

The Board noted the advertiser’s response that the advertisement complied with Commercial Television Industry Code of Practice and the advertisement was classified with a “M” rating and appeared in the appropriate timeslots for the rating given.

The Board determined that whilst the advertisement was mildly sexualised, it did not contain inappropriate nudity and did treat sex, sexuality and nudity with sensitivity to the relevant audience and that it did not breach Section 2.4 of the Code.

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