



## Case Report

1	Case Number	0307/16
2	Advertiser	Global Shop Direct
3	Product	Hardware/Machinery
4	Type of Advertisement / media	TV - Free to air
5	Date of Determination	27/07/2016
6	DETERMINATION	Dismissed

### ISSUES RAISED

- 2.6 - Health and Safety Unsafe behaviour
- 2.6 - Health and Safety Within prevailing Community Standards

### DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

This television advertisement features a male voiceover describing how the advertised product, a liquid plastic welding tool, can fix, fill and seal virtually anything in 5 seconds or less. We see the product being used on various objects as well as it being tested on a tow cable to pull a 1800 kilo truck.

### THE COMPLAINT

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

*I have a legitimate safety concern. The product is not the issue, but the advertisement depicts the product being used to repair the broken propeller blade on a remote controlled 'drone' style helicopter, and then shows the 'drone' being powered up and the propeller spinning at very high RPM. This sort of repair can be very dangerous in a toy, or such craft. Any thoughtful aviation safety engineer can explain this. The forces on the joint that the advertisement implies is "repaired" are perhaps not fully understood by the advertiser. (I am not an engineer. I am however mechanically skilled, and believe I have sufficient knowledge and experience to make the assessment that this advertisement poses a danger to public safety unless the product is certified for the purpose of propeller/fan repair). I am concerned that innocent people or an animal could be injured - eye injury particularly. The danger is that the now imbalanced, "repaired" propeller, being under the huge centrifugal load it gains as it spins, will very likely and if not, almost certainly (at some point - timing depending on*

*the skill exercised in the "repair") break away and fling outward at very high speed in any direction. The operator of the craft will presumably be watching it to steer it, and so have their eyes exposed, as may anybody else around. By including the segment with the helicopter/"drone"/flying toy, the advertiser is fairly explicitly recommending this product for the purpose of this dangerous repair on TV. It is possible a person, perhaps a toddler, may lose their eye this very weekend. I write for the public good, and no other reason. I simply ask that the section showing the helicopter be removed from the advertisement, I have no issue with the rest of the ad. If the advertiser had a licence to recommend this product for propeller repair from the Bureau of Air Safety Standards, the situation would be different. Perhaps the advertisers themselves would also agree with me if they considered such. Without such certification or licence it is clearly dangerous to recommend this product for use in a spinning fan or propeller, however the TV advertisement in its current form effectively makes this recommendation to all and sundry. Therefore the advertisement itself, as it currently stands, poses a threat to public safety. Unsuspecting children particularly. And of course, it may well be children who themselves buy the product expressly to fix their broken flying toy, and do it without expertise, or supervision, simply because the advertisement makes it look like the product is purpose designed for that very repair. In such a scenario the child or young adult may end up with an unbalanced propeller spinning - against the air - at (say) 4,000 RPM, - as they hold it in front of themselves testing, and watching it. I need not go on. It is just that one section of the advertisement involving the propeller, not the rest of the advertisement, or product itself, that I feel poses a danger to children, and bystanders.*

*I politely add, to the advertiser, that for other purposes the product looks really good, and I will be buying some at some stage, so what I am suggesting in saying that is that in my opinion, you don't need the flying toy thing in the advertisement anyway, (I am at least trying to be constructive here), - how, for instance, does it go on car dashboards?*

## **THE ADVERTISER'S RESPONSE**

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

*The product has been tested and passed through Australian compliance. The complaint refers to the "Bureau of Air Safety Standards", which doesn't seem to be a current government entity. I've searched on the Civil Aviation Safety Authority (<https://www.casa.gov.au/>) and the Australian Transport Safety Bureau (<https://www.atsb.gov.au/>) and while there are specific regulations on how close an unmanned/remote air vehicle (eg remote controlled plane or drone) should fly near people there's nothing regarding repair standards. While drones are relatively new people have been flying and repairing remote controlled planes and helicopters with hobby glue for some time, our product provides the same (if not better) bonding than a hobby glue and has been tested to withstand 46 Newtons per square centimetre.*

*In conclusion, I don't believe the product represents a general safety hazard and there are no specific regulations relating to this type of repair that I'm aware of.*

## **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 depicts the product being used to repair an item that, under pressure, could pose a danger to public safety.

The Board viewed the advertisement and noted the advertiser’s response.

The Board considered Section 2.6 of the Code. Section 2.6 of the Code states: “Advertising or Marketing Communications shall not depict material contrary to Prevailing Community Standards on health and safety”.

The Board noted that the advertisement is a plastic bonding product that is demonstrated being used to repair a number of items including a broken propeller blade on a remote controlled toy.

The Board noted the advertiser’s response that while drones are relatively new, people have been flying and repairing remote controlled planes and helicopters with hobby glue for some time, and this product provides the same (if not better) bonding than a hobby glue and has been tested to withstand 46 Newtons per square centimetre.

The Board noted that the use of flying toys may pose a risk in and of themselves. The Board considered that the drone in the advertisement appeared a small and light object, which if a part were to break off would pose a small risk but felt that this was a possible scenario in the case of any flying object, repaired or not. The Board also acknowledged the advertiser’s response that people continue to use a range of products to fix flying objects.

The Board noted the complainant’s concern that children may buy the product expressly to fix their broken flying toy. The Board considered that given the access to this product, via an online shop, this was not a likely scenario and that a child purchasing such a product unsupervised at a young age was unlikely.

The Board considered that the advertisement did not depict material contrary to Prevailing Community Standards.

The Board determined that the advertisement did not breach Section 2.6 of the Code.

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

