1	FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION
2	
3	
4	EHAVIORAL ADVERTISING
5	TRACKING, TARGETING & TECHNOLOGY
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	Friday, November 2, 2007
12	9:00 a.m. to 5:11 p.m.
13	
14	
15	
16	United States Federal Trade Commission
17	Conference Center
18	601 New Jersey Avenue, N.W.
19	Washington, D.C.
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	Reported by: Linda D. Metcalf

1	TABLE OF CONTENTS
2	Page
3	Welcome and Introductory Remarks
4	Joel Winston, Associate Director, BCP3
5	
6	Disclosure to Consumers9
7	
8	YouTube Contest Presentation95
9	
10	The Regulatory and Self-Regulatory Landscape133
11	
12	Roundtable on the Future of Behavioral Advertising203
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	PROCEEDINGS
2	
3	WELCOME AND INTRODUCTORY REMARKS
4	

1	even in the foyer behind us. Fire exits are located
2	through the main doors at the front of the building on
3	New Jersey Avenue and through the pantry area to the G
4	Street corridor and out to G Street, which is directly
5	behind us. In the event of an emergency or drill,
6	proceed diagonally to the building diagonally across
7	Massachusetts Avenue.
R	Finally, I would like to thank Microsoft for

behavioral marketing is, and of course we're going to have our YouTube presentation later that will further explore that.

We learned about who is using behavioral marketing, how it works, what information companies collect, how they use that information. So I think we all have a better idea now what we're talking about.

We also heard about the benefits of behavioral marketing, the fact that it enables consumers to get content on the Internet for free. And the fact that it delivers ads that are more relevant to people, less ad clutter, and of course there's certain business efficiencies that come from this practice.

At the same time we also heard about some of the concerns that have been raised, the privacy concerns. We heard about the lack of control that some consumers may feel over their information. We heard about concerns about the collection of sensitive information, medical information and other sensitive information, how that might be used.

We heard about anonymity, the issue of anonymity. And there was a good discussion of what anonymous means in this space, for example, is an IP address anonymous or not, the debate on that. We heard about some concerns about possible discrimination, that

targeted information could be used in some way to discriminate against a vulnerable group such as children and others, and also the overreaching of these vulnerable groups. And, in particular, we heard about the social networking sites and concerns about how information collected through those sites could be used to target teens.

We also heard about the possibility of data breaches, that these compilations of information exist and if they're not adequately secured there could be significant harm to consumers. Interestingly, at least what I heard yesterday was that consumers seem to be less concerned about the advertising they're getting as a result of behavioral targeting and more about the fact that the information is being collected and stored.

So that may give us some ideas for how to approach this problem in the future. So as is so often the case in the law and in policy, the challenge is to find the right balance. How do we preserve the benefits that behavioral targeting brings to consumers and to industry while protecting consumers from some of the possible privacy concerns or abuses that might arise.

And if you don't mind me giving a shameless plug for an upcoming workshop that we will be having in December on the use of Social Security numbers in the

1	can we do to shape the future? And hopefully we won't be
2	hearing anything more about Larry Ponemon's mother.
3	That's sort of my goal for today.
4	Anyway, I think it will be a terrific session.
5	And hope you all stay and participate. Remember, this is
6	a town hall, we want everybody to get involved. Thanks.
7	(Applause)
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1 SESSION 6: D	DISCLOSURES TO CONSUMERS
----------------	--------------------------

MS. ENGLE: Good morning, I'm Mary Engle, the Associate Director for Advertising Practices at the FTC. At this morning's session, we're first going to hear three presentations, and then we'll have a roundtable along the lines of the last panel yesterday. First this morning we're going to hear from Lorrie Cranor, who is an Associate Research Professor at Carnegie Mellon, then we'll hear from Declan McCullagh with CNET, and finally Scott Shipman from eBay. Lorrie?

MS. CRANOR: Good morning. I'm going to talk with you really quickly about some of the research we're doing at Carnegie Mellon that's related to disclosures to consumers. We've all seen the studies that show that people say they care a whole lot about privacy but they don't always take steps to actually protect their privacy. And there are all sorts of possible explanations for this that have been tossed around.

The two that I want to focus on today are that,

themselves. They typically require college-level reading skills to understand, and they also contain a lot of language that includes legalese and obfuscated language. There was a study that counted the number of hedging claims in typical privacy policies. And these include things like "except as", "on a limited basis", "we reserve the right to". And a typical policy includes at least 20 of these claims.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The students in my lab did a study this summer to test a variety of privacy policy formats and find out how effective they are with consumers. We started with one real-life privacy policy from a real company, but we removed the name of the company. And then we came up with several variations on that format. We formulated a highlights notice with the standard six boxes in it. also used the P3P computer-readable version of that privacy policy to derive some other formats. These were experimental formats we tested where basically you're given some summary of the privacy policy and then you can click on links to drill down and get more information. We had 864 participants that came to us on the Internet. Each were assigned to read just one of these policies. We then asked them eight questions about how well they thought they understood and trusted the policy. And then we asked them to find six specific pieces of information

in the policy.

We found that when people read the original natural language version of policy, there was some information they could find very easily. This was the information where they could just look for a keyword and find the information. So, for example, we said "Does Acme use cookies?" They could look for the word cookie, and 98 percent of them correctly answered the question."

But when we asked a question that required more comprehension, they had a lot more trouble. So, only 71 percent of people correctly answered the question, "Does this policy allow Acme to put you on an email marketing list?" And then an even more complicated question, only half the people got right: "Does this policy allow Acme to share your email with a marketing company that might put you on their email marketing list?"

So our preliminary findings, and we're still actually going through all the data that we have, our preliminary findings are that even well written policies are not well liked and they're difficult for consumers to use. We also found that the layered notice variant in the current format doesn't appear to help very much, although we think some changes might be able to be made to make that a lot better.

We also found that people perceived the long

policies as slightly more trustworthy but find
information faster in short policies, so we have a bit of
a contradiction there. The experimental formats that we
tested were not immediately intuitive to consumers. They
had trouble figuring out where exactly to find the
information in those policies. But based on these
findings, we plan further refinements and experiments,
and we think we can come up with something a lot better.

Another approach to privacy communication is to provide privacy information in search results. We developed a search engine called Privacy Finder which is available to the public at privacyfinder.org. We conducted a study this summer to determine whether people actually could use the privacy information provided by Privacy Finder and whether it influenced their purchases.

We did a lab study. We had 72 Pittsburgh residents come to our lab, and we paid them to make online purchases using their own credit cards and exposing their own personal information. We paid them all a fixed amount and allowed them to keep the change, thus they had an incentive to try to save money.

So, this is what the Privacy Finder search results looked like. You can see on the left column there's a privacy meter, those little green boxes, and if you click on the link underneath, that's a privacy

1	here is that if you can communicate clearly with
2	consumers about privacy, it does make a difference.
3	Thank you.
4	(Applause)
5	MS. ENGLE: Next we'll hear from Declan
6	McCullagh of CNET.
7	MR. MCCULLAGH: Hi, there. Good morning.
8	Thank you. So, news.com has done a series of privacy
9	surveys, including of search engines and
10	telecommunications providers and so on. And two of them
11	are relevant here, and that's what I wanted to mention.
12	The first we did in February 2006, and my
13	colleague, Eleanor Mills, helped with both. She's out in
14	San Francisco and covers the search industry. News
15	organizations tend to be more event-driven, and so the
16	first survey responded to privacy questions raised by the
17	Department of Justice's subpoena of Google. And you can
18	see the URL at the end of the presentation, if you want
19	to look at it yourself, but here are some highlights.
20	We asked all of the major search engines,
21	again, February 2006, this question. And Microsoft's

22

If you have a list of search terms, can you then -- let's say if the Department of Justice asked you, and let's assume that a lawful procedure is followed here, produce a list of people who search for that term. Al-Qaeda might be an interesting one or something more detailed.

And, so here is -- the answers were all yes except AOL, which was the outlier here, saying, no, we can't do it.

Here is another question, sort of the opposite or the inverse of the previous one, which is given someone's IP address or cookie value, let's say that you already had that in a similar criminal context, can you say what this person did?

The answers in this case were actually uniform.

All of them -- and of the four companies we surveyed said that, yes, they could with no exceptions. Now, this is one we did in August of this year. This came -- the second survey was a result of some of the recent news regarding improved privacy protections by search engines, and so Eleanor and I wanted to sort of put this in a clearer form to our readers and say, so, what exactly does this mean. Some of the companies were using different terms, and we wanted to explain to our readers what was going on by asking them the same questions and reproducing their answers verbatimt be an interesting one or someth:

For The Record, Inc.

(301)

are looking for and what they're finding, and certainly the second on the search industry. What I'm going to talk about is a little nuance from that in the sense that on the first presentation we, as eBay, as a online community, really try to aspire to those notice principles and keeping it easy to read for customers, so that component is certainly relevant for us as a company.

And on the second part with search and privacy related to the retention of information, within the search space, naturally eBay is a community and online e-commerce platform, so our retention periods are slightly different for a number of different reasons, obviously fraud protection and others. But nonetheless that does mean that we keep a large amount of data on our customers related to the transactions and certainly have a responsibility to make sure that we use that information as the customer would expect.

And, so, disclosures to consumers for eBay is not a new theory or even a new realm of work for us here or my team. And as I think the environment can be summarized, it's evolution, right? We've seen even back in'97 and '98, privacy policies that were these long, wordy, legal drafted statements. We've then moved to or at least many communities, many online platforms have moved to summaries, principles, charts, appendices. We

- 1 MS. ENGLE: Thank you, Scott.
- Okay. I'm just going to briefly go down and
- inat t at end I'Hopeful gothis is right, from t Renotes

address what I was wondering, and that is how do you
motivate people to search further? How much information
do you have to give consumers about what it is they
should inquire about before they'll inquire? Is a
question mark good enough? Is the word advertisement
good enough? You know, some of these may or may not
motivate consumers to actually take the next step. What
do you think about that?

MR. SHIPMAN: Yeah, and I think one of our -one of our key objectives is to make the program known
and to make the option known. So that's why we're using
different embodiments, because you just don't know yet
what they want.

MR. WINSTON: Right. I'm wondering whether some of the other businesses alert consumers to the availability of information on their sites about how advertising may be targeted to them other than through the link at the bottom of the page to privacy policy.

Peter Cullen, do you want to start with that?
How does Microsoft do that?

MR. CULLEN: We've explored different ways of providing advice, providing notice to our customers. And it really -- it's a balance between how do you provide relevant advice in situations that might be very contextual versus, to be really blunt about it,

1 overburdening the consumers.

So, let me think about an example of overburdening the consumer. So, in some parts of the world, as we heard yesterday, an IP address is considered personal information, so think about a scenario where you went to get a weather forecast off of MSN.com and there was a popup notice that said that here's how we collect, use your IP address. And I think most consumers would say, hey, look, all I want is the weather.

So that may be an example of kind of overnotice. The way that we've approached it is in certain situations, for example, the phishing filter where there's a sensitivity between providing Microsoft perhaps with URLs as well as providing the protection we do, kind of a very just-in-time consent notice. For other less invasive types of things, for example, use of behavioral information to provide ads or even contextual information, that's an example where we would have very detailed information in a privacy notice and provide the consumer with the ability to opt out of that tracking, despite Declan's information, that's not quite accurate, you can actually opt out of off-network and on network.

MR. MCCULLAGH: That's what you told us at the time.

MR. CULLEN: Sure the other -- so there's

different notices for different scenarios. And it's a balance between providing access to the information, providing relevant information in the context that from our understanding of our customers that they expect.

MR. WINSTON: Yeah, I think that's a good point, that there has to be a balance between too much information and not enough. But if you think about effective communication, the first step is getting the consumers' attention, letting them know there is information there that they might be interested in. And then you move to, all right, once the consumer is interested how do you explain it in a way that they can understand and what choices do you give them at that point.

MR. CULLEN: Yeah, so, you know, another interesting balance point is that for a user that first comes to Windows Live, applies for a Windows Live ID, they actually have to affirmatively attest they have read or received the privacy notice. Now, do we make sure that they have to scroll through even the short form notice? No, because in all honesty that's -- our customers have said that's just kind of an overdoing it.

Do we make it accessible on every page?

Absolutely. Do they have the ability to express some choice around that? Absolutely. So it's a balance

between making the information available, doing it in a way that makes it easily accessible, in fact, invites accessibility but doesn't make the consumer have to click through 18 screens just simply to sign up for an ID.

MR. WINSTON: Esther, you wanted to say something?

MS. DYSON: Yeah, thanks. I wanted first to talk about the disclosure of my own information in the bio here. It's kind of ironic. If you look at my bio, it's kind of vague. I do emerging stuff. The fact is I'm very involved with a bunch of companies that do online advertising. Somebody -- some I'm sure junior person at the FTC wanted to make my bio sound more prestigious or something, and they took out all these dinky little companies, but just for the record, I'm involved with Boxbe, which lets you manage your own email inbox and sell access to it to marketers, so it tries to empower the user.

I'm involved with Dotomi, which originally started with a similar user empowerment kind of business model where you get personal messages in a banner space on your website. We found that too confusing to sell to consumers. So I understand exactly what the issues are around trying to tell people stuff they don't really want to take the time to understand.

1 I'm on the board of WPP Group, which owns three

2

1	consumers are probably as smart as most advertisers,
2	generically.
3	So I think you're going to see more and more of
4	this happening. I don't think the FTC needs to set
5	standards. Unlike, for example, you can see your credit
6	report now. It's a very defined process, exactly what is
7	

1	problem of they don't understand is going to be solved
2	not by a single standard but by consumers' greater
3	familiarity with all these tools.

MR. WINSTON: Thank you, Esther.

Just to pursue a little bit more how companies are getting over this barrier of getting consumers' attention and alerting them to this -- the availability of this information, Srinija, am I pronouncing that right?

MS. SRINIVASAN: Yeah, that was perfect.

MR. WINSTON: Wow! How do you do that at Yahoo!? How do you tell consumers that you're gathering this information for advertising purposes, and explain how that works.

MS. SRINIVASAN: Sure. So, I'm Srinija, I'm Editor-in-Chief at Yahoo!, and I've been with Yahoo! since we were five people, and I can tell you since our inception that we got into this because we were so and remain so passionate about the transformative power of this medium that we can't wait to unleash that positive power for others and empower others to find out and discover what can be done, what's possible.

And we recognize that in order for that to happen there has to be a fundamental trust by all members, all participants in the ecosystem that drives

this medium in order to drive participation. So we were one of the first companies to have a privacy policy, and I don't want to for a second discount the power of that level of disclosure.

The policy itself, the final document, is an important outcome. And in it I think you'll find on the very top page where we try to succinctly boil down the essence of our information practices, you'll see that we very clearly say, we use the information we observe in order to customize the content and ads you see.

We further break down -- you know, we have been talking a lot about layered policies in the last day or two. Our version of layering has been in place for many years. And that is that many different Yahoo! customers, consumers, think of us in different ways because we offer so many different sorts of products and services. So we actually detail for each of our products and services what are the privacy practices that apply to this particular product? That way you don't have to read about the tons or more of specific instances that may or may not pertain to you, but you can see in a central policy what are the principles that apply. And then the practice is broken out by product.

So that's one way just in our policy statement that we make sure we have ubiquitous links to this on the

1	footer of every page, not just the home page, and that we
2	want people to know this is we take this seriously.
3	This is something that we think about.

The other thing is that has been quickly alluded to here, I think, but bears further discussion is that the policy itself, while it's very important, is the outcome of the thoughtful process that led to it that says we're a company that spends time thinking about the implications and the outcomes. And these are our quardrails.

We want to make that clear in as many ways as we can. So, if you're traversing across Yahoo!, we have, for example, a universal header. When you are known to us, it will say, "Hi, Srinija." If you are not known to us, because you've never registered with us or you aren't logged in, then there won't be that identifiable greeting. And that's just one small example of letting

For The Record, Inc.

rates are going to be for regular transactions like
search. I mean, Google doesn't even have a link to the
privacy policy off of the main search page. You have to
drill down.

The problem with the traditional privacy policy in this space especially is that I'm not dealing with a single transaction. I'm dealing with a prolonged transaction over days, weeks, months, and the information accumulates. So whether users are really aware of the implications of their transactions with this company after reading the policy one time at the beginning of the relationship is unclear to me.

I really liked what we saw here from eBay, which is a kind of constant reminder that we are aware of who you are, we are aware of oh, you should be aware that we're doing something with information that we're gathering about you. And I think that's a much more powerful direction to go in.

MR. WINSTON: Jane Horvath from Google, do you collect any statistics on how many people click on the privacy policy?

MS. HORVATH: I don't have those available right now. But I did want to talk about what we've done because we do agree that the privacy policy tends to be very legal oriented and difficult to read and difficult

1	to follow, so we're exploring different means of making
2	our privacy practices clear. In particular, we first
3	started with blogs. And we were blogging about different
4	issues with respect to privacy, and these blogs are
5	interactive blogs, so users have the ability to write
6	back and ask questions.
7	And in response to a number of the questions we
8	realized that there were some issues with respect to

L	make people click through things, and the fact is that
2	we're never going to get rid of the fact that individuals
3	are incredibly busy, that individuals have lots of things
1	to do in their lives, that individuals want a great
5	experience when they go on the Internet, and there are
5	lots of things that are bundled into that.

So when we think about privacy notices, I think we have to think in terms of the roles of privacy notices, and it's not -- so it's not just consumers are aware of what's going on so they can make choices.

Privacy notices establish a sense of what is fair and what's unfair by the comparison of notices, the comparison of behavior.

Privacy notices create a sense of accountability that they define how an organization is going to behave and then organizations can be measured against that behavior. And that's a very different thing than just saying we're going to try to force individuals to read notices so that the consumer can then be in a position to police the market.

24 they define how arrious spaning stickers is reate a sense of

Commission is really in many ways because of the adoption of the concepts of harm and protection against harm which is appropriate for a consumer protection agency, it's really come down to a discussion of what is the appropriate uses of information.

And the appropriate uses of information, actually when we talk about communication, goes beyond just the role of notices as a privacy notice but also the concepts of the uses of information that are in terms and conditions, especially as you get away from branded organizations. So I'm just suggesting that while privacy notices are incredibly important, my God, I have spent 20 years working on privacy notices, I led the process of coming up with the multi-layered notice approach, we don't -- we shouldn't have an expectation that notices alone are the issue and that we shouldn't spend all of our time trying to figure out how we force consumers to read notices. We have to think about the accountability process that goes into a notice.

MR. WINSTON: I think that's right, Marty, although I think this panel really we want to drill down on how do we get consumers to look at this information and understand it and make good choices for them, recognizing that privacy policies serve a lot of other purposes.

1	D - 1 - 0
	DATATA
上	Peter?

MR. CULLEN: With respect to that, I do think we do need to pick a little bit on Marty's points a little bit. So, for example, the state yesterday, which I was incredibly surprised about, you had 15 percent of the whatever it was that Fortune 500 companies don't even have a privacy statement, so I think it's wonderful that we're up here discussing about how we can improve privacy notices. Perhaps the goal is to get people to read them.

But Marty's point about that an organization's privacy statement is also a promise to consumer advocates who frequently look at those statements to make sure that they're not deceptive, it's a promise to the FTC, after all, we have a 20-year love affair with you on that.

(Laughter)

MR. CULLEN: So, I think they serve a very valuable purpose, but I think we also need to be thinking about, well, why is it that 15 percent of those top

notice on the home page, wherever, that says we collect
information about your activity on this site and use it
to direct ads to you that may be most relevant to you.
To learn more about this and to understand what your
choices are, click here. And then you go to a statement
that explains all this. Is that is anybody doing
that? Is that feasible? Would that be effective?

MS. DYSON: I mean, frankly, that's what the question marks and learn more and all those other things are for. If you're a guy designing a website or a web page, every single square inch of this real estate is very valuable. You want to know how it's used, how it's monetized, what it's for, and spending a lot of space on this kind of thing is very hard to do if you're a marketer, so they use these little things. If you want to learn more, you can click on the learn more.

And I think -- you know, I don't think you can force consumers to look at this stuff. I don't think it's somebody's fault. It's just something, if they want to know you want to be able to help them learn more. I wanted to point out that Google has something called web history, which is not positioned as a privacy statement, but is exactly this kind of thing. Learn more about what Google has been tracking of your activities online.

And, again, I think the level of ambient

labeling your ads. Do you want to discuss that at all?

MR. MCGRAW: Sure. For those that don't know
Zango, we're an ad-supported online media company. We
use a software download to the desktop to deliver

contextually targeted, not behaviorally targeted,

6 advertisements.

It was a couple of years ago when Esther Dyson was at an anti-spyware conference and she challenged the industry to continue to give consumers notices to what's on their machine. And it's something that Zango accepted the challenge and has done ever since.

Since we're a download, as opposed to just a web page, we do have additional notice and consent. We have a fully easily understandable notice that appears before any download or installation occurs. And we also provide the after-the-fact reminders within 72 hours after the installation, as well as every 90 days thereafter that the software is on the machine.

The software delivers advertisements, and we identify those advertisements with a bar at the bottom that states that the advertisement is brought to you by Zango, together with a hyperlink for the consumer to learn more about both where they're getting the ad, what information that's being collected, with a link to the privacy policy as well as how to uninstall the software.

accountability. I think that's very important. But I think one of the problems we have here with all these technical solutions, which I think are very creative, and I like the eBay one in particular, as well, is the lack of standardization, because consumers are cognitive misers. They don't want to go through and learn one person's system and then another person's system.

Along with this study that I have been looking at in terms of seeing what people do when they buy online is they also do a lot of risky behaviors online as well. And those people who are not as skilled tend to do a lot of risky behaviors, and there's really two segments that buy online, the people who are not very well educated and the people who are really educated.

What we're missing out on is the middle segment, the people who really want to buy, you know, who are our market to expand e-commerce. And, so standardization would probably bring those people in, because they right now don't feel they have the skill level to navigate some of these difficult areas.

MR. WINSTON: Question?

MR. WHITEHEAD: So, I just had a question for the panel, and I would actually like to follow up on your comment and go back to what Joel and Esther were talking about earlier.

MR. SHIPMAN: That will teach me. I think one of the challenges certainly with labels is I think even in the context of the eBay and Yahoo! relationship with respect to AdChoice that there are many, many different permutations. So, for example, in our relationship it's anonymous aggregate sharing of information between eBay and an ad network partner. Yet in other instances, people, it may not be anonymous.

So what is the implications of that type of sharing? So there's two colors. You know, is the information sold, or is it just being shared for a one-time purpose? There's three colors. And you can go on and on and on. So, I think the challenges you end up, you know, with some sort of rainbow on the page, and you may lose all of the meaning that you were trying to get at.

The other comment that I had with respect to, you know, can we put a sentence on the page that describes, you know, we're doing advertisoral or behavioral targeting, the challenge there and certainly I know at least one member of my team will probably hear the chalkboard with nails on it in a minute when I say that our UI team always says every pixel fights for its life.

(Laughter)

1	MR. SHIPMAN: And, you know, ultimately,
2	they're trying to make sure that there is the best
3	customer experience possible, and what that means is
4	sometimes white space is what makes the best customer
5	experience possible because it's clear and clutter-free.
6	On other occasions it means question marks or
7	links or mouse-overs as other types of functionality, so
8	I think while in theory it's a great concept, I know a
9	number of teams have tried to explore how do we get
LO	labels. I know there have been chirping parrots on
L1	browsers and other types of things I've seen in the past
L2	I don't see any of them working today in a fashion that
L3	really is getting the consumer on top of the notice.
L4	MR. WINSTON: I guess the downside of the color
L5	scheme would be that people might confuse it with a
L6	terrorist threat level or something.
L7	MR. CULLEN: Yeah, Joel, don't forget, we've
. 8	

1	So, again, I think the clearest thing is to put
2	up the question mark. There are companies that sell
3	browsers that have these kinds of warnings on them.
4	There hasn't been huge take-up. Putting a question mark
5	or something like that and letting people see the
б	examples of what's going on, I think, is the most
7	effective way.

MR. ABRAMS: I think that there's a -- if you think about -- I think a lot of time thinking about what the regulatory structure is going to be three, four, five years down the road, and I think that you're going to be seeing the concept of trustworthiness related to a set of standards within industries. And, so, rather than a color code or multiple codes related to differing levels of data use, it's the trustworthiness around the data use.

In some ways the pickup on seals within the seal programs are an indication of that future, but I think the future is going to have multiple standards based on types of industries with greater regulatory oversight, so I think that something like that is coming, but it's not in the near term.

MR. WINSTON: Well, why don't we do this? Carlos has been wanting to say something.

MR. JENSEN: Let Lorrie answer first.

good point here. Putting links to policies and context is a great first step. The problem is that many of the policies that are embedded in these privacy policies are putting an undue burden on users.

So last time I looked at a privacy policy seriously two years ago, 50 percent of policy -- 50 percent of the sites that we visited had a policy that effectively said if we decide to change our mind about a privacy policy, we'll let you know here in the privacy policy. So that means that as a consumer I have to go and check the policy every time I visit the site or I have automatically agreed to new terms.

MR. WINSTON: Yeah, I think that's something we definitely need to talk about, and maybe we should move to that now, but for now we were focusing on the first step, how do you get the consumer' attention. Then the problem comes, all right, you got his attention, he clicks on it, he goes to privacy policy, how does he make heads or tails out of it.

MR. JENSEN: But I think this undue burden is exactly what's driving users away from reading the privacy policy. So, if -- I mean, reading a privacy policy that could change five seconds after you read it means that I'm not going to bother.

MR. WINSTON: Peter?

MR. SWIRE: Yeah, my name is Peter Swire, I'm a
law professor at Ohio State, a fellow at the Center for
American Progress. So, I want to pick up on this link to
context and especially what how manageable it is for
the people running the systems, and we have a lot of
people who run systems here, to have a policy that can be
detailed enough that it actually makes sense to readers.

There's a great temptation to be vague in the policy, namely we collect lots of different things about you and it changes over time. And part of that is for really good reasons, which is you won't get sued. That's a good reason. And another good reason is you do about 500 different things that are coming in from different perspectives and it changes over time and you have 43 contracts you're managing.

And, so the question is if you had Esther's idea or Joel's question of a link to in context to what the sorts of things are we gather about the consumer, is that manageable, can you actually say things, given your systems that any person can use? Can you have that data and have meaningful things, or is it so complicated, so changeable over time and so scary because you might say it wrong that you just basically inside your organizations can't say what it is you're collecting.

MS. ENGLE: I have a question for Colin

1	O'Malley at TRUSTe. Is there a role for
2	(Laughter)
3	MS. ENGLE: I'm sorry.
4	MR. WINSTON: Have we dissed you in some way,
5	Peter?
6	MR. SWIRE: No, I think the FTC has some
7	questions, that's all. If he can't answer it now
8	MR. WINSTON: Okay.
9	MS. ENGLE: Okay, well, just turning to the
LO	possible role of a seal program and trying to deal with
L1	some of these issues.
L2	MR. O'MALLEY: Sure. And I do think Peter
L3	Cullen from Microsoft made an interesting point before
L4	that there's a bottom-line accountability that has to
L5	exist in looking at these issues, right? Because they
L6	evolve constantly over time. And when we look at the
L7	TRUSTe program and we're going on ten years now, we just
L8	had our 10-year anniversary party, the issues that we've
L9	looked at in the last ten years have evolved constantly.
20	When we first launched the program we weren't really
21	studying the impact of cookie use. We weren't looking at
22	web beacons, we certainly weren't looking at behavioral
23	targeting.
24	So, any sort of high level alert system that is
25	color-coded or that really tries to simplify the

- 1 trustworthiness of a site has to take into account those
- 2 sorts of evolving issues. And I think that's what we've 3nto account those

you know, I think there's a serious question here about
whether it's simply not feasible for businesses or for
consumers to go use this sort of notice and choice
model. Is it more information than consumers can handle?
Is it too difficult for businesses to explain in a way
that gives consumers sort of both sides of the equation?
Is it too much to expect of consumers?

And, you know, a lot of people have been talking over the last months or years about the weaknesses of the notice and choice model, and it's something we're going to address, I think, in later sessions as well. But for now what we're trying to focus on is if we do go the notice route how do we make it better or can we make it better?

George, there you are, I understand that SafeCount has a cookie transparency strategy. Can you talk about what that is and how it works?

MR. PAPPACHEN: Sure, sure, I'd be happy to. SafeCount.net is a company that works with advertisers and publishers using survey research to get consumer opinion on marketing programs. And, you know, I do believe that, you know, publishers value every inch of their space and they want the consumer experience to be as optimal as possible. And as somebody said yesterday, that consumers have choices. And if they're not able to

deliver on promises consumers will go elsewhere.

So, the first thing we did insofar as we reach out to consumers when they're on web pages and ask them and invite them to take a survey, we worked with publishers to work out rules that we want the consumer experience to be not overloaded by invitations, so we set site rules and said, you know, we won't contact the consumer every -- but once every so often; whatever the site rules indicate.

Then we decided, you know, we want to have a process where the consumer will be able to see everything we have about them that we would deliver to a partner of ours. So we built out SafeCount.net. And, you know, there might be a question, well, why -- how would a consumer ever get there? Our presence on the web is such that over time we believe that with our survey invitations, an interested consumer would want to click through to our privacy policy, or at some point there are times when consumers are busy but there are other times when they might be surfing a site and a SafeCount invitation may come and they would choose to find out more.

And if they do land at SafeCount.net, our web page, our SafeCount.net web page, we turned it into sort of a consumer education program as much as anything else.

believe that every brand here, and we work with most of
the large publishers here, I would say all of the large
publishers and most of the websites that are frequented
by consumers, and I would say that every one values the
consumer and the consumer experience. And we're just but
one company that's identified a way by working within
this space to grow our brand as a trusted brand, and as
consumers use this space more we want SafeCount to be
known as a we want SafeCount to be a symbol of trust
and consumers willing to engage with us.

MR. WINSTON: What do others think of that?

Does that sound like a sensible thing to do? Anybody

want to comment on that? I guess not.

MS. ENGLE: I'm not going to comment on that, but I'll ask another question of Michael Cassidy. As an ad network, what approach do you use for disclosing to consumer what your behavioral targeting policies are?

MR. CASSIDY: Sure. I think we have a unique responsibility in that we don't directly deal with consumers. Our constituents are the advertisers and the publishers, and we sit between both those parties, but obviously we make it our responsibility to try to be as

have privacy policies and we do have opt-out opportunities for consumers interested.

I think the approach that we've tried to take is to really advertise the people that control the budgets, and those are the advertisers and agencies. There's a lot of marketers interested in behavioral targeting and these types of programs, and I think a lot of those organizations have actually done a good job of being very thorough in their questioning of these types of programs and how they can be used, how it regards to privacy.

So ultimately the interest in behavioral like programs are certainly growing, but especially as we're talking to the Fortune 500 companies, many of them are asking those tough questions, because I think they have been kind of a silent partner in this and that they're very much interested in maintaining a good dialogue with their consumers because ultimately the consumers if they're upset at some sort of ad or some sort of behavioral program, that feeling that they get is probably going to be taken out either at the publisher where they're seeing the ad or the ad that they're seeing themselves.

So, we have again some communication with consumers, where it's appropriate, but, again, most of

our efforts have been on the education side with the advertisers and publishers to a lesser extent.

MS. ENGLE: Well, when you say you are making educational efforts, I mean, do you review their policies, understand what the policies are, or try to affect those at all?

MR. CASSIDY: With the advertisers?

MS. ENGLE: Yes.

MR. CASSIDY: Yeah, I mean, I think with the advertisers, since our business is about working with advertisers and helping them communicate their ads to consumers across the web, our responsibility lies more in how they're communicating that and making sure that if there are any behavioral tactics used that they're used in an appropriate way and that we are safeguarding any sort of information that might be acquired, which at this point is no PII at all.

So, we will certainly work with advertisers and make sure that they're comfortable with what they're doing and obviously not do anything that would jeopardize any sort of consumer. We don't acquire any sort of information that could jeopardize a consumer. Right now, most of the behavioral targeting that we engage with and a lot of the other firms is very much just more on the surf-based side of things, so there isn't any sort of

1 confidential information that's being acquired.

But, again, with where we stand most of our efforts go more towards the advertisers.

MR. WINSTON: Zulfikar Ramzan, from Symantec's standpoint, how do you think advertisers or websites should give consumers the information they need to make good choices? What works, what doesn't work?

MR. RAMZAN: So, I think we have seen so far that what doesn't work is trying to provide consumers with more information because they barely read the information that they're given now and it's a big challenge we're seeing. So part of our goal really has been to make the task easier for the end customer.

One way we do that right now is through a new set of technologies that are designed around helping users to manage their identities in a much easier way. Right now I have identities -- multiple online identities. For example, I have an identity with eBay, one with Amazon. I've got one with a social networking forum I'm part of. I've got one at work and so on and so forth. Each of these identities right now for most people tend to have a common set of criteria. Like I might give the same email address to all different people. In fact, one email gets disclosed in some way, basically I am -- I'm more or less hosed, and everybody

is going to spam me and so on and so forth.

So, one thing we're trying to do right now is allow people to be able to provide different identities or different online entities that are consistent with how they use the entities. For example, the ability to have different email addresses for different online identities. If I were to do that now it would be complicated, but with some of the technology we're trying to build and that we have been building, we've simplified that process considerably so that when I do log in to a particular website I can associate an identity with that website automatically and then I don't have to worry as much about what I'm doing.

I think part of our goal is really ultimately to make the process much simpler for people rather than trying to present them with too much information, let them manage the information that they have with them in a much easier fashion.

MR. WINSTON: It sounds like most of you feel that improving notices is like rearranging the deck chairs on the Titanic, that there may be better ways of giving consumers the tools they need to protect themselves. Is that --

MR. ABRAMS: Notices have value that does not relate -- that goes beyond the consumer just

1	understanding. I don't think we can lose sight of the
2	fact that notices create a framework for accountability,
3	a framework for defining fairness in the marketplace.
4	So, we should care about notices being addressable,
5	notices being accurate, notices being able to drill down
6	through as many layers as it takes, that there's an
7	importance to notices that goes beyond just guiding
8	individual choice. And I think that that's an important
9	point.

I mean, the notices have to be accurate, they have to be addressable, they need to be actionable, they need to give guidance, they need to drive competition, they need to do lots of things. But if we just say it's a matter of give notice, have choice, it's -- it goes beyond that.

MR. WINSTON: Colin.

MR. O'MALLEY: Yes. I don't think it's about rearranging the chairs on the Titanic at all. I think notice is incredibly important, and I think that we need -- as an industry need to work on ways to deliver proactive notice, to come outside of the privacy statement and to delivery proactive notice in a fashion to consumers that's meaningful.

The problem is that when we get -- in our programs, for example, we're really running self-

regulatory programs. We're trying to provide guidance on industry best practices for emerging technologies. And when we get really prescriptive with the types of notice that we expect in a proactive fashion, across our network of websites, we tend to always get behind the curve.

Once we come up with standards for how a proactive notice needs to be delivered, the context changes across the properties that might be within our network. And ultimately contextual notice is probably the most meaningful notice. So, when we're looking at -- I was describing some of the ways in which our program has evolved, all those different stepping stones within the privacy landscape, the cookies, the web beacons, the behavioral tracking and go into further detail on what software might be available on that website and whether or not this site engages in email marketing and undmight be within the privacy landscape.

notice is incredibly important. And in particular for the issues that are currently highlighted at this point in time as being critical to the user, and I think that one of the functions of a workshop like this is to say, listen, behavioral targeting is becoming one of those issues and we need to think about creative ways for delivering proactive notice, because this issue is becoming really topical.

But we don't want to become really prescriptive and put a deep stick in the mud on this particular issue in isolation of all the other issues that are really important, and we need to recognize that we may very well have another town hall meeting 12 months from now on an issue that we didn't contemplate today.

MR. WINSTON: Lorrie?

MS. CRANOR: Yeah, I agree. We do need to improve the existing notices, and it is worth putting effort into that so that when people want to read them they're there and they can read them and they can be effective. And the fact that people don't read them shouldn't be a reason to abandon them. I don't think we should -- I don't think our metric should be do people read them. I think our metric should be when people want to find information, do they find them useful at that point in time.

1		MR.	GIVOTOVS	KY:	Yes,	just	a	quick	comment	and
2	perhaps a	a que	stion out	of	it.					

MR. WINSTON: Would you identify yourself?

MR. GIVOTOVSKY: Yes, My name is Nick

Givotovsky. I'm a consultant. My company is called

Datasphere Interactive, and I study rights and policy in the digital realm, among other things. And I'm very curious. I mean, what we're hearing is a diversity of different privacy policies and statements of those

policies across respective environments.

And I think if you drill down you can find out what the effect of those environments are and one's rights within those environments and the flexibility offered by those respective environments. And clearly there are some innovative developments here that suggest a greater degree of accountability on the part of presenters of advertising to consumers. And I think that's very productive.

As a consumer, as a user of the web, there's no way to combine across all of those different environments an aggregate profile of one's web exposure. There's no comprehensive location to go and say, well, to what extent am I exposed across all of my activities on the web? What's my active profile? And to what extent is it distributed and redistributed across these environments?

think that at least breaks it apart so there's no one single point of failure, so to speak. That's basically what I want to say.

MR. GIVOTOVSKY: Point taken. And I think the tools that are out there now for digital identity offer that promise. But I'm very curious as to whether those tools will be leveragable or be applicable to the problem that I mentioned, which is, okay, an association with my -- be it my work, my play, my private persona, to what extent have I disclosed and to what extent am I exposed in the application of that individual sub-persona, because I think we ultimately do have singular identities, even if we manifest personas separately within environments.

And, you know, many of the targeting activities that are undertaken right now are considered are all about combining the activities within different domains to one another, so that we can get marketing offers in one environment, perhaps acting in a private context, when behaviors were tracked in another environment acting perhaps in a professional context. I mean, that's the goal of surrounding people with marketing messages that are personalized is to create context in which meaningful communications can be presented.

So the purposes that we're describing are

actually at cross purposes and there will be an
intersection that I think is a collision coming down the
road between integrated digital identities and targeted
marketing.

MR. WINSTON: Jeff?

MR. CHESTER: Jeff Chester, and I have a question about disclosure, and by no means do I endorse this, but I have been thinking about there has to be a simple unified way to tell the individual exactly what is going on. One of my critiques about behavioral targeting is we need to make the process conscious so that the user, the individual, the citizen, the consumer understands what the purpose of the system really is and then can make meaningful choices.

So, I want to ask a question about disclosure. Why can't you say you're collecting and targeting and profiling all this information? Why can't you say what you tell your clients? You know, which we look at and read with interest, that you're collecting this data to move people through the, quote, unquote, conversion funnel, that you'll be mixing information across platforms, that your system is designed to deepen brand identity, that your systems are designed to, as many of you put it, not necessarily you but behavioral targeters say to up-sell, to retarget. Why can't you say to the

consumer what the marketing purposes and designs are of the system that's been put in place? Thank you.

MR. SHIPMAN: I think that's a great question. In some of my prep material for the panel today I actually printed out an announcement that we put on our announcement board. We put it out on October 5th. It actually has a picture of me when I joined the company in like 1998.

(Laughter)

MR. WINSTON: Want to pass that around so we can all see it?

MR. SHIPMAN: Feeling quite youthful. It begins with hello, you've seen a lot of news lately spotlighting privacy issues for Internet companies like Google's purchase of Double Click, Facebook's new ad programs or the improvement of practices among search engines like Microsoft, Yahoo!, Ask.com, all the things we've been talking about, right?

But to your point, why can't we just tell our customers what we're doing with the information, this general announcement, which is still available on the eBay announcement boards, talked about AdChoice and talked about what these links around the ads were going to be so that they could understand exactly how we're serving ads and why.

And I heard from Jane earlier about the
blogging and the videos that they're doing. And, so, I
think that we're seeing some attempts to get to the
customer and say here is why we're collecting information
and here is what we're doing with it. I think that the
challenge is the customer might not be used to it and
we've got to get them up to speed with what to look for,
which is why we're testing different types of links and
different types of UI.

But you're absolutely right. It's a challenge, which is, is it a paragraph on the bottom of every page?

Is it on the top of the page, is it on the left or the right? Those types of messaging for a bidder when there's five seconds left are going to be completely ignored and all they're going to do is try to find the bid now button to get that item that they must have.

And, so, in that context, it's completely inappropriate. So finding the right context which is also what I've heard today on the panel is also equally relevant.

MR. WINSTON: Peter?

MR. CULLEN: Jeff, can I pick up on that?

Because I think you raised such a great point. Last June you may recall we made some commitments to attempt to do a better job of describing many of the things that you

just did. And, so, for example, those went live this week, so many of the things that you actually talked about in terms of what information is collected, how it's used, how it's aggregated, have now been added to our particular privacy notice, in addition to being very explicit that we do not use personal information. So there's a pretty profound statement.

And I want to kind of go a little bit sideways on that, because it's not just the disclosure but it's also then the practices that an organization has to put into play. I suspect you've had a chance to look at the paper that's available here in terms of how we actually do that decoupling between that. So I'd love your feedback on that.

But I kind of want to then go a little high level, because, you know, we're having a discussion about how we perhaps provide some uniform symbol or whatever that might be more relevant to a consumer, yet we're still, I think, kind of ignoring one of the fundamental challenges that today there is no regulatory requirement in this country for companies to even post a privacy statement.

And, again, not to flog this horse yet once more, but we're, you know, pretty active in terms of saying that it is time for some form of uniform privacy

1	legislation. We think that's the right thing for
2	consumers of which obviously providing notice would be a
3	core part.
4	MR. WINSTON: Carlos
5	MR. JENSEN: No.
6	MR. WINSTON: No? Okay.
7	MS. ENGLE: Well, just setting aside the issue
8	of legislation for a moment, absent that, what about I
9	wanted to go back to an issue that Joel raised earlier,
10	the notion of, you know, is it an oversimplification to
11	have some sort of statement that would be more than just
12	the question mark or something like that, that will give
13	consumers a little bit more of a clue as to why they need
14	to click here to find out more information.
15	And people talked about the preciousness of the
16	real estate. Well, perhaps some sort of uniform label or
17	logo could be developed along those lines and that people
18	would come to understand in a way you understand what a
19	shopping cart means and things like that.
20	MR. CULLEN: Here's the challenge.
21	MS. ENGLE: And that wouldn't I'm not
22	talking about, you know, a red, green system for the
23	privacy practices themselves, but just something that
24	consumers would understand here is where I need to go to

For The Record, Inc. (301) 870-8025 - www.ftrinc.net - (800) 921-5555

25

find out this information about how this ad or how I'm

being tracked.

MR. CULLEN: So, let's take just a step, high
level here. So, today, we're talking about behavioral
targeting, we're positing may be perhaps instead of a
link at the bottom of the page that says privacy, we
might have something that hovers over it, learn more
about behavioral targeting.

One might speculate that two weeks from now when you have a town hall on Social Security numbers the subject will be well, maybe we should have a hover to learn about how Social Security numbers or, well, perhaps we should have a hover to learn how we respond to court orders.

So you start to think about pretty soon we're back to, wow, I guess that link called privacy is still not a bad place to at least create a start.

MS. ENGLE: But then tying back to the notion of just in time, I mean, that's -- people have -- a lot of people have mentioned that that seems to be important, that consumers need to have some sort of trigger to know to check the privacy policy. I mean, for example, I recently bought something online and before I bought it I had read some consumer reviews.

And afterwards -- and I purchased the product and had used it, I thought maybe I'll post a review of my

1	of notation that something other than privacy policy in a
2	month or two it's going to become generic as well and
3	people will not click on that for the same reason. And
4	that's why we've chosen to use things like blogs to go
5	much more into detail about important issues and then

norming that goes around that standard and that you have to think about that standard as it relates to other standards. So, the point is, all of these are great ideas, but you can't say, I'm going to do one simple solution that's going to fix an amorphous problem so I think there is some attractiveness that is being discussed in industry around this concept of just-in-time notices, but there's a lot of background work that needs to be done before you can get to the place of saying where should that be.

MR. WINSTON: Srinija.

MS. SRINIVASAN: I was just going to make the simple point to Mary's point that it is normal course of business for us at Yahoo! to put that just-in-time notice at the point of information collection, so any time you're traversing our site if there's a survey or a, you know, sweepstakes or a place where we're specifically collecting that information, I mean, the initial place where we would receive personally identifiable information would be if you choose to register with us. And read siteprivacynt licy. We eney et you have

1	it to customize the content and advertising that you see.
2	So what you just described is absolutely
3	routine, normal course of business for us. And I think
4	that you're seeing continual evolution and innovation in
5	

For The Record, Inc.

(301)

thinks the government should step in right now and prescribe a notice? Don't all raise your hands at once here. Ouestion or comment?

MS. DYSON: I want to just continue on this topic. I think in addition to just in time we should have just for you. It's sort of ironic, marketers are now figuring out how to tailor advertising and offers and all this kind of stuff to individuals. They will use different copy for different kinds of people. Yet why can't we do the same thing with privacy statements?

So when you say the privacy statement may change a week later, perhaps there's a way to ask the person if you're relying on this privacy statement and you'd like to know if we update it, click here. So that you end up having not just -- not only just in time but also consumer-specific information about privacy policies. I do care about medical information, I don't care about financial or whatever. But apply these same techniques and the same brilliance of communication you use advertising chocolate chip cookies to advertise online cookies.

MR. WHITEHEAD: Steve Whitehead. So, I wanted to comment on the just-in-time thing and the need for notification. I think that's a great idea. It actually goes back to that previous comment about having the set

1	of standardized symbols, for example. I think that would
2	be a great example of a place where you can have
3	potentially standardized symbols that said what is this
4	information that you're entering into this field being
5	used for.

It seems to me that you could have a relatively small set of standard symbols that could potentially be used to provide course-grain indications to users about whether this is being used for third party marketing or whatever.

But my comment, and maybe I'm a bit of a pessimist, but I don't see that ever happening. I think it would be someone like TRUSTe that would drive such a thing, but I don't see it happening because I don't really see that the publishers have any incentive to do that. I don't think it's there. And, so, it won't happen without strong incentives. And I don't see how the publishers have any incentives to do that.

Any comment?

MS. DYSON: Consumers may ask for it. They're getting used to it on Facebook. I really think the consumer expectations are changing. And that's what's going to change the marketers' behavior.

MR. McCULLAGH: Oh, and one other thought. I mean, this doesn't have to be done by the companies

1	represented up here. If you've got a great idea for a
2	startup that would be a third party rating service, go
3	for it. If you're right and people actually want this,
4	there's lots of money kicking around for startups right
5	now.
	ND MINISTER OF L

6 MR. WINSTON: Question over here.

7 MR. CULLEN: Esther, you going to invest in

9 MS. DYSON: I already have.

(Laughter)

that one?

MS. DYSON: But it wasn't in my disclosure statement because they took it out.

MR. ZITELMAN: Hi, my name is Jeff Zitelman, I'm a citizen and stakeholder here. I would urge -- I think there is a role for the Commission to take to create something that's very simple. I mean, there have been some relatively complex problems in other industries that have been solved by simple solutions.

A good example is TV rating. I happen to have a teenager, there's certain shows I don't wish for them to watch, okay? As soon as a TV show starts, I see that TV-MA, TV-14, whatever it is, in the corner. That could be done in this, with the symbols such as the gentleman before me had mentioned.

I think that requiring people to look through

1	privacy policies is frankly absurd because more often
2	than not, orders of magnitude more often than not, people
3	will simply click yes, I have read something, when indeed
4	they haven't. So I would suggest that the Commission
5	does have a role but play to create something very simple
6	and put it in place.

MR. WINSTON: Thank you.

Lorrie, did you want to . . .

MS. CRANOR: So you asked a question as to whether there should be a regulation with mandated standardized notices. And while I'm not ready to say yes, we should definitely do that, I think the answer is maybe. And, so, I'll go out on a limb here further than my fellow panelists.

But I think, though, that we shouldn't just be talking about mandated notices for behavioral advertising. I think that we should be looking at the privacy issues online more holistically and we shouldn't look this week at behavioral advertising and next week at Social Security numbers. We should be looking at the whole picture and think about do we need a nutrition label for privacy, privacy in general and, if so, which are the things that we need to pull out?

I mean, there was a whole lengthy process in designing the nutrition label. There was a lot of

1	short	list	of,	you	know,	this	is	the	food	content	label,
2	bluow	he f	easi	hle							

So, let's take an example of what kind of information that could be. When you go to a web page, for instance, having a short list of who else is getting information about my visit here, and is my information that's being tracked combined with any other source.

That's a very small amount of real estate that's required and something that is incredibly powerful to users.

Getting notices that say this information may be shared with trusted third parties, does that mean that I have to stop talking?

(Laughter)

MR. JENSEN: I mean, big notices such as, you know, this information may be shared with trusted third parties is completely meaningless to users. Who are these third parties? Who trusts them? I certainly don't.

MS. ENGLE: Well, actually, we do just have about one minute left. If there are -- question?

MR. CAPEK: Just a very quick comment. My name is Peter Capek. There seemed to be very little information available, at least that people are willing to share, about how many people read privacy policies. And what little information there is seems to indicate

4		- ·			7
	that	almost	$n \cap$	one	anea
	CIIC	$\alpha \pm m \cup D \cup$	110	\circ	acco.

I'm curious, I'm curious whether anyone has
looked at whether -- and maybe somebody could, if the
information is available, whether there's more
examination of privacy policies in situations proximate
to things that you might expect people to worry about.
For example, if I go search for cancer at Google, did I
just go look at the privacy policy before that or right
after it? Probably before it is more indicative. Or if
I look at medical sites, is there more use of privacy
policy? I don't really care about eBay's privacy policy,
because there's nothing I do there. I assume they will
take appropriate care of my credit card number, but
beyond that, I don't really care who knows what I buy.

MR. WINSTON: Any other last comments? Anybody?

MS. DYSON: Yeah, the way to get people to read these statements is to say follow this link and earn a chance to win \$5.

(Laughter)

MS. CRANOR: I just wanted to comment that I would love to have that sort of data. I'm not in a position to collect that data, but with our Privacy Finder search engine, some of the data that we do plan to collect is when do people click on the privacy report

1	link and is there a correlation between, say, healthcare
2	searches and clicking on the privacy report link.
3	MR. CULLEN: You know, this we seem to be
4	inferring that this information about few people collect
5	is some proprietary type thing, It's just, you know, I
6	think many of us probably look at it. I don't have
7	current data, but I can tell you when we first launched
8	service pack 1 2, sorry, for Windows XP, it was the
9	first operating system that actually had a privacy
10	statement.
11	In the first three months over 1.5 million
12	people clicked on it. Now, do I know whether they
13	actually read it, do I know what page but it gives you
14	some order of magnitude that people actually do look at
15	these sorts of things.
16	MS. ENGLE: One last comment from Carlos.
17	MR. JENSEN: To answer your question more
18	directly, I mean, we do have experiments that show that
19	when you ask people for information directly ask
20	people for information that they consider to be sensitive
21	such as Social Security numbers or credit cards, they do
22check p	r¢kack polva¢yspallotemozelotemozetfyeqhantwkethan when
23	you're at a random search engine, which may or may not be
24	the right thing to do.

For The Record, Inc. (301) 870-8025 - www.ftrinc.net - (800) 921-5555

1	Google does, because simply because of the
2	accumulation of information over time. So hopefully that
3	answers your question.
4	MS. ENGLE: Well, I'd like to thank all of the
5	panelists this morning, and we will reconvene at 11:15.
6	(Applause)
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1 companies that we didn't disclose in her bio.

Τ	different type of panel discussion.
2	So, on that note, we're going to start with our
3	first video.
4	MR. MAGEE: Apparently, we may have to run the
5	videos straight through. If that's the case, then we'll
6	have the creators get up at the conclusion of the fifth
7	and we'll do it that way. Sorry.
8	MR. WEINSTEIN: All right, sounds good. So,
9	let's see the first video and possibly all five.
10	(Laughter)
11	(Videos played)
12	(Applause)
13	MR. WEINSTEIN: So, while someone tries to
14	figure out how to get the lights back on, we'll introduce
15	each of the creators and ask them to stand. The first
16	video, which is the one with the clever graphics, was
17	called "Cookies" and that was by Clayton Miller from the
18	Chicago area.
19	(Applause)
20	MR. WEINSTEIN: The second one with the young
21	girl, that actually was a girl, by the way, doing the
22	Cockney accent was called "What's a Cookie with Mari,"
23	and that was submitted by Leslie Weiner of Florida and
24	her daughter Mari.
25	(Applause)

1	started. I was thinking about these issues as, amazingly
2	enough, I often do, and it seems to me, again, the real
3	problem is not with the disclosure statements or
4	typically with the behavior of companies who actually
5	deliver on their promises, but on consumers'
6	understanding of what's going on. And I thought, well,
7	why not do a YouTube video contest? That's the way
8	everything else happens.
9	The purpose is not really to pick a winner and,
10	

knows this, and in many ways, this contest fits how the industry wants to frame the problem, in a very narrow, technical way.

The industry understands in its own words the, quote, "marketing and media ecosystem" that it has created. It has fully implemented the one-to-one marketing paradigm where a vast apparatus is now in place across applications, across platforms to collect, profile target and engage. That's the issue, and it's not about just cookies. And I urge you, if you haven't read our report, the Digital Food Report that came out in May -- I cite it because, in many ways, it's the best I think that's been written -- and I co-wrote it, yes.

(Laughter)

MR. CHESTER: But this is an area that I work on and care about. It's the best that's been written -- I do this with my wife, Kathryn Montgomery -- that describes the whole picture. It's blogs. It's the data collection and the relationship that's been created on blogs, on broadband, videos, through instant messaging, through social networks, it's an all-encompassing system that we have to address because the default is data collection and targeted marketing without the consent, awareness of the user to get them to engage in behaviors. Maybe it's shopping, voting for a candidate

now and others without their awareness and consent.

2 So, I have a problem with the narrow framing.

3 None of the videos really addressed the behavioral

4 targeting issue. I don't want to take up too much time,

I have other comments, and I'm happy to say that I'm sure

6 I will as we get on with this.

But, first place, if you really want to know what the industry is doing, look at the research they fund which we talk about in our report. The industry can't hide and say we don't know because they have spent tens of millions of dollars, in particular, looking at children and teens to know exactly how to target and collect that data. It's fully conscious, it's there. So let's be honest about it.

And I just also want to conclude by saying one thing, the industry has set up a kind of false dichotomy here. It's sort of suggesting we're anti-advertising, which I'm not, but what it really is saying is, well, without advertising there can't be editorial content. But what we're saying is there has to be rules here, safeguards for everyone to make sure that that content is given to the public in a way that ensures integrity.

creating landing pages, it is changing the editorial content for each user in order to give them a different relationship with the advertising and to facilitate the data collection. It's the industry, broadly speaking, that, in fact, is using editorial content to create and capture all this data, and we need to make these issues more visible. Thank you.

MR. MAGEE: Jeff, I think you made some good points. Online behavioral advertising is not just about cookies, but they are a part of it. And I think one of the messages that came out of the videos, at least for me, was that consumers have a lot of empowerment in terms of being able to go on to their computer and delete cookies and things if they're concerned about them. But in some ways that puts a big burden on the consumers.

I'm not sure that -- whenever I think about this, I think of my mother who is not the most computer savvy as opposed to my mother-in-law who really is. But my mom really just views the computer as a way to send email back and forth and pictures of her granddaughter, and I think the idea that she should be expected to understand cookies and be able to manipulate them is a little farfetched. I'm wondering if the panelists have any ideas on how to make the process more transparent or easier for people that aren't necessarily the most

1	contests. So, I think everybody should be applauded for
2	their participation and having that viewpoint and knowing
3	that it's really about consumers are empowered, they
4	just may not quite know it yet. So, what can we do to
5	get the word out there I think is key.
6	MS. COOPER: I would respectfully disagree with
7	Mike. I think that despite how simple it may seem for
8	all of us sitting in this room, I watched the five
9	finalists several times, and almost all of the

you saw, for example in the last video, Cookies 101, he 12

submissions, and it was not clear to me that any of them

really fully explained all the controls accurately. And

10

11

holds up his comput 00 0os 101, hedtt.n thiel.00000 0.00aeo6prot0000 13

1	straightforward and to not necessarily use the same
2	mechanism to track consumers to also opt them out or to
3	also give them choice. So, I think there's definitely
4	space to grow in how easy we can make the choices for
5	consumers.

MR. ZANEIS: If I might just clarify, I wasn't talking about NAI's self-regulatory. That's a whole different issue. I'm talking about a tool that's built into every single browser, so every single consumer has.

MS. COOPER: It may be a separate issue, but I think it's a big part of why we're all here to discuss today.

MR. ZANEIS: It just shows the options that are available to consumers.

MR. MAGEE: I think Alissa's got a good point, though, the cookie paradox of going in and deleting your cookies and then deleting your opt-out cookie which could be very frustrating, I think, to consumers. What are the options on that?

MS. DYSON: Well, also, it doesn't guarantee you privacy to delete your cookies if you have entered your email address. It will guarantee your privacy from certain kinds of tracking, but it's -- just deleting your cookies is a false promise if anybody says it will guarantee you privacy. That was a problem with one or

1	two of the videos, which fortunately I'm not voting on
2	because I can't remember which one it was.

MS. COOPER: Well, I think only given two minutes, it's probably impossible to -- we didn't only ask you to talk about how you can delete, how you can manage your cookies, the questions were, what is a cookie and -- you know, far too much information to provide in two minutes. So, it's a challenge.

MR. PEGORARO: Yeah, one of the things I often hear from readers, there's a lot of folks out there who have this sort of single-mined focus on cookies. On the one hand they forget that there are many other things they should be worrying about in the Internet in terms of their security of their computer, which in turn means their privacy. If you get hit by spyware, who cares how many cookies you've accepted, you have far more problems to worry about.

On the other hand, there's this thing called the rest of your life where you might use a credit card or use a loyalty card at a supermarket and that will put out far more data exhaust than any amount of cookies you could possibly pick up browsing the web for years on end.

MR. MAGEE: Lorrie, it looks like you have a comment on that.

MS. CRANOR: Yes, a few comments on a few

things. I agree that cookies are actually a relatively minor part of the problem. They are part of it, but there's a lot more out there. Also, as far as how do we get the message out to the public or what do we need to do, I think these educational videos are good, but I think we really also need to look to the tools that users have built into their web browsers. I think those tools have really come a very, very long way from Version 2 of the web browsers. However, they're still not completely where they need to be.

I think if you actually look at, for example, it was shown -- I believe the IE 6 or IE 7 cookie controls and if you actually read the text next to that slider bar for high, medium, low, it's nearly impossible for most people to understand what it means. Now, that said, the default setting in Internet Explorer arguably is actually a reasonable choice for a lot of people because, by default, it's actually blocking a lot of third party cookies when there's no opt out available to data sharing. And by making that a default setting Microsoft actually kind of set a bar.

Now, we could argue as to whether they set the bar in the right place, but there's a lot of power in how we set the default settings in our browsers.

MR. MAGEE: Jeff, do you have a comment? I see

4			
1	7/O112	hand	1110
-	your	mana	up.

2	MR. CHESTER: Yes. I don't think it's fair to
3	place it on the user. We want to work with industry here
4	in the United States and we started to work in the EC as
5	well to try to address these concerns. But it is the
б	entire system. All you have to do is read the report
7	that I referred to yesterday, which is just one of dozens
8	of these things. The first IAB AAAA report, HD
9	Marketing 2010, most of you probably are members so
10	you've gotten it already, Sharpening the Conversation, it
11	just lays out the entire scope of it and how it all
12	interacts and how marketers and I think it's so
13	interesting, Esther, I want to blog this that WPP,
14	which now owns $24/7$, didn't want to fund this.

1	MR. MAGEE: Let's maybe talk about some of what
2	we liked about the various videos. I mean, I thought
3	they were all fantastic. One of them, I think it might
4	have been Aaron's video, seemed to say that there's a way
5	that your cookies could get intercepted and maybe I'm
6	misreading that, but is that possible? When someone is
7	online, can their cookies be hijacked?

MS. DYSON: They can, but so can your password and your financial information which is much more dangerous than your cookie being hijacked. It all goes down to, especially if you're using a WiFi connection, your stuff may be in the clear. So, I think your cookies are probably the least problem you have, but they certainly can be hijacked.

He was also a bit glib when he said, it's a bad implementation to put a Social Security number in a cookie. It's a disaster.

(Laughter)

MR. ZANEIS: I think that's really the key is what kind of information is in the cookie. By and large, they're just anonymous random numbers and letters and such. The scary guy in the corner, the shady guy in the corner, I think, was what he talked about. But to your credit, you also talked about they're not really a data security problem in and of themselves and they don't

deliver viruses, which I think was key to that video. I thought it was well-balanced there.

MR. WEINSTEIN: Let's stay on that theme for a minute and talk more about why cookies are there in the first place, a little bit about what are the good things that are coming out of cookies that make users actually want to have that particular technology and tool available to them. Certainly, the videos illustrated several of these.

MR. PEGORARO: I really liked the analogy. I think the first and the fifth used virtual postcards, Post-It notes, which sort of get across the fact that cookies -- a lot of websites need them to function. I remember reading somebody's blog a while back which said, if the inventor of the cookie format had just called it website preference or something innocuous, no one would be wigged out about it. Instead, you have this cutsie name and people have gotten to think that cookies are a form of spyware, which they're not a form of any sort of ware. They're just an inert file on your hard drive.

MR. CHESTER: Look, I mean, it's not too long ago, even though it goes back to '93, '94 in the history of it, they were created purposefully to advance the role that advertising could play -- I mean, Netscape did it -- in the online environment. So, personalization is one

1	thing, but it has, from the very beginning, been a part
2	of implementing what they call the one-to-one paradigm,
3	the fact that they can the goal of interactive
4	marketing is to know so much about each and every one of
5	us that it can then engage us in very deep ways. I don't
6	have to tell you guys because you're doing it. I don't
7	know how many non-industry people are here.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

So, that's really the primary role of cookies and the associated data collection applications like pixels and web-bugs that have evolved.

MS. CRANOR: Well, that's how cookies are being used now, but I don't think that's how they were originally invented. They were originally invented as a state management mechanism is the computer science term. And there's actually a really nice paper by the people who invented them in the IETF that talks about the history and how basically the first year that they were out there, they were using them so they could actually make the web work, and then somebody discovered, this is great for advertising and they felt like, oh, my gosh, this thing is out of our control and there's nothing we can do about it now.

Yeah, the advertisers had no idea MS. DYSON: what cookies were when cookies were 0 1.00could t,-nit cookies were

history here. And if you go back to Netscape and the role of Netscape in helping create the cookie, it was clearly the advertising was in mind, and I refer people, I'll plug my book, I'll refer people to my book, Digital Destiny, which came out earlier this year. I have a whole chapter on the history of the interactive marketing system, including the origination of the cookies for commercial purposes.

MR. MAGEE: Tikva.

MS. MOROWATI: Hi, guys. I first want to tell you all who I am. I used to be a film maker and this whole space is not even two years old to me. I went through an international telecommunications program at NYU, which many of you might know about. Anyways, I'm telling you that because I see myself somewhere between you and the customers. And we've already gotten to the discussion about different age groups and places that people are at, a customer, there's lots of different kinds of customers.

Anyway, because you had asked a question,

Peder, one of your first questions was about your mom,

what can we do about your mom and these kinds of things.

What I see valuable in having this conversation and in

this competition really is about -- especially in the

scope of this conference is that we're really in touch

with where the users are coming from. It's really
interesting. Like every single one of the videos,
there's an inaccuracy about the way that cookies work,
and that's interesting, I think.

And I think the key is not -- in this panel, we're not talking about really the regulatory aspects like we are in the rest of the conference. Rather, we're just taking a look at the reality of where people are at and educating people about how they can empower themselves. I think it's true there's potential, the potential is there for empowerment, but I just don't think it is there. I think people are pretty head in the sand, butt in the air about their privacy.

MR. MAGEE: Well, I think the idea of using videos like this just from consumers and having them sort of self-educate is a really interesting one. Maybe we can talk about other contexts in which this could work. But, also, Max, what sort of response did YouTube get? Like how many people looked at these and what were the comments that were posted? Did the public find them interesting?

MR. WEINSTEIN: It's a good question. I'm not sure we have a great answer for you right now. When we publicized this contest, it was on fairly short notice. Esther gave us a little bit of a short time frame and we

of what this thing is really all about.

MR. CHESTER: But I do think it behooves

Berkman to bring in other partners that are unaffiliated with the industry. I mean, I know you -- Google is a funder of your program and Google paid for some of the expenses here. And I think it's very important that we have a lot more public participation, which we're going to encourage in all of this because young people really do need to make a statement and we will be encouraging them to do that about this ecosystem.

But as we have so-called privacy channels, it is incumbent upon the people that organized them to ensure that there is a broad array of perspectives, that there's an honest discussion on that channel that is prominently made visible on the home page, so it's not just a kind of narrow definition of the problem.

MR. WEINSTEIN: Sure. Mike, an industry response?

MR. ZANEIS: I'd like to thank Jeff for pointing out the fact that it actually is a partnership between the consumers and the businesses. Somebody needs to provide the platform for the user-generated content. We're not talking about industry having any sort of editorial control over this. It just makes the point that because of the ad-supported Internet, it empowers

consumers to go out and do things like this. So, but for that advertising, you don't have the platform to do it.

MS. DYSON: Frankly, I was expecting a lot more negative videos that -- you know, weird people in the corner sniffing around and so forth. And I thought that would have led to a better discussion, somewhat along the lines of what Jeff was talking about. With luck, those will show up. People should understand what happens when things go wrong, and that will enable them to protect themselves better.

This was vis-a-vis Lorrie's comments much earlier. I think people pay some attention to a privacy statement, but let's face it, they pay a lot more attention to who the website is. You probably haven't bothered to read American Express' privacy statement. If you go to some little website that offers a great deal on something, you may be much more likely to be concerned and you probably shouldn't believe their privacy statement anyway. So, it's a very large and complicated thing.

MR. MAGEE: It's hard to judge whose tent is up, but there's one down there.

MR. CHESTER: It's me. I want to just respond for a second to Mike and the ad-supported Internet and I think Kathryn said this yesterday. I had to leave.

1	Look, the Internet is more than just the ad-supported
2	system. I agree we have to have the monetization machine
3	and it is advertising. Right? I think it has to be
4	responsible advertising which includes good privacy, but
5	the Internet serves more than just a forum for ads.
6	Indeed, YouTube, in a way, was kind of envisioned in part
7	as a kind of public forum and the web really developed in
8	a way as a public forum and it remains a public forum.
9	It is, in fact, where our democracy, the digital media
10	system, rests, and not all of digital democracy should be
11	advertiser-supported.
12	We have to have spaces and places and practices
13	and policies where we can have this debate without it
14	being funded and for industry so as to tout, well,
15	without the advertisements, there goes democracy. That's
16	not the way it should work.
17	MS. DYSON: So, will you fund it with the
18	profits from your book or how will it get funded?
19	(Laughter)
20	MR. CHESTER: Well, to be honest with you, we
21	have funded a tremendous amount of work on this topic,
22	including a report we released yesterday. Tens of

For The Record, Inc. (301) 870-8025 - www.ftrinc.net - (800) 921-5555

23

on the part of industry to make the contributions
necessary so there can be a vital set of spaces in the
digital media that promotes citizenship and civic
expression without it having to be ad-supported.

MR. WEINSTEIN: I want to focus a little bit on the technology piece and ask what is the right way for consumers to protect their privacy within the narrow context of cookies? We have seen suggestions in the videos that range from choosing to accept each cookie individually to deleting all your cookies after the fact to refusing to accept cookies in the first place, refusing to accept third party cookies. That's a lot of options. Which one is the right one?

MR. PEGORARO: I'm a fan of the block third party cookies approach, which may not be good since our website, Washingtonpost.com, has quite a few of them.

(Laughter)

MR. PEGORARO: I think that is the simplest way overall. You don't suffer the real hit to just the utility of the web by having to look at every single cookie. If you do that, it's a mind-numbing task. You might as well not go on the web at all.

Trying to track the reputation of individual advertising networks, do I trust DoubleClick? How about this other one that, how about this other one, that

1	requires a lot of research that I don't have time to do
2	and I'm sort of paid to do that. It also has the
3	advantage a lot of web browsers are already set up to
4	block most or all third party cookies. Apple Safari, for
5	instance, blocks them by default. Firefox used to let
6	you click to block third party cookies and for some
7	reason they took it out in Firefox 2. It's not too hard
8	to do in Internet Explorer 7 either.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. MAGEE: Speaking of the alternatives, the protagonist in the video "Cookies 101" noted some alternatives to cookies, but he spoke pretty quickly at the end and I didn't catch them. What are the alternatives? And what are the pros and cons of those? Lorrie?

I listened to that ending a few MS. CRANOR: times to try to understand it. I actually played all these videos in my class on Tuesday. I teach a privacy class at Carnegie Mellon, and we had a big discussion about that. Some of the alternatives are actually alternatives that I'm not sure they're really any better. They're different than cookies, but I'm not sure, from a privacy perspective, that we really want to encourage people to do that, and they may even be worse because there are fewer control for the consumers to do those.

MR. MAGEE: What are they? What are you

1	referring	to?

MS. CRANOR: By using other mechanisms that essentially still tag you but not through the cookie mechanism. I think there was something about watching your IP address was in there, and there are a number of mechanisms where you can effectively put a cookie on a user's computer but it's not in the cookie folder. So, when you delete your cookies, it won't get deleted.

MS. DYSON: And, of course, those are not at the consumer's option. So, it's kind of like that's what advertisers can do, but it's not what consumers can do.

MS. COOPER: Or if they are at the consumer's option then the control is just impossible to find or not very clear.

I wanted to respond to your previous question about what's the best way and, obviously, Rob deals with everyday consumers all the time, so he has that perspective. But I think the real answer is it depends. Right? So, as we talked about this sort of false paradox of having ad-supported free content or paying for the content and not having ads, if you're someone who likes getting relevant ads, then maybe your choice is going to be different than someone who is more concerned about their privacy.

So, I think the answer is -- and you can see

the diversity of answers given across all 24 videos is
it really depends on the consumer and what the consumer
wants to be able to do and also probably the level of
tech savviness of the consumer, although it would be nice
if that wasn't such a factor and the controls were easier
so that if you chose that you wanted to be really privacy
protected, it could be one click instead of three or five
or ten or however many it maybe.

MR. ZANEIS: I think that's right. I would characterize it a little bit differently. We're talking about how you protect yourself. I think that's a little bit of a false promise than cookies make you more unprotected. I'm not sure that's right. I think it's an intimately personal decision, and the wonderful thing is that you have a number of choices as a consumer on what that level is and everybody gets to make that decision. I think that's the right way to do this, right?

We're going to have a self-regulatory panel next. I think the best form of self-regulation is when a consumer regulates themselves and has the empowerment to do that. So, I think that's where we're at with cookies.

MR. WEINSTEIN: I suspect Jeff would disagree, but I'm not putting words in your mouth, Jeff.

(Laughter)

MR. CHESTER: No, no, I do think this is, in

1	they want. But there's one thing the Internet has
2	enabled and, to a large extent, it's being funded by
3	Google's AdWords, is the tremendous rise of personal
4	publishing. People who aren't trying to maximize their
5	ad revenues, though some of them can still help fund
6	their lives through AdWords who are writing about
7	whatever it is they please. I'm talking primarily about
8	the blog-o-sphere, the profusion of content that is
9	created not for money but for self-expression or
10	sometimes for marketing your carpentry business or
11	whatever.

But it's exciting and it's exactly what you wanted. It's not funded by a public interest group, whatever its goals are, it's not funded by large media, it's funded by individuals who have something to say. That's probably the best antidote to all this.

MR. ZANEIS: Twelve million Americans have blogs. That's 8 percent of the population. That's a pretty powerful statement. I couldn't agree more.

MR. MAGEE: Does anyone in the audience have questions about any --

MR. CHESTER: Can I just respond for one second or are we out of time? But I do want to sort of underscore that the interactive advertising system put in place is going to have an impact. Yes, there's a long

1	tail, but it's going to have an impact on the funding and
2	diversity of content. Already advertisers on blogs,
3	including the company that Google bought, Feedster, they
4	can start blacklisting. You can start blacklisting
5	blogs.
6	I'm just suggesting to you, Esther, we need to
7	look at these issues very carefully and have a larger
8	public debate. There's no easy answer here necessarily.
9	MR. MAGEE: There's never any easy answer. Do
LO	we have questions from anyone in the audience?
L1	MS. DYSON: For the creators as well as for the
L2	panelists.
L3	UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I would love to hear from
L4	the creators a little bit. I don't know if you could
L5	describe in a minute or so just the thought process that
L6	went into your work and really exactly, how did you
L7	think about this?
L8	MR. CHESTER: They should come up here, I
L9	think. Come on up.
20	(Applause)
21	MS. DYSON: Did you do it just for the money?
22	(Laughter)
23	MR. MAGEE: Just go ahead and jump in.
24	MR. SCHAACK: I did "Got Cookies", along with
25	Kristin here Our thought process behind it is we kind

1	of were going off the idea of like grandmas, grandpas,
2	you know, people that just have no idea what a cookie is.
3	They watch the nightly news and they hear oh, cookies,
4	those are bad things. And when you do the research, it's
5	not necessarily so. And that, you know, they weren't
6	necessarily created for bad things, but like most things,
7	things can be exploited and used in a negative way.
8	MS. SCHAACK: So, we just wanted to sort of
9	break it down and have a simplistic way to explain it
10	creatively so the masses would be able to understand at

talked about the options I had at the very end, the reason why they're really fast is I needed it under two minutes.

(Laughter)

MR. WELCH: And then I realized, holy cow, I just dumped out all these words and now I've got to explain this and that's a whole seven other minutes of explanation. The two minutes was enormous difficulty and the scope of just -- we should have just left it with what is a cookie and then dealt with all the other stuff first. But, yeah, it was just mainly to keep it simple.

MR. PAYNTER: I'm online here with Madame Levy in France and she said she was trying to answer the six questions that they posed on the Berkman site in two minutes or less. But I can also say that for her and her daughters, this kind of work is as much about art as it is about technology. And those kids that she brought in to play on it are part of that generation to whom this is all simple and they were born and raised with this technology.

MR. SURING: Yeah, as I have been here for the past couple of days listening to all this, there was a lot of stuff I left out that seems more relevant to your discussion here and I kind of wish I had left it in. But we started more like a level past like the most basic.

1	We figured people knew what a browser was and it's more
2	extending past that and trying to get as much information
3	as we could in there. It was hard to do.

MR. MILLER: I think one of the central things in mine was that I wanted to recognize there's definitely a diversity, as has been mentioned, a diversity out there of individual -- I mean, I would say comfort levels, thresholds, of what individuals feel is how much information they want to share with different organizations. And so, yeah, kind of one thing that I tried to hone in on is that these are not necessarily bad, they can be bad for some people, good for other people depending on how they related to the companies involved.

MR. MAGEE: That's great. I think we should -this really felt like a town hall. I think we should go
ahead and we'll do our audience vote and the judges will
do theirs.

(Brief pause)

MR. MAGEE: All right. If this section could just on a show of hands what was your favorite video?

Video number 1 was the one with the great animation.

Video 2 was the young girl. Video 3 was the man with the plate of cookies. Okay, we're going to vote.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I don't think the

1	audience over here is
2	MR. MAGEE: I'm just going to do it section by
3	section. We'll go across. All right, I'm sorry. That's
4	what I'm going to do. I'm going to go through all five.
5	The man with the plate of cookies is video 3. Video 4
6	was Aaron's, the one we showed twice, and video 5 was Tim
7	Welch sitting on the couch with the Post-It notes.
8	So, who votes for video 1? Okay. Who has got
9	video 2? Video 3? Keep them up for a second, please.
10	And video 4? Okay. Video 5, Post-It notes?
11	All right. If we could get the middle of the
12	room to do it. Who votes for video number 1? This is
13	just this section right here. Video number 2?
14	UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Can you repeat the
15	videos?
16	MR. MAGEE: I'm sorry. Video number 1 was the
17	animation. Video number 2 was the little girl. Video
18	number 3 was the man with the plate of cookies. Video 4
19	is the one we showed twice. Video 5 was the Post-It
20	note.
21	So video number 1? Video number 2? Video
22	number 3? Video number 4? And video number 5?
23	Do you need me to repeat them again? Okay.
24	Who votes for video number 1? All right. Video number

For The Record, Inc. (301) 870-8025 - www.ftrinc.net - (800) 921-5555

25

2? Video number 3? How about video number 4? And video

1	number 5?
2	So, we're going to give them a moment to
3	compile the audience choice here.
4	(Brief pause)
5	MR. MAGEE: I'm just going the announce the
6	public's choice. We wanted the public to weigh in on
7	which one they liked best. The Berkman Center has got
8	its own prize and the judges have voted for theirs. So,
9	this is just for our internal purposes here. Public voted
LO	number 3 was the winner.
L1	(Applause)
L2	MR. MAGEE: Cookies 101. The fifth video was
L3	second.
L4	(Applause)
L5	MR. MAGEE: And the first and Aaron's, the
L6	fourth, were tied for 3rd. And I just wanted to thank
L7	all the creators. They were all fantastic.
L8	(Applause)
L9	MR. MAGEE: So I'm going to ask Erica to bring
20	up the plaque for our grand prize winner. I did not
21	mention in the introduction, but it should be made clear

For The Record, Inc. (301) 870-8025 - www.ftrinc.net - (800) 921-5555

that the panelists, in addition to the great job they did

22

23

1		AFTERNOON SESSION				
2	SESSION 8:	THE REGULATORY AND SELF-REGULATORY	LANGUAGE			
3						

many models that build on the notice and choice
structure, and we heard earlier today that that has a lot
of challenges and proponents and opponents.

Others take a more harm-based approach, for example, prohibiting certain practices that are viewed as harmful, or rather certain uses of data that are likely to lead to harm. And I'm hoping that in this panel we can explore perhaps some models that might be based on that.

But we're going to begin today with three panelists that represent different perspectives in this area. Then we'll move to a roundtable discussion and, again, not a round table so it's a challenge here. And, hopefully, we have some audience questions in the end as we have had throughout the day.

First, Trevor Hughes of the Network Advertising Initiative is here to discuss the NAI principles. Then we're going to have Pam Dixon of the World Privacy Forum here to represent the consumer perspective, and I think she's got a recent study she just did, which I haven't had a chance to read.

Did you release it this morning? Yes? I'm looking forward to reading it.

And, finally, we'll hear from Reijo Aarnio,
Data Protection Ombudsman of Finland on how the EU's

companies, always organizations, always websites that we'd like to have posting privacy policies, privacy policies do exist, and we have been telling the marketplace for a long time to post privacy policies.

They are up there, I know that there will always be issues with regards to readability and consumer engagement. But I think Marty Abrams' comments were notable earlier today that privacy policies have not only been a vehicle for notice, but they are an incredible vehicle for accountability because organizations take on significant responsibility by posting those privacy policies.

We also talked extensively about browser control. The last panel was a great exploration of the various controls that exist with regards to cookies. And we certainly have the opportunity to talk about other state management tools, but I want to make sure that we don't miss the fact that there are many, many, many controls available to consumers, most of them within just two or three clicks and regardless of which browser you are in, you have the ability to block, delete, in some cases, manage first versus third party cookies. You have the ability to do a lot of things.

I also want to point out that there is in the primary browser in the marketplace today, which is IE 6

or 7, Internet Explorer 6 or 7, the ability for consumers
to really determine what their own public policy posture
is with regards to many of the issues that we have been
discussing.

If I'm a privacy complacent as Larry described it, I may decide to accept all cookies. If I'm a privacy pragmatic, I may decide to set an opt-in or opt-out for cookies on my system. I may decide to segment between first or third party cookies. If I'm very, very concerned about privacy, I can block them all or I can block just third party cookies.

I think it's also notable that in the default setting, which is the setting that generally stays in place for the majority of consumers, Microsoft blocks third party cookies that do not have a P3P statement attached. So, if you don't have a privacy statement associated with your third party cookie, you're blocked in 75 percent of the browsers around the world.

More than that in Safari, another major browser, third party cookies are blocked in the default setting. So, behavioral targeting is essentially not happening in those browsers because Safari is blocking those third party cookies basically preventing any behavioral targeting from occurring.

So, consumers have control. Now, certainly,

1	certainly, certainly, industry, the advocacy community,
2	the FTC, all of us could be doing a better job at
3	educating consumers about the availability of these
4	controls. But let's not forget for one second that these
5	controls are very strong and they're there and they're
б	available for use.
7	T . 1

I also want to make sure that I mention some of

dot-com economy really deflated and membership dropped pretty precipitously at that time.

I want to share with you, though, that the NAI is built on many of the fundamental principles that we have talked about over the past two days. Notably, it is built on the concept that consumers deserve notice and they need to have the ability to exercise choice with regards to the practices of NAI members.

I do need to mention to you, though, that the NAI principles are built for a very specific function. That's something that we call online preference marketing. So, the NAI is not a silver bullet for the entire online advertising industry. It is not a one-size-fits-all solution for every single practice that exists. But for those companies that are engaged in online preference marketing, as it's defined in the NAI principles, which is basically the gathering of data across a broad network of websites for the purposes of aggregating a profile so that that profile can be targeted back. It certainly is and has been working.

We also have layers of controls. So, the amount of notice, the level of choice increases with the amount of personal data that you're using in the NAI principles.

Further, we have special protections for

personal data associated with sensitive consumer characteristics.

I want to show you how it works. The NAI principles required that notice be provided on websites that are using the services of NAI members. This occurs in one of two ways, it occurs where a link is provided back to that NAI member or back to the NAI gateway site.

We've talked about the Washington Post over the past couple of days, here is their notice. I'm two or three slides away. So, if I can just sneak through. Thanks.

So, this is notice on the Washington Post with regards to NAI practices from our member companies. We also have some companies, weather.com was mentioned previously as well. Here is a link back to the NAI Global Gateway site. When a user reviews the privacy policy in that site and clicks through -- and based on our understanding, there are over 20,000 references to the NAI opt-out page out across the web, so over 20,000 places where this link appears.

A consumer clicks through, they come to this page. We tried to make the opt-out very noticeable, it's a big red button right there. If you click on consumer opt-out, you're presented a page where you are told whether you have an active or have no active cookie from

1	the various NAI members. You have the ability to opt out
2	of one, two, three, all of the NAI members. You click on
3	submit and you're presented with a page that tells you
4	whether your opt-out was successful or not.
5	Now, this is technology. The vagaries of
6	browser settings, of the various types of operating
7	

somehow in their opt-out cookie serving at that point in time. We have successfully resolved all of those concerns and we focus heavily on complaints and functionality for NAI members.

I do want to close, though, by saying that the NAI was formed at a time when this issue was very hot, and we have not been complacent nor silent over the past six years. In fact, as the behavioral targeting world sort of came apart during the dot-com crash, we turned our attention to other efforts. We worked collaboratively with many of the advocacy organizations here on web beacon guidelines, best practices for the use of web beacons.

We worked extensively on the trusted download program in the adware and spyware debate. We worked extensively in the email industry to try and promote best practices in that industry and heavily promote it through the use of email authentication.

Now, with a number of mergers and some constructive criticism from our advocacy friends, the time is, again, appropriate for us to review and look at the NAI principles. And I'm happy to report today -- we actually weren't intending to release a document today -- but we have been working for the better part of the last year on essentially a plug-in or a set of best practices

L	fragile and it's very susceptible to deletion.
2	So, for example, if you have a computer
3	protection program on your computer that's just
1	automatically deleting third party cookies, it tends to
5	wipe out the NAI opt-out cookie as well.
5	So, we have a core protection as part of the
7	

1 often and it's really variable depending on your browser setting, depending on your firewall settings, so a lot of variables. So, the simple opt-out is not a simple 3 4 opt-out. In comments that have been filed for this meeting, that has been acknowledged. So, I think we know we have a problem there.

2

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

But there's a further problem, and that is this, there are new tracking -- actually, old tracking technologies that are being used in new ways that extend far beyond cookies. So, for example, let's say a user has downloaded an NAI opt-out cookie successfully, they somehow manage to hear about it and they downloaded it and they haven't deleted it. If they go and watch a video online, they can very well get a flash cookie. Α flash cookie has more tracking capacity than an NAI opt-out cookie.

How do you address that within the NAI structure? The answer is the NAI structure doesn't address it at all and it wasn't meant to and it doesn't. So, we have a tracking technology that's in use of 98 percent of the computers today that's not addressed. That's an issue.

We also have the Tacoda hardened cookie to talk about. So, we actually did a technical packet sniff analysis of how the cookie worked. What happens is that

1	it's going in and resetting the NAI opt-out cookie. So,
2	someone deletes the cookie and then the technology goes
3	in and says, oops, that cookie is gone, let's reset that
4	

think from the consumer perspective the real issue here
is, is this a program that's working to protect consumers
and is it a true robust self-regulatory program? I think
you have to answer it, at this point based on the factual
evidence, I think you have to say no. I think it has
failed and I think we need to take a new look at it.

Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. AARNIO: Ladies and gentlemen, it's great to be here again with some European perspectives for you here.

So, gentlemen, Friday afternoon, please raise your hand if you attempt this. As we know, this technology is there in your pockets right now. We have our mobile phones. So, in this picture, the technology is ansium (phonetic). So, the European perspective in this case is who makes the decision? Either the wife on the left side or the husband on the right side.

Who are these guys? If they are not a couple, they might be employer and employee or business unit and its customer and so on.

So, anyway, the European perspective is that we have a89()Tcal disput

discussing about data security. And it's very simple to
define data security as a right which secures these other
rights.

So, why do we need all these rights? Well, simply, therefore, that our human dignity should be respected, our autonomy should be respected, our honor should be respected and nobody shouldn't be discriminated and our equality as citizens is secured as we all know.

Now, can we put a price label on this? Some people say that they do not have anything to hide, other people are very, very precise with their privacy, with their data protection. So, we are talking about quality of life, which means that this is a very personal question. If somebody wants to exercise these rights, then let him do so, or her.

Here is the global environment and national states and how this affects. So, as we can see, we have a general data protection and, on the other hand, access to public documents legislation. Then we have a lot of legislation on different functions like marketing, communication and so on. We have sectoral legislation, health care sector, public sector, social welfare sector and so on. And the latest instrument is codes of conduct.

In Europe, we have this three pillar system

1	which are now getting closer to each other since there is
2	a brand new framework. This isn't data protection, it's
3	applied also on police and security matters. But Lisbon
4	Treat, which is mentioned here, means that the 19th of
_	

So, to the extent we have been talking about information that's not personally identifiable in the traditional sense, the data directive would not apply.

MR. AARNIO: Well, actually, this legal framework is about personal data, so identifiable data, but also traffic data, so communication data. And, now, this regulation means, in some cases, you are not allowed to know who is part of a communication.

MS. BRANDENBURG: We are going to turn to the roundtable portion of this session. I'm going to introduce from the far end the roundtable participants.

We have at the end Jerry Cerasale from the Direct Marketing Association; Peter Swire, Moritz College of Law at Ohio State University; Jeff Chester, Center for Digital Democracy; Karen Geduldig, who is from the Office of the New York Attorney General; Ari Schwartz, Center for Democracy and Technology; Brad Schuelke, Office of the Texas Attorney General; Mike Hintze from Microsoft; Mark Cooper from the Consumer Federation of America; and Mike Zaneis from the Interactive Advertising Bureau. Then, of course, our presenters, and you know Jessica Rich and myself. She's moved over there.

So, we have just heard three approaches or takes on the issues that we have raised dealing with behavioral advertising. We wanted to get out, at the

beginning of this session, any other models for self-regulation that may be out there. So, I'm going to direct this question to Mike Zaneis, if you could start us off.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Sure, I appreciate it. Obviously, MR. ZANEIS: Trevor did a good job of covering NAI and I'll let Jerry talk about DMA and you've heard from others, such as OPA, earlier in the program. So, what I might just touch on is sort of the success story we see on individual company self-regulation and the number of companies that are now really competing on privacy. And it's not a new phenomenon, I just think you hear a lot about it because of good events like this. But I think it's something that we've really seen incentivized recently. seems to be disconnect today. People seem to say that consumers don't know what's happening and they don't know about privacy policies and they don't know about cookies, and I think that's probably borne out by some of the consumer survey data that we've seen.

But one thing that the private sectors figured out is that being strong on data security and on privacy practices is just good business. So, you see some of the announcements such as what AOL is doing. You heard earlier from eBay where they're actually embedding notices and the opt-out right there in the advertisement.

And I think it's a great way, what we really have is now fertile ground for competition and innovation within the private sector. And what you see is people devoting real resources and attention to this.

And I think what we'll see is sort of this blooming of a thousand flowers of different models because the Internet is so diverse and there's a reason that a one size fits all doesn't necessarily work on here because there's so many different platforms, there's so many different business models, whether it is the 12 million bloggers out there in the United States, many of whom are able to sustain their infrastructure and their time and resources because of a plug-in from Google or anybody else, that's a real success story.

So, what we want to do is allow the competition within the private sector. Again, you know, I said it before, the key here is to provide consumers with options and with tools. And the more that you try to regulate and just to have one single solution, I think the more you're just sort of doomed to fail here.

MS. RICH: Mike, do you want to talk just a little about -- IAB has its own principles, right? Do you want to just briefly describe what those are?

MR. ZANEIS: We do, and they follow the basic tenets of privacy online that you would think. So, our

Τ	best practices state that every member should have a
2	privacy policy, it should be clearly worded, it should be
3	easily accessible from the first page and subsequent
4	pages on your site. Those things, consumer choice,
5	strong data security, I mean, this is we had a
6	conversation about cookies before and there we're not
7	talking about sensitive information. But on various
8	platforms you're going to have businesses that collect
9	different types of information. Right? You can't have
10	an ecommerce website without collecting certain financial
11	information, credit card number and such.
12	So, data security has to go hand in hand with
13	that. That's where IAB's best practices really focus
14	attention.
15	MS. RICH: And how many members do you have?
16	MR. ZANEIS: We have over 350 members.
17	MS. RICH: And do you do anything to enforce
18	the standards?
19	MR. ZANEIS: It's just best practice, it's not

MR. ZANEIS: It's just best practice, it's not regulatory. We don't kick people out necessarily. We have been looking at the potential for -- we certainly have partnered with TRUSTe on a number of their programs. As I said, we support NAI and DMA and OPA, but we've looked at maybe seeing if it's feasible to roll out some sort of privacy compliance program, whether it's a

For The Record, Inc. (301) 870-8025 - www.ftrinc.net - (800) 921-5555

privacy seal or something like that working with -similar to what you see BBB online doing.

MS. RICH: Thank you. Jerry, do you want to talk about how DMA's best practices may touch on these issues, specifically behavioral advertising?

MR. CERASALE: Sure. DMA has some best practices, but we also have guidelines which are requirements for members to follow. And we also have a self-regulatory framework with ethics committees and adjudication, and self-regulation is viewed more as not punishment but corrective action to try and stop the practice, get it stopped and get it going. And we have sent many a case to perspective Attorneys General and the Postal Inspectors and the Federal Trade Commission.

In online marketing, our whole thing goes on notice, and if you're using -- I think our thing says cookies or any other passive means of data collection, whether the data collected is used internally or whether it's transferred to third parties, there are things that have to be noticed in the privacy policy of all DMA members.

We have found in writing this that you had to -- we started doing these quite a ways back, that you could not just leave it to cookies and we had to try some other language because there is going to be successors

well as search, around issues around transparency and user control and protecting the data and how we anonymize data, which we followed up on with a white paper that we released this week in terms of describing in more detail how we anonymize data and how we protect data while we have it.

And, so, I think that there's a lot of companies that are doing really interesting things. We saw from eBay, we saw AOL's initiative. The advocates have thrown out some great ideas. I think there's probably no one silver bullet here. There's a lot of things that go into protecting data, protecting privacy in this area and that ranges from regulation, the FTC using their existing authority under Section 5 or in merger reviews to the extent that consolidation of data or data collection raises competition as well as privacy issues, technological solutions that we're seeing, consumer education is an important part as well.

I think all those things need to play together when we look at overall solutions in the space.

MS. RICH: So, we have international standards, we have FTC unfair, deceptive acts or practices, we have NAI, we have IAB, we have DMA, we have individual initiatives. Let's round it out, the states. What are the tools and the standards that you would use possibly

to address these practices? What are the standards you're measuring them against? Brad and Karen.

MR. SCHUELKE: I guess before I start, before I make any comments, I unfortunately have to make the disclosure that nothing I say is official opinion of the Texas Attorney General or the Texas Attorney General's Office.

I think in general right now the states are looking at a couple of things. I think, first and foremost, it would be the states' deceptive trade practices and unfair practices statutes, similar to the FTC's Section 5. I know California has a specific statute regarding consumer's ability to opt out of data collection, but I think that right now as current, those are the two primary things.

MS. RICH: So, it sounds like we have a fair number of standards in this area, but maybe not that many that apply specifically to behavioral advertising, is that right, and address these practices. So, maybe to come at it from a different angle, and this would draw on everything we have been talking about yesterday and today, in the behavioral advertising area, are there practices we can agree are off-limits or in-bounds? I think we heard -- which could form the basis for some sort of consensus or standards.

works, which is stuck in the cookies world which only 1 applies to the NAI companies, and in some ways those are the best -- I mean, the leaders. The only company we 4 have on the panel here is Microsoft and they have some of the best practices in the space. You have the best -you have the --

(Laughter)

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

It was worth coming, right? MR. RICH:

MR. SCHWARTZ: You have the leaders who are here at this session, but the concerns from consumers are all those outliers and what do we do about them? Larry Ponemon said this on the panel yesterday, do we go after the good guys or the bad guys? I'd hope we'd go after the bad guys and we do it in a way where we can make sure that the good guys still want to do what they need to do without harming the bad guys.

MS. RICH: Jeff? And then maybe we'll move into a discussion of what we think about the various models. But Jeff first.

MR. CHESTER: I don't want to talk too much because I've had too much -- I've a great opportunity, which I thank the Commission. But, look, there are certain practices that should be not allowed at all, particularly in the children's area, particularly in the youth area. I don't have to get -- we talk about the

1	health area, we talk about the obesity area. There are a
2	number of practices that should not be permitted at all,
3	and we will make sure that these issues get addressed
4	over the next several years and, hopefully, the industry
5	will come and agree to work with the privacy community to
6	make sure that those practices don't further evolve.
7	MS. RICH: What are those practices? I would
8	love to hear everyone's view on what are those practices.
9	Does anyone else want to venture forth? What are
10	practices, Mike, that your companies shouldn't be doing?
11	MR. ZANEIS: Well, let me answer that question
12	by also answering your last question. I think we
13	actually do have a harm-based model, don't we? It's
14	called the FTC Act, and it works well and on a number of

1	So, specific models, we've talked about them.
2	You're right. We need to not be violative of whether
3	it's COPPA or the Fair Credit Reporting Act or HIPAA or
4	something like that. It's not the wild, wild west.
5	There are laws out there. There are practices and people
6	are following those. So, let's at least be
7	intellectually honest about what the landscape is.
8	MS. RICH: Let's move in to sort of what we
9	think about
10	MS. BRANDENBURG: Mark?
11	MS. RICH: Oh, Mark?

expect and what marketers think they deserve. There was
a huge gap between what the marketers said consumers
should have for privacy and what consumers wanted. And,
of course, the presenter suggested it was a uninformed
consumer. But what it is is a concerned consumer.

So, I've heard the word "accountability" a hundred times. But accountability without actionability is meaningless. And we have seen the numbers. There is no actionability for the vast public and, therefore, the marketplace cannot possibly effectuate the solution because consumers cannot act on what the industry claims these models are providing.

So, I think the fundamental from premise here of wanting to move on from notice and choice to the other aspects of behavioral marketing missed the point, that the model we have already does not work, the consumer does not think it works, and the consumer expectation, perception, belief, is actually what this is about.

MS. RICH: Well, I have been trying to get a discussion going on a model that wouldn't necessarily put so many burdens on the consumer, but I'm not hearing a lot of principles that everyone can agree on that would

he wants something or she wants something, you're going to let them do it.

The questions are what are the choices? I respect Trevor and I was around when NAI was created. I worked in the government then. And that was a guess at 2000 about what might work and it was accompanied by a very clear signal that the merger of online and offline database wasn't going to happen. Now, we have the world offline where there's many, many ways in which stuff that's not readily identifiable at point one is hooked in through an email or something else and is fully identifiable to lots and lots of people.

So, now, we're in the place online that we prevented happening in 2000. And the question is, how well do our guesses in 2000 bind us today? I think for the last couple of days and everybody getting ready for this meeting, it's pretty clear that the choices that we had as of six or eight months ago were lousy for consumers. No ordinary human being could figure it out. Sorry, but that's pretty much it.

And the public policy goal it seems -- whatever you call the model, I think the public policy goal goes something like this: We know from Larry Ponemon and Alan Westin that there's people with diverse privacy preferences. There's some people who go on Rivera and

Jerry Springer and they're not caring about privacy.

2 They say amazing things. And there's other people

3 that -- and depending on the numbers it's 20 or 30 or 40

4 percent -- have high privacy preferences. And the FTC

5 ran the do not call list for telephones and what's the

6 number, a hundred million or something. There's a lot of

7 people on that one.

So, we know that when it's workable, there's a whole bunch of people, pick your number of tens of millions of people, who have privacy preferences. The public policy goal, roughly speaking, is letting the system work so it matches their privacy preferences. If they want to be personalized and they want the sign up and they know what they're getting and all that, hallelujah, let that happen. It's pretty clear if you give folks a chance they don't want something it ought to be workable for them.

You can call that notice and choice, you can call it harm to me, if I don't get what I want, you can call it whatever model you want, but at a public policy level somehow it ought to be that normal people more or less can get what they want. That's a good goal for the FTC.

And then in terms of how to get it -- and I'll just go for just a couple sentences -- I think that it

1	how it might be expanded to be better, and also move to
2	talking about the do not track proposal and whether the
3	diverse group here thinks that could be feasible on a
4	broader basis than just one company, whether it be
5	voluntary or something else.

So, who would like to start mentioning in a constructive way?

MR. COOPER: I'll try. We have six principles. Let me outline what I think the principles are having been one of the signatories of the document yesterday. What I would call six principles for the uninterested, illiterate, uninformed and unskilled. Those are folks who need your protection. We don't need to protect the other guys.

So, here are the six principles as I see them from yesterday's announcement. A simple consumer friendly interface to declare across all platforms that you do not want to be tracked.

Two, robust notification about how to make that declaration and contextual notification if that wish is perhaps to be violated or to remind you what you decided to do in case you want to change your mind.

Three, a consistent set of basic privacy protections and definitions that consumers can understand across platforms.

1			Four	,	teeth	to	enforce	compliance	so	consumers
2	can	trust	the	sy	stem.					

Five, an effective right to correct information about and categorization of consumers that is used in online marketing.

And, six, an organized process for overseeing and updating the protection of consumer privacy. Seven years is far too long to wait to keep up in a space as dynamic as this.

I think those six principles were outlined yesterday in that statement and, frankly, a lot of my constituents fall into that category of people. Now, don't tell them I said that about them, but actually that's why they hired me to protect their interests here in Washington, and I think those will, in fact, go a long way.

That doesn't mean there aren't people who choose not to opt-in and, therefore, can do other -- you know, you can treat them otherwise. But this needs to be there because the number of people who fall in that category is very large and, therefore, they need protection.

MS. RICH: Trevor.

MR. HUGHES: So, certainly, we are happy to engage in the dialogue. Let me just make sure that I

1	clarify a few things about the NAI principles. First of
2	all, the NAI principles are not technology-specific.
3	They are technology-neutral. They don't say anything
4	about cookies. So, to the extent that someone is using a
5	flash cookie, XML silver light, cascading style sheet,
6	whatever it might be and they are doing behavioral
7	targeting, they should be a member of the NAI, and if
8	they're not, shame on them.
9	A0 0000 TD

two of their subsidiaries, Tacoda and Advertising.com, 1 2 and Microsoft and Google both have pending applications that we're working through right now, and we look forward 3 4 to both of them being members. So, we do have significant breadth, I think, in terms of behavioral targeting online within the NAI.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And then, finally, just in the sort of responsive points. We're not hard to find. We're not hard to talk to. We're pretty well-known and visible within the privacy community particularly and no one talked to us. Had anyone talked to us, we would have been able to say we've got over a million hits on our website this year. The opt-out page is getting a million hits a year. We would have been able to say, there are over 20,000 references to the NAI opt-out page across privacy policies around the world even.

Certainly, we can do better. Certainly, there are other issues that we can tackle. But to throw the baby out with the bath water, to label this as a failure, I think is inappropriate given that the NAI was built to do a specific thing for a specific set of practices and it has been doing that for six years.

Now, on to what can we do better, because I think we can do things better. I mentioned sensitive I think that there is room for us to talk as a data.

1	community about the use of sensitive data in even
2	non-personal behavioral targeting.
3	So, are there sensitive categories that we can
4	identify where, as Peter Swire so rightfully suggested,
5	we should require a cut finger, a seal on paper and a
6	signature in blood that someone really means that they
7	want to let us target on those things?
8	We can create a de facto use limitation on
9	

MR. SCHWARTZ: Let me first start by saying there are several things I agree with Trevor about, including the fact if companies are network advertisers and they're not NAI members, shame on them. They should join. And Trevor and his staff do great work and they've done great stuff on web beacons and emails and have consulted with us and other groups on that.

However that doesn't make up for the fact that there have been no changes to the basic implementation of the guidelines of the principles since they were put into effect, including the fact that it is cookie-focused.

And there's a basic problem in giving the opt-out to the individual in the same structure in which they are being tracked. Individuals want to delete them so they disappear.

I don't even have to go much further than to say look at the videos we saw today about cookies. Do you remember how many of them mentioned the NAI in the video, in going to the NAI to opt out? None of them did. In fact, I saw a lot morin going tir 0.wust the five that

universal, more technology neutral, and something that can build a marketplace for Consumer Protection in this space? We suggested the opt-out. If I can have just two minutes to describe the do not track list, I would like to do that because --

MS. RICH: Well, I would like to move to the do not track list, but I first want to understand whether people think that that NAI is something that can be fixed and improved because a lot of complaints we're hearing is it's not known or not used or it's --

MR. SCHWARTZ: Well, there's also a range of things in the principles that we complained about originally that we still have concerns with. We could probably come down to -- and I haven't read Pam's report fully yet, but I know that it hits on a lot of these points. You probably come up with about nine different complaints from CDT about the NAI. I don't know if it's fixable or not, for that purpose. Like I said, some of the other work they've done has been very successful.

MS. RICH: Pam.

MS. DIXON: Look, I think that we really have to look at all the options here and really look at the facts. I don't think we can just speculate and say, okay, well, let's see, let's see how we can possibly foresee into the future.

1	One of the things that we proposed in our
2	consensus document is that there be some kind of
3	oversight committee so this wouldn't happen again. I
4	think it is very difficult to draw a line in the sand and
5	say, okay, we're going to ask that technology stay here.
6	We can't do that. Technology is going to move on no
7	matter what we do. Since we know that that's going to
8	happen, we should be able to mitigate for that going
9	forward because we know all the things that happened this
0	time around.

The NAI was crafted at a period of time after which there was extraordinary change. So, I think it's very difficult to then try to put so much weight on it that it would survive now. But I think Ari is correct, I think that we need to look at all the options.

MS. RICH: Brad?

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. SCHUELKE: Well, I think there are a number of issues and it certainly may be difficult to fix. think the one problem that I don't know is addressable in the model is the fact that it's sort of not mandatory membership. And sort of just like the do not call, I don't know that there's any way that you can fix that telemarketers don't have to be a member of DMA or direct marketers or behavioral marketers don't have to be a member of NAI, and if there's nothing beyond that, you

always have those outliers, you always have the bad guys that we really want to look at anyway. Those are going be the ones that aren't a member of NAI, and I don't know how you fix it strictly in the NAI principles.

MS. RICH: So, that's an inherent problem with self-regulation. So, to the extent -- if you were to conclude there's -- I mean, all self-regulation, right?

MR. SCHUELKE: Sure. Well, I mean, you could have it as a safe harbor and so this will be self-regulation within a safe harbor and outliers have different standards. So, I mean, you could still have self-regulation in a regulatory model.

MS. RICH: Jerry?

MR. CERASALE: Seven years ago, we heard the same thing, that gathering information, following where people are going was going to undermine the Internet, undermine consumer confidence. If I sat here today and just came here to listen to this panel, you would think the Internet was an absolute total commercial bust and that people were being harmed constantly.

You know, people are going there. Three quarters of Internet users that we found prefer to go to free sites that don't charge them, that they're paid by advertising. So, people understand -- and 86 percent are going to buy more off the Internet than they did before.

So, it's not a bust. The self-regulation that has occurred since in those seven years has been positive.

The Internet has grown and so forth. We have more things to do.

One of the things that I didn't say on DMA's guidelines, and I think is an important thing to look at in the future, is a basic requirement for all of DMA is that marketing data, data obtained from marketing purposes can be used only for marketing purposes. Lots of things we've heard about others using it, it can be used for different types of requests, not to just give you an offer, those are things I think that we have to try and pull into this as well.

And the other thing is, in support of Trevor, we didn't have the technology back then that we have today. As a matter of fact, technology has moved to actually help consumers and it's going to continue to move in that direction, as we see with Microsoft's Internet Explorer changes and so forth going forward. Those things are actually making things better in that sense.

So, as you look at self-regulation, you also have to look at what is technology doing. That's a big part of self-regulation in its own right.

MS. RICH: I know we've got some volunteers,

L	but in further support of Trevor maybe I should have Mike
2	say why Microsoft is joining NAI? What motored that
}	decision? I guess the acquisition. But what
1	MR. HINTZE: Because we didn't want Ari to beat

(Laughter)

up on us.

MR. HINTZE: We acquired a company that was a founding member of NA, and they're actively engaged in being a third party ad network and behavioral targeting.

Separately, we've been looking at expanding our own activities in this area and we decided early on that once we did move into that area we would join NAI in our own right. We think that NAI is a good forum to discuss these issues. Despite what the membership may have been in the past, today the major players are there, the responsible players are there.

It's a good self-regulatory framework. It's not perfect. As we've seen in the latest wave of consolidation, the environment has changed a lot. NAI was formed in a time where these third party ad networks didn't have direct relationships with customers, for example. Now, most of the big ad networks have been bought by companies that do have direct relationships with customers and have an awful lot of PII.

So, maybe one of the things that we need to

B025

1 Attorney General or the Attorney General himself.

That said, I think that the do not track proposal is an important one because it focuses on more what we are learning today especially is really the problem. We have learned over the past couple of days that consumers seem to like targeted content but they also want to have control over their privacy. And what the problem with the opt-out of behavioral marketing is that it doesn't really take into account the fact that they've already lost control of their privacy if they're opting out of the marketing but not the actual collection of their data.

What do not track focuses on is it's not that I have a problem with the targeted content, I have a problem with you running around after me while I'm online and I have a problem with you following me when I'm online, which is really a step before the marketing. It's the collection. I think that that's an important focus because it allows a consumer to say -- it might not be they don't want to be tracked, it might be that they just want to know that they're being tracked or if you have a different preference, it might be that you don't want to be tracked at all, and I think that that's an important way to look at this issue.

MS. RICH: Great, thanks. How about Trevor?

1	Everyone should be very brief so we can open it up to the
2	audience.
3	MR. HUGHES: Am I going to get graded?
4	MS. RICH: No.
_	

1		I thi	nk we h	ave bett	er contr	ols tod	lay in our
2	browsers a	and I	think w	e should	be focu	sing on	consumer
3	education	on th	nose con	trols.			

MS. RICH: Pam, I think you were a signatory on this proposal.

MR. SCHWARTZ: Can I just respond to that one very last point, which is that there are anti-virus and anti-spyware tools that do that today.

MS. RICH: Pam?

MS. DIXON: There's a couple of things. First, you know, can the industry police itself? That's a question I have and I think that's a very real question we need to grapple with. We've had seven years and it hasn't policed itself well and I think that's an issue.

Where is the consumer input into the business practices? Trevor was talking about the NAI, and this is great and I'm glad you're going to look at it again. But where are the real consumers' input? The NAI was built by industry for industry and it's managed by industry.

So, this proposal really puts a balance back into the conversation. That's what it's about. It's about, yes, we really think it's quite important not to change the model of the Internet. We think ads need to remain. But consumers need something easy, simple, one place so that they're not confused, so that they don't

1	have to go to the thousand flowers blooming. Innovation
2	is fabulous, but simplicity for consumers is also
3	fabulous.
4	I think the do not track list is about finding
5	a balance.
6	MS. RICH: Reijo, quickly.
7	MR. AARNIO: Thanks. Article 29 working party
8	and the Federation of European Direct Marketing
9	Association's dialogue went on for ten years for creating
10	a code of conduct for direct marketing business and
11	sector. This system of code of conduct is made of
12	abidingness (phonetic) aspect, supervised by business
13	branch itself aspect, and it's like moving from general
14	directive to more precise regulation.
15	So, my understanding is that in Europe we have
16	a regulatory minimum level and then this code of conduct
17	which can be technology-neutral or can include something
18	about technology. This code of conduct always should
19	bring some added value to the business and to customers.
20	MS. RICH: Mike, do you think your companies
21	would be willing to do this?
22	MR. HINTZE: Well, Trevor might be a little
23	ahead of me. I haven't had, in the last 36 hours, a
24	chance to go back to my 350 plus members. I think if
25	they were serious about moving this to implementation,

1	they would recognize the partnership that industry has
2	with consumers and they would have brought us into the
3	process. But it makes very good headline. Everybody has
4	been looking since do not call, they have been looking
5	for the next flash in the pan.

So, I'm not going to get too detailed about how it will work. I think I share Trevor's -- you know, at a top level implementation on the technology side, I think it would be challenging and I would say that we've probably got a pretty darn good consumer mechanism in your browser filters that -- thanks to Microsoft, whatever their market share is, 85 percent -- everybody has available, and we're not talking about blocking cookies, we're talking filtering them out before they ever get put on somebody's computer. So, I think that's a pretty good mechanism right now.

I would just say this: If we're talking about blacking out large swaths of the Internet, ecommerce sites, free news sites, blogs, social networking sites, I think we've failed consumers if that's the solution.

MR. SCHWARTZ: That's no suggestion to block any content. Not even the ads.

MR. COOPER: The sites that engage in the unacceptable behavior will be blocked.

MR. SCHWARTZ: It would be the choice of the

1	content	server	to	do	the	tracking	from	the	same	place
2	that the	ey provi	ide	the	eir o	content.				

MR. COOPER: I find it incredibly ironic that this industry, which is represented to me as being incredibly innovative in its ability to surveil and target, suddenly couldn't possibly figure out how to register.

example. Microsoft's new browser is a great example. All we're doing is giving people an easy access to a list that will populate that browser. That's all we're talking about. And I guarantee you that if we do the other platforms, if they know -- and here's where you have to give them incentive to cooperate -- if they know that if they fail to register and they engage in the behavior, they're in trouble, they will have the incentive to populate the list and participate in the register and we will have solved the problem.

I don't think it's a hard technical problem to create that list, especially when I know people can invent easy ways to download it.

MS. RICH: Jerry and Mike, do you think this is something that's feasible?

MR. HINTZE: Well, I think we certainly share the goals that are being articulated here of workable

user controls that put the user in control of their experience, and we think it's absolutely wonderful that the consumer groups are throwing out these proposals to get this conversation jumpstarted. We have to go back and look at sort of the specifics of the proposal to determine whether or not it's workable.

It's not a hard technical problem, but whether economics, et cetera, support this to create dual infrastructures, dual servers, where one may be used today for delivering content and advertising. But, absolutely, we're anxious to work with groups on this to help come up with the best possible solution and implementation.

MS. RICH: Jerry?

MR. CERASALE: I know enough technically to get in trouble here. So, I'm going to stay out of the technical side, although the fact I think technology has come along and given choices and, so, I have faith in technology. But I think we have to take a look at all the downward consequences of the double kinds of servers, two choices on the ads. I don't know how it works.

I do know the one thing that I can see that bothers me is Europe is larger than the United States, Europe has greater broadband than the United States, Europe has greater penetration of mobile Internet than

1	And I think that free content is something we
2	have to watch out for when you look at any type of forced
3	regulation on the net and to try and keep it open because
4	I think that free content is democratization.
5	MS. RICH: Peter hasn't had much of a chance.
6	Let's take Peter, and then open it to a question or two.
7	We've run late.
8	MR. SWIRE: I had prepared various things to
9	talk about, none of which I talked about yet, which is

fine. We have a big panel with many different people.

But the free content point was something I wanted to talk

10

11

there might be somebody else who didn't want that. Then next thing that happened was in 1988 when Judge Bork was nominated for Supreme Court Justice is some enterprising reporter went to see what movies he had rented at Blockbuster, and some of you might remember the report was extremely boring. He watched John Wayne movies apparently. But, apparently, some members of the United States Senate had watched some other stuff.

(Laughter)

MR. SWIRE: And within a couple of weeks

Congress passed the Video Privacy Protection Act that
said -- a hundred to nothing. They usually can't find a
hundred senators for anything, but they found a hundred
senators for this one. And that was sort of an
interesting thing.

There's similar rules to certain respects about

-- in phone companies under some of the CPNI rules, et

cetera, and there's similar rules where courts, such as

in the Tattered Cover Bookstore case, that put heightened

rules about seeing what a bookstore content has had.

So, I just sort of point this out if we're talking about the Washington Post as our poster child for the two days, is that when it comes to what you're doing politically which is related to First Amendment, that's actually been considered sensitive content under privacy

laws in the United States of America in the sense that this has to do with your democratic, your political views, is your boss going to see your political views, a whole series of concerns like this.

So, part of the context that I don't think we've heard in the last two days is that this editorial content that's been used as we need wide open profiling so that we can give you the Washington Post, is really a funny thing to put around news and political debate, to have widespread profiling on that. So, that's just a different take on free editorial content.

There might be a lot of differences between
Europe and the United States. One thing I notice is that
languages are different, so the market for advertising in
Finnish is different from the American advertising in
English. And there's a lot of different reasons why
markets get big or get small and we have some advantages
in the United States. But I think this point that
profiling around people's what they're reading and what
they're saying and their political expression, there's a
history in the United States that that's been considered
something to be careful about. And I don't think that
theme has come out much in the last two days.

MS. RICH: But now it has. Do we have any questions from the audience? Yes? No? Somebody is

1	adjusting	the	microphone.
---	-----------	-----	-------------

- MS. BRANDENBURG: Jessica, there's one over
- 3 here.
- 4 MS. RICH: Oh, excellent.
- 5 MR. BOHANAN: Mark Bohanan with the Software
- 6 and Information Industry Association. I apologize, I
- 7 missed some of this discussion. So, if this was
- 8 answered, forgive me.
- I had a chance to study, I guess I got it from
- 10 Ari on Wednesday, the proposal. I think I'm still trying
- 11 to digest the diagram, but I look forward to
- 12 understanding it better. I just want to make sure I
- understand the scope of the proposal because I think what

14

the proposal is somewhat vague on that point. And it's
not meant to be words that can be taken and put into
legislation. We meant it as a discussion document, and I
mean that more to address Mike's point that he wasn't
brought in. This is meant to start a dialogue, not to be

the end of a dialogue.

6

hearing from the Federal Trade Commission that let's try
to carve out some solution here that focuses on harm as
we would define it, that is sensitive information like
health information, and not taking into account the good
point that Peter made about civil discourse and not
taking into account the fact that as is enshrined in
Finland, people just have a basic human right to dignity,
to autonomy, and to be left alone.

So, if, as Mark greatly pointed out and as some of the marketers have said over the last couple of days, the aim is to give consumers what they want, let's find a way to truly give consumers what they want, whether it's this no tracking proposal or some other proposal which I'm sure the smart people here can come up with. I'm not going to be satisfied if we're not able to solve this.

MS. RICH: Susan, I just want to respond. When I was asking about whether we could identify certain practices that would be off the table, I was really reflecting what I thought were some of the statements that have been made in the last few days and just talking about another alternative way to approach this as I was trying to get out on the table many approaches.

The FTC is not pushing it. I was seeing if there was movement there and there really wasn't.

MS. GRANT: But I heard yesterday harm, harm,

1	harm, harm, harm, and how harm is defined depends on the
2	consumer.
3	MR. CHESTER: We need enforceable rights here.
4	We need to implement our version of the OECD guidelines.
5	We need enforceable rights and we need to structure the
6	business practices based on privacy not just we worked
7	with Pam on that, but we don't think technical solutions
8	work. You have to structure the market so that privacy
9	is protected from the get-go.
10	MS. BRANDENBURG: Great. Thank you so much and
11	for everybody's patience. I know this is a very dynamic
12	area and I am confident that we'll continue to discuss it
13	afterwards. We are going to take a break and be back
14	here at 3:45 for our final panel.
15	(Applause)
16	(A brief recess was taken)
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1 SESSION 9: ROUNDTABLE ON THE FUTURE OF

2 BEHAVIORAL ADVERTISING

MR. QUARESIMA: We'd like to welcome everyone to the final panel, Session 9 on the future of behavioral advertising. Format, we'll begin with three brief presentations, then we'll move to a moderated discussion.

MR. HINE: I'd like to first introduce everybody who is on the panel. Starting from my far right, we have Katherine Albrecht from CASPIAN. To her left, we have Zulfikar Ramzan from Symantec. To his left, we have former Commissioner Mozelle Thompson from Thompson Strategic Consulting. To his left, we have Jules Polonetsky from American Online. To my right, I have Alissa Cooper from the Center for Democracy and Technology.

My name is Jamie Hine. I'm an attorney with the Division of Privacy and Identity Protection here at the FTC. To my left, I have Rick Quaresima who's with the Division of Advertising Practices here at the Federal Trade Commission. To his left, we have Robert Gratchner from aQuantive. To Robert's left, Scott Shipman from eBay. To Scott's left, John Thorne from Verizon. To John's left, Joseph DeMarco from DeVore and DeMarco. To Joseph's left, Brad Schuelke from the Office of Texas Attorney General. And last, but not least, on the far

left, we have Tim Lordan from the Internet Education

Foundation.

I'm going to turn it over now to Katherine
Albrecht.

MS. ALBRECHT: Great. Well, I'm going to kick this off with a bang. I have very limited time, so I'm going to go quickly through these slides.

What we're doing here in talking about online marketing and tracking consumers online, I think is going to be setting a precedent for what's going to be coming down the road in the future involving people and real-world cookies. There's a couple of examples of how people tried to do this in the past.

IBM, at one point, actually took out a patent and considered a way to spray tracking ink on people's shoes so they could actually mark them in a way similar to an online cookie and then track them around the store. And the idea was that they would actually step on a little hidden unit in the floor that would be an applicator that would spray some electromagnetic ink on their shoe and program an individual code to them and then put a little puff of air and then dry it quickly so that it would be unobtrusive, the consumer wouldn't notice it. And then they would have little devices around the store in the floor that would actually see

where they browsed, how long they stood and 80'atthey TjET1.00000 0

In fact, it's the topic of my doctoral dissertation at
Harvard University.

I discovered by the way -- I'll just throw this out apropos of some other topics that have been discussed -- that 75 percent of American consumers do not recognize that their loyalty card is used to collect their personal information or to make a record of what they buy, and I would be happy to provide that data to anyone who would like to follow up on that.

One of the plans by NCR, the National Cash Register Corporation, which is the technology partner for Wal-Mart, is actually to use RFID on consumers in order to track them around the store and charge them different prices for different items depending on individual characteristics of those consumers as gleaned from these tags.

The idea is that if you have one of these in your wallet or your purse or your backpack or your pocket, because radio waves travel right through fabric, leather and plastic, they would be able to read these tags on your person without your knowledge, and presumably without your permission, so that as you walk through doorway portals -- and here you see one, the normal one that we're used to seeing for anti-theft purposes, those can be upgraded to become RFID readers

1 and read these tags.

They are also now creating ones that can go horizontally so that they can scan you in a nice wide open space and you would never even know it was there.

I'm going to skip this one because we're low on time. IBM probably does the best job in one of their patents in describing how this would be used to track consumers, and they've patented something they call the person tracking unit. What this person tracking unit is, it's an RFID reader that picks up these signals from people's belongings and they can place them in walls, floor, ceiling tiles, shelving, doorways, literally anywhere, and they discuss a desire to place these into public spaces like museums, theaters, libraries, even elevators and public restrooms. So, literally everywhere you go, you could be scanned.

Now, the best way to understand how this works, they spell out in their patent, is because each RFID tag has a unique ID number, it's kind of like a unique cookie number, and it can be linked to your identity. So, for example, if you sell me a pair of shoes that has unique ID number 308247 in a cookie embedded into the soul, then any time in the future you see unique ID number 308247, because that's the only object on Earth that will transmit that number presumably, then you can look that

into the stores their cell phones, unbeknownst to them, would grab information from the cookie and keep a record of everywhere they had been. Then when they walked into other stores, all of that information could be downloaded. So, a complete record of their travels, their interests, what they had browsed and where they had been would be available to other stores that were part of the system.

Bank of America has a similar plan, this is also a patent. And this particular device, you walk up to a billboard and it would identify, collect, gather, and use personal information about you, again, using these real world cookies in your belongings.

There are plans to scan the tags in people's garbage developed by BellSouth. This is an idea when you throw these things away -- because the industry says, well, we'll just put them on the packaging, don't worry. Well, when you throw them away, they came up with a plan to actually scan your garbage at the dump and figure how long it had taken you to use up that bottle of shampoo or whether you traveled with that bag of dog food. Those are literally examples that they provide, and making that information, of course, available to retailers, manufacturers, distributors, and the like for marketing purposes.

1	marketing industry, rather than opposing these practices,
2	has actually condoned them, referring to them as a
3	practice called digital redlining, meaning marginal
4	services and high prices designed to drive the
5	unattractive customer somewhere else.
6	So, I think if we allow this to happen in the
7	online world, if we do not take steps at this point to at
8	least say that these practices are objectionable and to
9	look more closely at them, then down the road we could
10	actually be creating an infrastructure in which
11	everything we do would be tracked all the time.
12	If you have any further questions on this, we
13	have two websites, spychips.com about product tagging,
14	and we have a new website up at antichips.com, which
15	deals with the actual injection of these devices into
16	human beings in the form of RFID implants.
17	We'll talk more when we get to the Q&A section.
18	Thank you.
19	UNIDENTIFIED MALE: What was the second one?
20	MS. ALBRECHT: Spychips.com and antichips.com.
21	Thank you.
22	(Applause)
23	MR. HINE: We'll have time for questions
24	afterwards.
25	We're going to move to the second presentation

1 from Zulfikar Ramzan from Symantec

MR. RAMZAN: Thank you for making it this long
in the day. I was kind of worried about giving a

presentation at 3:30 on a Friday, but you've lasted.

So, I'll talk a bit about some of the new consumer technologies. I'm only going to spend about five minutes or so describing them. There are two particular technologies I wanted to mention which I thought were relevant to this particular discussion. One is something called Browser Defender and another is called Identity Safe, and I'll explain what these are shortly.

So, let me start with Browser Defender. As we all know, the web browser has now become the conduit for most people's online computing experience. They don't really talk about using the operating system or Windows, or anything like that. It's all about what do I do on IE, what do I do on Firefox, and so on and so forth.

Attackers have realized the same thing. They know that if people are spending most of their time online using the web browser, that is the most viable place for attackers to try to target individuals.

What's interesting is -- I'm not sure if most people know this, but the most commonly targeted person on the Internet is the individual consumer. Ninety-five

1 percent of targeted attacks go after consumers. They

don't go after businesses or banks and that sort of

3 thing. It's all about the end person, which is something

4 most people don't realize.

So, oftentimes, these attackers are just trying to leverage flaws in your browser. These are software products out there, they often have technical vulnerabilities. Those vulnerabilities can be exploited by another piece of software. And, as I highlighted, some of this software is available through toolkits.

So, in fact, you don't need to have technical sophistication to compromise someone's website or someone's browser. All you need is the ability to buy a toolkit online or through an underground market.

The going rate for one of the most recent toolkits, something called Impact, was about a thousand dollars for the toolkit, and that actually included a one-year support contract. So, if you had any problems, you could contact customer support of the toolkit seller. I'm serious actually. It did include a one-year support contract.

So, the reality is that it's taken a lot of the difficulty out of the equation. The whole market has become, in some sense, commoditized. Attackers also are not just going after free sites. It's not like I can

1	So, MySpace accidentally hosted an
2	advertisement that happened to contain malicious code.
3	That code could take advantage of a browser vulnerability
4	and could exploit that machine and essentially allow an
5	attacker to take control of it. It turns out when
6	MySpace had this happen to them, a million people
7	actually saw the advertisement. Now, those people
8	maybe some of them had their computer security software
9	up to date and their browser up to date, but I think that
10	the odds are that most people didn't. So, it's a scary
11	thought.

With that said, the good news is that we have technologies in place to try to deal with those kinds of issues. We designed a new technology called Web Browser Defender. It actually does proactive detection, so it can detect any attempt by a piece of malicious software to take control over your machine through your browser and block that attempt. Actually, because it's proactive and because it's behavior-based, it can not only detect all the known threats, it can also detect many of the unknown threats out there. I thought that was an important type of detection mechanism especially since most people are using the browser these days.

It's included in the Norton Anti-Virus line of products and in the Norton Internet Security line of

products that are coming out in 2008.

Finally, I want to talk briefly about something called Identity Safe. The reality is, as I mentioned earlier this morning, most people have multiple online identities. I have an identity with my email provider, I've got an identity that's associated with, let's say, a merchant I do banking with. I've got an identity associated with any kind of social networking forum I'm part of, so on and so forth. Each of those identities contains with it a set of information about me, like an email address, passwords and so on and so forth.

One of the challenges we're seeing is that because people have so many identities, it's hard to manage all of them. How many people here have multiple passwords they use online and multiple accounts? I think most of us do. How many people have more than five? I would say some people have even more than that. So, that's quite a few accounts you have to manage.

We've realized that's something that is very difficult for consumers to do, so we're building a technology now that has the ability to manage these online identities, and that can include things like taking care of your passwords, being able to detect if you're about to enter your password into a fraudulent website, automatically being able to switch between

For The Record, Inc. (301) 870-8025 - www.ftrin

t n

1	there are also a greater array of tools to manage
2	information.
3	We also see that users have changed. You know,
4	we have a generation of people out there right now who
5	have always known the Internet, who have never known what
б	it was like not to be online, and they have a mixture of
7	impressions. On one hand, they may not be as
8	sophisticated in understanding some of their risks, but
۵	

1	their target market and figure out the better way to
2	spend their money more efficiently to do so. That has
3	not changed.

How it manifests itself in an online world and the tools available to do that, that may be a little different and evolves over time.

Second, there's this lingering impression among some people that the public is dumb, and they're not. They are perfectly willing to exercise choices. Now, some of them may be misinformed or uninformed, but they make rational choices based on what they know and what they assess is their own value at the time they exercise their choices.

Another myth is that the FTC's role is somehow

1	are here in this room. They are people who are engaged
2	in unscrupulous practices, who have technologies that are
3	there to surreptitiously spy and take information from
4	people, and that they don't feel like they have any
5	obligation to comply with any of the self-regulatory or
6	regulatory codes that are out there.

7 So, what that means for us, I think, in the future is a couple of things. There's still a large gap 8 9 between what consumers and users know and what they need to know. And while there are various sites who are doing 10 11 an admirable job to try to better inform consumers and also public interest groups who are trying to do the same 12 13 and governments, there's still a great opportunity, in a 14 coordinated fashion, to provide more sophisticated information to users. 15

16000 TDd, T.00 0.00 0.00 rgBT57.6000 440000.e.0000 0.0000 cm1.00000 0till a g

1	create a market that actually rewards or raises to the
2	top instead of the bottom? How do you create a
3	marketplace that rewards companies who give strong
4	privacy tools, that gives choices, that tell consumers
5	and users what they're doing with information?

I see that there are some companies who are out there that are doing that, and I think what I am seeing is more and more consumers are flocking to those companies because they represent something that always is important in any marketplace, the trust between the consumer and the vendor. Thanks.

1	The interesting thing about cookies is that
2	they're not perfect. They're not perfect for ad delivery
3	or targeting. In fact, there was some comment that only
4	5 percent of the people managed to understand how to
5	control cookies. The reality is, if you sit in a room of
6	advertisers and marketers, they'll tell you that, hey,
7	where are the cookies going? Twenty percent, 30 percent,
8	40 percent, the industry is sort of constantly debating
9	studies that wonder where are the cookies going.

Well, some are removed by Symantec and Macfee and anti-spyware programs that automatically remove cookies. A lot of them, apparently, are being removed by people who somehow have figured out how to use the browser controls. Lots of them are being blocked by P3P. So, the disadvantage of cookies is, in some ways, a real advantage.

Years ago, the fact that you had to send lawyers to courthouses to get data gave us privacy. Today, the limitations of cookies, which are reflected in the imperfect manner to deal with them, is that there are all these tools built around them and they're not actually -- they're good enough, right? People have built entire business models, all the big companies in this room and all the networks have business models, and the vast majority of ad delivery and content analytics is

completely built around this kind of shaky, good enough because, frankly, it works, but it's quite imperfect.

So, I think it's a remarkable thing that seven years later, from the conversations that we had years ago, you still see people using cookies. One of the reasons why I think some of the privacy compliance people like me at many of the companies look at these flash cookies and other novel tracking uses and we say, well, wait a second, the cookie has some controls, it isn't perfect. But until you come up with some really good way to make an effective way for users to control that, that's not something that's fair to use in an extraordinarily robust way.

So, I think that looking into the future, you're going to see technologies -- cookies or very similar to cookies that actually have user controls. People are looking at mobile today obviously, and there are not yet ubiquitous mobile cookies. One of the problems that's sort of being scratched and thought about is, well, okay, probably mobile is an example where people really will want my address remembered or the things that I don't want to have to punch in so that I can instantly get my directions or whatever the case is. What are the ways that you're really going to put somebody in control so as not to have them running in a

1	аi	fferent	dire	ction?
<u></u>	α_{\perp}	TTCTCIIC	$\alpha \pm \epsilon$	

So, my prediction is that both the -- we really should spend a good deal of time focusing on how to ensure that the cookie-handling model, which is going to be with us for quite a while, the business models are built around it and a huge amount of preferences and control and browsers are built around it. So, we really should engage more with getting the cookie structure right.

MR. QUARESIMA: Tim, are new mobile technologies using something else?

MR. LORDAN: Are they using something else?
Well, I think since 2000 -- we did our first
congressional briefing on location advertising back in
2000. It's remarkable to think back then that we
actually were doing congressional briefing as a
legislative issue on this issue seven years ago. I don't
think we kind of understood the issue, but we knew that
being built into phones were different triangulation and
GPS chips and, ultimately, after 9/11 we had the act that
allowed every one of these devices to be located for
E-911 purposes.

And every year since then I sTSTlwe had the act that

marketplace of all this -- this becoming a new cookie just doesn't happen. The marketplace is glacial in its implementation. Probably for consumers that might be a good thing.

The other thing is that for the past week I have been carrying around a phone, it's one of the only like location services, it's called Looped, Sprint uses it, there's very few, some are for child protection, but this one is like a social networking type thing. It's pretty cool. I have a map on the phone, I can see where all my friends are, and I was really excited about it. And then after a few days, I realized that not only did I and my friends live really boring lives, it didn't give me the granularity that I want, that I thought would be interesting. Basically I go from home, I go to work, I go from home, I go to work. Then I go to the Federal Trade Commission. Really exciting stuff.

(Laughter)

MR. LORDAN: So we have some 20 somethings in the office and they were going on a trip to Los Angeles. We have two of these phones. And they go, can we take them to LA and we'll play around with it. I said, yeah, sure, take it with you. We're going to a USC football game. Can I see her on the other side of the stadium? I'm like, no, no, it's not that granular.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Well, if we're in a different part of the bar
and I'm talking to some guy and she's talking to another,
can I see where she is? No, it's not that granular. And
I think the thing is that these things aren't that
granular, first of all, when it comes to mobile phones.

And, secondly, I've learned a lot here. If you are going to track people, where they literally go in the physical space as you do on Myspace or on the Internet, you have to have some kind of delivery mechanism, right? You have to deliver the ad somehow. And how do you do Supermarket aisles have those coupon feeders, you're walking down the aisle and they're shooting coupons at you and you're like -- or you get a text That's the really trite hackneyed example is message. that I'm walking by a Starbucks and they're going to send me a dollar off latte example. I think the professor from Amherst had a chart that said the advertisements that consumers find most annoying and I think the top one was getting a text message, it's like getting a phone call at dinner.

And how you present the advertisement -- and I think there's a pretty compressed short window where you could do that and actually convert a sale. Somebody said data is good online for like three hours. If you're walking by the Starbucks, you have like ten seconds where

they're on another block. How do you present the ad in a way that doesn't annoy them?

So, I think that's a combination of factors that's really making this process really glacial. I see the most dynamic aspect of location, locating people, and self-reporting. Online people are twittering, people are disclosing their information on their blogs, on their social network sites. And that is, by far, the fastest-growing location technology there is, and that's basically just pure social networking.

What I would say is if you don't want people to know your location on a social networking site, don't disclose it. One thing I find interesting in this new paradigm of social networking is people are like just vomiting their personal information, every aspect of their lives online. It's like digital data diarrhea. But even that is like diarrhea of the mouth, put it's like diarrhea of texting and the keyboard. People have to take responsibility for that. I think that's -- I'm going to stop there on digital diarrhea.

(Laughter)

MR. QUARESIMA: Thanks, Tim. I'm glad we didn't do this right after lunch. I'm actually going to come back to mobile in a bit, but I would like to turn it to Alissa. And, Alissa, if you see other alternatives to

that information to target ads just like they do on the web, except now they can see everything that you do.

So, some of the companies that are doing this, there's one called Nabu Ad, which thanks to Jules I learned about recently. Just got a second round of funding, \$30 million venture funding for Nabu Ad.

Adzilla is an American company, \$10 million in venture funding. There's a UK company called form PHORM, P-H-O-R-M, which has a market cap of half a billion dollars.

So, it does seem as though this ISP model where not just a few websites that you visit or your search history, but everything that you do online could be involved in the creation of the profile about you and that certainly goes beyond cookies, it goes beyond flash cookies, it goes beyond any of these other web-based technologies.

MR. QUARESIMA: Just a point, if anybody in the audience has any questions, the mics are open and please step up. I'm actually going to come back to the ISP-based technology shortly, but I just wanted to throw this open to anybody else on the panel who is aware of other technologies besides cookies that they believe is going to become prevalent in the near future.

MR. THOMPSON: I wonder if the question is really the cookie question, and I'll explain why. If

1	it's not a cookie, it will be something else because
2	there's still a demand, and it's ever increasing, for
3	what I call mass customization, that you have 10,000
4	users and each expect a different experience. And they
5	expect you to deliver to them on a real-time basis, and
б	what that means is that you're going to need to know

something about each one of those people.

So, if it's not a cookie, technology changes every day, but as long as there's a demand for customized services, especially in the online environment, that's always going to be a challenge.

MR. QUARESIMA: Okay, I just want to revisit the ISP model that Alissa had spoken about. This type of model probably raises both legal and business questions.

So, first, I want to turn to the legal questions. I'll throw this for Joe DeMarco. Joe, do you see any different legal framework for this at the ISP level?

MR. DeMARCO: I do, Rick, and just by way of background, I was a federal prosecutor for ten years and I headed the computer hacking unit in the U.S. Attorney's Office in New York where I routinely prosecuted wiretappers and computer hackers. And over the last few days, I've sort of been listening to and listening for the raising of the wiretapping and computer hacking

at people's IP addresses. At the other end of the spectrum, if you're a provider, if you're an ISP looking at the content of someone's emails and you're not a party to that email, you probably are getting into some content issues. But I think it raises very, very important questions under the Wiretap Act.

My recommendation to everyone is as you think about the deployment of these new technologies, which I personally believe are going to involve things like deep packet inspection, which of course is just carnivore renamed. I mean, it's the same sort of technology which looks at contents as they traverse a network. As you're talking about that and thinking about that, from the point of view of a provider, you really need to start thinking about are you violating the Federal Wiretap Act.

Similarly, I heard in the last panel mention of the ability of various companies to turn on cookies that had previously been disabled. I think that raises issues under the computer hacking statutes.

So, I'm not saying this technology is bad, I'm not saying it's good. I think that as you do the analysis about whether or not different legal regimes apply, you have to consider whether you're monitoring content, how you're monitoring it, who is consenting. And

1	interestingly, in the wiretap cases you have a very
2	robust and well-developed juris prudence of consent which
3	usually requires implied consent or actual consent. You
4	really need to be thinking about these things very, very
5	carefully and making sure that you get the legal analysis
6	right. Because if you get the legal analysis wrong you
7	not only have a business disaster, you've not only
8	committed a federal tort and are liable for damages, but
9	you could wind up in jail. And I think that is going to
10	be part of the future analysis of behavioral advertising.
11	MR. QUARESIMA: Just in the audience, Jeff?
12	(Individual not at amplifying microphone)
13	MR. CHESTER: I'm glad you brought that up,
14	because that (inaudible) I'm sorry.
15	Let's talk about rich media. Can someone talk
16	about the role of data collection via current practices
17	and future practices and the rich media, multi-media
18	units that are now deployed and will further evolv 0.730.0000 TD()T

some of the maybe business ramifications. Assuming all the legalities are there, what are the business ramifications if this ISP model catches on? And maybe I'll turn that over to Rob first since it's directly in competition with yours.

MR. GRATCHNER: I just want to preface this by saying at aQuantive we've just recently been acquired by Microsoft, so the Microsoft ISP model is new to me and I'm learning on a daily basis the new Microsoft model. But I would like to go back to one thing about the new technology and the law is is Jules is absolutely correct. Cookies right now for online advertising and marketing is the key technology. I don't foresee that changing any time in the near future.

Now, that doesn't preclude other technologies or other things happening in the future. So, every business model may have different technology as we look into video-on-demand or mobile marketing or other types of technologies, as we evolve in the space, may require a different type of technology besides the cookie.

So, one of the things that we need to make sure as we go into this is that we understand what are the consumer expectations. And the part of this that I think has been left out is advertisers. What are the advertisers' expectations and where do they play a role

in this? They've actually played a very big role in this. As I've seen over the last two years I have been at aQuantive, advertisers really want companies who are doing the right thing. They want to make sure that they're handling data appropriately. Not only do we see it as a business value add to advertisers that we do things right with privacy, but these companies are coming to the companies that are doing things right like aQuantive, like the other members of the NAI.

And, so, as we go and expand into these new realms and these future technologies, we need to make sure that we have things baked into our technology similar to the Microsoft principles, as I'm learning, on product development and understanding how privacy plays a role around notice and choice. We have the same principles at aQuantive and we want to make sure that as we develop new technologies and go in new areas for our advertisers, that we understand and we provide the notice and choice to folks and that we're transparent.

MR. POLONETSKY: The big thing that has changed when it comes to ad technology, because most of these issues in the data collection and so forth again have not substantially changed. What you couldn't do easily years ago was actually the smoothness of the implementation.

So, let me give you an example. Banner ads,

years ago, were indeed a banner ad. We acquired a mobile company maybe a year ago called Third Screen Media, and I remember having conversations years ago when I was at DoubleClick about, well, how could our mobile ad server make sure that nobody accidently sent us personal data and kind of have like a screen that would catch stuff if someone sent it that we didn't want and sort of going through the issues.

And here we were years later and I said, okay,
I'm expecting all kinds of interesting, intricate, new
challenges, and it turns out their greatest advantage and
the reason they're considered sort of a leader is there's
lotcmla leader is there's

you were going to deliver an ad with an ad server, you didn't have 200 ads for 200 potential types of customers.

And if you somehow spent a lot of money with all kinds of creative shops and you created 200 ads and you had them sitting there, the ability to sort and get the right one just wasn't possible. Today, sophisticated advertisers indeed can morph together and create the ad. So, the technology has smoothed out and so a lot of what was envisioned years ago is actually finally happening in a smooth way.

There used to be a career. It was called dart trafficker, and it was people who went to sort of a special training course to learn how to get their ads and use the interface to get their ads, if you were an advertiser, on a publisher site. That career is gone because most of us in the room today, technical or not, could sort of sit down and puzzle out and probably accomplish running -- and, indeed, there are millions of people around the world who run ads on Google and are on Ad.com just by using some of the tools that are out there. So, that's really what's happened with the richness of media.

MR. DeMARCO: Could I add a point though on the richness of media? And I don't know if this is where you're going, Jules. But you're right, banner ads used

to be crude and they just used to be across the top of your screen. But if what you're talking about is ad delivery in a form which substantially modifies or alters the website being viewed, for example, a blogger's website which inserts ads into the blog spool, which may or may not be clear to the extent that they're ads or not, I think you've got a copyright issue out there.

And I know that copyright issue is not on the radar screen of most lawyers concerned about things like the Wiretap Act and computer law, but bloggers have content rights in copyright and in their blog, and one of those rights -- and it applies to corporations as well -- involves the right to control and the right to create derivative works. So, if you're now talking about advertising which is substantially modifying and possibly creating a derivative work of the site being viewed, whether it's the website of a big company or the website of a blogger, I think you have to do a copyright analysis, too.

MR. POLONETSKY: I fear something nowhere as sophisticated, but rather I have a little blog that I barely use and I was able to put a little piece of code on it by grabbing it, just following some basic instructions and putting it at the top, and all of a sudden, sophisticated video ads from American Express and

1	all kinds of interesting stuff is running on my website,
2	and I don't know how it's happening. I didn't do
3	anything special.

And all of a sudden, click, click, and I'm suddenly hosting some of these very creative ads that seem to be delivered in an instant.

MR. HINE: So, let's actually take this legal issue somewhere else.

(Laughter)

MR. HINE: No, no, no, very related.

Unfortunately, Declan McCullagh was supposed to be on the panel, but could not, and recently Declan and CNET have addressed the issue of ad blockers and, certainly, as we're moving into an area where we can deliver multiple versions of rich media and hopefully consumers get the right version that the advertisers want to deliver, consumers still have tools at their disposal to help mediate the experience. Zully talked about those. Five years ago, it was an anti-virus program. Today you don't buy an anti-virus program. You have an all-in-one solution.

Declan's article specifically talked about

Firefox and talked about this issue of ad blocking and

surmised that some people in industry are very concerned

about these tools, that in essence if consumers are

blocking the advertisements that maybe there are some legal challenges that should be made to look into the legality of some of these tools.

And I'm wondering, maybe Scott, if you have some thoughts about this, particularly in light of your AdChoice efforts to help reach out to consumers?

MR. SHIPMAN: Yeah, I don't know if I have a comment as the privacy lawyer from eBay, but certainly as an attorney trained in high-tech law, I think that one of the challenges you've got, certainly as was already raised, is copyright. You also have some claims certainly against anybody that's altering the content of your site without your permission, something that we run into quite often and we defend vigorously against.

I think the challenge that you'd face with respect to the ad choice model that we have rolled out is in that in the ad context we are actually the ones that are voluntarily creating a system where users would continue to see the ads, but it's the data behind the ads that would be altered based on the user's preference. So, it's a slight nuance from what you're asking, I guess, so it may not be a direct answer.

MR. HINE: Maybe, Rob, you can follow up on that. I guess we would like to touch on some of the ramifications. I mean, this changes the whole ecosystem.

And what happens if something like ad block catches on much more than it does today?

MR. GRATCHNER: So I won't speak from a legal perspective probably because I only play a lawyer on TV and not in real life. But from an ad blocker perspective from a business model, obviously, we want to make sure that users are getting the content that they want to see, and from user experience, is this going to affect the content that they're going to see? So, if we're blocking ads and not getting the advertising model out there, is this going to affect what content is out there?

If that's the case that's not a good thing for consumers. I think one of the things that I think I have not seen -- actually seen it or seen the article or read it, but one of the things is how do we reach consumers? What other mechanisms are out there? And while there may be some good players out there who do that, maybe there's other mechanisms out there that I know at aQuantive we wouldn't do, but others may do to go out there to provide those ads, to get those ads out there. So, it might provide some other model we don't know about today if we're blocking banner ads on websites.

MR. HINE: Well, let's actually shift that.

Maybe, Zully, you would like to comment from Symantec's perspective because you are developing tools that, in

1	some	sense,	empower	consumers	to	control	their	online
2	expei	cience.						

MR. RAMZAN: Sure, I think it's an interesting question. I was just thinking about ad blockers recently because it turns out that you don't even need to install any kind of special software on your machine if you want to block ads. It's pretty trivial. You just have to change one text file and add some information to it and you can block a whole bunch of ads.

So, I think the core issues is that we're

trying to maybe attack with technology or attach a

specific instance rather than looking at the core

underl 0.00hj0.0000 0.0000 TD(13)Tj68.4000 0.0000 TDp3'pl TDa0 cm1.0

1	can	do	the	exact	same	thing	without	resorting	to
2.	trac]it.i	i ona ⁻	l cook	ies.				

Maybe that's what it is. My voice sounds really funny. I don't know why that is. Let's try that again. That maybe is a little less annoying. Sorry about that.

So, the point I want to make is that from a technology perspective it's important not to just look at a specific instance or a sensor-specific technology but to look at the overall principle because some of these technologies are inherent in the way the web is designed. I don't think we'll be able to get rid of these concepts, per se. So, I think that's important to keep in mind.

MR. LORDAN: Jamie, following up on that, this isn't something new, the ad blockers. Back seven or eight years ago when we were just kind of reaching the threshold of dial-up and things like that, people were using -- I think the largest penetration of ad blockers at that time was really because people wanted to conserve as much bandwidth as possible. So, the ad blockers at the time weren't as much a privacy issue. I mean, it was also served as stop annoying banner ads and tower ads.

But it was because people, they were bandwidth intensive and people were on dial-up and the motivation for them to download and use an ad blocker was that they

1	wanted a faster surfing experience. And, so, I think the
2	motivation for using those tools, I think what's the
3	difference between you're concerned about privacy so you
4	buy an ad blocker. Why wouldn't you just go in and
5	manage your cookies?

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So, I think it's really the same equation now in the absence of a bandwidth constraint.

MR. HINE: Well, I want to actually circle back and come to you Commissioner Thompson. We've heard, for example, some information about research, but particularly Larry Ponemon's research that touches on consumers and their desire to control their online experience and to have more control over their privacy, and this implicitly suggests that trust is an issue and you've touched on some of these issues. But I think that there has been an amazing explosion in the growth of social networking sites. And as Tim eloquently put it, people can't get enough about willing to share the details of their lives. And, so, I know that you have done some work with social networking sites, and if you could talk a little bit about is there something unique about social networking sites? Do they engender some different or unique form of trust?

MR. THOMPSON: Well, it's no secret that I've been advising Facebook and not all of social networking

sites are the same. They don't track the same audience and the behaviors are different. But what I do think is a myth is that people like to go to social networking sites and just like throw up on a page. I don't think that's accurate.

I think that the social networking sites actually provide more granularity that allow you to decide who is going to get what information and under what circumstances. Is in some ways represents what the new privacy model is. Because there are instances -- and Joe kind of alluded to this when he was talking about blogs and copyright. People want information about themselves out to people, but they want to control who it gets to and under what circumstances. And, so, when you talk about copyright and blog, in some ways, a blogger may have a copyright right that he has, but he may not want to assert it because he wants people to pass it along. Now, whether that's attached to advertising or not may be a different question.

So, what we're seeing here -- what I don't want this conversation to go too far in, it's not necessarily a binary equation is to add yes or no or information yes or information no. It's really a much more sophisticated question than that. It's the circumstances and to whom and from. And it's not going to come from the top down.

1	You're going to get information from your neighbor across
2	the street or your college roommate and that may include
3	advertisements or it may not. So, that's a different
4	kind of model than whether you're visiting a website and
5	they give you a cookie or not.
6	MR. QUARESIMA: Scott?
7	MR. SHIPMAN: So, it's not often that I
8	actually purposefully agree with Mozelle, but I think I'm
9	going to here, but also highlight that a lot of what
10	we're talking about is not new. Let's take eBay 1998, a
11	completely open marketplace for people to buy and sell
12	any
13	MR. THOMPSON: Boy, do I wish I would have
14	bought into eBay.
15	(Laughter)
16	MR. SHIPMAN: Hey, you're early at Facebook,
17	Mozelle.
18	Any user at eBay that bought or sold or anybody
19	that registered for the community meant that when they

Any user at eBay that bought or sold or anybody that registered for the community meant that when they registered, they were willing to give their contact details to any other member. It was a completely open transparent marketplace. So that meant that any registered member with the simple request via email would receive the other and vice versa. The contact details.

Now, we fast forward, you know, in certain

aspects, parts of eBay's original social networking capabilities to today and we've actually dialed those protections up and removed some of that functionality because, in fact, as we listened to the customer, they didn't want -- and certainly as the site grew from thousands of members to 250 million members, they didn't want that information available to everyone. They wanted that information available to people that they did business with, people that bid on an item or that won an item successfully and vice versa with the seller.

So, we look at the history, we look at the transformation of how information has been provided on the Internet. In many ways, it's no different than the DDD acronym that we heard a minute ago, digital data diarrhea.

(Laughter)

MR. SHIPMAN: But as Mozelle said it's context based and people are providing information to other people based on the context of the transaction whether that's the social networking website, whether it's an address so that an item can be shipped, payment information, whatever it might be.

I think one of the challenges, and certainly to jump back to the cookies question originally, is cookies is the one way, and in many ways a very poor way, of

1	collecting information on the Internet. The most
2	efficient way is to collect the information directly from
3	the customer, and that's a server. That's not a cookie.
4	It's not being stored on the customer's computer, it's
5	being stored back in San Jose or back in whichever
6	location your servers are at. And that's the real way
7	that companies can collect and enrich a database is by
8	collecting the information directly.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So, this fear about a cookie, it's a technology that is working adequately for advertising, it's not a very good technology for collecting information or for storing information. So, really what we're looking at is the use practices and what we're talking about is how are people using information for advertising? Are companies providing choices with that information and how it's used? And, certainly, that's what we're trying to do with the AdChoice program is to provide customers with that opportunity to reflect how the information is being used with respect to ads.

MR. OUARESIMA: Katherine, you had something? MS. ALBRECHT: In the last couple of minutes we have left, I would kind of like to bring this back around to consumers, if we could, because if we're talking about the future there's more to this than just the technology.

I think we all agree that the technology will

1	evolve, it's going to evolve into the more online space
2	onto the real world. But I think the bigger question
3	that I have as a consumer educator and someone who deals
4	with consumers every day is, how do we help them
5	understand what it is that's being done?

I think one of the reasons why cookies and all of these other technologies are so worrisome to people is because they're invisible. They occur in the course of doing something else, someone is sort of almost attaching on to you like a parasite when all you're trying to do is order a set of sheets for your bed or when all you're trying to do is walk down the street, and other people are taking advantage of your presence and your activities for their own reasons. I think that's where we need to do -- there needs to be an educational component here.

I was stunned that in something like a supermarket frequent shopper card, that now 90 percent of American households have these things and people use them all the time, and yet here we are almost 20 years into having this technology, this simple technology of a shopper card and 75 percent of households don't realize that their data is being collected.

So, we can sit here and talk all day long and come up with terrific ways in technological run-arounds to help people protect their privacy, but until they

deals and get me into the store and, third, they just love me.

(Laughter)

MR. ALBRECHT: And at each opportunity I said, can you think of any other reasons, can you think of any others. I prompted them three times and only 14 percent of consumers said because they want to know what my shopping history looks like. And even when I came out then after that and we did something called prompted knowledge on -- spontaneous knowledge was that, do you know it, and then prompted knowledge was if I tell you, do you know it.

So, I said to people, does the supermarket make a record of your purchases every time you scan the card? And 75 percent of people said no. And, in fact, many of them said, oh, come on, I'm not a conspiracy theorist, I'm not paranoid, it's not like they're the CIA, blah, blah, blah. And people were really adamant in absolutely insisting that their supermarket would never do something so despicable to them.

Now, this is a tangible thing that -- you know, they sign a little form and you would think that they would understand that, but they don't. And the reason, I think, is because when I looked into how the supermarket frequent shopper card was introduced throughout the mid-

1	1990s and the late '90s, it was not introduced as a data
2	collection card, big surprise, it was introduced as a
3	join the club we want to reward you, we love you. And
4	most people, for good or for bad, they believe what you
5	tell them.

So, if you say, come on our website because we love you and we want to have you shoot the little bonobo and be part of our contest or whatever, they will believe you. So, I think there needs to be a greater degree of openness of saying, here is the trade-off that we're

1	what's going on? We're not doing it, we're not
2	responsible for this. And we came up with a little
3	script and people were really annoyed. We started
4	marketing this script, we ran banner ads, hey, are you
5	getting these? And we showed them pictures, are you
6	getting these ugly pop-ups? You want to not get them,
7	click here so that we can run this script. And a lot of
8	people did.

And guess what? A huge majority of the people kept calling us, which was expensive, saying turn off those pop-ups, and we kept running these ads and, finally, we said, you know what, let's just roll out a script and turn it off to everybody. And one or two of the security people said, ew, why did you do that? Don't do that to somebody's computer. I'm like, wait a second we just stopped this terrible thing happening to so many people. But just think about the education. People really didn't like it and in the same context here we were saying to them, hey, stop the pain, click here and we'll fix it.

So, we need to do so much more and I think we're all sort of guilty in industry and coming a little too late in really putting a little bit more energy into this.

I urge people to look at a site called

1 k	been terrifically valuable, I can tell you, from my being
2 h	nere two days.
3	Something that Mozelle said earlier deserves
4 ∈	echoing that answers your question, and that's that
5 0	consumers actually respond to different levels of
б г	privacy. We follow very closely the third party

reputation surveys, like the Ponemg5d party

7

L	numbers	over	to	а	central	agency.

Sara Deutsche, who's in the back of the room, and I had a fairly public fight a couple years ago on behalf of our Internet service provider with the recording industry. I'm not going to re-fight copyright issues although they -- some people think that what the recording industry was doing with automatic robots searching the web and then issuing subpoenas was a privacy concern. We thought it was just illegal, and we fought the IRA. Again, the experience was users wanted to switch from -- I'm not going to name names down the table there, other ISPs who were less confrontational with some of the copyright holders about turning over names.

So, we have found in our experience, you get more customers if you protect privacy. It's in our interest to be good with this. It's a way to grow the investment we're making.

MR. OUARESIMA: Commissioner Thompson?

MR. THOMPSON: Well, that trust comes at various levels. It begins with how you talk to your user, your customer, about what your obligations are. Then for every piece of technology, every piece of functionality that you do something that's consistent with what that promises. And I really like your

comments, Katherine, because it really is true that it's not -- it's a series of things that consumers test on a regular basis.

The FTC knows more than it wants to about supermarkets. And, so, that's one example. But I can tell you, for example, in the social networking space that there's robust privacy protections on Facebook and people actually use it.

Now, is there a gap between some people who should be using it more and they don't? Yes. So, one of the things that could happen that would really be fruitful is for the FTC to shine its light on good practices, because there are companies out there who are doing good things so that consumers know that they have choices and that where things look like practices that are helpful to them and tools that are available to them, that the FTC can actually talk about it. I think that that's valuable.

And I also think it's valuable for the online industry generally to talk to itself about what those array of tools are that might be useful. Because it really is hard to get after the bad actors. But if you can begin to isolate what some of the good practices are, that's fruitful. And I think it's a real challenge to create a race to the top because a lot of business would

1	£ - 1 72 A		000100	+ ~	2001		madiaani+	
⊥	LIIIQ	エし	easter	LO	ueai	$M \perp CII$	mediocrit	- Y

2 MR. QUARESIMA: Anybody have a response to the second portion of that question, which was sort of 3 4 verify? I mean, we've heard issues about that there are 5 possible harms associated with and about discriminatory 6 pricing. So, let's say you have a consumer who has now 7 opted in to everything that they wanted to opt in. can this consumer make sure that some of the bad 8 9 practices that we've identified earlier may not be happening to them? Anybody want to take a crack 10 11 at that?

MR. POLONETSKY: Mozelle and I are Facebook friends and I implicitly trust him with my data.

MR. QUARESIMA: Well, since we're out of time,
we began with homework.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. THOMPSON: I won't comment on that.

MR. QUARESIMA: Well, we began with homework and we're going to -- oh, we do. Brad?

MR. SCHUELKE: I mean, I would just sort of go back to -- and, again, my disclosure from the last panel carries over to this one as well. But I think that is one of the biggest difficulties in this area is the lack of transparency, the fact that consumers don't understand cookies and the fact they can't see it and they can't verify it.

1	I think that's one of the things that in this
2	area makes self-regulation a little bit more difficult
3	than maybe even other areas is that if consumers don't
4	have the technological ability to verify on their own an
5	opt-out or some other procedure, then they're going to
6	look for a third party to be able to do that verification
7	for them and to give them some form of trust.
8	I think transparency is really the key and the
9	issue.
10	MR. THOMPSON: Can I just add one other thing,
11	though? One thing that has changed that's really
12	important is there are more people out there with easier
13	access to
14	MR. QUARESIMA: We're running over, so we've
15	got to take one minute. One minute.
16	MR. THOMPSON: They speak up now. If consumers
17	don't like something, if you're doing something that
18	people get wind of it will be on a blog and there will be
19	100,000 users in two days complaining about it. That's
20	got to be encouraged and not discouraged.
21	MR. GRATCHNER: Everyone is absolutely correct.
22	Transparency and choice is very important, but I think
23	there's also a combination of other good work that
24	organizations are doing and others are doing. But people
25	are going to vote with their wallet, and if they feel

1	they're being misused or misguided on a website, they
2	won't go back and visit it.

MR. QUARESIMA: It is now three minutes past
5:00, so we're going to have closing remarks. Eileen?
If everyone could stay, we're going to have closing
remarks. Just stay here.

MS. HARRINGTON: This will take a nanosecond. Thank you all for staying until the end here. This has been, I think, a wonderful effort. And, again, we want to thank the people on our staff who worked so hard on this.

(Applause)

MR. HARRINGTON: And I'm going to name them one more time, in no particular order. Peder Magee, Jamie Hine, Lori Garrison, Rick Quaresima, Jessica Rich, Mary Engle, Joel Winston, Stacey Brandenburg, Mamie Kresses and Tracy Shapiro, and numerous of our wonderful honors parallels.

MR. THOMPSON: Will they have cookies waiting for them?

(Laughter)

MS. HARRINGTON: Well, no, I have a suggestion for everyone in that regard. We're very pleased, I think, with the good start that we've made over the last two days. We have learned a lot more about behavioral

advertising including some about how it works and the consumer protection issues that it raises.

We have had some debate on the issues including whether disclosures work at all in this area and whether existing models for managing privacy are adequate.

We enjoyed the YouTube videos and greatly benefitted from the participation from all who attended and hope that you found that the town hall nomenclature really carried with it a difference in your ability to participate, ask questions and interact with other participants.

We heard some general agreement, I think, about certain issues which should help our efforts as we go forward. First of all, behavioral advertising is clearly a growing practice and it is largely invisible to consumers. Although reasonable minds can differ as to whether the practice itself raises concerns, there appears to be a fair amount of agreement that greater transparency and consumer control would be a good thing, recognizing, of course, the limitations on notice and its value.

There are also legitimate concerns about what happens to consumer data, very legitimate concerns, that is collected for advertising. Is it limited to use in

L	advertising or could it be used for some secondary
2	purpose? What if it falls into the wrong hands,
}	especially if the data are sensitive or personally
1	identifiable?

Now, everyone who was here at this town hall is obviously thinking very seriously about the challenges here and what the best approach might be for managing privacy in this area, and so are we. Based on what we have heard, we would like to see a reasonable approach to this issue that is flexible, that doesn't stifle innovation, that gives consumers information and control without placing unrealistic demands on their time and

1	suggest	new	ideas.
_			Tacab.

Now, at the same time that we think this has been enormously productive, I think that we also have a sense that we haven't yet seen or heard enough of the concrete and specific facts about information collection in connection with behavioral advertising and its actual and planned uses nor have we seen or heard concrete suggestions for improving consumer protection and privacy in these areas. So, we are going to keep coming back asking for the concrete.

I think that there has been a certain guardedness on the part of many of the companies that are involved in behavioral advertising in describing, in this forum, exactly what it is that they're doing and maybe this is not a forum for, as our old boss Jodie Bernstein liked to say, open kimono, but we want the kimono opened. So, we're going to keep coming back and we're going to keep asking questions here.

Finally, you all should go out and have a drink. (Laughter)

MS. HARRINGTON: Or whatever it is that you do. I, myself, I would go for ice cream. But this has been a long haul, intense information packed, and everybody here has worked hard. So, it's 5:00 on Friday afternoon and now you should all go off and do something far less

1	wholesome than sitting in this room. So, thank you,
2	everyone, for your participation.
3	(Applause)
4	(At 5:11 p.m., the town hall was concluded.)
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	CERTIFICATION OF REPORTER
2	
3	MATTER NUMBER: P075401
4	CASE TITLE: EHAVIORAL ADVERTISING TOWN HALL
5	DATE: NOVEMBER 2, 2007
б	
7	I HEREBY CERTIFY that the transcript contained
8	herein is a full and accurate transcript of the notes
9	taken by me at the hearing on the above cause before the
10	FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION to the best of my knowledge and
11	belief.
12	
13	DATED: NOVEMBER 16, 2007
14	
15	
16	LINDA D. METCALF
17	
18	CERTIFICATION OF PROOFREADER
19	
20	