Statement of Chairwoman Edith Ramirez and Commissioner Julie Brill
In the Matter of Apple Inc.
FTC File No. 1123018
January 15, 2014

The Commission has issued a complaint and proposed consent order to resolve allegations that Apple Inc. unfairly failed to obtain informed consent for charges incurred by children in connection with their use of mobile apps on Apple devices in violation of Section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act. Consistent with prior application of the Commission's unfairness authority, our action today reaffirms that companies may not charge consumers for purchases that are unauthorized – a principle that applies regardless of whether consumers are in a retail store, on a website accessed from a desktop computer, or in a digital store using a mobile device.

As alleged in the Commission's complaint, Apple violated this basic principle by failing to inform parents that, by entering a password, they were permitting a charge for virtual goods or currency to be used by their child in playing a children's app and at the same time triggering a 15-minute window during which their child could make unlimited additional purchases without further parental action. As a consequence, at least tens of thousands of parents have incurred millions of dollars in unauthorized charges that they could not readily have avoided. Apple, however, could have prevented these unwanted purchases by including a few words on an existing prompt, without disrupting the in-app user experience. As explained below, we believe the Commission's allegations are more than sufficient to satisfy the standard governing the FTC Act's prohibition against "unfair acts or practices."

I. Overview of In-App Purchases on Apple Mobile Devices

Apple distributes apps, including games, that are likely to be used by children on Apple mobile devices through its iTunes App Store. While playing these games, kids may incur charges for the purchase of virtual items such as digital goods or currency (known as "in-app charges") at prices ranging from $.99 to $99.99. These in-app charges are billed to their parents' iTunes accounts. Apple retains thirty percent of the revenues from in-app charges. As part of the in-app purchasing process, Apple displays a general prompt that calls for entry of the password for the iTunes account associated with the mobile device. Apple treats this password entry as authorizing a specific transaction and simultaneously allowing additional in-app purchases for 15 minutes.

While key aspects of the in-app purchasing sequence have changed over time, as described in the Commission's complaint, one constant has been that Apple does not explain to parents that entry of their password authorizes an in-app purchase and also opens a 15-minute window during which children are free to incur unlimited additional charges. We allege that, since at least March 2011, tens of thousands of consumers have complained about millions of dollars in unauthorized in-app purchases by children, with many of them individually reporting hundreds to thousands of dollars in such charges. As a result, we have reason to believe, and have alleged in our complaint, that Apple's failure to disclose the 15-minute window is an unfair practice that violates Section 5 because it has caused or is likely to cause substantial consumer injury that is neither reasonably avoidable by consumers nor outweighed by countervailing benefits to consumers or competition.[1]

The proposed consent order resolves these allegations by requiring Apple to obtain informed consent to in-app charges. The order also requires Apple to provide full refunds, an amount no less than $32.5 million, to all of its account holders who have been billed for unauthorized in-app charges incurred by minors.[2]

II. Application of the Unfairness Standard

Importantly, the Commission does not challenge Apple's use of a 15-minute purchasing window in apps used by kids. Rather, our charge is that, even after receiving at least tens of thousands of complaints about unauthorized charges relating to in-app purchases by kids, Apple continued to fail to disclose to parents and other Apple account holders that entry of a password in a children's app meant they were approving a single in-app charge plus 15 minutes of further, unlimited charges.

In asserting that Apple violated Section 5'se of the C(incation of t5(of fu(92hef)Tj-29[Po

angwhery thppliwc-.eparents 57hese

A. Substantial Injury to Consumers

We begin by addressing the issue of harm. It is well established that substantial injury may be demonstrated by a showing of either small harm to a large number of people or large harm in the aggregate.[5] Both are present here. As alleged in the complaint, in many individual instances, Apple customers paid hundreds of dollars in unauthorized charges while thousands of others incurred lower charges that together totaled large sums. We allege that, in the aggregate, at least tens of thousands of consumers have complained of millions of dollars of unauthorized in-app charges by children. Moreover, we have r

B. Injury Not Reasonably Avoidable by Consumers

We also have reason to believe that consumers could not reasonably avoid the alleged injury. An injury is not reasonably preventable by consumers unless they had an opportunity to make a “free and informed choice” to avoid the harm.[11] Before billing parents for in-app charges by children, Apple presented parents with a generic password prompt devoid of any explanation that password entry approves a single charge as well as all charges within the 15 minutes to follow. We do not think parents acted unreasonably by not averting harm from a 15-minute window that was not disclosed to them. Consumers cannot avoid or protect themselves from a practice of which they are not made aware, and companies like Apple cannot impose on consumers the responsibility for ferreting out material aspects of payment systems, as FTC enforcement actions in a variety of contexts make clear.[12] Apple’s disclosure of the 15-minute window in its Terms and Conditions was not sufficient to provide consumers with adequate notice.

Over time, through experience, some parents may infer that entry of a password opens a 15-minute window during which unlimited purchases can be made. The receipt of an invoice

Under the proposed consent order, Apple is permitted to bill for multiple charges within a 15-minute window upon password entry provided it informs consumers what they are authorizing, allowing consumers to make an informed choice about whether to open a period during which additional charges can be incurred without further entry of a password.[15] The order gives Apple full discretion to determine how to provide this disclosure. But we note that the information called for, while important, can leaving Apple for other companies. But customers cannot switch suppliers easily or quickly. Mobile phone and data contracts typically last two years, with a penalty for early termination. In addition, the time and effort required to learn another company's operating system and features, not to mention the general inertia often observed for consumers with plans for cellular, data, and Internet services, could very well mean that Apple customers may not be as responsive to Apple's disclosure policies as seems to be envisioned by Commissioner Wright.

* * *

We applaud the innovation that is occurring in the mobile arena. Today, parents have access to an enormous number and variety of apps for use by their children. We firmly believe that technological innovation and fundamental consumer protections can coexist and, in fact, are mutually beneficial. Such innovation is enhanced, and will only reach its full potential, if all marketplace participants abide by the basic principle that they must obtain consumers' informed consent to charges before they are imposed.