

**Before the
FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION
Washington, D.C. 20580**

**COMMENTS
of the
CONSUMER BANKERS ASSOCIATION**

on the

CAN-SPAM Act Rulemaking, Project No. R411008

Marcia Sullivan
Vice President and Director, Government Relations
Consumer Bankers Association
1000 Wilson Boulevard
Suite 2500
Arlington, VA 22201
(703) 276-1750

Counsel:
Ronald Plesser
Henry Polmer
Stuart Ingis
Piper Rudnick LLP
1200 19th Street NW
Washington, DC 20036
(202) 861-3900

April 20, 2004

I. Introduction & Summary

The Consumer Bankers Association (“CBA”) appreciates the opportunity to comment on the Federal Trade Commission’s (“Commission”) request for public comment on the “CAN-SPAM Act Rulemaking, Project No. R411008, 16 C.F.R. Part 316; 69 Fed. Reg. 11776 (March 11, 2004).

The Consumer Bankers Association is the recognized voice on retail banking issues in the nation’s capital. Member institutions are the leaders in consumer financial services, including auto finance, home equity lending, card products, education loans, small business services, community development, investments, and deposits. CBA was founded in 1919, and provides leadership, education, research, and federal representation on retail banking issues such as privacy, fair lending, and consumer protection legislation/regulation. CBA members include most of the nation’s largest bank holding companies, as well as regional and super community banks that collectively hold two-thirds of the industry’s total assets.

In enacting the CAN-SPAM Act, Pub. L. No. 108-187, Congress recognized that e-mail has become an extremely popular and important means for Americans to communicate for both personal and commercial purposes, but that an avalanche of unwanted spam now threatens the reliability and usefulness of this channel of communications. The Consumer Bankers Association wholeheartedly agrees.

On the commercial side, e-mail is used on a daily basis to communicate an enormous range of information. Many companies use e-mail to promote their products and services, as well as to deliver many other types of messages, including messages that discuss business issues with fellow employees, external colleagues, business partners, clients, and customers.

Our members, in particular, often use e-mail to communicate with corporate clients as well as customers in order to exchange messages regarding interest rates, market research, mortgage costs, and other financial information that is critical to the proper functioning of our capital and other markets.

The CAN-SPAM Act generally recognizes this broad business use of e-mail in the safe-harbor section it calls “transactional or relationship” messages. Unfortunately, the categories described in this section of the Act primarily address deals already made. Therefore, in our view, the Act could leave a wide range of business e-mail messages improperly vulnerable to its requirements and prohibitions.

Fortunately, Congress has given the Commission the authority to refine its definitions. The Consumer Bankers Association believes that in the CAN-SPAM Act, Congress has placed in the hands of the Commission an effective tool to combat the onslaught of bad actors who flood everyone’s mailboxes with fraudulent and deceptive spam. The Commission, in this rulemaking, should make sure that the Act does not result in the unintended effect of bludgeoning legitimate commercial electronic commerce to the detriment of e-mail recipients and the national economy. We believe the keys to effective CAN-SPAM regulation are in defining the terms “commercial electronic mail messages,” “senders,” and “transactional or relationship messages” so as to focus the law on bad actors without damaging the utility of e-mail for e-commerce of all types.

The Consumer Bankers Association would like to comment on the following issues raised in the advance notice of proposed rulemaking:

1. Primary Purpose. The Commission should provide senders of e-mail with clear standards that allow for certainty in managing their e-mail operations.

2. Sender. The Commission should clarify what entities are “senders” and, with respect to e-mail messages where there are numerous advertisers, the Commission should clarify that each advertiser is not a “sender.”

3. Transactional and Relationship Messages. The categories of “transactional or relationship” messages should be expanded to include: (1) messages sent with recipient consent or at the recipient’s request, (2) messages sent by employees in a business-to-business context, and (3) messages containing legally required content. Moreover, several existing categories should be modified to clarify their intent or broaden their reach to provide greater certainty and accurately reflect current business e-mail practices. These include: (1) e-mail sent to a recipient that provides information, products or services as part of an ongoing relationship concerning products or services that the recipient has received or will receive from the sender; (2) e-mail sent pursuant to the terms and conditions of an agreement, such as an account opening document; (3) e-mail negotiating transactions; and (4) e-mail sent by a company to its employees regarding products or services available to the employees, including products or services of third parties.

4. Amount of Time for Honoring Opt-Out. The 10-business-day time frame to honor opt-out requests should be extended to 31 calendar days.

5. Duration of Opt-Out. A two- to three-year time limit should be established as the period during which an opt-out must be maintained and honored.

6. E-mail Labeling/Reward System. The Commission should recommend against “ADV” or similar labeling and against a reward system.

These items are discussed in more detail below.

II. Primary Purpose

The primary obligations of the Act apply to “commercial electronic mail” messages, defined as any e-mail message whose “primary purpose” is the “commercial advertisement or promotion of a commercial product or service (including content on an Internet website operated for a commercial purpose.)” The Commission has suggested several alternative tests for determining the primary purpose.

The statute, by stating “the primary purpose,” indicates that an e-mail message can only have a **single** primary purpose. Many messages sent by CBA have multiple purposes—regarding a transaction as well as including advertisements or promotions. As the Commission develops its standards regarding “primary purpose,” it should set forth clear guidelines that provide senders the certainty required to manage their e-mail operations.

There are several categories of e-mail that are not “commercial.” First, e-mail messages whose primary purpose is to transmit billing or account related information that may also include advertising is not “commercial.” The recipient in this situation has a relationship and can manage the e-mail received in that context.

Second, the Commission should clarify that e-mail messages that would not have been sent “but for” the non-commercial component of the message should not be deemed “commercial” in nature.

Third, the Commission should clarify that e-mail that provides substantial editorial content, including newsletters, is not “commercial.” Often CBA members send their customers editorial content intended to educate them about financial issues, for example financial literacy. Such messages are not the advertisement or promotion of a particular good or service and should not be treated as commercial.

We believe that there are additional categories to those enumerated above. The more clarification and examples like these that the Commission can provide in its rule, the more certainty will exist for businesses that send e-mail. This will prevent unnecessary litigation and potential interpretations of the Act that could hurt legitimate commerce.

Finally, the Commission should clarify that a message does not need to fall within the category of “transactional or relationship” message in order to fall outside of the scope of “commercial” e-mail. There is e-mail that definitely does not have a primary purpose of advertisement or promotion of a good or service that also may not fall into the existing categories of transactional or relationship messages.

Financial institutions send numerous e-mails to customers that relate to the safety and soundness of their accounts and the banking system, but do not necessarily fit into the Act’s transactional or relationship categories. For example, some messages from a financial institution that relate to issues of safety and soundness, such as (a) protecting the confidentiality or security of records, (b) protecting against actual or potential fraud, unauthorized transactions, claims or other liability, (c) risk control or resolving customer disputes, or (d) warning customers about password “phishing” that may be occurring, may not fit squarely within the definition of either commercial or transactional or relationship. The Commission should clarify that such messages are not subject to the Acts requirements including opt-out and suppression for senders of commercial e-mail.

III. Who is the Sender?

A. Criteria to determine the sender

The Commission should provide criteria that will assist businesses in determining who is a “sender” under the Act. Some interpretations of the Act suggest that multiple parties that

advertise in an e-mail are all senders. Such an interpretation would require multiple opt-outs, suppression against multiple lists, and inclusion of multiple physical addresses in such e-mail. For example, many of our member financial institutions send messages that include advertisements or special offers from other entities. Our members also are advertisers in e-mail that contains multiple advertisers. Requiring suppression against multiple lists of all of the numerous advertisers on such messages is impractical and unworkable. Such a result could also undermine privacy by requiring the transfer of e-mail addresses across unrelated businesses. We do not believe that this is what the Congress intended.

CBA believes that the Commission can avoid this unintended result by setting forth criteria that would determine whether an entity is a “procurer” under the statute such that they become “senders.” We recommend the following criteria:

- **Who the message is from.** If it is clear the message is from a particular sender, even if other advertisement exists, the other advertisers would not be senders. Who a message is from can be determined by multiple factors, including indication in the header of the e-mail and prominent indication in the text.
- **Advertiser provision of recipients.** If the advertiser does not provide the sender with a list of e-mail recipients, then the advertiser should not be treated as a sender. An entity “procures” a message under the statute if it is sent on “one’s behalf.” The purpose of this definition is to prevent an entity that is prohibited from sending messages as a result of an opt-out from having another entity send it on their behalf. If no recipient e-mail addresses are provided to the sender, then this scenario would not occur. (We note, however, that a transfer of addresses would not necessarily make the advertiser a sender.)

- **“But for” test.** If a message would have been sent regardless of a particular advertiser, then the advertiser should not be treated as a sender. Many members of CBA send particular e-mail on a regular basis such as special offers for participants in their rewards or points programs. These messages are sent regardless of any particular offer or advertisement. The advertisers rotate on a regular basis. In this situation, the bank is the sender and not the advertisers.

B. Line of business

The Commission should clarify that a product or service that consists of different products or services marketed under a single brand can each be considered a line of business. The statute indicates that “if an entity operates through separate lines of business or divisions and holds itself out to the recipient throughout the message as that particular line of business or division rather than as the entity of which such line of business or division is a part, then the line of business or the division shall be treated as the sender of such message for purposes of this Act.”

In addition, the mere fact that a parent company or other legal entity is mentioned in a line of business’s e-mail should not alone eliminate the ability for an e-mail to be treated as sent by that line of business under the definition of “sender.”

If one line of business sends an e-mail with an offer from an affiliate, which itself may be a line of business, only the line of business actually sending the e-mail should be considered the sender.

IV. Transactional and Relationship Messages

The Act includes five categories of messages that are “transactional or relationship messages,” and authorizes the Commission to expand or contract these categories. In order to

combat bad actors rather than legitimate commercial electronic exchange, the Commission should expand and not contract these categories. CBA believes that several of these categories should be modified to provide clarity and certainty to businesses that certain messages are transactional or relationship messages. Moreover, the Commission should expand this list to include three additional categories: (1) e-mail messages where the recipient has requested the e-mail or consented to receive the e-mail; (2) one-to-one e-mail sent in the business capacity by individual employees; and (3) e-mail containing legally required content. Additionally, we believe that the Commission should make modifications and clarifications to the existing transactional and relationship categories.

Each of these additional categories will provide helpful guidance to CBA's members regarding these types of messages, allowing business operations to continue without unnecessarily burdensome changes in the manner that we communicate using e-mail.

A. Recipient consent or at the recipient's request

The Commission should add to the list of e-mail that is "transactional or relationship" messages that are sent to recipients with the recipient's consent or at the recipient's request. Under the CAN-SPAM Act, there may be situations where an individual has provided consent that does not fit within the existing types of messages considered to be "transactional or relationship" messages. For example, many of our member financial institutions, when requested by a consumer, send consumers who are in the process of purchasing or refinancing a house e-mail that includes the latest interest rates.

Clearly, if an individual has requested the material, then there is a relationship that should not be limited by this Act. For example, the Commission, in its Telemarketing Sales Rule, 16 C.F.R. Part 310, allows for marketing to individuals with consent. If these types of consensual e-

mail are not included in this category, it is possible that individuals could not receive e-mail that they have asked to receive. This could be the case if an individual has requested a specific message from an entity whose commercial e-mail the individual has previously opted out of. This is not a result that either senders or recipients desire. Thus, the Commission should indicate that any time consent is obtained or information is requested by a consumer, such messages should fall within the definition of transactional or relationship.

B. E-mail sent in the business capacity by individual employees

Like consent, a category should be added for one-to-one e-mail that is sent by employees in the business-to-business context. Both large and small businesses engage in corporate-to-corporate e-mail exchanges that involve complex transactions with a lot of e-mail flowing both ways. For example, in the commercial real estate business, e-mails are sent to brokers by individual representatives of lenders to inform them of current mortgage rates. In addition, in the context of the equipment leasing industry, it is typical for lenders to e-mail equipment vendors a rate sheet that describes the amount of interest a lender would charge on a given piece of equipment. One interpretation of the Act could require that such e-mail contain an opt-out and be run against the business's suppression list prior to transmission. CBA believes that such a result would be very difficult for businesses to administer and was not intended by Congress.

Business e-mail systems are not designed to scrub each e-mail sent by an employee against the business's suppression list. Such a requirement would result in the need to redesign numerous businesses' e-mail systems and would be extraordinarily burdensome and expensive. In addition, such a requirement would interfere with legitimate practices that are critical to business relationships and operations and e-mail that provides information critical to developing

the financial marketplace. Moreover, restricting this type of e-mail would restrict legitimate e-mail without solving the spam problem.

C. E-mail sent that contains legally required content

Subpart (iii) of the first category of “transactional or relationship” messages includes messages whose primary purpose is to provide certain important information relating to accounts and other ongoing commercial relationships, for example, change in terms, change in status of the account, or account statements. Financial institutions also use e-mail, which may be combined with commercial messages, to send their account holders notices and other information as required by law, including disclosures under Federal Reserve Board’s Regulations E and Z and privacy notices that are required under the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act. The Commission should take note of this banking practice and add it as a new category, since it is consistent with the goals of the Act and the Commission’s congressional mandate to establish the transactional and relationship message category. The Commission should also coordinate with the traditional regulators of financial institutions to ensure that any regulations issued in this area are consistent with existing financial services regulations.

D. Modification of existing categories

In addition to creating these new categories, the Commission should modify several of the other categories to provide clarity to businesses that certain types of messages are “transactional or relationship” messages. These modifications should include as “transactional and relationship” e-mail: (1) e-mail sent to a recipient as part of an ongoing relationship concerning products or services that the recipient has received or will receive from the sender; (2) relating to the provision of goods or services received as a result of the opening of a service relationship with the sender; (3) negotiating transactions; and (4) sent by a company to its

employees regarding products or services available to the employees, including products or services of third parties.

1. *E-mail sent to a recipient as part of an ongoing relationship concerning products or services that the recipient has received or will receive from the sender.*

The Commission should extend § 3(17)(A)(iii) of the Act to include information related to products or services that a client or customer will often expect as a part of an ongoing relationship. The current category classifies as “transactional or relationship” messages that provide “(I) notification concerning a change in the terms or features of; (II) notification of a change in the recipient’s standing or status with respect to; or (III) at regular periodic intervals, account balance information or other type of account statement with respect to a subscription, membership, account, loan, or comparable ongoing commercial relationship involving the ongoing purchase or use by the recipient of products or services offered by the sender.” The FTC should amend this provision by adding a new (IV) “concerning information, products, or services that the recipient has received or will receive from the sender.” This section as currently drafted is limited to account statements or a change in terms of a customer’s account. This category should be expanded to include information that a customer expects to receive, such as a prospectus, inventory, research, and information about seminars.

Additionally, CBA believes that the Commission should eliminate the words “at regular periodic intervals” from § 3(17)(A)(iii)(III). Often there are account statements that are sent following a transaction, rather than on a “regular” temporal schedule. Such messages are clearly transactional or relationship in nature. Thus, this section should allow for the sending of account information even if it is not “regular.”

2. E-mail sent pursuant to the terms and conditions of an agreement.

The Commission should clarify or, if necessary, expand the definition of transactional or relationship message so that messages sent pursuant to the terms and conditions of an agreement, including account opening documents or other documents that establish the terms of a relationship, are transactional or relationship messages. The Commission should clarify or, if necessary, expand the scope of § (3)(17)(A)(v) of the Act so that it is clear that e-mail sent pursuant to consent obtained in account opening or other documents that establish the terms of an agreement, are transactional or relationship messages. This section currently includes e-mail that has a primary purpose “to deliver goods or services, including product updates or upgrades, that the recipient is entitled to receive under the terms of a transaction that the recipient has previously agreed to enter into with the sender.” The Commission should clarify that if an e-mail is sent pursuant to consent obtained at the establishment of the relationship, such e-mail constitutes “services” that the recipient is entitled to receive under “the terms of a transaction that the recipient has previously agreed to enter into with the sender.” Alternatively, the Commission should expand the scope of § 3(17) and add a new (vi) in order to include messages sent pursuant to the terms and conditions of an agreement.

3. E-mail negotiating transactions.

The use of e-mail has greatly facilitated the ease and efficiency of negotiating transactions and should not be restricted. Section 3(17)(A)(i) of the Act should be modified to include situations where parties are negotiating a transaction. The subparagraph should state: “to negotiate a commercial transaction or to facilitate, complete, or confirm a commercial transaction that the recipient has previously agreed to enter into with the sender.”

4. *E-mail sent by a company to its employees regarding products or services available to the employees, including products or services of third parties.*

Section 3(17)(A)(iv) of the Act covers messages that have a primary purpose “to provide information directly related to an employment relationship or related benefit plan in which the recipient is currently involved, participating, or enrolled.” The Commission should clarify the scope of this provision so that a company’s communications with employees concerning products and services available to them are considered to be “directly related to an employment relationship or related benefit plan.”

V. The Commission Should Extend the Time Frame to Honor Opt-Outs to 31 Days

If a recipient opts out of future e-mails from a sender, the Act requires the sender and others who act on behalf of the sender to cease future e-mails not later than 10 business days after receiving the recipient’s message. The Commission has the authority to expand this time frame. The Commission should extend the number of days required to comply with an opt-out to 31 calendar days.

Ten business days may be a possible time frame if the financial institution is the only sender. However, in joint marketing situations or other instances where multiple advertisers are involved in the e-mail programs that have opt-outs lists, 10 days is insufficient. It takes time for businesses to obtain an opt-out and scrub it against a list of addresses to which a commercial e-mail is going to be sent. Often a commercial e-mail campaign is in progress with the e-mail addresses selected more than 10 days prior to the sending. Compliance with a 10-day opt-out would be difficult in these situations. This is particularly true when the sender uses the services of a third party to transmit the message on its behalf. Congress recently mandated that the Commission modify its Telemarketing Sales Rule to require that do-not-call lists be updated

every 31 days for telephone numbers submitted to the do-not-call registry. CBA believes that a 31 day time frame is equally appropriate in this context.

VI. Amount of Time to Honor Company-Specific Opt-Out

The Commission has requested comment on other issues than those raised in the notice that it should address under the authority to issue rules on the Act. CBA recommends that the Commission should set a two- to three-year cap on the length of time to honor an opt-out. Setting such a cap will reduce the scrubbing of lists from nonfunctional e-mail addresses, will give businesses an opportunity to attempt to contact recipients with new offers, and will provide businesses with a manageable time frame to maintain such information.

Unless there is a time cap on the duration that opt-outs are preserved, these lists could continue to grow with no limit. A large percentage of e-mail addresses change annually. For this reason, many of the addresses on an opt-out list over time will not be functioning. Putting a time limit on the opt-outs would reduce the need to suppress e-mail addresses that are no longer operational.

Likewise, over time, businesses change and evolve, as do recipient preferences. Providing for a two- to three-year duration strikes a balance so that as businesses and consumer preferences change, a business could send commercial e-mail to the recipient. Of course, at that time, the recipient would have the ability to opt out for another two- to three-year time period.

Finally, maintaining opt-out requests for two to three years is a significant amount of time for recordkeeping. An increase in the number of e-mail addresses on opt-out lists results in a corresponding increase in business costs to maintain and honor such requests. Such a cap would reduce the recordkeeping and administrative costs associated with maintaining the opt-out list. For these reasons, CBA believes that two to three years is an appropriate time frame.

VII. The Commission Should Recommend Against “ADV” and Other Labeling

The Commission requests comments regarding its required report to Congress on mandating an “ADV” header or comparable identifier in an e-mail message. CBA opposes the use of “ADV” labeling. Such labeling is unnecessary. The Act already requires that messages include a clear and conspicuous identification that the message is an advertisement or solicitation. This is sufficient notification that a message may contain advertisement.

CBA is particularly concerned about the inclusion of “ADV” in messages that may have multiple purposes. Recipients may disregard messages that include such a label and thereby not open an e-mail with important information in the message.

An “ADV” label would not be followed by bad actors. Prior to the CAN-SPAM Act, several state laws required the use of “ADV” labeling. This requirement had no impact on eliminating spam. This is because spam is sent by entities that do not comply with the law. This fact is clearly indicated in the results of the FTC’s own survey, which showed that only 2% of e-mail included an “ADV” label. *False Claims in Spam*, A Report by the FTC’s Division of Marketing Practices, April 30, 2003, at 11.

VIII. The Commission Should Recommend Against a Reward System

The Commission has also requested comment regarding the report it is required to submit to Congress regarding a reward system for those who supply information to the Commission about violations of the Act. CBA opposes the creation of a reward system to assist in enforcing against spam. Such a system would divert significant Commission resources needed to combat spam to determining who should receive a reward. It is our understanding that the Commission already possesses tremendous amounts of information about spam that is forwarded to it that it puts in its spam “refrigerator.” Likewise, there already are significant private sector efforts by

ISPs to enforce laws against spammers. These efforts require significant expertise to successfully prosecute spammers.

Conclusion

The Consumer Bankers Association appreciates this opportunity to comment in this proceeding. We look forward to continuing to work with the Commission on these issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Marcia Sullivan
Consumer Bankers Association

Ronald Plesser
Piper Rudnick LLP