BEFORE THE

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

In the Matter of	)	
	)	Re: COPPA Rule Review
Request for Public Comment on the	)	16 CFR Part 312
Federal Trade Commission's	)	Project No. P104503
Amendment of the Children's	)	
Online Privacy Protection Rule	)	

COMMENTS OF AT&T INC.

Alan Charles Raul
Edward R. McNicholas
Colleen Theresa Brown
Jonathan P. Adams
SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP
1501 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 736-8000

Counsel for AT&T Inc.

Keith M. Krom
Theodore R. Kingsley
AT&T INC.
1133 21st Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 463-4148

Kelly Murray
AT&T SERVICES INC.
208 S. Akard Street
Dallas, TX 75202
(214) 757-8042

December 23, 2011

Introduction

AT&T Inc., on behalf of itself and its affiliates ("AT&T"), respectfully submits these comments in response to the Federal Trade Commission's ("FTC" or "Commission") Notice of proposed rulemaking to amend the Commission's Rule under the Children's Online Privacy Protection Act ("COPPA"), 16 C.F.R. Part 312 (the "COPPA Rule"). AT&T believes the FTC's longstanding measured and focused approach to implementing COPPA has helped to foster a safer, more privacy protective environment for children online while encouraging a vibrant, innovative and dynamic online ecosystem. AT&T is pleased to continue its participation in the Commission's initiatives to protect children's privacy and security in the online environment.

AT&T applauds the Commission in recognizing there is no need for a change to certain critical provisions – including the "under-13" age threshold and the "actual knowledge" standard – and that the statute's existing language covers emerging technologies. However, we believe that there are a few areas where the FTC is proposing to define new terms that may have potential impact well beyond the purposes of COPPA. The Commission's decisions and general approach in this proceeding also could set a precedent for the broader privacy framework proceeding.

In particular, AT&T is concerned that the Commission's proposed expansion of the definition of the term "personal information" to include geolocation data and persistent identifiers even in instances where such data are not associated with individually identifiable information is overly broad and unworkable, while doing little (or nothing) to further children's online privacy beyond the current COPPA framework.

Similarly, the Commission's decision to jettison the "Email-plus" or "sliding scale" mechanism for obtaining parental consent may well be premature. We do not believe that the removal of a widely-known and understood consent mechanism is the proper approach to stimulate innovation. Eliminating email-plus as a consent mechanism is particularly unjustified when the Commission has not articulated any instances where the deployment of email-plus led to fraudulent consent. The elimination of the email-plus mechanism may in fact sow confusion in the market, especially where the proposed alternatives may be impractical or unworkable.

In order to ensure that the COPPA Rule continues to help protect children's privacy online effectively, AT&T recognizes that periodic review of the Rule in light of technological and marketplace advances is appropriate.[1] It is unclear, however, what particular, clearly-defined problems or needs would be solved by the proposed amendments that are not already covered by or addressed in the Rule as it currently exists. For example, with respect to one of the most important technological developments since the current rule was adopted – "mobile apps" – the FTC acknowledges in the preamble to the proposed rule that the existing regulatory language regarding websites and other "online service" activity is sufficiently flexible to cover

[1] *See, e.g.,* U.S. Dep't of Commerce Internet Policy Task Force, Commercial Data Privacy and Innovation in the Internet Economy: A Dynamic Policy Framework 22 (Dec. 2010) (describing the two higher-level government goals of "protecting consumer trust in the Internet economy, and promoting innovation").

the new "app" phenomenon under COPPA without the need to amend the rule.[2] The FTC, regulated entities and the public would thus be well-served by the agency conducting a thorough cost-benefit analysis for the regulatory proposals in accordance with President Obama's Executive Orders 13,579 and 13,563, as discussed below.

The Commission also should take care to avoid stifling technological innovation or successful self-regulatory processes. A flexible and collaborative approach to privacy protections will prove to be more effective in meeting the needs of consumers. Greater consumer demand for dynamic online media for children and increasing expectations for children's privacy and security have resulted in the adoption of self-regulatory best practices such as the recently announced Cellular Telecommunications Industry Association ("CTIA") Mobile Application Ratings System.[3] AT&T is a CTIA member, and is proud of the progress that has already been made in advancing COPPA compliance and general awareness of children's online privacy throughout the digital marketplace, as well as with parents and children.

AT&T is committed to providing our customers with the tools and information they need to make the best decisions for their families when using our technology. In addition to the efforts outlined in our opening comments, AT&T has recently announced a new collaboration with Common Sense Media focusing on the mobile ecosystem. Specifically, Common Sense Media and AT&T recently announced a new first-of-its-kind agreement to help AT&T's more than 100 million wireless customers get the information they need – up front – to manage mobile content in a way that is best for families. The partnership with Common Sense Media is the latest step in AT&T's continued effort to enhance families' experiences and safety in the online world. This effort adds to AT&T's existing support of other leading online safety organizations, including Family Online Safety Institute, iKeepSafe, Connect Safely and Enough is Enough, and will complement our active engagement with CTIA's ongoing effort to create an industry-wide mobile apps rating system. AT&T also offers a variety of "Smart Controls" for parents to choose what works best for them no matter what the platform.[4] We believe that it is important for our Company, and other responsible organizations, to maintain this focus so that parents can keep up with the rapidly-changing technology and their kids. These programs, along with other AT&T initiatives,[5] reflect AT&T's commitment to fostering an online environment tailored to the needs of families and children.

---

[2] 76 Fed. Reg. 59,807 (Sept. 27, 2011); *see also* Consent Decree, *United States v. W3 Innovations, Inc.*, No. CV-11-03958-PSG, F.T.C. No. 102 3251 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 8, 2011) (enforcing COPPA Rules against a developer of mobile applications).

[3] *See* CTIA – The Wireless Association, *CTIA – The Wireless Association and ESRB Announce Mobile Application Rating System*, Nov. 29, 2011, *available at* http://www.ctia.org/media/press/body.cfm/prid/2147. It is particularly worth noting that the CTIA/ESRB rating system will make determinations of age-appropriateness based on, among other factors, the application's "minimum age requirement, the exchange of user-generated content, the sharing of a user's location with other users of the application and the sharing of user-provided personal information with third parties." *Id.*

[4] *See* AT&T, AT&T Smart Controls, http://www.att.net/smartcontrols.

[5] For a description of other AT&T programs and initiatives, including its KeepSafe, iKeepSafe, Mobile Safe Kids™, "Online at Woogi World," and Enough is Enough Internet Safety 101℠ , see Comments of AT&T Inc. to Dep't of

Ultimately, any framework the Commission develops in this proceeding and in the area of privacy, generally, should promote and encourage a dynamic digital universe and safe online environment for children. Thus, the Commission should ensure that it develops flexible standards to address concrete problems that can be successfully adapted as technology and consumer use of technology change over time.

I. COPPA Applicability

AT&T appreciates the Commission's acknowledgment that "where mobile services do not traverse the Internet or a wide-area network, COPPA will not apply."[6] But it is also important that the FTC clarify what entity in the often complicated stream of online transactions is responsible for COPPA compliance. This is especially critical in the mobile "app" marketplace. Both COPPA and the COPPA Rule place the relevant obligations on website and online service providers, regardless of the access technology. But multiple providers may be tangentially involved in a given transaction. AT&T believes that the party directly requesting children's personal information through a product or service such as a mobile application should be responsible for COPPA obligations vis-à-vis that data collection, rather than, for example the application store host where the application is purchased, the manufacturer of the device that downloads the application, or the internet service provider that facilitates the data transfer.

The Commission correctly made the decision to retain the "actual knowledge" standard, rather than establishing a lesser standard that would introduce uncertainty by incorporating constructive or implied knowledge. This same reasoning supports a clarification that the actual knowledge standard applies only to the web site operator or online service provider. An application store host or wireless carrier should not be responsible for COPPA obligations based on the knowledge that a web site or online service is directed to children. The Commission likewise should clarify that the actual knowledge standard applies only to the web site operator or online service provider and will not be imputed to other entities and providers.

AT&T believes that the Commission should avoid adopting any amendments that would have the unintended effect of eroding the actual knowledge standard. In expanding the definition of "personal information" to include new data types, discussed below, we recommend that the Commission incorporate language clarifying that these data types are insufficient to create actual knowledge of a user's age. Such clarification is essential given the broadly acknowledged role of the "actual knowledge" standard in creating an understandable and workable framework for defining and identifying personal information.

This clarification is especially important considering the Commission's proposal to expand the definition of Personal Information to include geolocation data. A significant amount

---

Commerce, Information Privacy and Innovation in the Internet Commerce, Docket No. 101214614-0614-01 at 23-26 (Jan. 28, 2011), *available at* http://www.ntia.doc.gov/files/ntia/comments/101214614-0614-01/attachments/ACF320.pdf.

[6] 76 Fed. Reg. 59,807 n.43 (Sept. 27, 2011). Accordingly, SMS and text messages would continue not to be governed by COPPA.

of technical data integral to the provision of telecommunications services could constitute "geolocation information sufficient to identify street name and name of a city or town." However, third party applications and services often determine user location without using this data and without any involvement from an internet service provider. For example, third parties can obtain such information directly from the device, or by partnering with location providers who, in turn, obtain location from use of GPS, Wi-Fi hot-spot mapping, reverse-engineered cell tower ID information, and other available mechanisms.

Finally, AT&T suggests that the Commission should reevaluate its definition of "personal information" to ensure that the amended Rule places the responsibility for providing notice and obtaining consent on the appropriate party. In many instances, multiple parties are involved with the deployment and use of a single application or website, and many of these parties may access or collect user information through a variety of means. Under the proposed Rule amendments, it is possible that each and every party interfacing with consumers through web applications and services would be required to obtain user consent, even if this renders the user experience frustrating and time-consuming. This is particularly important as, in many instances, third-party operators and providers involved in the provision of online services may not have any actual knowledge as to what information pertaining to children is collected by first-party operators. It would instead be preferable that the Commission consider the approach adopted by the CTIA in its *Best Practices and Guidelines for Location-Based Services* ("LBS Guidelines"),[7] which place upon first-party providers the responsibility for providing notice and obtaining consent. Third-parties—including manufacturers, carriers, support providers, and advertising networks—should then be permitted to rely upon the consent given to first-party providers. AT&T believes that this approach will maintain the vitality of the online experience while ensuring that the privacy of children is protected.

II. **Defining Personal Information: Geolocation Data & Persistent Identifiers**

A. Geolocation Data

The Commission should carefully consider how the large and evolving variety of geolocation data collection points, methods, and data holders could be affected by any amendments to the Rule that are predicated on the potentially amorphous concept of "geolocation information." In other words, the FTC should take special care to ensure that only "geolocation data" that is collected and used for purposes of contacting children as proscribed in COPPA is covered by the Commission's amended language. If the "geolocation" language is unduly broad, it could result in unintended consequences and lack of clarity with respect to which entity in the interconnected stream of online market players is ultimately responsible for COPPA compliance.

Industry and government share a common goal of developing privacy and security practices that will promote consumer trust and foster innovative growth in location-based

[7] CTIA – The Wireless Association, *Best Practices and Guidelines for Location-Based Services* 2 (Mar. 23, 2010), *available at* http://files.ctia.org/pdf/CTIA_LBS_Best_Practices_Adopted_03_10.pdf ("The Guidelines apply whenever location information is linked by the LBS Provider to a specific device (e.g., linked by phone number, userID) or a specific person (e.g., linked by name or other unique identifier).").

services applications. AT&T agrees with the Commission that the collection and use of geolocation information for advertising purposes, particularly in connection with children, has significant privacy and safety implications . However, the COPPA Rule is directed at the specific issue of personal information to the extent it "permits the physical or online contacting of a specific individual."[8] AT&T is concerned that the proposed expansion of the COPPA Rule's definition of "personal information" to include "geolocation information" without the addition of another individual identifier is not consistent with the statute and is insufficiently developed for inclusion in the Rule at this time.[9]

In its comments to the Commission filed July 12, 2010, AT&T took the position that geolocation information would be considered the personal information of the child when combined with individually identifiable information such as a name or mobile phone number. In support of that position, we cited subsection (g) of the current Rule specifying that personal information includes "information concerning the child or the parents of that child that the operator collections online from the child and combines with *an identifier described in this definition.*" The inclusion of another identifier with any information designated as "geolocation" is critical in order for the rule to appropriately address the types of information that may allow children to be contacted.

As noted in our previous comments to the Commission concerning COPPA Rule amendments, the current definition of "personal information" contained in the Rule is sufficient to include "mobile geolocation data" when such data is combined with "individually identifiable information like name or mobile phone number."[10] AT&T notes that industry self-regulatory initiatives, such as the CTIA LBS Guidelines, provide more practical and effective guidance to market players on the use of geolocation data in the context of wireless carrier services. Merely anonymous, technical geolocation information, however, without the addition of any other identifier, is insufficient to contact an individual child. Accordingly, this data alone does not raise the privacy concerns that COPPA was carefully designed to address.

Indeed, the proposal to define geolocation information as data "sufficient to identify a street name and name of city or town" in the absence of an additional identifier has the potential to create confusion,[11] may be difficult (if not impossible) to implement, and exceeds the intent of

---

[8] 15 U.S.C. § 6501(8)(F).

[9] Although the Commission has in recent years engaged in some efforts to facilitate stakeholder conversation on the topic of geolocation information, the proposed Rule amendments provide only a cursory analysis of how the FTC views this complex issue, and, notably, the Commission did not request public comment on its decision to include geolocation information in the Rule's definition of personal information. AT&T believes that the Commission's ultimate decision with respect to the treatment of geolocation information merits further explanation and should be arrived at only after careful dialogue with relevant stakeholders.

[10] *See* Comments of AT&T, dated July 12, 2010, at 3-4 ("In particular, the definition of Personal Information is broad enough to include 'mobile geolocation data' or any other sensitive data that becomes relevant in the future, when such data is combined with individually identifiable information like name or mobile phone number.").

[11] For instance, geolocation information that provides an approximated location in a crowded city would be considered, under the proposed definition, "personal information" even if that data point applies equally among thousands of individuals who, absent other individually identifiable information, cannot be contacted solely on the

Congress in defining Personal Information. The Commission acknowledges that any geolocation information providing precise enough location information "to identify the name of a street and city or town" is already covered by § 321.2(b), which provides that "a home or other physical address including street name and name of a city or town" constitutes a child's "personal information." But by referring only to street name and city or town, the FTC ignores a critical piece of the definition – namely, the street number component of the address, generally considered a requirement for "a home or other physical address." It is the street number, plus the street name, plus the name of the city or town that provides sufficient information to identify a home or other physical address. It is this more specific data that could facilitate the contacting of an individual child (even if it applies equally to an entire household), which was Congress's purpose in crafting the definition of Personal Information.[12]

COPPA authorizes the Commission to expand the definition of "personal information" to include "any other identifier that the Commission determines permits *the physical or online contacting of a specific individual*."[13] This proposed expansion would extend the definition of personal information beyond what could be used to contact a specific individual, and it would exceed the Commission's rulemaking authority under COPPA. Instead, the Commission should maintain a clear definition that includes location information only to the extent it permits the physical or online contacting of a specific individual. The Commission also may want to engage in further study and discussions with the industry about the applicability of this definition in the context of complex service arrangements.

B. Persistent Identifiers

Under the current COPPA Rule, persistent identifiers must be associated with other individually identifiable information to be considered personal information. The proposed Amended Rule removes the requirement that persistent identifiers be associated with other individually identifiable information, meaning that "device serial numbers," "unique device identifiers," IP addresses, customer numbers contained in cookies, and other similar data would constitute personal information, as would any "identifier that links the activities of a child across different Web sites or online services."[14]

---

basis of the geolocation information. Such an expansive definition will likely create additional, perhaps needless burdens on businesses that offer consumers location-based services.

[12] 15 U.S.C. § 6501(8)(F). The problem of extracting "a home or other physical address," leaving only the "street name and name of a city or town," with respect to geolocation data applies equally to the question concerning the designation of ZIP+4 as an identifier, where ZIP+4 codes may describe a block, a building, or another sub-division within a ZIP code that is less specific than an individual household. We do not believe ZIP+4 should constitute personal information.

[13] 15 U.S.C. § 6501(8)(F) (emphasis added).

[14] AT&T agrees with Staff's conclusion that the use of device identifiers only to identify a particular device -- and not to identify individuals – does not raise the concerns that COPPA addresses. 76 Fed. Reg. at 59,812 (Sept. 27, 2011).

In general, AT&T's use of many of these data would generally fall within the FTC's proposed "internal operations" exception.[15] AT&T is, nonetheless, concerned that the Commission's proposed "internal operations" exemption is too narrow and may not encompass the myriad ways in which service providers and other players in the online ecosphere use persistent identifiers for internal operations or to protect the security and integrity of their services.

While AT&T recognizes the Commission's view that emerging technologies increase the "ability to link a particular individual to a particular computing device,"[16] the ability to link a specific individual with a specific device is still dependent upon the availability of some other data about the individual device user that may be linked to the device.

The Commission should avoid drawing categorical conclusions regarding device identifiers and other persistent identifiers, as the utility and use of these identifiers is often context-specific. We agree with the Commission's position that it is unpersuasive to argue categorically, as some commenters have, that persistent identifiers allow operators to contact only a specific device or computer. Context matters. Under certain circumstances, such as when an identifier is or can easily be associated with another piece of critical information, the identifier can be used to facilitate contacting an individual. But such contexts are limited. We believe that the Commission makes essentially the same mistake in its definition, by categorically determining that identifiers on their own and in all circumstances can lead to individual contact.

The proposed amendment overstates the nature of these identifiers by equating technical data that identifies a particular machine or device with an identifier that allows the contacting of a specific person. On their own, without some complementing data, the "persistent identifiers" identified by the Commission are not "individually identifiable information," but rather are simply "device identifiable information." Accordingly, persistent identifiers should not always fall within the definition of personal information, particularly given the Commission's continued support for the actual knowledge standard. Instead, the Commission should work with industry to indentify those specific areas where persistent identifiers are problematic, articulate the costs and benefits of resolving that specific problem, and draft its regulation in a manner that is tailored to specific problems.

Neither the FTC nor the courts have identified any threats to children's privacy based merely on anonymous device identifiable information.[17] Unless the FTC can identify specific,

---

[15] *Id.* Under the terms of the AT&T Privacy Policy, many of these data are treated as personal information. AT&T's treatment of personal information in its Privacy Policy reflects our special relationship with our subscribers and our efforts to exceed legal requirements with respect to protecting customers' privacy.

[16] *Id.*

[17] For example, in a recent district court decision, Judge Lucy H. Koh expressed uncertainty about how unique user IDs assigned by an online service provider, even if shared with third parties, could give rise to a violation of personal privacy. The Court noted the absence of any relevant allegation about "*how* third party advertisers would be able to infer Low's personal identity from LinkedIn's anonymous user ID combined with his browsing history." *Low v. LinkedIn Corp.*, No. 11-CV-01468-LHK, slip op. at 5 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 11, 2011).

actual problems that the new requirement would abate, we would respectfully recommend that the Commission not establish prescriptive new requirements that could stifle innovation in unpredictable ways. And, as noted above, expansion of the definition of personal information to include data that does not permit the "physical or online contacting of a specific individual" would exceed the Commission's rulemaking authority under COPPA.

At the very least, the Commission should clarify that the exceptions for internal operations extend to telecommunications carriers and internet service providers. Given the potentially extraordinary breadth of the proposed definition of "persistent identifier," the availability of the internal operations exceptions becomes significant. Nevertheless, the Commission proposes to limit such internal operations exceptions to "websites or online services." Providers of telecommunications services and information services, including both telecommunications carriers and internet service providers should also be either expressly included in the application of the "internal operations" exception, or the Commission should make clear that it does not intend its proposed rule to the apply in any way to telecommunications carriers and internet service providers when they are providing telecommunications services or information services, as those terms have been defined by and interpreted by the Federal Communications Commission.

III. **Rejection of "Email Plus" as a Consent Mechanism**

AT&T understands and appreciates the challenges in developing "verifiable parental consent" mechanisms. The Commission's proposal to eliminate the "email plus" method of demonstrating consent, however, is unwise, particularly since the agency is (a) declining to recognize alternative methods proposed by commenters (including such diverse mechanisms as text messages, non-credit card payment methods, parental controls in gaming consoles, offering a centralized opt-in list, and permitting electronic signatures) and (b) encouraging a standard of consent that seems inconvenient, impractical or virtually impossible.[18] These proposed consent mechanisms will be cumbersome for parents, impose substantial new costs on business, and could ultimately stifle innovation for children's online services.

Rather than eliminating e-mail plus and limiting the ability of industry to explore new methods of verifiable consent along with emerging technologies, the Commission should consider establishing roundtable or working groups with multiple stakeholders to foster creative market-driven solutions that satisfy statutory standards and consumer demands while harnessing the power of market-driven innovation. The FTC has demonstrated leadership in facilitating such an approach toward the self-regulatory model for online behavioral targeting, and that approach has delivered results. AT&T believes that such an approach is much more likely to produce desired results here, including a vibrant experience for children online that ensures the consent and involvement of the parent.

[18] Including the Commission's proposals that parental consent be obtained by, inter alia, the use of scanned, mail, or facsimile consent forms, toll-free telephone calls, video-conferencing with trained staff, and the use of government-issued identifications.

IV. **Revisions to COPPA should deliberately address identified threats to children's online privacy through a cost-benefit analysis.**

AT&T recommends that the Commission's further consideration of its proposal engage in the sort of explicit cost-benefit analysis requested by President Obama. As the President stated in his Executive Order 13,563, "Improving Regulation and Regulatory Review," his Administration's cost-benefit analysis and regulatory review principles are intended to produce a regulatory system that protects "public health, welfare, safety, and our environment while promoting economic growth, innovation, competitiveness, and job creation."[19]

The President's principles, which he has expressly requested that independent agencies follow, in Executive Order 13,579, "Regulation and Independent Regulatory Agencies," include: proposing and adopting a regulation only upon a reasoned determination that its benefits justify its costs (recognizing that some benefits and costs are difficult to quantify); tailoring regulations to impose the least burden on society, consistent with obtaining regulatory objectives; selecting regulatory approaches that maximize net benefits; to the extent feasible, specifying performance objectives, rather than specifying the behavior or manner of compliance; and identifying and assessing available alternatives to direct regulation, including providing economic incentives to encourage the desired behavior.[20]

We commend the FTC for its support of these important principles, including Chairman Liebowitz's statement that "President Obama deserves enormous credit for ensuring regulatory review throughout the federal government, including at independent agencies. Although regulations are critically important for protecting consumers, they need to be reviewed on a regular basis to ensure that they are up-to-date, effective, and not overly burdensome."[21] Indeed, referring specifically to the COPPA rules in congressional testimony in July 2011, Chairman Liebowitz expressly indicated that "[t]he Commission understands the importance of avoiding undue burden on business, and seeks to promulgate rules and guides that improve the ability of legitimate businesses to compete in a marketplace free from deceptive and unfair practices."[22] The Commission's program for complying with these regulatory review principles is set forth in the its "Regulatory Review Plan: Ensuring FTC Rules Are Up-to-Date, Effective, and Not Overly Burdensome."[23] The Plan thoughtfully concludes: "In the spirit of Executive Orders

---

[19] *See* Exec. Order No. 13,563, 76 Fed. Reg. 3821 (Jan. 21, 2011) ("Improving Regulation and Regulatory Review"), *available at* http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2011-01-21/pdf/2011-1385.pdf.

[20] *See* Exec. Order No. 13,579, 76 Fed. Reg. 41587 (July 11, 2011) ("Regulation and Independent Regulatory Agencies"), *available at* http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2011-07-14/pdf/2011-17953.pdf.

[21] *See* Cass Sunstein, *The President's Executive Order on Improving and Streamlining Regulation by Independent Regulatory Agencies*, July 11, 2011, http://www.whitehouse.gov/blog/2011/07/11/president-s-executive-order-improving-and-streamlining-regulation-independent-regula.

[22] *See* Testimony of Chairman Liebowitz and Commissioner Kovacic, before House Energy and Commerce Comm. Subcomm. on Oversight and Investigations, July 7, 2011, *available at* http://www.ftc.gov/os/testimony/110707regreview.pdf.

13563 and 13579, the FTC is pleased to reiterate its continuing commitment to regulatory reform and introduce new initiatives to help ensure the effectiveness of its regulatory programs and industry guidance while minimizing burdens for U.S. businesses."

In the spirit of President Obama's regulatory Executive Orders, the Commission's final rule should be adopted only after rigorously characterizing and assessing the applicable harms, risks, benefits and costs, and implementing the prescribed analysis and justifications requested by President Obama. This process can help the FTC to identify and focus on any areas where the market fails to provide adequate incentives and safeguards. This will help promote economic growth, innovation, competitiveness, and job creation while achieving the crucial statutory objectives of protecting the privacy and safety of children online against the real risks identified by the Commission.

[23] *See* FTC, *Regulatory Review Plan: Ensuring FTC Rules Are Up-to-Date, Effective, and Not Overly Burdensome*, September 2011, http://www.ftc.gov/ftc/regreview/regreviewplan.pdf ("[I]t is important to systematically review regulations to ensure that they continue to achieve their intended goals without unduly burdening commerce.").

Conclusion

AT&T appreciates and applauds the Commission's efforts to ensure that children's privacy and security are protected in the online environment. AT&T encourages the FTC to continue to engage with industry and other stakeholders, perhaps through forums or roundtable discussions, to identify the most pressing challenges and threats to children's privacy and security in the digital ecosystem, explore the existing and developing self-regulatory responses to these challenges, and consider the technological implications and cost-benefit analysis of proposed solutions.

AT&T is particularly committed to, and very proud of, our Company's efforts to protect the safety and privacy of children online. Our collaboration with Common Sense Media is just one recent example of our longstanding, profound commitment to helping protect families and children.

AT&T looks forward to continued public/private partnership on safeguarding children's privacy online, and remain committed to further industry collaboration with stakeholders in government and the privacy community to continue promoting a reasonable and effective privacy framework that encourages innovation and consumer confidence.

Respectfully submitted,

Alan Charles Raul
Edward R. McNicholas
Colleen Theresa Brown
Jonathan P. Adams
SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP
1501 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 736-8000

Counsel for AT&T Inc.

Keith M. Krom
Theodore R. Kingsley
AT&T INC.
1133 21st Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 463-4148

Kelly Murray
AT&T SERVICES INC.
208 S. Akard Street
Dallas, TX 75202
(214) 757-8042

December 23, 2011