1	FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION
2	
3	REBATE DEBATE
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	San Francisco, California
10	
11	Friday, April 27, 2007
12	
13	9:00 a.m.
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	Official Reporter: Adrian Edler
25	

1	<u>I N D E X</u>
2	
3	PROCEEDINGS:
4	
5	Convened
6	Afternoon Session
7	Adjourned
8	
9	AGENDA:
10	
11	Welcoming Remarks
12	
13	Panel 1: An Overview of Rebates
14	
15	Panel 2: Rebates: Open the Envelope and Cut the Check
16	What Could Go Wrong?
17	
18	Panel 3: The Future of Rebates
19	
20	Panel 4: Industry Solutions: Exploring Best Practices in
21	Rebate Promotions
22	
23	Panel 5: The Rebate Debate: Legislate, Litigate, or
24	Lose Rebates?
2.5	

PROCEEDINGS 1 April 27, 2007 2 SAN FRANCISCO, CA REBATE DEBATE CONVENED 3 4 MR. GOLD: Hello, everybody. Could we get started? That was great. 5 Hi, my name is Matthew Gold, and I'm really 6 7 excited to welcome everybody to the FTC's Rebate Debate. We've got a really exciting program scheduled here, and 8 I'm really gratified to see such a wonderful attendance 9 here. I think we're going to have a full house. 10 I've corresponded with quite a few of you over 11 12 the last few weeks and months, and it's very gratifying for me to finally be putting some faces to names. And I 13 14 hope all of you can introduce yourselves to me before the 15 day is out, if we haven't met already. 16 As you can see from the agenda in your packets, 17 we've got five panels today. There are three in the 18 morning and two in the afternoon. And this agenda, by 19 the way, is identical to the one that's been on our website for the last few weeks. So if you've seen that 20 21 one, it's the same one. 22 The first four panels of the day are going to 23 feature prepared presentations by panelists, and if 24 everything goes according to plan there'll be some time

For The Record, Inc.

25

for questions and answers at the end. During these first

four panels, what we'd like you to do if you do have questions is to use the question cards that are in your packets. If you do, just jot down your question and waive it in the air, and Linda Badger will be roaming the aisles and you can pass it to her, and she'll get it to the moderator. But don't worry, if there's a need for extra question cards we've got more on the table over there by the water.

In the last panel of the day there's going to be a substantial period of time set aside for audience participation also. That will be kind of an open mic, in which you'll get a chance to make a comment or ask a question of one of the panelists.

Everyone's input here is really important. I know we have very limited spots as far as panelists are concerned, and so unfortunately I had to turn down some requests. But we really want your input, so it's important for you to use those question cards, or participate in the open mic at the end of the day.

Also keep in mind that there's a court reporter, and so if you -- right up front, so if you are speaking sometime during the day you're going to have to talk through a mic so he gets -- so he hears what you have to say. And also if you speak, please identify yourself, that's important also. We will be, all the

1	proceedings today will be transcribed and eventually
2	posted on the Rebate Debate website, so look for that in
3	the weeks ahead. The link to the Rebate Debate will be
4	directly accessible from the FTC's homepage for a period
5	of time also. And in addition, all of the Power Points
6	that are here today, that are presented today, will also
7	be on the FTC's on the Rebate Debate portion of the FTC's
8	website starting hopefully next week, but in any event,
9	soon.
10	Now, I just want to get to a few housekeeping
11	matters. Remember, please, that we are in a classroom at
12	San Francisco State University.
13	[Phone ringing.]
14	Hello? Hi, Lesley.
15	MS. FAIR: Could you remind people to turn
16	their cell phones off?
17	MR. GOLD: I forgot that one. Please everybody
18	turn off your cell phones. I'm doing that right now.
19	And that should have been my first housekeeping.
20	We're in a classroom, as I was saying, and just
21	keep that in mind because there are other classes going
22	on in the building, so when you're walking around the
23	halls or talking outside our classroom.
24	The restrooms are located either way down the

For The Record, Inc.

25

hall.

 $I^{\prime}m$ told that the ones to the right are a little

larger, but if you go down the hall either direction you'll find them.

Also, I'm sure you've all seen the literature table outside. We've got a lot of brochures and other items that may be of interest to you. One particularly neat thing is the what we call the 'business briefcase,' which is this. I imagine they're already all taken by now. This is a little thing that looks like a business card, but it's actually a CD with several dozen of our most popular brochures on it.

And another item on there is our ID theft -[microphone interference] -- I'll keep my arm down, is
our ID theft magnifying glass, and the magnifying glass
comes in very handy for looking at all that fine print on
the rebate forms.

Lastly, I'd like to introduce a few of the FTC staff who are here today, so in case anybody has any questions for FTC staff or just general orientation.

Linda Badger, you saw.

Dean Graybill, from our offices there.

Kerry O'Brien, is right there.

Evan Rose, is in front here.

And, Lesley Fair, who you've already heard talk on the phone, is there.

And, Mitch Katz (phonetic), is here also, he's

For The Record, Inc.

l with	our	press	office.
--------	-----	-------	---------

2 Thanks again for coming today.

And I would like to present now Jeffrey

Klurfeld, who is the Director of the FTC's western region

here in San Francisco.

[Applause.]

WELCOMING REMARKS FROM THE FTC

MR. KLURFELD: As Matthew indicated, I am

Jeffrey Klurfeld, and I have the honor and privilege of
serving as the Director of the Western Region of the

Federal Trade Commission. And I also welcome you to the
Rebate, which we are pleased to be hosting here in San

Francisco.

Over the years the Federal Trade Commission has brought a number of enforcement actions to remedy problematic rebate practices. Because consumer complaints persist, however, we thought we might take a different approach, and that is by bringing everyone involved in the rebate process, from the manufacturers and retailers who determine to offer the rebate, to the fulfillment houses who perform the back office paperwork, to the consumers who wait and sometimes wait and wait for receipt of their rebates, to discuss problems and solutions in a 360 degree forum or debate.

In hosting this forum, I'm reminded of an

For The Record, Inc.

advice book that my wife made me read when we were confronting the challenges of our three somewhat exuberant adolescent children. And the title perhaps expresses some of the themes in the debate of rebates, and perhaps also some of the perceptions regarding the role of government. The title of the book is, Get Out Of My Life, But First Can You Take Cheryl And Me To The Mall?

[Laughter.]

MR. KLURFELD: You thought these were going to be just dry, desicated, opening remarks. Since this is also an election season I thought I might also introduce some presidential history into my remarks that might also reflect this tangent, and hopefully these anecdotes will also entertain you.

When I think of free and competitive markets I immediately think of Theodore Roosevelt, who was really larger than life and truly a champion of vigorous free markets. And as you know, he was apostrophized as the "Trust Buster." Indeed, his daughter Alice, whom Teddy could not manage, although he could manage the government, perhaps, and whose antics would have made her the poster kid for a tabloid press if there had been one at that time, she remarked that her father wanted always to be the bride at every wedding and the corpse at every

For The Record, Inc.

1 funeral.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

His cousin, Franklin Roosevelt, might be placed at the other end of the spectrum. Franklin loved regulating the economy and imposing codes and other government restrictions on entire industries. Franklin got his comeuppance, and not just from the Supreme Court. He often was at the receiving end of Eleanor's, his wife, her rapier wit. And here is a true story. After FDR's first election he took residence in the White House. Eleanor thought it would be desirable to get a physical check-up, and at that time there wasn't a physician who was resident in the White House, so she had to go out of the White House, which she did. After returning from her appointment she went to see Franklin in the oval office. He asked her if everything had gone well, "yes," she said, then Franklin asked her if the doctor had said anything about, quote, "her big fat ass." Without missing a beat, Eleanor replied, "No, Franklin, your name never entered the conversation."

[Laughter.]

MR. KLURFELD: Now, I have a housekeeping detail, and that is -- whoops. It's part of my duties to animate and pump you up in the morning. We really do want to hear from all of you, and we have designed a rebate form of our own, hold it up, it's in your packets.

For The Record, Inc.

1	And what we would like you to do is to fill it out, and
2	you will notice that there are a place where you can
3	indicate what your three biggest gripes are with rebates.
4	It's essential that you provide this to us, if you are
5	willing to do so, in anticipation of the last panel, when
6	we are going to reveal the results. You can either put
7	it in the boxes, which Matthew will now point to.
8	MR. GOLD: One right over there by the water,
9	and one on the other box on the tables over there.
10	MR. KLURFELD: I have the honor of, you know,
11	turning the letters to get a vowel, or something like
12	that. Or you can give it to Kerry, Linda, or Matt, whom

So before you go to lunch, if you could complete that out and give it to them, that would be great.

I also would like to recognize for their yeoman-like

work, as well as other members of my staff, in organizing

this.

And then I am also privileged to introduce our first speaker. She is Eileen Harrington. Eileen is the Deputy Director of the FTC Bureau of Consumer Protection in Washington, and in that capacity she is the nation's number two consumer protection enforcement official. Her presence here today is eloquent testimony to the importance of this event. Often people do not live up to

their reputations when you get close. In Eileen's case this is certainly not true. She personifies intelligence and insight, she also has grace and gumption, and the American people is indebted to her for her strong and able leadership. Among her many distinctions is her service to America for her role in establishing the national Do Not Call Registry, and that is a gift that continues to give, as we know.

Anyway, it's my pleasure to turn the podium over to Eileen.

[Applause.]

MS. HARRINGTON: Thank you very much, Jeffrey.

I'll just get the mic up here. It really is such a privilege to be here today with all of you. And I want to begin by echoing and maybe even elaborating on what Jeffrey said about the incredibly good work that the team that has organized, that really conceived of this gathering and has put it together, have done: Matthew Gold, Linda Badger, Kerry O'Brien are the rebate team in our western regional office. And they, although we all serve the public and we are one FTC, I would say they own this issue and have done such good work developing principles, reaching out, learning, listening, and leading.

And so I want to commend them as well as my

For The Record, Inc.

other colleagues who are playing leadership roles here today: Joe Mulholland from our Bureau of Economics is out from Washington; Lesley Fair, who is simply the most talented person at the Federal Trade Commission in a whole stable of talented people there's nobody like Lesley, as you will see later on; Mitch Katz is here from our Office of Public Affairs; Dean Graybill from our western region also will be presenting today. And if I've left anyone out in terms of the leadership group, I apologize. But what a good group, Jeffrey, you and Erica have here.

We're here today to do two of the things
that -- to serve two of the functions that the Federal
Trade Commission carries out that we value highly and
take seriously. One of those is to study the
marketplace, to understand what it is that's happening,
to learn from people who are directly effected and are
participating, so that we can do our jobs better. And
the other function that we are here to carry out, and
that we take so seriously, is our function in the area of
education: educating ourselves and educating business and
consumers about problems of deception and unfairness and
how to avoid those.

This is one of many workshops that we're holding during this season at the FTC. We recently just

For The Record, Inc.

earlier this week held a very important workshop in Washington on authentication of identity in connection with our work in the identity theft space. A couple of weeks ago the Commission held a very important three-day workshop on energy, also in Washington. Within the next couple of months we'll be holding an important spam summit, and an important workshop on childhood obesity and food marketing, those also in Washington.

This session is special and unique because it's here and it's not in Washington. This is the first of our workshops of this sort to be held outside of the beltway, and I think it really is a credit to the leadership and the staff in the western region that we're here doing this. It's a really smart thing to do, to do this here. But for Washington bound people letting go is not an easy task. And so I think it really is a wonderful compliment to the folks here in the western region that this is happening here. It's about time, and I'm really glad to be here with all of you.

Now, we use generally a three-prong strategy to learn and address issues in the consumer protection area. And today we're actually seeing all three prongs. I've mentioned studies, I've mentioned education. The third prong, and one that we use to further our education mission, as well as to correct deceptive and unfair

1 practices in the marketplace, is the enforcement prong.

And this morning I am announcing that the FTC has reached

and is issuing today two consent decrees with companies

4 to correct deceptive or unfair practices that they

5 engaged in, we allege, in connection with rebate offers.

And Matt has the press releases, which he'll be passing

7 out so that you can read them, and pay absolutely no

8 attention to what it is that I'm about to say.

[Laughter.]

2

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. HARRINGTON: The first of the consent agreements that we're announcing this morning is with InPhonic, which is the largest online seller of cell phones and cell phone calling plans. The settlement with InPhonic stands for the principle that consumers must be put on notice in advertisements that offer rebates that the terms of the rebate program may be unusual, complicated, significantly different than what a consumer might reasonably expect from reading the advertisement of the rebate offer.

Now, in this case, InPhonic offered attractive prices, often free phones. Unfortunately, there were some material requirements that reasonable consumers we believe would not have anticipated, and that InPhonic did not adequately disclose in the advertisement. One of the principal problems with the advertisement and the failure

to adequately disclose, was with the hyperlink on the website to the terms and conditions of the rebate offer. The hyperlink did not satisfy the Commission standard for adequate disclosure under Section 5. The best articulation of that standard is in some work that really was groundbreaking, that was done as a result of this kind of workshop that the Commission held in 2000, and that resulted in the development of a really important publication, The Dot Com Disclosure Guide, which is in the business briefcase that we have out front. So if you haven't picked up that little disk that Matthew held up, do it, and look at the Dot Com Disclosure Guide, because in this case that is really the basis for the Commission's analysis that the disclosures were not adequate.

Let me read to you from the Dot Com Disclosure Guides, which say that, 'you have label the link to convey the importance, nature, and relevance of the information it leads to. That is, the label should make clear that the link is related to a particular advertising claim or product, and indicate the nature to be found by clicking on it. Some text links may provide no indication about why a claim is qualified, or the nature of the disclosure. In most cases simply hyperlinking a single word or phrase in the text of an ad

For The Record, Inc.

may not be effective. Although some consumers may understand that there is additional information available, they may have different ideas about the nature of the information and its significance. The same may be true of hyperlinks that simply say disclaimer, more information, details, or terms and conditions.'

Here the hyperlink basically said, 'Rebate Offer.' It wasn't enough, it wasn't enough to alert consumers to the nature of the terms and conditions that came with this order, which included a requirement that consumers had to wait for to submit their rebate claim for between 180 to 210 days, would have to submit a number of bills, would have to fill out a form providing significant information including emails addresses and so forth. You can read about the case in the press release and online. But it's an important case that, once again, stands for all of the principles that the Commission articulated in the Dot Com Disclosure Guides.

The second settlement we're announcing this morning is with Sanyo -- Soyo, I'm sorry, excuse me. If anyone is here from Sanyo I am really sorry.

[Laughter.]

MS. HARRINGTON: The Soyo settlement -- and is there anyone here from Sanyo this morning? Hands, hands, did you just have a heart attack?

For The Record, Inc.

The Soyo settlement stands for the principle that rebate delivery promises have to be met. The promises you make you have to keep them. Now, the Commission has made this point in earlier settlements and it restates it in this case, where the promise was that consumers would receive their rebate within ten to twelve weeks. Ninety-five percent of consumers who receive rebates in this promotion received them outside of and beyond the twelve-week outer limit that was promised. The average was twenty-four weeks, and some waited for a year. Not good.

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

Now, we are very proud of our folks in the western region who did these cases. The Commission will stay on the beat in this and other areas, but really would be happy to never again bring another rebate enforcement action. And that's why we're here. We want to understand from the people who are most knowledgeable what the best practices are. We want to talk about how the best practices might get even more best. We want to understand what the consumer perspective is. And we want to, as Jeffrey said, work with all of the stakeholders to see to it that rebate offers which have tremendous benefit for manufacturers, for retailers, for consumers, alike, are made in a way that satisfies the promise and does not cause us down the road to have to announce more

For The Record, Inc.

1	enforcement actions.
2	So I'm delighted to be here. I look forward to
3	learning a lot today. And we'll turn it over to the
4	first panel.
5	Thank you so much.
6	[Applause.]
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

PANEL 1: AN OVERVIEW OF REBATES

MR. MULHOLLAND: Good morning. I'm on? Okay. Good morning, I'm Joe Mulholland. I'm an economist at the Bureau of Economics and the Federal Trade Commission. And I'll start off by saying I too would like to thank Matt, Linda, and Kerry for putting together this conference and for inviting me out here to moderate.

The issues raised by rebates are important and have a good deal of economics content. The Bureau of Economics hosted a conference last week that featured a number of prominent behavioral economists who discussed the research into various psychological aspects of consumer behavior, and the policy implications of the findings for consumer protection policy. One important area of research involved the way consumers make correct, incorrect, and often overly optimistic projections of their future behavior. One manifestation of which, of course, is the failure to follow through on the initial intention to redeem a rebate.

This first session here seeks to set the stage for the ensuing discussion of the various policy issues involved involving rebates by describing how rebates work, how they evolved, how they're used by consumers, and how they effect the profitability of the various stage of the product stage chain.

I think our three panelists are ideally
situated to provide this kind of overview for this
session. We're going to first of all look at consumer
behavior, how consumers respond to rebates, and how often
they redeem, why they redeem, why they don't redeem. The
second then is going to look at the rebate processing
process. And then the third is from the standpoint of
the rebate issuers, what are their motivations for
issuing rebates in the first place.

Our first presenter is Tim Silk. He's an Assistant Professor of Marketing at the Sauder School of Business at the University of British Columbia. Tim is an expert on consumer behavior related to rebate promotions, in particular the ways in which offer characteristics interact with behavioral biases to influence purchase and redemption behavior. Tim recently received his PhD in marketing from the University of Florida. Which I think is quite important, his academic work is complemented by his prior career in business, where he was a marketing manager for a Canadian beverage company, and an account manager for an advertising agency.

So, Tim, please?

MR. SILK: Can you hear me okay? Great. Thank you for the opportunity to speak. I'm trained as a

For The Record, Inc.

1 consumer psychologist, and what I really care about is
2 understanding what drives people's purchase and
3 redemption behavior in the rebate context.

So I'm going to show you results from two sources of data. I've got some industry data, over 3,000 promotions which can give insights into incremental sales and redemption. And then I run some experiments with people, with their own real money, with over 1,000 consumers trying to look at what mechanisms are kind of influencing their purchase decisions and their redemption behavior.

So I'm going to start off here with some industry data. Sorry. Whereabouts is the? Oh, I didn't see that. Right there? Oh, all right, very good, okay. So what I'm going to show you first is some industry data from over 3,000 promotions. Sorry for the feedback here. Okay. Can you hear me still? Okay.

So what we have here, we have the percent sales. So this is basically what the industry will call lift or increase in sales. And what I'm plotting here is the lift that occurs from a \$1 rebate. What I have along the bottom here is what that \$1 rebate represents as a percentage off the list price. So down here we have say a 25 percent discount, which means it would be a \$1 rebate on a \$4 offer. Here we'd have a 50 percent

discount, so it would be a \$1 rebate on a \$2 offer, etcetera. And what you find here is people are very sensitive to the change in the discount percentage. So this is still all just a \$1 offer, but as that \$1 represents a greater percentage of the list price people respond to that offer.

Now what we're going to show next is what happens when you increase the absolute size of the rebate and go to a \$5 offer. And what we'd expect is we'd see a big jump in lift because it's five times larger the offer. What we find is there is an increase, but it's not a very strong increase. It's significant, but the point here is that it kind of shows the same pattern as the \$1 offer. So people are incredibly sensitive to the percentage of the list price that the rebate represents. [Tape interference.] Jesus, sorry. Very sensitive. But they're not that sensitive to the absolute value.

And so here's the \$10. Of course, you don't see a lot of \$10 offers that represent more than 50 percent of the list price, which is why it just stops here. And then there's a \$20 offer.

So the point here is that it's the percentage of the discount, not necessarily the absolute value of the rebate that seems to be driving the incremental sales. All right. And that they're increasingly

sensitive to changes in the percentage. So as you move up the curve it's not only positively slow, but it's arching more and more up. All right.

So what this is telling us is that we could try and infer that perhaps this is because consumers have a tendency to frame rebates as a percentage discount. They look at the size of the offer, they look at the list price, and that's what they're sensitive to. And so the implication here is that people are going to be more responsive when the discount is high, so a \$5 rebate on a \$10 item is going to create more lift than a \$10 rebate on something that's twice the size but that as a smaller discount percentage. So the thing -- this is from industry data.

What I want to do now is let's take a look at some experiment results and figure out, well, how do we figure out what's actually driving the purchase behavior, and what time of things can we influence when we change the offer characteristics. So what I've done here is run a series of experiments where I have experimental control. I manipulate the offer characteristics while holding everything else constant, so I can really get out what's going on. And one thing I find is it's the confidence that they have that they will redeem that really drives a purchase decision. I ask consumers right

when they're making their purchase decision with their own money in a natural context, how likely are you to redeem this rebate? How confident are you that you would, on a zero to a hundred percent scale? And what we find is the people that are buying are incredibly confident, and the people that aren't buying obviously are kind of moderately confident.

Now that doesn't seem that surprising.

However, there is a point of view up there that consumers view rebates like an option, in that it's an option that you could or could not take up. And what this is telling you is that for the incremental buyers, the people that otherwise would not buy, only those that are extremely confident are buying, so they're not treating these things as an option. That's the point here. All right.

We also asked people, all right, you're really highly confident, maybe it's because you think redemption rates are really high on these things, and that's what's driving your confidence. So we ask them, what do you think the average redemption rate is on this particular rebate that you're buying? And the response was around 54 percent. And so they're basically saying I understand that the redemption rate my guess is probably 55 percent, but I'm 95 percent confident that I'm going to do it. Now there's nothing wrong with that, as long as you

follow through. And we'll look later if they do. All right. And there's no difference obviously between the buyers and those that aren't, in terms of what their estimates of redemption rates is. So this overconfidence or this confidence isn't stemming from some inaccurate perception of what redemption rates are in the marketplace. Okay. So it's what we call it's not a false consensus of fact.

So sorry for the -- it's from the mouse. So what drives purchase? And purchase is a function of really manipulating confidence. So what things can we do to manipulate confidence? So one thing we found was if we increase the percentage of the discount a higher proportion of people buy. So this is actually the proportion of potential consumers that actually bought the rebate offer. And here we have a 45 percent rebate, or 75 percent rebate. The confidence results, which I won't show you, there's just too much data to show, go in line with this. And what we're really doing, by manipulating the size of the discount percentage what we're really doing is manipulating the confidence, and that's manifesting itself in purchase behavior. All right.

The other thing we did is we manipulated the length of the application deadline, how many days they

For The Record, Inc.

had from buying the offer to mailing. And when we give people more time they become more confident. So, again, confidence goes up and as a result you see higher purchase rates. And so what you've got here is over time as you increase the time you've got more people buying, but there's also the effect of the size of the discount percentage maintained. All right.

So you can either increase the size of the discount percentage, you can also give people more time. And the point here is that people tend to discount effort that occurs in the future. When things are 21 days away, ah, no problem, it seems easy, you know. What we call a temporal construal effect in psychology, that explains when things are far in the future we basically abstract them and they seem really easy. All right.

The other thing which I won't show on a graph here is if you conceal the application requirements people become more confident and they're more likely to buy. So I manipulated whether or not there was a detailed description of all the things they had to do to redeem the rebate, whether that was present or absent when they made the purchase decision. And when you disclose what's required to be done confidence drops, less people buy. Okay. So the point here is that when you don't disclose the effort it's not salient. And

combine the fact that if it's far in the future it seems really easy. So you really do have to give consumers, you know, really detailed information in order for them to really improve their calibration.

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

So the question now is what drives redemption So the point here is being highly confident doesn't necessarily predict your redemption behavior. So what I've done here is I've grouped the people that actually were successful in redeeming in dark, the people that weren't successful redeemers in light blue. And if I go back and say well maybe the reason that they didn't redeem was that, sure average confidence was high, but the people that didn't redeem were probably lower in their confidence than the ones that were successful. we find, no, that's not the case. There's no difference. So being highly confident is not predicting what you're going to do. The people that failed to redeem were just as confident as those that were successful. All right. And when we look at their redemption rate estimates, again, there's no difference.

So this is what we call like a mis-calibrated consumer. You're highly confident, but your own probability of redemption is in fact very low. All right. And so this is an overconfidence problem.

And so the question is, what's driving

For The Record, Inc.

redemption behavior? How do we influence whether or not they really redeem? So one way we can influence redemption behavior is increasing the rebate dollar value. Now here this is where the effect of the dollar value actually shows, and it's not about the discount percentage. So here again is our graph -- this is from real world data, all right, same axis, but except here now we have the redemption rate. And on the \$1 offer, yeah, the redemption rates actually are higher as the size of the rebates a larger discount. But now we start to see much stronger effects of the size of the rebate. Okay. So on the redemption side the dollar value of the rebate is having a big effect, where that was muted on the purchase side. Okay.

So it suggests there may be some type of reframing. At the time of purchase people look at things in terms of a percentage discount, but when they get home and look at the effort it's really about how much is it worth versus how much work it is, and now we see an effect of the size of the rebate.

The other thing is we play with that deadline, that also influences redemption behavior. Now this is what's interesting. In industry surveys with managers we ask them if we give people more time to redeem do we expect the redemption rate to increase or decrease. And

they say it will go up, we're giving people more time, they'll get to it. We find the exact opposite. If you give -- this is a controlled study with real people's real money -- if we give people more time to redeem the redemption rates go down, it's pretty strong effect. And the question is, well why is that? That doesn't make any sense. You're telling me the people that we only gave one day to redeem the redemption rate's much higher than if we give them three weeks? And it's like absolutely.

And so the idea here is what you do here is you give people a long time you basically foster procrastination and forgetting behavior. All right. And I'll show you that in a minute. Longer delays, when you give people more time they take longer before they start the application process. Let me show you this, what this is is the number of days that elapse between buying and initiating the application process. What they had to do in our studies was go online to download an application form. That was the absolute first step to redeeming. So we know how long it took them between purchase and initiating that first step.

And the people on the 21 day condition are taking over 4 days before they even go and get the form. What's interesting is when you look at the delay between starting and finishing the application process, and so we

look at the postmark date, look at how long people are taking. Not only are they waiting 4 days before they start, but then they wait another 12 days on average before they finish. Versus the people that are only given a day, they go and they get the form that day and they tend to mail it. Obviously there are some people that fall outside, they were late. But that's what's interesting, you're fostering delays. And that's what's kind of driving it.

The other thing we found is owner redemption requirements, you think well if I increase effort you're going to basically decrease the redemption rate. And what we found is the opposite. Here's the same graph before, when we increase the effort the redemption rates went up, not down. And the reason for that is people were buying, the effort was not disclosed, and when they actually experienced the high effort we angered them. Like, God damnit, I'm going to make sure I get my money, these guys are making me do too much work.

[Laughter.]

MR. SILK: And the evidence we have for that is that those delays I showed you decrease. When we give people -- this is the delay when we increase the effort. There's no difference in when they start the process, why is they haven't experienced any effort yet. But once

For The Record, Inc.

they start and they realize, wow, how much work it is, they get done sooner, they don't delay in finishing the process. So there's a backlash effect.

I've got to wrap up. So I'm just going to go to the last points here. I'd be happy to talk with any of you if you have questions.

Repeat purchase. Among redeemers it was 40 percent. We had people return and had a chance to purchase the same offer again. So we wanted to look at, you know, do you learn from your mistakes. Non-redeemers, only 8 percent of those bought. But the people that were successful, 40 percent of them bought. If you're in the high effort group you're much less likely to buy.

So the point here is that if you're ranking the effort up on people there's an opportunity that you could actually be increasing your redemption rates, rather than decreasing them, and then you're angering people and they're not buying the second time around. So there's no loyalty.

So just to wrap up. Confidence in redeeming drives purchase. Consumers tend to be overconfident, it's a function of the discount percentage, the deadline length and the disclosure of the application requirements, many fail to initiate the application

For The Record, Inc.

process. And so maybe we're over-emphasizing the role of effort here. Much of breakage comes from people that never initiate the process, they didn't experience any effort. So increasing or decreasing the amount of work they do won't influence those people because they're not even starting the process.

And then high-effort rebates can be risky, can motivate higher redemption rates, there's a backlash effect that we found, repeat purchase, less likely.

But when we disclose the effort required that backlash effect goes away. Why? We're not violating expectations, people know what they're getting into.

So sorry for to rush through that. But I'd be happy to speak with any of you. And for those of you in industry, love to hear of your results show these patterns or if they differ. Thank you.

MR. MULHOLLAND: Now we're going to talk about the nuts and bolts of the fulfillment process itself for rebates. And here is Tom Diffley. Tom is Executive Vice-President of Business Development at Helgeson Enterprises. He has ten years of experience in promotion fulfillment with multiple service providers, providing directly -- working directly with large and small retailers, and market package goods, consumers electronics, and wireless services.

For The Record, Inc.

1	MR. DIFFLEY: Good morning. My name's Tom
2	Diffley, and I have been in promotion fulfillment for the
3	last ten years. So I thought I would start by
4	introducing you to promotion fulfillment. And there are
5	a number of terms that we use within our industry that
6	you may or may not have heard before. So I thought it
7	might be helpful if we would start with those.

First of all, customers are the people with whom we are interacting, as opposed to the general pool of consumers. You can think of a customer as somebody who has actually made a purchase from one of our clients.

A client are the people who hire us. And in most cases they are manufacturers, service providers, and retailers or E-tailers. And these are also companies who fund the rebates. So they are the people, they are the people who are paying the customers.

Fulfillment company, what we are, we are the third party who processes the request from the customers and we ship whatever it is that the customer wants back to those customers. We're also known as fulfillment houses, fulfillment services providers, or FSPs, and we're also simply called rebate processors.

Promotions are what these customers get involved in. And I specialize in consumer-based

For The Record, Inc.

fulfillment and consumer-based promotions. There are other types of fulfillment out there. But these consumer-based offers call to action the customer to buy a product or service right now. These are also called promos, offers, deals, rebates.

And a rebate is a particular type of promotion where the customer receives a rebate check or a rebate card back by mail. These are also called MIRs, or mailin rebates.

And a premium offer is a slightly different type of offer, and that's where the customer receives an item back by mail, or I guess via any courier. But this is as opposed to a rebate check.

And then invalid submissions are submissions that we have received from customers, but the customers didn't do everything that they were supposed to do. This is as opposed to customers who simply didn't participate in the process. But these customers who have mailed to us and didn't do what they are supposed to do, those submissions can be called invalid, disqualified, unqualified, rejected, non-compliant, a number of different expressions. But they all mean the same thing.

First of all, what are fulfillment companies and what do we do? We get involved when our clients or our prospective clients want to run a promotion and they

1 require a third party like us to process the submissions.

The companies running rebates typically don't have the facilities or the interest or the systems in place to process rebates, so they hire us to take over that, to take over all that interaction with the customer. And what we do, is we set up all of the different customer contact points. So where the customer may believe that

he or she is dealing with a manufacturer or a service

provider or a retailer or E-tailer, they are actually

dealing with us.

So we are the PO Box, we are the telephone number, the email address. And we are also the organization corresponding with the customer, so we are the ones sending the checks, we are the ones sending the reject letters, and we're also the ones sending the status update email messages.

So we are, or we attempt to be, in most cases transparent to the customer. But we are serving as the manufacturer or the service provider in our interaction with the customer. We are providing support for that customer typically in three different ways and at three different points. Before the customer submits, we provide support via telephone and the web. After a customer submits, we also provide support via telephone and the web, and this would be a customer who is seeking

a status inquiry. And then after a customer has participated we also support that customer via the phone or via the web. And if the customer has made a mistake we help that customer understand what the requirement was that he or she missed, and we help him or her get the materials together.

There are a few things that we are not. We are not the organization that creates the promotion. Our clients create the promotions. We are not out there, in most cases, actively promoting promotions. Typically our clients and prospective clients come to us with a need already.

We do not make the rules for qualification. We follow the rules. We can advise our clients on how to set up the rules to make things less burdensome for the customers, and make it a more pleasant experience. But ultimately it is the client who makes that decision.

I'm not advancing.

We do not have a financial stake in the promotions. And I read on, I read on blogs, I read just a number of different things out there, even some published statements by politicians, that seems to imply that we have some motivation to disqualify customers who send in. We process submissions, and it isn't of any interest to us whether the customer qualifies or

disqualifies, we are process -- or we are paid to process submissions and take telephone calls. So whether we are mailing a check or whether we are mailing a reject letter to that customer is immaterial to us. We will get paid either way.

And also I get all sorts of telephone calls from prospective clients, from the press, people asking me -- they almost always lead with the same question, especially the press -- and the question is what percentage of customers respond to a rebate offer. And we're just, we're very mediocre resources to give this particular answer. And the reason is we know how many pieces of mail we see on an offer, but we don't know what the sell-through was, with the exception of certain types of offers where the client is the retailer or the E-tailer. But asking us to project what a response rate would be is extremely difficult.

In most cases history is the best indicator for any client or prospective client. If they've been running rebates in the past they will begin to understand what their response rates are.

Where did rebates come from? I've been in the industry ten years and I can tell you what I think, where I think they've come from, although Hal is in a better position to tell you where they have. If we take a look

at rebates today we're probably all thinking about consumer electronics and rebates on hardware and software and even wireless services. But rebates have been around for quite a while. We just don't see many of them today on some of these products that used to be rebated pretty often.

If we go back a few years ago, wine and spirits were typically rebated, automotive was very popular, very high volume rebates. And also even packages goods. If you walk through a grocery store ten years ago you would see many, many mail-in offers on the shelves or advertised. And that's simply not a place where you see mail-in offers advertised today.

Did these offers evolve from premium offers -did rebates evolve from premium offers? I don't know.
But there were, well, these offers still exist today, but
there was something pretty common when I was a kid, and
that was you save up the proofs of purchase off your
cereal box and you send in the, you send in your shipping
and handling and you get back your Tony the Tiger. Which
is what I did in second grade, and then about a week
later it was stolen, and that is an event that still
stings today.

[Laughter.]

MR. DIFFLEY: But fulfillment companies were

For The Record, Inc.

shipping and handling. When you took a look at the 1.95 to get the Tony the Tiger pack to you, or the 3.95, that was, that was our part of it. So the 3.95 was our shipping and handling and we were shipping and handling.

It's also possible that they've evolved from try-me-free offers, which were pretty common with packaged goods, where if you bought two of the packaged good you would get the cost of one of those back by mail. And it's possible that you folks who offer consumer electronics products saw those offers, saw they were effective, and just got rid of the whole buy two of them and get the cost of one back by mail.

And then also I think they've evolved from coupons. And that it's coupons are a promotional tool that were simply not available with some of these consumer electronics retailers up until even just a few years ago.

In the last ten years I've seen a number of changes with mail-in rebates. Years ago the rebate amounts were quite small, it was very common to see one \$2 to \$10 rebates. You may see a few of those today. But for the most part the rebate amounts are considerably higher now.

There's another type of offer which is pretty common now, too, and those are rebates on services, as

opposed to just rebates on products. And with services will typically come probation periods where you ask the customer to wait a period of time to prove that you are still on contract, or a customer in good standing, before you're eligible for the rebate.

Ten years ago there was another type of promotion, which was you would mail away for a kit, or you would mail away -- what was really popular was mailing away for a cookbook. Some of these offers would take place around the holidays, they were extremely high volume offers. And that type of promotion has essentially been eliminated by the web. There is absolutely no need to mail away for those items any more. You can go download those items on the web now.

Ten years ago there were, there were essentially a lack of, well, the technology didn't exist to communicate with a customer in a couple of additional ways that we're able to do today. For example, IVR wasn't as popular, so we're now able to make IVR applications available to customers so that they can call us and check their status.

Pushing email status to customers ten years ago was virtually unheard of, but seven years ago began to show up. And then of course web status, where the customer is able to check the status by themselves.

For The Record, Inc.

And this is something that I find is almost ironic, but the same small office home office products that have become so popular with rebates, and that have been the highest volume rebaters, are actually the products, and the services that made it possible for customers to voice their concerns about rebates.

And on average what I watched, in a well-constructed offer roughly 90 percent of customers will qualify. In other words, if we receive 100 pieces of mail about 90 percent of those pieces of mail will qualify. And I haven't seen that number change much over the past 10 years.

And then I can speculate a little bit about how rebates will continue to change, at least some things that I hope are going to change. I hope that clients will -- our clients will continue to fund rebates faster so that we can get checks out to customers more quickly.

There is a great deal of pricing pressure on us, the fulfillment companies. So I suspect that we'll see more and more outsourcing of various parts of our process.

Premium items today exist, but I think they're almost going to go away. A couple of different factors: their shipping expense, the availability of the product. Now let's say laptop batteries, for example, are really a

1	good premium offer that still exists because they're
2	highly complementary to the product that was originally
3	sold. But as the production of those batteries gets
4	outsourced getting a hold of those batteries on short
5	notice becomes more difficult.

I think that prepaid rebate cards will replace some checks. You know, checks have been around for a long time, they're quite established. We haven't had much that's novel, and it looks like rebate cards could be something novel and exciting.

And then I also think that retailers and E-tailers are going to control more of the rebate process. And we're seeing quite a trend in that direction today.

Thank you.

15 [Applause.]

MR. MULHOLLAND: Thanks, Tom.

Our next speaker is Stuart Patterson, who is Senior Counsel at Hewlett-Packard. Stuart has worked at HP since 1997. Prior to that he practiced in San Francisco with the predecessor firm to Bingham McCutchen. Before law school at UCLA he worked on the legislative staff of Senator Bob Packwood and especially in regard to the commerce committee jurisdiction.

MR. PATTERSON: Good morning. Am I better there? Great, thanks. Apart from that I'd like to thank

For The Record, Inc.

Matt and Kerry and Linda and Joe for inviting me here to speak. I didn't realize they were turning people down for panels, or I might be out there with you. And things like that.

I've been asked to kind of come and comment about ten reasons why, why do we do this, and what motivates us from a manufacturer's perspective and things. You've gotten a lot of insight already from the previous speakers.

The thing and in Tim's position, the first reason, and by far the most powerful reason is what we call demand generation. If the three rules of real estate are location, location, location, the three rules for us as rebate providers is demand generation, demand generation, demand generation, demand generation. To draw attention to your products to increase sales to get the lift that Tim talked about.

I also wanted to touch on why we do it. Also I will be speaking to some of the challenges we see when we do it. We obviously want to do it. They allow us to target and see a return on an investment on an effort, on a promotion. What do you get back for what you've done. You see the lift and you can measure it and quantify it.

It's challenging to administer, because one reason we're here debating, consumers sometimes find the

process frustrating.

We also in a regulatory environment have not only the Commission watching us, but numerous state regulators and enforcers, and a plaintiff's bar looking at you carefully. And there are numerous state statutes around price optics and things, so things you can do in general you'd like to nationwide you have to watch your marketing collateral. HP is gifted with a very vibrant and lively channel, which helps us a great deal with that, because they actually practice and work in those areas and can often inform us of those concerns.

And speaking of that, I would note as I got here without the hearing the FTC standard disclaimer about things. I would offer one of my own, I'm going to do my best to answer your questions and talk about our practices. I have some limits around confidentiality and privacy of our resellers and customers that may limit what I can say here today, or how far my comments might be read.

Number two, is the competitive response. What's going on there is not only that boy we're doing it because my brother's doing it, and I know how much Lesley and Eileen love hearing that explanation. But it also goes into the area of rebates allow somebody, particularly with a long lead time and sell-in, like with

a lot of our products, to react to things in the marketplace. Someone may be coming out, someone who may have provided this laptop to the FTC. Because of the nature of their selling motions on the internet can price and do things much more dynamically than somebody who operates primarily through a channel.

So throwing a rebate at something, promoting it and developing it allows you to help respond to pricing pressure and makes of technology that's out there.

That's something that's very important to us.

Number three, improve and change the customer experience. This touches on what Tom was talking on of premium products primarily. A lot of our rebate offers when they were premiums in the premium area give you a taste or example, a prime example is an HP media pack of new and different paper. Maybe you will use your technology in a way you hadn't envisioned before. Maybe we'll give you some software that will expand the time you spend with it, and surprise and delight you with how you'd do it.

I would take a little issue with one of the things Tom said about the web doing it in because it's downloadable. I would agree the web has contributed to why you're seeing fewer of these, at least from us. One thing is they are very hard to manage because the web,

it's very hard to control your target and demand on it.

Word gets out about these things. And we have had a lot of dissatisfaction from our channel and from customers when you run short of the product. And even when you follow your mail order rule and do everything and notify you're going to get it to them, if people want their Halloween cookbook and pumpkin printing card ideas they really, you know, and marketers heard me explain this, they don't want it in November. Right? So it is a risk and a dissatisfier.

One way in wish fulfillment is being taken out of the premium thing is not only is are we cutting down on it, but we're trying to do it more at the reseller point of sale level. So you may come to the checkout with a qualifying purchase, and actually handed the kit, so you get it right there, and we can keep a much better tap on the amount and numbers of it, as well as expectations.

The other way to do it, the other reason we do it, that's very big for us, is a long line of consumer and small medium business products is to expand your product line and extend it. HP has moved into digital photography with a vengeance. We have Snapfish kind of things. When you buy a printer you may be offered a hundred free prints, or a discount or something of that

1	nature.	It'	s a	way	also	o in	a	bundled	rebat	te to	bring
2	somebody	in	and	offe	er a	new	ex	kperience	for	them.	

Challenge products. [Microphone interference.]

Am I too soft or too loud? It's just me, okay.

Challenge products. This is a euphemism for when we have a miss. You may have a forecasting error, you may have a signal that isn't correct from the market and something comes out. You need to move product to get somebody new in.

Tom mentioned the automotive industry. We're all familiar with the year-end rebates that come in from that thing. It's no different in consumer electronics. We want to bring something out and push it in, it may be the competitor has landed with something that's more dynamic. So that may be something where you want to get a rebate in there as well. Life cycles really do drive us.

[Microphone issues.] No problem. Is that better? Okay, great.

See HP technology. It will work for you.

So the other big one my previous panel members have touched on is what we call 'customer touch.' This is it gives you an opportunity at all levels when you offer a rebate to have some interaction with the customer at the reseller level. If someone comes in and inquires

For The Record, Inc.

about an advertised or promoted rebate it allows their
customer service representative to say, hey, you know,
you're interested in that, here's a complimentary
product, or here's something else that may help a
talented reseller who manages a market basket approach to
a customer a way to maximize their interest, and
hopefully add greater services or products to what their
customer might be leaving their store with.

For us, obviously, and again mindful of concerns over consumer privacy, and HP is a strong opt-in company, you checked off the box and hopefully you will invite us to entice you with more rewarding and delightful offers about the product you just purchased from us, and you'll do that as part of the rebate service.

Tom also talked about web fulfillment. And that interaction where you're now being sent messages back and forth, it's an idea to show you that we progress and care. And the point was also made about particularly in technology products we give you the means to communicate with us and talk with us about it, and customer touch in developing some of the ways to help teach you and familiarize you with the capabilities of your product.

Market expectations. This is a kind of general

For The Record, Inc.

rationalization for you do it so long that everyone expects you to do it. Again, rebates in the auto industry is a prime example. Being invited to come speak at this panel has caused me to focus a little bit more at where I'm hearing these offers. A couple of weeks ago during a spring break drive, I don't know whether this was a national or regional campaign, but a car manufacturer was putting an ad out playing on the sound frogs made of ribbets, ribbets -- rebate, rebate, rebate, to try and get people to come in. And I listened to it several times in the course of a lengthy drive, never heard the amount, you know, just the fact we're offering it that is going to get you to come in and hopefully think about this spring purchase of a new car. And that's just one example of it.

Sometimes we assume we're going to rebate because we do it so often, and I see the business people make the calculus wait a minute, this product doesn't need this or it's not wrong -- it's not right at this time, we can go forward and do it. But you actually get into an area of expectations.

And then you get into customer and distribution partner demand. I don't know if Tim had it in the rest of his slides, and I don't have an analytical approach to it, but as somebody who has been working in this area for

well over seven years, I am amazed at hearing why people submit rebates and what they do with them. And we get, you know, we do get complaints, plenty of them. But we also get lots of thank you's. And it is fascinating to me how internal domestic economics, you know, somebody — we have acquaintances who use it to fund college education. I find that not advisable, but interesting, interesting.

[Laughter.]

MR. PATTERSON: There are others who use it for a night out, you know, comes in, thank you, kind of thing. Also people who count on it. Again, in a business like ours with a consumable business attached to it to fund the next purchase of the consumable, and it kind of makes them feel better about spending that kind of money on that. Just kind of interesting.

Finally, or not finally, next, the brand.

Classic area here is bundled rebates, where if you can present a compelling package of rebates to a reseller or to customers you might draw more attention in a Sunday circular, you might draw it in store. It might be very — somebody might realize, oh HP, they do hand-helds as well. The Commission knows all about that. But you have a chance to kind of hopefully aggregate your share of eyeballs or your share of customer awareness.

For The Record, Inc.

It's something as an adult survivor of a kitchen remodel, why all the appliances in my kitchen I couldn't make a decision, but oh there was a group rebate on it.

Being it's time to wrap up. The final one is a marketing alliance idea. The best example in technology that many of you are familiar with, and regulators are familiar with, is the internet service provider offer that drew a lot of attention at the height of the dot com boom, and continues, that you try and partner with another brand that's on the move or on the rise, and it shows that you are compelling and interesting in today's market.

Many of you have one of these. I'm holding up a cellular telephone. For the record, that is turned off, Lesley. And you're aware that you see the service provider and the handset provider put something together to kind of make a really compelling choice in that kind of thing.

So the final thing to wrap up, for those of you who are bored in your next conference call, go to YouTube, search the word *rebate*, and you'll see something that will touch on Tom's point about how long these have been around. And, again, observe all intellectual property laws. You will see a Bill Cosby ad for a Texas

1	Instruments personal computer touting a mail-in rebate.
2	It's got to be early Cosby Show era, and he's sitting
3	there and the bulk of the commercial is explaining how to
4	file for a rebate, like you call, and it's totally
5	different from where consumers are now. And thinking
6	about it you'll also see a Portugese hand game called
7	Rabatae (phonetic), and then you will, you will also see
8	a five-minute seven-second blues jazz riff from a
9	disgruntled customer of a cellular telephone rebate,
10	which is entertaining, and, again, puts something towards
11	the manufacturers of something else we need to be aware
12	of of how someone can comment on what we're doing.
13	Thanks
14	[Applause.]
15	MR. MULHOLLAND: Thanks, Stuart. We're going
16	to open it up for questions. And I wanted to start with
17	a visitor.
18	MR. SYME: Thank you very much. My name is
19	John Syme, I'm a lawyer with the Department of Justice
20	from Canada. And I had a question for Professor Silk in

John Syme, I'm a lawyer with the Department of Justice from Canada. And I had a question for Professor Silk in relation to how consumers value rebate offers as compared to offers of a straight sale price type representation. And I'm wondering whether or not there are any studies that look at that issue, and look at sort of transaction utility in terms of, for example, on a given product

For The Record, Inc.

whether or not a consumer would value a rebate offer of say 40 percent at say and compare that to say a 30 percent or 20 percent straight sale price offer on that same product.

MR. SILK: To my knowledge there's nothing that's done that. I've run some studies where I had the same percentage off, and I ran it as a sale versus a rebate. Because I was wondering if there's a perception that rebates are offered on inferior products. And I do get that. I asked them what you think this product is really worth that's less when it's a rebate than when it's a straight sale. But I don't know why that is. But it's not a strong effect. And it's definitely something we're studying, it's just lower down on the list of the things that we had on priorities. But if I find out more about it I'll definitely let you know. But unfortunately to my knowledge no one's really done that.

On the quantitative side, we would like to get data from firms or from retailers where we can look at equivalent coupons versus rebates, versus straight discounts, and really look at how sales lift is affected by the format of the discount delivery. But, again, we don't have data on that. If anyone wants to provide it we can definitely look at it.

MR. MULHOLLAND: I have one question for Stuart

For The Record, Inc.

and Tom, and that's in regard to the incentive structure that fulfillment houses have. Could you talk a little bit about how that works? In other words, how does like your client monitor your performance in regard to say the rate say rejects that you have? Or exactly how does that work, and does it vary among different fulfillment houses and manufacturers?

MR. DIFFLEY: I'm sorry, I don't understand.

MR. MULHOLLAND: Well, what I'm thinking of is the example I'm thinking of is say in the automobile dealer, as far as warranty repairs are concerned, there has to be some sort of check there or the dealer just everything that comes in they call it a warranty work and they go ahead and do it. And is there some way or other that how they monitor your work? Let's say if you went ahead and accepted every single rebate offer that came in, as opposed to rejecting a certain number of them, is there some feedback you get from them regarding the percentage of rebates that you reject?

MR. DIFFLEY: Our clients can and do audit frequently, and they're looking at a couple of different things. They're looking at the quality of our data entry work, and then they're also looking at the speed of our work. But the way that we communicate the quality and the service to the client in between audits is through

reporting. So this data is available to the client at all times. And part of it is reinforced through the invoicing process, because when we're looking for funding we have to provide invoices to the client for those customers who've qualified as well as the supporting documentation or, yeah, I guess the supporting data, for those qualifying customers.

Does that answer the question?

MR. MULHOLLAND: Yeah, okay.

MR. PATTERSON: So I guess my answer is pretty much the same. I mean, we manage our rebate vendor of which there is normally primarily only one, for simplicity sake, in the consumer space at least. You know, there are regular audits to see how well they're performing and how soon we're getting things out. There also are regular I think they may be weekly now, I don't know, they may be less, on if issues crop up, you know, with -- the complexity is really the hidden issue in a lot of these issues I talked about bundling and branding and things like that. And if we have a miscue we may know to, wow, that's coming in low, you want to lower your throttle on the qualified, you know, and allow more qualifieds to go through. That's just good business.

Back to the customer touch point, I obviously it's news to me the Soyo decision. But the comment I

For The Record, Inc.

would make to that kind of treatment to customers is you
are serious about your brand and in your interest it is
far less expensive to pay a rebate to a nonqualified
person than to anger a customer who potentially needs to
come back and buy your brand again. And that tends to be
our philosophy going forward with the eye towards there
is the issue on the other side of consumer fraud. That
there are people who are brilliant at working ours or our
fulfillment house's systems to get more than they're
entitled to by leaps and bounds. So it's a tension
there.

MR. MULHOLLAND: We have room, we have time for one more question. Is there any question from the audience?

MR. GLASSER: Well, first I'd like to just say very quickly to Mr. Silk -- I'm sorry? Oh yes, Roy Glasser, E-journalist and consumer advocate.

First, I got to speak very quickly to Mr. Silk.

I was very impressed with everything you said, but my research doesn't match yours.

I find that there are three types of rebate people. One of those, one is people who are buying something they really need like a washing machine or a refrigerator, and their response is going to be one kind. The second kind of rebate are the free after rebate, and

For The Record, Inc.

the response from that is going to be much higher. And the third kind I would refer to simply as the casual rebate, and that kind of response is going to be much lower, some of those people don't care. And in both of the last two categories there are people who specifically are looking at the price because -- I'll get to that in a moment, but they are looking at the price and decide to buy solely on the price instead of and knowing they're not going to submit the rebate.

As far as the price goes, I see that even though items are coming up for sale and it's illegal to change the list price for the sale, the list prices are being changed for the sale, as though there's a difference in mark. Sometimes it goes up, sometimes it goes down.

I'd like to speak very quickly now to

Mr. Diffley. You said that you don't have an interest in

disqualifying rebates. You're an exception, sir. Some

of the rebate processors advertise the high rejection

rates as high as 25 percent that they have, in order to

solicit business. I don't want to mention a company

because someone from Parago will be here speaking, but

this is happening, and not just from one company.

 $\mbox{So if I could? Well, I've taken up enough} \\ \mbox{time. Somebody else wants to speak.}$

For The Record, Inc.

all three panelists. I think this was very informated [Applause.] MR. MULHOLLAND: And very much sets the set for the remaining sessions. We'll take a 15 minute now. And I would remind you again about filling out survey, because that would really help for the after session. 10:30. Okay, 10:30, please for coming back. (BREAK) (BREAK) 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	1	MR. MULHOLLAND: Well, thank you very much.
[Applause.] MR. MULHOLLAND: And very much sets the state of for the remaining sessions. We'll take a 15 minute now. And I would remind you again about filling out survey, because that would really help for the after session. 10:30. Okay, 10:30, please for coming back. (BREAK) (BREAK) 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	2	This marks the end of this session. I'd like to thank
MR. MULHOLLAND: And very much sets the st for the remaining sessions. We'll take a 15 minute now. And I would remind you again about filling out survey, because that would really help for the after session. 10:30. Okay, 10:30, please for coming back. (BREAK) (BREAK) 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	3	all three panelists. I think this was very informative.
for the remaining sessions. We'll take a 15 minute now. And I would remind you again about filling out survey, because that would really help for the after session. 10:30. Okay, 10:30, please for coming back. (BREAK) (BREAK) 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	4	[Applause.]
now. And I would remind you again about filling out survey, because that would really help for the after session. 10:30. Okay, 10:30, please for coming back. (BREAK) (BREAK) 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	5	MR. MULHOLLAND: And very much sets the stage
survey, because that would really help for the after session. 10:30. Okay, 10:30, please for coming back. (BREAK) Brian 19 Company 10:30, please for coming back.	6	for the remaining sessions. We'll take a 15 minute break
9 session. 10:30. 10 Okay, 10:30, please for coming back. 11 (BREAK) 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	7	now. And I would remind you again about filling out that
Okay, 10:30, please for coming back. (BREAK) (8	survey, because that would really help for the afternoon
11 (BREAK) 12 (BREAK) 14 (BREAK) 15 (BREAK) 16 (BREAK) 17 (BREAK) 19 (BREAK)	9	session. 10:30.
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	10	Okay, 10:30, please for coming back.
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	11	(BREAK)
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	12	
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	13	
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	14	
17 18 19 20 21 22 23	15	
18 19 20 21 22 23 24	16	
 19 20 21 22 23 24 	17	
 20 21 22 23 24 	18	
21222324	19	
222324	20	
23 24	21	
24	22	
	23	
PANEL 2: REBATES: OPEN THE ENVELOPE AND CU	24	
	25	PANEL 2: REBATES: OPEN THE ENVELOPE AND CUT THE

(301) 870-8025 - www.ftrinc.net - (800) 921-5555

CHECK: WHAT COULD GO WRONG?

MS. O'BRIEN: -- Federal Trade Commission, and also the moderator of our next panel. And just to let you know, again, all the PowerPoint presentations will be on the website as soon as we can get our act together tomorrow. So you'll all be able to see them.

And I have a question for you. When consumers send in their rebate forms, I mean they are just not confident they are going to get their rebate check in the mail. And I guess the answer to my question, you know, is why is this, why is this happening. I think it's either the reality, well, it's certainly the perception that everyone's had a bad experience with rebates, or they certainly know someone who has.

And this panel is going to explore situations where rebate offers have gone bad, or may go bad. And hopefully the panel will set the stage for some of our later panels that will talk about solutions to some of these potential problems.

With me today is Joe Ridout. He's with

Consumer Action. Consumer Action is the national nonprofit education and advocacy organization. And it's

been advancing consumer rights for three decades,

something like that, three and a half decades. And

during this panel Joe's sort of our voice of the

For The Record, Inc.

1 consumer.

We also have with us Hal Stinchfield, who is a recognized expert in the field of rebate advertising. Currently he's working as a consultant working with marketers to develop and deliver more consumer-friendly rebate offers. So Hal today is sort of our eyes of the industry.

And finally, with us is my colleague Dean

Graybill of the FTC. And he's going to be giving us a

sort of law enforcement view of rebate advertising, and

explain some of the bad consequences that can be

[microphone interference] that fail to keep their rebate

promises.

Of course, we all know the saying we learn from our mistakes, and hopefully during this panel we'll be able to learn from the mistakes of others.

So without further ado, I'll put on Joe, [microphone interference] before I get electrocuted.

MR. RIDOUT: Good morning. Can everybody hear back there? Might give it a little more. Thanks a lot for having me. It's a great honor to be here. My name's Joe Ridout. I'm with Consumer Action, as was mentioned. We're a consumer defense and education group that sends out about two million pieces of free information to consumers and other groups all over the country, and up

to eight different languages every year.

We also maintain a hotline that receives a lot of complaints, or other kinds of comments from consumers about what they're experiencing in the marketplace with different companies. And rebates is one of the areas in which we hear a lot of different stories from consumers.

So I'm here to talk a little about the consumer side of the rebate experience, some problems that can arise, and what to do about it. I guess one thing we hear sometimes is that when there's a product defect rebates can be a dicey proposition, like with that microphone there. So hopefully this was not ordered on rebate.

[Laughter.]

MR. RIDOUT: Rebates have been characterized at times, at different times a tax on the disorganized, a reasonable tradeoff of consumer's time for money. Or sometimes when things go bad, as a ripoff that wasn't worth the time and aggravation that was invested in the process. Unfortunately, many consumers sometimes come away with the experience of rebate, emphasizing the 'bait' part of the rebate, and it leaves a bad taste in one's mouth who's been denied a rebate that they felt they were entitled to.

Retailers at times see rebates as attractive.

For The Record, Inc.

We're seeing a couple of retailers getting out of the rebate business, but many retailers still see rebates as attractive because they get to induce sticker swoon, the opposite of sticker shock, and entice consumers into buying products they might not always have been disposed to do so. Retailers can reap the benefits of advertising a lower price than they necessarily have to deliver to everyone.

Consumers for their part can find a terrific deal on certain items, but they often face a series of confusing and irritating obstacles in order to claim their rebate. For example, a rebate customer customarily must save the receipt, obtain the proper form or forms, fill out the paperwork completely, enter the product codes or offer codes, dissect the box the item came in, and submit the proper UPC code, send in all the documentation under the deadline, wait for a check to arrive months later probably will look a lot like junk mail, and then cash or deposit the check before it expires in a short amount of time. So consumers are faced with what seems at times like an endurance race of hoop jumping, and it's not a surprise that problems arise along the way.

It's no secret that many rebate companies try to encourage mistakes on the part of consumers. We

For The Record, Inc.

recently saw on the part of Parago, the company behind
Circuit City rebates, receive patent number 7120591 for a
rebate processing system. This is from the application:

'The rebate processing system provides a user friendly
interface, yet retains hurtles sufficient to maintain
breakage.' Breakage, of course, rebate denials.

Consumers do make mistakes, and that's a lot of the
reason why rebates go bad, to be sure. But that's just
part of the story. And there are a lot of companies
spending a lot of time and money trying to maximize how
many of those mistakes consumers can make, and increase
breakage, or rebate denials.

This is more from the application. 'By requiring post-purchase activities, the rebate offer attempts to reduce the number of successful rebate claimants.' And it goes on, 'Because rebate programs offer the potential for breakage, manufacturers can offer more valuable rebates compared to a straight reduction product price.'

So it's no secret. Some rebate companies freely admit that they are in the business of discouraging or denying rebates, as much as they are in the business of fulfilling rebates. And to be sure, some consumers are trying to game the system as well. It's not as though there's one party completely out to dupe

the other, it's more the system being a game than consumers or the industry trying to game the system.

There's a number of consumer websites out there, for example, that try to identify free after rebate items, or even unusual circumstances where someone could actually make money by buying a product, presuming that all the rebates go according to plan.

So sometimes, in some ways rebates can represent a strange convergence between consumers who want something for nothing and companies who want to give nothing for something that they promised as part of the original deal. So not surprising, this leads to a lot of problems. And I'll go into discussing how these impact consumers, and what we've heard from people about these experiences.

As I said, we maintain a hotline at Consumer Action where people call in and report what kinds of experiences they have, negative or positive. Some of the main rebate issues we hear are about items that were purchased as a gift, and they failed to qualify for the rebate because the original box went to the gift recipient, and they were unable to redeem their rebate. Rebate checks that were supposed to be mailed within say three months and arrived say nine months. These are all garden-variety complaints. We get forms that were

properly completed but then denied.

Some of the more interesting ones involve a problem with the packaging or lack of information about what the rebate form should include. We heard from one consumer recently who bought a memory card and was eligible for two different \$20 rebates. On each form he had to put the serial number of the card. He couldn't find out where exactly the serial number was, so he included the number on the side of the box thinking it would be the best solution. It turned out the number was etched on the card itself, and it was a number you couldn't actually see with the naked eye, you needed a magnifying glass to see it. So better disclosure in these kinds of cases about where to put the pertinent information on rebate forms is really the least we should expect going forward.

Some consumers, it's interesting, find rebate forms so confusing and so intimidating that they enlist the help of salesmen of the product at the point of sale to help them fill out the rebate forms. And this, in itself, can create more problems should the salesman fail to fill out the form properly himself. Because we've heard, like I said, we've been hearing increasingly from consumers who have tried to get someone where they bought the cell phone or bought the computer to fill out the

form for them because the consumer approaches sometimes a rebate with the sense of impending disaster, and they try to minimize the chance of that. But sometimes the salesman makes the same mistake filling out the wrong forms, switching a number, in this case the same result, a denial is what happens to the consumers.

And if the rebate is so confusing that people at the point of sale can't fill them out properly, here we have a serious problem, and there's no reason that these kinds of problems should be affecting people, if people even selling the products are having difficulties filling out the rebate form.

We heard a little earlier about how rebate companies are replacing check rebates with prepaid gift cards. It's certainly a trend that we're hearing about. And some consumers have been frustrated by this, because for example in California many people are aware or they've heard that gift certificates can expire in California. But they're not aware that bank-issued gift cards can, they certainly can, they usually begin to expire after six months, and that's the case with most of these prepaid gift card rebates as well. So many consumers are surprised to see their rebate dying a slow death when they thought it was just a gift card, a credit card, that would be just as useful and have the same

longevity as a normal credit card or normal gift certificate from a store. That's not the case. And it takes some people by surprise.

I should add there's been something of a backlash against rebates lately. Best Buy and Office Max are examples of a couple of retailers who really have washed their hands of rebates and have tried to get out of the business, because they found that so many consumer complaints were beginning to drag down the retailer's reputation. Others like Staples have moved towards processing rebates electronically, and removing some of the possibilities for things to go wrong. And really all rebates could be processed online. Although as I'll mention in an example in a second about how merely including an electronic component of submitting your rebate does not guarantee it's going to be any easier for the consumer.

But more than the kinds of outright fraud or deliberate denials of rebates that were properly submitted, we hear more about ingenuous ways in which people can trip up, or rebate forms that have devilish little details that people often have great difficulty following.

We heard from Eileen Harrington earlier about the case of InPhonic and Wirefly, and we heard a lot

about these guys as well. They were offering substantial rebates for purchasing a cell phone, often \$200 or \$300, and the catch was the rebate form had to be submitted no later than seven months, and that sounds pretty fair. But the problem was it couldn't be submitted any sooner than six months. So it was a maddeningly small window, and it was one of those offers that not surprisingly led to widespread denials. There's a saying in the tech industry, it's called, 'Broken As Designed,' Broken As Designed. And this is a good example of a rebate that was broken as designed. People were not supposed to complete this, and it was designed with the intent of maximizing denials, rather than maximizing fulfillments.

We've been getting a lot of complaints about some -- a problem with direct rebate processing company called OnRebates. And it's interesting because this kind of represents a strange convergence between mail-in rebates and the new electronically-submitted rebates. With some of the OnRebate submissions they really are kind of like a Frankenstein-like hybrid of the worst elements of a mail-in rebate and an electronic rebate. The way it works with many of the rebates is the consumer has to go online, fill out a complex registration form, and then receive an email from the company acknowledging that the registration's complete, email the company back,

then return online to complete that part of the registration process. But at that point they have to print up a rebate form, they have to fill it out manually, they have to cut out the UPC code, and guess what, they have to mail in all the documentation anyway. This is something that really doesn't serve the consumer at all, and it's really a good example of traps being set in the way of the less-sophisticated rebate submitter.

So even when we have an electronic component that doesn't necessarily guarantee it's going to be any more user-friendly. And the OnRebate example is something that we take note of.

The same company, it's interesting, too, they coincidentally they offer an option to process rebates more promptly in which basically they rebate back to themselves a portion of the rebate the consumer is entitled to. For about 10 percent of the rebate OnRebate promises to expedite the rebate processing, and from what we understand it really does expedite it significantly. But frankly, if this option's available it should be available to everyone, and it's deceptive to offer it only to those who are willing to pay 10 percent of the rebate back to the rebate company.

Consumers also have privacy concerns. People feel sometimes like they're giving away their personal

information without a lot in it for them. Sometimes that personal information can be just as much value as the rebate itself.

But we're encouraged by what the FTC is doing to defend consumer rights. We're very encouraged by the steps they've taken that were mentioned earlier this morning. We're also encouraged by some state actions, such as New York with AB8436 that requires strict deadlines for sending rebate checks, requiring forms to be more accessible to people who want to fill out rebate forms, and that companies have to accept copies of receipts rather than original receipts. These are fairly common sense solutions that can help consumers avoid these kinds of problems.

I should add that consumers themselves have been taking matters into their own hands to some extent. Consumer-generated websites like Fat Wallets, Slick Deals, or Rebate Place, all have helped share in disseminating information about how to contact rebate fulfillment houses, tips on how to make sure your rebate gets to the finish line, and which companies tend to cause the most problems, so that some of these problems can be avoided or at least identified.

So that's about all I have here. And I thank you very much.

For The Record, Inc.

1 [Applause.

MS. O'BRIEN: Next will be Hal. So thank you.

MR. STINCHFIELD: Today I'll give you a brief introduction of my background, so that you can see the perspective from which I'm looking at this topic. We'll talk about some of the most common misconceptions about rebates; consumer and marketer challenges with rebates; some of the fulfillment provider issues; what I think needs to change in order to help improve this process; and when a marketer knows that they're headed for trouble.

I'll start by dispelling any rumors and suggest that, yes, I have been in the business for 30 years. And, frankly, the Federal Trade Commission was not interested in all in rebates when I began, and there's a very good reason for that. Rebates were a quarter, that was a 25 cent piece. Our biggest issue in that day, by the way, was when a quarter got sealed into a coin card, inserted into a number 7 envelope, and labeled on the outside of it, and somewhere in the mail stream someone would take that envelope and slug it like that and make the quarter come out the other end and that was a mail theft, and that was about it. So there wasn't much fraud back then.

I have managed over 50,000 rebates and consumer

For The Record, Inc.

promotions for the Carlson Marketing Group; as an equity partner for Young America; also for Boomerang Marketing, which was an E continuity startup, which was the original transmission of proofs of purchase over the web; and also as the senior vice-president for Marketing Services. And today my interest is on educating marketers on how to do a better job with these offers so they can increase their efficiency, effectiveness, customer satisfaction (inaudible). Clients include Symantec Corporation, United Health Care, Lorillard, PayPal, Pfizer, and a few others.

There is one project that I'm working on right now that's kind of interesting. I'm working for a prime contractor to the federal government on a one billion dollar initiative for the NTIA, that's going to give us two \$40 coupons when our televisions go dark February 17, 2009.

My memberships are Promotional Marketing
Association, as well as The Society of Consumer Affairs
Professionals.

One of the most common misconceptions about rebates is that they're somehow inherently problematic, that rebates are bad. That's not what I'm finding. The problematic issues and the problems are not because of the fact that they are a rebate. They are not tactic-

For The Record, Inc.

specific, they're not marketer-specific, and they're not retailer-specific. They're all program-specific, and every program is different. And so they have to be analyzed on a one-on-one basis. So all this hubbub about the consumer complaints and what not are somewhat generalized. And we can go through some examples there.

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

All problems and all issues are emanated from offer structure, offer communication, and offer I'm sorry HP is in the room right now, but this could have been anybody's, as could the next subsequent six slides. So try to disregard the names here. But when I first looked at this I saw that I could buy a monitor for \$599, but after a \$350 rebate I could actually get it for \$199. And the fact of the matter is that that's not true. I have to buy the monitor, I have to buy the tower, I have to buy a printer, I have to buy Turbo Tax, and probably submit my first born in order to get that down to \$149. Now this may not be considered deceptive by the Federal Trade Commission, but I can assure you that in many state jurisdictions it is in fact illegal, just by the way it's positioned. And so we want to watch out for offers like that.

This next one is extraordinarily challenging for consumers in the software space, where a lot of the software folks were saying, free, free, free, free, free,

For The Record, Inc.

but if you read the fine print down below here you find out that you not only have to purchase their product and submit their proof of purchase, but you may have to submit a competitive proof of purchase from a product that you purchased over a year ago. I can't find receipts of purchases I made last week, let alone a year ago. So I say that that's a little difficult, especially in a condition where it's in such fine print here that you're telling the consumer here that they can get it for free. Sure they can get it for free if they submit their proof, the receipt, and the receipt from a previously purchased product. So we kind of want to watch out for offer structure and communication that looks like this.

Communication piece I'm generally referring to, however, is the copy on the mail-in certificate, which is where a great deal of the deception occurs, or perceived deception occurs. I try to be balanced in this issue, so I say "perceived" as well.

Here's another offer where I thought I could get a Sonic Care probably for about \$15, because if I submitted the middle panel I could get a \$10 rebate, and if I submitted on the lefthand side I could get a \$5 coupon off, excuse me, \$10 coupon off -- I haven't memorized the slides clearly -- but I thought I could get this price way down; but it says in the fine print here

that you can either have one or the other, either the rebate or the coupon but not both. Now that's a little problematic because this offer was delivered in a free-standing insert would probably hit a circulation of 52 million pieces. So what I'm essentially doing is I'm going to alienate about a half a million people who may have been interested in this offer just by including some small type thing here that says I can only have the rebate or the coupon, but not both.

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

This next one, I don't remember the, I don't remember the manufacturer here, but let me just indicate one challenge here. Not only is this fairly busy both on top as well as on that lower righthand panel, but here's a problem for a manufacturer. This manufacturer is simply asking for the consumer to fill in their name, address, city, state, and zip code, and the UPC symbols from the products they purchased, when in reality all they have to do is go to the store, look for those products, fill out the UPCs, and go get their \$35 virtually with no proof of purchase. So we try to act a little bit balanced here to say it's not the fulfillment provider, it's not the retailer, it's not the marketer. Marketers have issues as well with the way they structure their offers, sometimes to the point where that's going to cost them a lot of money.

For The Record, Inc.

This next one, and I love Pepsi, I've worked
for them for many, many years, but you don't need just a
magnifying glass to read this copy, you need a
microscope. And that's just plain unfair for guys of my
age, I mean I'll never get that \$10 rebate, I've got news
for you. And there are a lot of them out there like
that. And I think the next one is going to be even more
so. The one after this, maybe.

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

I think cross-ruffs can often be a challenge. I think this was a very short timeline program. to buy a DVD and 92 packages of Brachs products. isn't the worst example I've seen, but it's still a little bit challenging for the consumer. The fact of the matter is, excuse me, with most of these offers we're not thinking about -- as marketers we're not thinking about how the consumer is viewing what we're delivering to them. We just create them, a product manager creates them, he hands it off to an agency, the agency goes and executes, and by then than brand manager's off on something else again. So when his job is sort of in the can, if you will, he's off onto some other thing. evaluating a promotion post-implementation or postexecution is rarely done on the marketer side, and I would encourage them to do so.

Here's another one. This is just a beauty. I

For The Record, Inc.

can't read that no matter how high I blow it up. And I'm 1 thinking, what were they thinking? First of all, I don't 2 know the sponsor here, I don't who's paying for it, I 3 4 don't know what the prize is, I don't know what the expiration date is, I don't know what I can get for it, 5 but I can say that this offer ran again in a free-6 7 standing insert probably in a circulation of 52 million pieces. It ran four weeks later, I can understand why, 8 they didn't get any entries the first time, so they had 9 to spend another quarter of a million dollars to 10 11 distribute 52 million more of them. And even if they did 12 there's no call to action here, there's no real motivation for the consumer to send in, because if you're 13 only offering one prize and your circulation was 104 14 15 million, why would you bother? I hope whoever's it is is 16 not in the audience. I could get eggs thrown at me, I'm 17 telling you.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So what are consumers challenged by? Consumers are challenged by unclear offer requirements, multiple mail—in certificate versions for the same offer, different terms and conditions for the same offer, and that's fairly common. I know they're used a lot, but attaches in bundles and cross—ruffs are just they're hell on wheels for consumers, they just cannot comply with them. So we either have to restructure them or figure

For The Record, Inc.

1 out how to recommunicate them.

And we saw the printer offer, so I won't go through that.

And the most challenging consumer offer these days that I hear about is a rebate request invalidated for a legitimately attempted purchase. They actually went out and did this and for some stupid little minor reason that really wouldn't affect the marketer's budget they got disqualified.

We also hear, you know, if a manufacturer offers a rebate, and I hear this from governmental agencies and the press all the time, if a manufacturer offers a rebate why do they make it so difficult to comply with? So we're kind of shooting ourselves in the foot when we make these offers but we don't do them in such a way that's going to encourage compliance and high customer satisfaction, and still be affordable and efficient for the manufacturer. It absolutely has to change.

Rejection letter copy; offer expiration dates too short, not enough time, you see that, there's a lot of legislation on that; unclear offer copy; and offer limits enforced but not obviously communicated -- that's the fine print on the bottom that says limit one per household but nobody ever sees it so they submit in four

1 times for it.

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 marketer challenges I experience, and things that my clients will come to me about will be, you know, many rebates fail before they begin. They don't have in-house expertise to design consumer-friendly offers, or the created is relegated to an agency, or as is most common, they operate in silos. You have marketing, you have sales promotion, you have consumer affairs, you have finance, and you have treasury, but they never talk about what's going on. So the programs really have to be evaluated both before they're delivered and afterwards. And in many organizations it's so political that the cross-referencing of those communication pieces never takes place. And, again, they're usually calling me when it's too late, after the phones have been ringing off the hook or they're hearing from some governmental agency.

Fulfillment providers are also a challenge. So we can't throw all the mud at them. They rarely get to review the offer copy in advance. Sometimes they don't even know about an offer until they start receiving the mail, and they go, what's this? And then they have to go through their setup procedures. They usually aren't considered at all during the development process, they're sort of the last one on the end of the totem pole. And

often reject thousands of consumer requests, perhaps as the original specifications called for, but not understanding that they're alienating half of the marketer's constituency. The margins are thin so they don't often have time to pick up the phone and call and say, you know, we're getting too many complaints here.

And it's difficult for fulfillment providers to understand how vocal consumers can be. So that needs to change. I think they should at least be supplied with the offer copy in advance of the offer so that they can have a look at it, maybe give you guys some feedback about what might work and what might not work. The processing agreement must specify what threshold a fulfillment house must notify a marketer, and that's as a percent of invalids to valids, so that they're not disqualifying the 50,000 out of a 100,000 that we talked about before, Matt.

Marketers must be made aware the consumer complaints might not only cause consumers to stop buying their products, but it could also be unlawful behavior, as is the case in Section 5.

I would also encourage marketers to use more common sense. If it looks problematic, it probably is.

And the fulfillment industry must pay closer attention to the problems inherent in the traditional

For The Record, Inc.

mail-in process that caused all of this attention in the first place. I mean it really is a joint effort between marketers, advertising, fulfillment providers, to sort of get together and say, geez, why would it take 18 weeks to fulfill something? You know, is that intentional, is it deceptive, are we telling the consumer? Is it full disclosure? This is going to be an extraordinary issue in the gift card space and the prepaid space, both closed-loop and open-loop, when we get to the point where we're talking about dormancy fees, we're talking about maintenance fees, we're talking about split-tender where they can't use the extra four bucks left on the card. I mean this is extraordinary, I mean it's extraordinary. Sure that's a valuable and efficient tool, but if you don't disclose to the consumer what the condition is for which they're getting this card, don't bother, stay away from them.

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

Fulfillment also should be more innovative in coming up with more consumer-friendly processes. That is happening, for those of you who don't know, it is literally possible to submit a rebate today, submit for a rebate today, and get it back tomorrow. That technology exists, and there are a few pioneers out there who are doing it.

Marketers need to take a more proactive role in

For The Record, Inc.

training their marketing and promotion personnel, and in their sales promotion personnel. People don't do this on purpose. We don't design offers that alienate the consumers. I said once in Business Week that that would be akin to brand suicide. We know that most of them are not doing it on purpose. So let's change that, and train the personnel who are handling these offers.

We also need to perform analyses that will lead to measurable and actual improvements in their promotions. So let's look at the data, analyze it, get it objective in nature, and present it to whoever's responsible for executing these offers. Usually senior management has to get involved to break through some of the political silos that exist in some marketers.

I contend that each successive offer has to have a higher customer satisfaction rate than the previous offer. And I think marketing departments need to listen more closely to their internal and external contact centers.

 $\label{eq:control_control_control} \mbox{I'm doing what Tom did earlier, sorry, missing} \\ \mbox{my slides here. Okay.}$

When do marketers know they're in trouble? If they hear from Matthew, that's a problem. If more than 3 percent of their consumers are on any given program are invalidated. Tom cited 10, it really depends on both

For The Record, Inc.

offer structure, size, how many proofs, and so on and so forth. But a good benchmark, you want to look at about a 3 percent maximum. So if you're going over that -- I evaluated about 25 for a pharmaceutical firm and 24 of them were well beyond that, starting at 300 percent greater than that and going up. So this happens all the time, and it comes partly from the fact that a lot of the sales promotion departments and marketers have disappeared these days, so there's really kind of nobody minding the store.

If you hear from a state senator or Better
Business Bureau, if more than 1 percent of your consumers
are contacting your contact center, internally or
externally, and oh by the way, those numbers are usually
not aggregated, so you have an internal call center, you
have a fulfillment call center, and you have an external
call center, each of them are getting 2 percent, 2
percent, nobody's saying that oh my God 7 percent of our
consumers are really angry with us and our offerings.
And those things have to be looked at.

If you haven't done training sessions for your marketing and sales promotion and agency personnel, you absolutely must begin to do so using real live data, and kind of blurring those political lines internally, and say, okay, this is for the good of the company. It

For The Record, Inc.

doesn't matter who did it or whose fault it is, or why
this happened, we have to break through that clutter and
get it done and just plain educate.

And then if you don't have regular reviews with your call center and fulfillment suppliers to find out what's gone wrong, so that you can aggregate that data and continue training and your continuous improvement.

And that's it.

[Applause.]

MS. O'BRIEN: Thanks, Hal. Next up is Dean Graybill.

MR. GRAYBILL: Good morning. Use this one here. I should start out with the standard disclaimer that any statements I'm going to make are not necessarily reflective of the Commission. I'm the only one required to say that. But what I'd like to do is really give you first a very general overview of what are the laws that even apply here. You know, in some areas like mail orders, we have a rule that's very specific about things you got to do and the hoops you got to jump through. Here that's not the case. So what you see is us applying two very basic doctrines.

One is deceptive acts and practices. Frankly,

I view this as a common sense sort of thing. Now, it may
have very difficult applications, but the idea is are you

For The Record, Inc.

making a representation, express or implied, that leaves a net impression about the value of this rebate or the ease of it, or the hoops you've got to jump through.

And then there's another lesser used doctrine called unfair acts or practices, which is reserved more for the situation where the harm isn't really stemming from what people were told so much as the seller has done something to structure the transaction that puts consumers in a bind they can't get out of. A good example of that is, you know, they tell you well you got to send in the UPC code, but it turns out that a lot of people don't get a box that has a UPC code on it. You know, that's a structural problem with the offer.

Over the years we've brought a lot of cases against a lot of types of firms. We don't discriminate, we welcome all comers. Bumble Bee Tuna, actually that was one of my favorites, where it was an offer you got 75 cents off on your next purchase. So you take the can home and you got to peel the thing off, and then turn it around to look what that offer is, the 75 cents off if you buy 5 cans of tuna. So that was a very popular promotion.

And it's funny, for whatever reasons you see a lot of, a lot of things in the tech area. I don't know, I'm sure there's reasons for that that are beyond me.

But I use the words "taken by surprise" to really describe this deception authority, as opposed to the unfairness authority. And again, you know, we do run across firms that it's just out and out fraud, you know, outfits that from the get go are just offering a specious thing.

That's not really what we're talking about today. We're not necessarily talking about intentional, venal actions, there can be just people not being realistic about the offer they're making and making exaggerated claims for what's going to happen. And then, and this is the biggest problem, usually they fail to communicate the very important types of conditions, such as the ones that were just spoken of earlier, in a way that, A, is understandable, that's noticeable, that will really sort of -- oh, you know, the real moment where you finally understand what the value and the onerousness of this thing really is.

One case that was brought some years ago, I think this was around 2000, was a Buy Dot Com, I'm sure it doesn't do it justice, but this was a full page newspaper ad appeared in USA Today, and so forth. The basic idea was that you could get a computer for I think it was \$269. And if you looked at this thing and you were looking in the newspaper, you wouldn't really see

any signal that there's any mention of important conditions or considerations. But in 4 point type at the very top there was a bunch of gobbledygook which, again, you would need a microscope to discern. It goes gobble, gobble, gobble, then it goes down and says, 'Requires Compuserve activation.' Even then it's not telling you, what, a month? A free activation? For a month? Or what is it? That's the entirety of the disclosure in that ad. So that was one problem.

In fact there were some very important conditions having to do with this. One was that well you had to spend the money, \$869 up front, and then send in two different rebates to get your money back. That was one thing. The more important thing was it required a three-year subscription to Compuserve Internet Service at the cost of \$21.95 a month. Now, or you could pay \$792 if you wanted to for that. And that wasn't all, you also if you decided to cancel out of that Compuserve thing you lost the rebate. And on top of that you had to pay another \$50 cancellation fee. So again, it's not a judgment about the wisdom of an offering like that, it's the fact that nobody understood this. Nobody really was made to understand that at the point of sale.

Now, I want to say one thing just in the middle, and that is, you know, FTC has had a pretty

For The Record, Inc.

vigorous enforcement program, but none of it indicates

any institutional opposition to the idea of rebates.

Frankly, we're just neutral. We're just neutral about

4 that like we are about everything in life. You know,

5 it's if people -- well, maybe that's not true.

[Laughter.]

MR. GRAYBILL: But, you know, if people understand what is being offered they can reject it or they can accept it. There may be some rebates that just look silly to us, but although I'll have to say if they're counter-intuitive that does have to bear on how they should be dealt with, because the more counter-intuitive an offer is, you better, you better conspicuously disclose that.

And there's one prime bizarre example of that in our own office where Matt Gold, who was one of your people that introduced today, accepted an offer in 1993, he went out and bought a mattress for \$700 and he liked the price that it was, but he also saw there was a rebate offer, you can get 50 percent off. He filled out some paperwork, you get your 50 percent off if you send it in 10 years from now. And I'm sure the company's on the golf course saying, you know, what a sweet promotion that was. But suffice it to say they didn't know who they were dealing with. And the years passed, children were

born, and in May 2003 Matt's looking at his calendar, whoa I got to go to the doctor this morning, bing, time to get my rebate check, and he did. But the thing is they actually gave it to him. And, you know, it's like I either get a rebate check or I get a case, you know. But what's not to like. But that's just an example of, you know, it's bizarre, but frankly they conspicuously disclosed it. He understood what he was getting, he's one out of a million people who took it, and they followed through. So that would not be the profile of a case we would bring.

The InPhonic case we've already gone over to some degree, and I'm going to leave some time here so I'm not going to belabor it. Other than again as Eileen said this morning, one of the big issues in this was having to do with the use of hyperlinks, and actually the Buy Dot Com thing was InPhonic should have known from the Buy Dot Com case that we have concerns with this, because the Buy Dot Com case that's an internet seller, so that's a legitimate question, is well maybe they tell them all about it on the internet. Well, no, they didn't, because you went there, the first page, you know, it didn't tell you anything, there's a hyperlink. You go to the second page, it came out in drips and drops, it's like I'll tell you about this, I won't tell you about that. It wasn't

For The Record, Inc.

until you got to about the fourth disclosure page, the fourth hyperlink, which, by the way, was a page that you didn't have to go through before ordering, that you finally got all the stuff.

So that already gave notice about the use of hyperlinks as a -- and also the hyperlinks itself, and here's the important point, there wasn't those warnings and red flags around the hyperlink indicating read this, this is important. And actually if you looked at the order in Buy Dot Com, it didn't condemn the use of hyperlinks but it said you better say something like, 'Owner's cancellation requirement, read here.' It wasn't quite that draconian, but I mean it was something like that, because people, you know, you don't always hit hyperlinks, you don't always know how important it is. You sort of assume they're going to tell me at some point how important these caveats are.

Another reason InPhonic should have, and I'm not trying to paint a picture of evil here, I'm just saying this was not really cutting edge law in a way when we came out with InPhonic, because we also in May of 2000 had come out with this thing, and again it's in the business card thing you have where Eileen already quoted from it. But there's actually two or three pages on hyperlinks alone. And the sort of thing you should think

about before using that as your exclusive route to tell the truth. And you can also go to FTC.gov, which by the way is a wealth of information on these subjects and you print off a copy of this tonight if you want to.

Here I'll just quickly say, what did the hyperlinks say? Well, it's like Eileen said, it just basically said there's a rebate. I mean these two things where it said \$90 customer mail-in rebate. If you noticed there was a hyperlink you could get more information, but it certainly didn't send up any red flags that you better take a look at this in detail, otherwise.

There were some other aspects to the InPhonic case which also appear in other cases. And that is there was also a matter of, I think I'll just flip through this stuff, again, there was this aspect, as was mentioned before, about InPhonic, where there's just this weird 180 day to 210 day window of time, no earlier, no later. You had to have proof of continuous wireless service, you got disqualified if you changed your phone number. And then there was also a twist in that case where they actually told people, hey you know what, if you don't quite get this right the first time we're going to help you out. They didn't, not many times, at least. So let's say you happened to forget to put your email address on the

thing, it would reject it. They had big red stamps going reject. And telephone number, they would crater that one, too, right there. Ineligible or incomplete forms, did that.

Here was an example of that thing I was talking about before, which is an unfairness, which is there was also a problem of they had some things were somewhat standard, you know, the UPC code and this, this, and this. Also you were supposed to send in a guide to wireless service. And, you know, not all customers would get that stuff. So and then they would just automatically, you know, reject it. And they are 50 percent. Now you've been hearing these figures about well what's the trigger point where you should start worrying, or at 10 percent has something gone wrong: 50 percent of InPhonic customers that had sent in a rebate got rejected. When you got something like that something ain't right.

Last subject, and I'll quick speed through this, is just the idea of late fulfillment not going well. And InPhonic had, you know, sometimes -- you've heard much more wisdom on that than I can give you -- small companies can get in over their head, large companies don't make it a priority, whatever. The Soyo case was mentioned, where 95 percent of Soyo's rebates

1 were late.

There was another case that was done by our San Francisco office which I thought was, I didn't have anything to do with, but it was I thought a great case, or interesting case, in that it was Comp USA. And Comp USA is a retailer, and they were advertising a manufacturer-funded rebate. And they made a promise, rebate checks will be mailed in six to eight weeks. And what happened there is that to put it simply a great many rebate checks were received as much as six months or more past that deadline, and some just weren't gotten at all. And frankly I think it was a case where the people handling the rebates, the QPS, which was the manufacturer, you know, they were in trouble, and they were having trouble with all sorts of things in the company, and they were going to go bankrupt ultimately.

But you can ask yourself, well wait a minute,

Comp USA is a retailer. Was it fair to hold them

responsible for the problems of the manufacturer? Let me

just say that in this case as in all cases, you know, we

really are reasonable people, we hear the best arguments

all sides can give, and frankly in this case the

Commission went out of its way in the complaint to signal

the reasons. And one, I forget the verbiage, what it

was. Comp USA had knowledge and continued to advertize

the same promotion up until just before QPS went bankrupt.

I would simply, I think that's pretty much it I would say that if you want more knowledge about the cases we do, the FTC.gov website is a great wealth. One little research tool I used is that in every one of these cases, and I haven't mentioned two-thirds of them, are accompanied by press release, and very often electronically online on FTC.gov the press release of the company as well by electronic copy of the actual complaint and the order. Maybe not in some of the older cases, but almost in the last five years I think all of So you can go to FTC.gov, look for 'newsroom,' which is where you get the press stuff, and it's searchable by term, you can put in 'rebate,' or if you know you want to see Comp USA type in 'Comp USA,' it will bring up the press release, it will give you a chance to actually print out as well the pleadings and it's something where you can sort of fill in the details as to how we view these things.

Thank you.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

25

[Applause.]

MS. O'BRIEN: If you, can you hear me? We have a couple of questions from the audience.

Start off with Joe, if you're ready. Do you

For The Record, Inc.

1	have an interest in helping consumers, so if you hear
2	from consumers about maybe interest in your organization
3	actually help them individually?
4	MR. RIDOUT: At times we'll contact a retailer
5	or fulfillment house to try to mediate when the problems
6	have arisen. We can't do as much as the Federal Trade
7	Commission or say the state Attorney General can do,
8	because we don't have any jurisdiction like that. But we
9	can try to mediate in a reasonable way so that it
10	wouldn't get to the sort of the complaint where it would
11	have to be brought to the attention of those
12	organizations. But we do try to help, yeah.
13	MS. O'BRIEN: Great. And just so you know the
14	FTC we welcome complaints from consumers, that's how we
15	know the cases to bring.
16	I'm not sure who exactly this is directed to,
17	but I'll just ask the question so anyone can answer.
18	Copies of receipts present problems of consumer fraud, do
19	you think consumers should shoulder some of
20	responsibility?
21	MR. RIDOUT: Well, I don't think anyone would
22	disagree with that. That sounds like consumers
23	certainly have to shoulder some of the responsibility.
24	But there certainly are methods by which you could
25	securely determine if a copy of a receipt represented

L	fraud, just an honest attempt to safeguard one's material
2	in the event of a rebate form getting lost. There's
3	certainly easier ways to do it, but consumers have to
1	bear responsibility, but making a copy of a receipt I
5	don't think presents an inordinate opportunity for fraud
5	with the other safeguards in place.

MS. O'BRIEN: What is the NTIA?

MR. STINCHFIELD: The National

Telecommunications and Information Administration division of the Department of Commerce.

MS. O'BRIEN: And I think this is probably directed at Hal. Have you seen that practices have changed on a national level because of the recent Connecticut law and Rhode Island law regarding rebates?

MR. STINCHFIELD: I think that because of all media attention, marketers are getting smarter about this, but it's kind of slow to come. The fulfillment industry is also getting a little bit smarter with electronic transmission of proofs of purchase and the submission of electronic rewards back to the consumer by ACH and other mechanisms that speed up the turn time.

I think with Senator Schumer, attention by the Federal Trade Commission, Better Business Bureaus, other Attorneys General, that in general the industry's getting smarter, it just has to accelerate that speed of

learning.

MS. O'BRIEN: I know the answer to this
question, this is one of my own, but I'll ask Dean
anyway. Maybe you could tell folks what actions when the
FTC actually takes an action, I mean what sort of
remedies can we get?

MR. GRAYBILL: Death by hanging.

[Laughter.]

MR. GRAYBILL: But actually one example, in Comp USA, for example, there's almost always a conduct prohibitions, don't lie again, disclose XYZ. In Comp USA, for example, there was — and this is a common provision, conduct order said have a reasonable basis at the time you're making the claim for the idea that you can deliver on it. Now you say, what's reasonable basis? It's a floating concept that has to be judged case by case. But that's one thing. The second is just say don't be late anymore. In Comp USA there was also a redress thing, I think it was \$15 to \$100, they had to offer redress. I'm not sure how much money that ended up actually being, but that's a very common result.

MS. O'BRIEN: Thank you. Here's another question toward you, Dean. I don't know if you have a comment based on this. But wouldn't it be useful to add to the FTC's disclosure guidance a point that unfamiliar,

For The Record, Inc.

unusual, onerous, unexpected terms require more prominent disclosure?

MR. GRAYBILL: I would have thought it already is covered. But I mean certainly the concept. Again, we don't, I think as I said earlier, we don't make judgments, we don't regulate the content of offerings, that's too gimicky, maybe we should but we don't. And that's not our job. But it is a truth, and there's truth in all types of advertising, you know, if you're leaving a net impression about the value of something and there's a totally counter-intuitive aspect to it, I've always viewed it as sort of a sliding scale, you know, the more counter-intuitive, the more onerous, the more unexpected, the more it affects the value of the offering, you better be -- you better err on the high scale of clearness and conspicuousness.

I think if you read the deception statement which we have as overarching thing on deception, I think it talks about it in general terms.

MR. STINCHFIELD: I would go one step further on that and suggest that the development of offer copy and the communication of offer copy is not an art, it is an absolute science. You can measure the invalid rates and the consumer's understanding of an offer simply by measuring those invalid rates and redesigning the offer

1 copy in order to drive them down.

MS. O'BRIEN: I'm not sure exactly what this question is but I'll read it, because I've been having a hard time understanding it. What is legally objectionable about requiring that consumers comply with all disclosed terms of a rebate offer? Mr. Ridout paints a view of rebates that suggests that no reasonable person would attempt to participate in a rebate offer, then once consumers, I'm not sure, who to get to determine which requirements they comply with. Does that make sense?

MR. RIDOUT: Not exactly. I didn't mean to leave the impression that we felt that consumers should not comply with rebates, or that a reasonable consumer would steer clear of them. Merely we were highlighting some of the problematic areas that have befell consumers who have complied with what they thought were the reasonable terms presented, that turned out to not be reasonable or turned out to be not complied with by either the rebate fulfillment house or someone else down the line.

But rebates in and of themselves we don't have any objection to, per se, merely the way that some of them have been unfairly presented and unfairly processed at times.

MS. O'BRIEN: And as Dean was saying earlier, I

For The Record, Inc.

mean we're not really -- the FTC hasn't made a value judgment on the term so far, it's whether consumers are actually understanding them when they buy the product.

MR. RIDOUT: If you look at some of the reforms that some companies like Staples looked at the consumer complaints associated with rebates being their number one complaint they received from their clientele, then they reformed their rebate procedures a great deal. And that's really exemplary, as far as we're concerned, and, you know, they've reduced the complaints they've received enormously.

So rebates can work very well. But it's interesting to look at those that don't and figure out why.

MS. O'BRIEN: I don't know if any of you know the answer to this question, but can a rebate, a company that's offering a rebate actually refuse to mail to a PO Box?

MR. STINCHFIELD: You know, that's a good question. I think if it's clearly stated on the order form they're within their rights to say so, but I would pretty much caution against it, and work rather than on an elimination routine that precludes or prevents or makes it more difficult for a consumer to write different PO Boxes down in order to defraud the company and get

1	multiple requests. They have to be careful there.
2	On the NTIA initiative it so stated in the rule
3	making that PO Boxes are generally not allowed, that they
4	generally would not constitute a U.S. household.
5	However, there were exceptions, like territories in
6	Alaska and Indian Reservations and the like. I don't
7	think we have to go that far. A fulfillment provider
8	could suggest send back a letter asking for either a
9	rural route or a street address. I mean that's one
LO	possible out.
L1	MS. O'BRIEN: All right, thank you. I think
L2	that's the end of our time for this panel.
L3	[Applause.]
L 4	MS. O'BRIEN: We're going to take another short
L5	break and reconvene at 11:45. And I encourage you again
L 6	to fill out your survey forms.
L7	(BREAK)
L 8	
L 9	
20	
21	PANEL 3: THE FUTURE OF REBATES
22	MR. GOLD: Our last panel of the morning is
23	called The Future of Rebates. We're going to be looking
24	at this topic from two different angles. First, we're
25	going to hear from Matthew Edwards, who is an assistant

For The Record, Inc.

1	professor	in	the	Department	οÍ	Law	in	the	Zicklin	School
_										

of Business at Baruch College in New York City.

3 Professor Edwards has written an article called, 'The

4 Law, Marketing, and Behavioral Economics of Consumer

5 Rebates' that will soon be published in the Stanford

6 Journal of Law, Business and Finance. And I would

7 certainly commend it to you once it's published.

One of the topics that he addresses in his article is the recent state laws and the increasing activity among state legislators in enacting and proposing laws in the area of rebates. As we heard in the last panel, there is no federal law that specifically governs rebates. Some states, though, have legislated in this area, and there's been quite a bit of legislative activity on the state level just in the last year or two. And Matt Edwards' presentation is going to focus on state laws, both existing and pending, in the area of rebates.

Our second presentation is going to be by Chris Quinlan, who is co-founder of PlusNet Marketing, which is a promotion marketing company in Wilmington, Delaware. PlusNet has developed an online rebate redemption model that he'll describe, which is very easy to use and attractive in a lot of ways from the consumer perspective. Chris is going to be describing in his presentation how his company's web-based rebate

redemption model alleviates a lot of the issues about which consumers have complained over the years regarding rebates.

Now, that's not to say that the online redemption model answers all of the problems from the consumer's standpoint. And Eileen Harrington, who is our Deputy Director in the Bureau of Consumer Protection of the FTC in Washington, D.C. is going to be addressing some of those issues, and reacting to the issues that she hears in the first two panels.

One interesting facet of PlusNet Marketing's online redemption model is providing consumers with a variety of payment possibilities, alternative methods of payment for their rebate. And these raise certain disclosure issues, and Eileen, among other things, will be discussing some of those disclosure issues raised by those payment methods, such as gift cards.

So let's start out with Matt Edwards.

[Applause.]

MR. EDWARDS: It's an absolute delight to be with you here today to talk about rebates. This is an informal presentation on a paper that I'm working on. I have a longer paper that is coming out very soon in the Stanford Journal of Law, Business and Finance, as Matt Gold pointed out. And you can tell I'm from academia,

For The Record, Inc.

because if you want a copy of that paper once it's

published I'd love to send it to you, just give me a copy

of your email address and your address, and I'll send it

to you for free. It's just you tell me who you are and I

mail it to you for free, which is a little bit different

from some of you are used to dealing with.

When I was writing my first paper I found out about a large consulting firm that had done a study on rebates, and I thought it might be interesting to get their information, so I contacted them and said, you know, I'm writing this little academic paper, it would be nice to just see your report, and they told me it's \$15,000.

[Laughter.]

MR. EDWARDS: And I explained that I work for the City University of New York, and I teach underprivileged kids, and that sort of thing, and they explained to me it's \$15,000. So we do things a little bit differently. You give me your address and I actually just send you stuff for free. Oh yes, and this is informal, don't cite, quote or distribute, it's not ready at that stage. In fact, after I finish I'm going to have to ask you to forget that you've ever seen me.

[Laughter.]

MR. EDWARDS: Okay. We've heard about all the

For The Record, Inc.

problems of rebates. Usually articles about rebates in periodicals are singularly unhelpful. They say rebates are a scam, rebates are a rip-off, they don't focus in on exactly quite often exactly why rebates are a scam or a rip-off. And most of my work goes trying to figure out the regulatory fit between very specific rebate problems and proposed solutions, and trying to guarantee that the problems that we are seeing with rebates are actually solved by the proposed solutions.

There's a lot going on in the area of regulation of rebates. New York recently passed a statute that, a significant statute that's the first of its kind probably in the country to so comprehensively regulate consumer rebates. The California legislature twice in recent years passed very significant rebate reforms, both times those bills were vetoed by Governor Schwarzennegger. Most recently in September 2006 a rebate law was passed in Texas, a fairly comprehensive statute that was also vetoed by the governor. And as has already been mentioned before, Senator Schumer in one of his Sunday afternoon press conferences called on the FTC to regulate rebates in January 2006.

So there's a lot of activity out there reflecting some of the problems that we've seen, some of the consumer angst over rebates, some of the problems

that have been discussed already. There's a lot of agitation out there in the states in terms of doing something about the rebate problem, so the issue, of course, is what exactly is a problem and what should be done.

There's several major types of rebate regulations, and I'm not talking -- every state has an unfair and deceptive trade practice law, a very broadly worded law that could apply to rebates, just like the FTC has its Section 5 authority. I'm not talking about those broad laws that say you can't do anything that's unfair or deceptive, we're talking about laws that are much more specifically focused just at rebates, just at consumer rebates.

There's some laws that govern consumer price advertising. We're going to go over each one of these categories quickly. There's some new rules about mandatory rebate form availability; mandatory redemption periods that's saying how much time you have -- the consumer has to redeem the rebates; mandatory rebate award payment periods, how much time the rebate offeror has to pay the rebate; and then some rules about mandating the duplicate rebate receipts. So these are all state laws that are focused right at various practices within the rebate industry that are considered

to be the most egregious, the most egregious problems.

Rebate price advertising, New York, California, Oklahoma, all require that if you advertise a rebate you make it very clear that the rebate redemption is required in order to obtain the advertised price. So this is a price advertising statute that these three states have, that basically says you have to clearly say this is price, this is the rebate, so it's a price after rebate. New Jersey assembly just passed a bill in January, 71 to 8, and it's pending now before the New Jersey senate.

A lot of this stuff is in flux, so it's important in whatever state you're operating in, or if you're operating nationally that you consult an attorney, and not me, to make sure what you're doing is legal.

I'm not going to go through the California, read the California code to you, but it's basically just says that you have to be very clear, that you have to clearly and conspicuously make it known that to obtain the price advertised you have to mail in a rebate. So that's the California law, and there's other states with such laws.

Connecticut by regulation, and Rhode Island, have even tougher rebate advertising laws. And effectively -- and I want to thank Matt Gold for pointing this out to me because I sort of misstated my initial

draft in my paper, Connecticut and Rhode Island actually make it an unfair or deceptive act just to advertise the price with price after rebate. So effectively rebate price advertising, price rebate final price, is unlawful in Connecticut and Rhode Island. That is a very, very strong approach, and it's an unusual approach in the law. So you can't advertise in Connecticut, you know, rebate price after rebate.

There was a proposal in Maryland just like that, that was stalled, and there's some proposals right now pending in Massachusetts for the same thing, where you can't advertise the price after rebate. And the idea is that it is inherently misleading to consumers because they can't understand the whole thing of a price and then a rebate, and then a price after rebate, this is something that they somehow they grapple with and can't really comprehend.

I'm going to quickly go through this. There's some laws that have long been on the books. One in California, it's called the subsequent event law, there's a law that says that you can't offer -- you can't tell somebody they'll receive a rebate if receiving a rebate is contingent on a later event, meaning something else has to happen to get the rebate. But the California courts have held that this does not apply to traditional

mail-in rebates, even though by the text of the law it would seem that the fact there's a subsequent contingent event, mailing in the rebate, that it would apply to rebates. So just in the interest of comprehensiveness I put this in, but it doesn't really apply to rebates.

Maine and New York now have laws that ensure that rebate forms will be provided to consumers in an timely manner. So these are things about consumers showing up and saying I want to do the rebate but I show up at the store and there's no forms, and it's difficult to obtain forms.

California had such a provision in its vetoed bill. There's been proposals of this kind in Arizona, Massachusetts and Texas. So these are the types of things where people saying I want to redeem but I can't get forms. So these are rules saying that if you're going to say you're offering a rebate you have to make sure that you have the forms available. A pretty reasonable requirement.

New York's approach, which I won't go into detail, obviously it's a lot of text on that slide, it basically says that you have to have the forms there where somebody makes the purchase, or you have to have some sort of method for them to generate the form. And a rebate offeror can comply with the statute simply by providing sufficient forms based on reasonably

anticipated sales. So you don't violate the law if in New York if you provide sufficient rebate forms based on what you anticipate, and it turns out that you run out, that's okay, that's a safe harbor in the law. But if you anticipate having 20,000 come in, 100,000 people come in, and you put out 5 forms, that would be violating the law. And there's provisions in the law for internet and telephone sales. And these violations can give rise to damages of \$100 to \$1,000 per violation, under the GBL.

There's been almost no litigation or no cases under these provisions yet. They're very, very new. And, in fact, for those of you who are really interested there's another New York general business law, 391, with exactly the same number that has to do with the sale of used clothing. And somehow the New York legislature when they passed this new statute didn't realize they were giving two different laws the same number. Just something for any lawyers in the room, something of interest.

Rebate redemption time periods. New York now requires that you give people at least 14 days to redeem their rebates. California would have given consumers 30 days. Schumer, Senator Schumer recommended 30 days. And there's a proposal pending right now in Massachusetts that would give consumers a full year, and hearings are

being held this month that would require a year. And this is very interesting, it builds on Professor Silk's fascinating presentation earlier which the general feeling in legislatures is let's legislate longer periods, but the behavioral economics evidence and the marketing research indicates that longer deadlines might not necessarily be beneficial. And I rely on Professor Silk's research in this area in my paper, that longer deadlines might not be beneficial. But that's what consumers think they want, so that's what the legislators are pushing for are long, long deadlines, even though that might actually decrease redemption and increase breakage.

There's also rebate payment periods. New York's new law requires payment within 60 days. After somebody satisfies the rebate requirements California would have required 30 days. A proposal is now pending in Florida, for those of you who want to lobby the Florida senate, that would require payment in 15 working days. And then there were a couple of other proposals.

So these are things saying you have to pay people quickly, which, of course, the problem, as you know better than I do, these short payment periods may create complications between rebate offerors and fulfillment centers, and it may not be possible to pay

people that quickly. But legislators are getting into the act, they want to mandate rapid payment of rebate rewards.

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

Rhode Island requires rebate offerors to accept copies of receipts now. So in Rhode Island you have to take a copy of a receipt. New York, there's a proposal pending that would require the provision of duplicate receipts, and of course many firms are already doing that There's many rebate offerors that provide on their own. duplicate receipt for rebate redemption, Best Buy, Circuit City, there's other firms that do this. And California also had a similar thing saying that you either have to accept duplicate receipts or accept copies, you have to provide receipts or accept copies. So this is the whole problem of people saying well I have the receipt but I need to hang on to the receipt in case I return the goods, or I need multiple receipts because there's multiple rebate offers, and that's a frustration some consumers have claimed, saying there's multiple rebate offers but they need original receipts for each one of the rebate offers. And so this would ameliorate that complaint to some extent.

Now, a ban altogether. In my paper, which I wrote a long time ago, I said this is not even an issue, so therefore it's not even really worth discussing,

For The Record, Inc.

nobody's interested in banning rebates. But there are proposals pending now in New York and Massachusetts that would require payment of rebates at the point of sale. That is effectively a ban on rebates, if you require payment at the point of sale. In the past in New York this has not been successful. In New Hampshire it has not been successful. I have no indication of whether it will or will not be successful in Massachusetts, I doubt it. But this is the type, that's probably the most radical remedy, it would effectively be a ban on rebates if they require payment at the point of sale.

But there are things pending now in New York and Massachusetts requiring instant payment. And in many of these proposals legislators simply cite the newspaper articles that we've all read, and they cite those newspaper articles as evidence, and those newspaper articles as many in the room know are quite insipid and quite lacking in any sort of sustained reasoned discussion of the advantages and disadvantages of consumer rebates.

There's other miscellaneous proposals that have floated around in different states. Some proposals have said you have to give people a way of checking on the status of their rebates, some sort of mandatory method for checking on the status of the rebate. The second one

is some sort of clear marketing of rebate reward checks. This is part of the whole junk mail thing that the checks look like junk mail. I'm very, very sympathetic to the complaints that consumers have about all of these things. Some of the complaints seem to be a little odd to me, the whole check is junk mail kind of you have the picture of the consumer getting something in the mail and oh what's this, you know, I think people can recognize a check in the mail. But some people say it looks like junk mail, so maybe there should be clearer markings on rebate reward checks.

And then the last thing is something that touches on what we talked about earlier, is requiring -forbidding rebate offerors from requiring too much personal information. They say, you know, they ask for everything on these forms. I've filled out a lot of rebates. I have not seen that they require an excessive amount of personal information, but some states have said that they want to limit the amount of information that could be required.

So then the question becomes for people at the FTC and at the state level, the bigger question stepping back is is this a good thing where we have 50 different states where different legal approaches might be tried on regulating rebates. On the one hand it gives you a good

chance to experiment with different approaches, which is always a good thing in legal regulation. On the other hand it could complicate things for national retailers and rebate providers to have 50 different state laws to follow. So the question is would a single federal approach be better, some sort of best practices, would that be better, a state model law. What would be the best way for the whole industry? On the one hand you wouldn't like a strict law, but maybe a strict law that's the same everywhere would be easy to work with rather than a mishmash of strict laws and relatively lenient laws.

And building on Professor Silk's point, the question about creating what legislators think are consumer-friendly rules that actually have an adverse impact on consumers, you know, requiring so much, requiring levels of disclosure that might have an adverse impact, requiring deadlines that would end up making rebate offers not feasible. So the question is are we really helping consumers with some of this legal regulation, and what is the optimal level of regulation to ferret out the most egregious rebate conduct without deterring honest retailers and rebate offerors from providing something to consumers.

And then the last thing is more of an FTC

For The Record, Inc.

thing, and also with the states, what is the better way
to deal with this sort of thing, is it through litigation
under unfair and deceptive trade statutes, simply picking
out the worst players and having law suits against them.
Or would it be better to legislate across the board or
have a regulation across the board. And those are always
difficult questions to answer, whether it's better to
regulate via litigation or some sort of legislation
across the board.

As I said, I'd love to have further contact with all of you. And if you want to get a copy of my first paper just stop by, I'll give you my card. And I'm going to write a follow-up piece, I'd love to send that to you and get input as well, because it's very difficult sometimes in the little office with no window to get an idea of what's going on in the real world. So I just sort of make stuff up.

[Laughter.]

MR. EDWARDS: And it's slightly better to actually talk to people that work in the business than to invent things, even though it might be less amusing personally.

Thank you.

[Applause.]

MR. GOLD: Next up we're going to have Chris

For The Record, Inc.

1 Quinlan.

MR. QUINLAN: After Matt's presentation I'm kind of hoping I have a job next year with everything that's going on.

I'm going to talk to you a little bit about the process that we go through at PlusNet. First I'm going to give you a little background on the company, and then actually run you through a demonstration.

Basically what we've tried to do is transform the rebate industry from our side and the consumer behavior side, from a breakage model to a redemption model. And breakage for us is the uncashed funds, or unused funds on cards.

A little bit about the company, we were the first to launch in '99 an online rebate process at Rite Aid Corporation, we were the first to offer a completely online solution to redeem end value and actually validate and fulfill the rebates electronically. And our technology is free to the consumer.

This sort of, you know, the old way versus the new way, if you will. In fact, I have a couple things here. Traditionally you have to cut out UPCs, mail in all kinds of information. We've kind of taken that down to one process where you can actually use this receipt to actually go online. You can mail in the receipt at the

bottom by filling out the information and drop it in the mail, or you can go online and we're going to go through a demonstration of that in a second.

This is just a little bit about what the consumers are saying. These are actual consumers that use the process, I do more shopping at Comp USA due to the rebate. This is by far the easiest process I've ever went through for a rebate. E-rebates are the best thing to happen. No postage. And then there's some longer ones that will actually be in part of the presentation. You get love the rebate system.

This is a key component to what we do, in terms of a constant communication with the consumer. We basically touch the consumer over four times with emails to tell them the status of actually if their rebate is approved, how they're going to get paid, rebate status check so it's an actual brand enhancement for the actual retailers as well as the vendors.

Some of the numbers, and I'm going to give you an update as of I think it's through April 15th, we're approaching 75 percent of our rebates are done online. Our average check turn time is down to 11 days. With some retailers there's actually a hold period for returns, so the 11 days is actually on top of that hold period. And we don't have 1 percent of contact, Hal,

For The Record, Inc.

yet, but we're working on it.

This is what I'm going to walk you through, in terms of what the customer sees. One key point is that actually we can actually project redemption rates as well as sales rates, because of the historical POS data that we get from the retailers. And it can be done by category and/or brand.

So in this case the consumer makes a purchase at Comp USA, either online or in the store, they're told with the receipt they can file the rebate either electronically, or as I said earlier, they enter their information, they drop it in them mail. So at this point they're directed back to the Comp USA site. They either have an account where they log in or they can create an account. And on the other side, the lefthand side, is sort of all the FAQs, and then they can actually search the rebate categories as well. So if you have a user name and password you use it, if you're not a member you click there, we take demographic information from the consumer. All the demographic information's collected is used for customer service purposes, we don't sell or rent the lists.

And then, sorry, in some cases, and this will come up later, but we ask some relevant questions to the consumer that are optional. Just as you'll see this

For The Record, Inc.

feeds into the back end processing part. So in this case it's are you a satellite radio subscriber.

Once a consumer is signed in they can actually submit a new rebate claim, they can check the status of their current rebate claims any that are outstanding, and they can actually find offers. They can also actually look up the history of what they have. So in some cases there's taxable events or potentially issues where you have to keep copies of your receipts, you don't have to do that in this system, it's all held for you.

At this point they have an E-Rebates account number. We verify their consumer information.

Obviously, if there's something to update we can update it. And then we walk them through what we need off the receipt to validate that transaction.

So in this case -- it also we have a second step that they put the total of the receipt in, because we get all the POS data from the retailer, so we can actually match to make sure that if by chance somebody was trying to fish through the system and enter specific areas or at specific data points we still have the ability to weed them out through the actual total of the receipt. It's a big fraud issue, from our point.

The status, the status page, it's available 24-7, it shows you your pending rebates, it shows you the

rebates paid, it shows the rebates not approved. Also with this slide if there was a multiple purchase piece, buy the printer, buy the laptop, buy the monitor, if you bought two of the three but didn't buy the third it would tell you right there what you needed to do to make that additional purchase.

This is sort of where we're headed after the assumption that the consumer actually makes their purchase online, or redeems the rebate online, or mails it in, and they've got a valid rebate.

Let me get to my page. And this is where we think the sort of the next generation of what we're doing is headed. It's a rebate option acceptance maximization. The platform provides the options for the consumer when they're actually validated for their rebate to get multiple payment options. So in this case what we do, we take the vendor product information, the rebate amount, the demographics that were collected earlier, the transaction profile of the consumer based on previous transactions, we put it through the system, and then understand that these offers on the righthand side are the most likely to appeal to that consumer. Okay.

So if a 37 year old male goes in to purchase a Epson printer we'll change on the fly here to HP. So what happens is we know what they purchased, they've got

a \$50 rebate, they enter it online, it's validated, there's no mail-in, there's no UPCs, it goes through the system, and then it will spit out relevant offers based on that. So in this case we could use Snap Fish where they'd get a \$75 value for going to Snap Fish at that time, instead of the Epson cartridges and printers. So they're actually vendor-specific.

If, in fact, they don't want it, they can click through that piece and they don't want that actual offer they can go to another offer. So another alternate redemption choice could be based on the fact that they had earlier given us that information. The other piece is that all these other offers which are always valued at above the cash value of the rebate. So if they didn't want to do that, we sort of go to the second and third level offers, which go back to there's a Comp USA rebate card, no expiration date, and no dormancy fees for those cards. If, again, another shot at if they wanted to get their rebate tomorrow they could use the PayPal method, and if they were feeling I guess philanthropic they could donate to Make A Wish.

Now, at this point in time the consumer always has the option to go back for a check if they really wanted to check. It's there, it's just we give them a lot of offers up to that point to try and change their

1 behavior.

And at this point in time the consumer actually chooses a card, and if they use the card in a certain period of time at Comp USA or at Comp USA dot com they get a 10 percent discount off their order.

Again, everything that we're doing today is either under patent protection already or actually in the process of being patented. In our situation we believe that everybody wins, because the consumer wins. There's a complete transparent process for the consumer to see all through the steps as to where they are with their rebate. The retailer wins because they don't have any of the backlash or brand suicide, as Hal mentions. And then the manufacturer wins obviously because of all those reasons. And we have a happy customer that actually buys more product from that brand and from that retailer.

That's pretty much it.

[Applause.]

MS. HARRINGTON: I'm going to stay seated right here, because I need to read my notes. I've been taking furious notes as our first two panelists presented, to provide hopefully some useful further questions, reactions, responses, so that you can watch at least in real time how one person who works at the FTC might think about some of these developments as they are playing out.

For The Record, Inc.

First, let me turn to Matt's wonderful presentation about developments in state law and respond with some thoughts about those. My first thought was that one of the things that makes as I listen to Matt talking about enactment of specific state laws and consideration of other legislative and regulatory provisions at the state level, my first thought was that one of the things that makes the Federal Trade Commission perhaps a somewhat different governmental entity is our very heavy reliance on economic analysis and our valuing of that as we go about thinking about what the most sensible approach is to government intervention in the marketplace.

We, sometimes to the consternation of our critics, take quite a while in our formulation of marketplace issues and our response to those. And one of the reasons that we take quite a while is that we want to rely on empirical evidence to inform our assessment of what it is that is happening in the marketplace. We want to try to avoid what are often unintended consequences that can flow from regulation or legislation that may seemingly really hit right on the head of the nail the problem with some marketplace development, but when you look more deeply instead of hitting the nail right on the head you wind up splintering and shattering the very

1	valuable prospect that you're trying to protect in the
2	first place, which is the prospect of good value for
3	consumers.
4	And so as I listen to the description of
5	various state efforts to regulate in this area, my
6	question is what do the economics tell us about that
7	particular approach.
8	So let's look first at the category of price
9	advertising. We heard that there have been enacted laws
10	that say that you cannot advertise at all the price after
11	rebate. And I'm wondering, and maybe somebody here knows
12	the answer to this, Joe, are you here still? No, Joe
13	Mulholland?
14	MS. ABRAHAMSON: I know the answer to the
15	question.
16	MS. HARRINGTON: Well, let me is Joe
17	Mulholland here? Rats. I'm wondering what we know about
18	what's happening in Connecticut, where the law apparently
19	prohibits advertisements of price after rebate. What is
20	the answer to my question?
21	MS. ABRAHAMSON: Actually, there's a slight
22	misstatement of the law. What the law says is that
23	MS. HARRINGTON: Okay. Can everybody hear?
24	SPEAKER: No, you need a microphone.
25	MS. ABRAHAMSON: No one has ever said that to

For The Record, Inc.

1	me	in	my	life.	Are	we	being	recorded?

2 SPEAKER: And please introduce yourself.

MS. ABRAHAMSON: My name is Tsan Abrahamson, and I'm a (inaudible) attorney, I'm outside counsel, but we've dealt with this issue several times. What both the Connecticut and the Rhode Island laws say is not that you cannot advertise the net price, but that if you do you must give the rebate at point of purchase. So what that means is you can say buy an HP printer and get a \$20 rebate and you can do a mail-in rebate for that, or an online rebate, but if you say buy an HP printer and you'll only pay \$100 after rebate, that is the net price, you must give that rebate at point of purchase.

MS. HARRINGTON: Okay, thank you for that.

Matt, did you want to say something? Hold on.

MR. EDWARDS: Yes, that's absolutely correct.

And in the interest of simplifying the presentation I may have overly simplified what the Connecticut law says, but that's right, that's absolutely right.

MS. HARRINGTON: The concern is, my concern would be the same, and that is whether this, and I don't know the answer to this, but the concern we would have is whether this particular regulation would have the effect of discouraging the distribution of truthful information to consumers that could be of benefit.

And the question, the way that we would look at this always is under the Section 5 standard that Dean so well explained, and that is whether there is material information that is misrepresented or that is not adequately disclosed in a way that in light of the overall impression left by the ad causes consumers to be misled.

And I'll put in another plug just using that example for what we think is the value of the elastic principle that is set forth in Section 5 of the FTC Act. So rather than prohibiting a particular kind of claim, we would look at the claim or the information that's provided in light of the entirety of the ad and ask what a reasonable consumer would understand the claim or the advertisement to mean. So that would be a concern I think that we would have, and a reason why generally speaking in the area of price advertising you don't see a lot of activity from the Federal Trade Commission.

Now, you might say well but you do have these guides on price advertising, and what I would say is yes we do, and those guides were promulgated a long time ago. And if you go to our website and look at our enforcement agenda and study our casework you won't find press releases announcing FTC enforcement actions based on our deceptive pricing guides, or any of the other pricing

guides. Which isn't to say that we never would do such a thing, but we have a concern, a real concern about unintended consequences that can flow from this kind of regulation. And we've learned, I think everyone has, and as the school of law and economics has grown up over the years I think everyone has learned. And so hopefully we benefit from that.

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

I was interested in the laws that require rebate form availability and provide the safe harbor for reasonable expectation of response. That reminded me, you know, of the whole issue about rain checks a number of years ago. Same kind of issue. There were efforts made to require that retailers either have insufficient supply to meet 100 percent of the demand that item that was advertised, or that if rain checks were offered that there be some reasonable expectation, that there be some requirement that they have at least enough of the item on hand to meet reasonable expectation. There were efforts made, and maybe there are laws on the books in states, that essentially would prohibit the use of offer of rain checks, and say instead you have to have enough product on hand to meet 100 percent of the demand. unintended bad consequence there was that consumers then never had the opportunity to buy the item on sale, because no retailer wanted to run the risk of not having

For The Record, Inc.

enough to meet the very last of the consumer requests for that product. And that didn't serve consumers well. An effort to regulate to protect consumers in some places really backfired and deprived consumers of the opportunity to buy the product on sale. Nobody wanted that.

And so, again, we learned. And by sharing that reflection in no way do I mean to say that people who advocated for consumer interests in those instances were wrong or did something bad, it's just that we learned.

I was interested in the comment regarding the ban on mail-in rebates, you know, where legislators or the proposed ban on mail-in rebates where legislators are relying on press accounts on things that happened.

Again, bringing it back to the value of empirical evidence and really analyzing that before legislating or regulating.

Future challenges that Matt mentioned, you know, what will happen as more and more states or local governments move in with very specific laws or regulations in this area. Is it better to have a variety of different regulations, or will there be a call for one national standard. I guess I would make the observation that we think we have one national standard, and it's Section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act. And I

For The Record, Inc.

think we would likely say, at least I would likely say, and I finally probably should issue the disclaimer that these comments reflect my views and not Dean Graybill's views, not Jeffrey Klurfeld's views, not Matt's views, but they're my views alone. And also I would bet that if we took a poll and the FTC -- among the FTC staff -- that the majority of us would think this way, why should this kind of advertising be treated differently than other kinds of advertising generally.

Now, sometimes Congress finds that there is a need to have a particular set of standards apply to a particular kind of advertising where there are important public interest needs for that kind of specific regulation. If the Congress were to do that here, we would of course say, you bet, you pass the laws, we implement them as you direct us to. But stepping back and asking the question about whether we would use our regulatory authority here, I think the answer is no we wouldn't generally. We think that Section 5 is a very good standard generally to apply to all advertising, and that we would always wonder whether there are special needs that would require a departure from that general principle for any particular kind of product or service.

So those were the thoughts that I had in response to your presentation, Matt.

For The Record, Inc.

Τ	Chris, what an interesting model. It was
2	innovative and interesting. And one of the questions
3	that I had, and you people from the industry in the room
4	can tell me this, is the word breakage a relatively
5	recently developed term or has that always been around?
6	MR. STINCHFIELD: It's always been around. The
7	confusion becomes the difference is between the
8	MS. HARRINGTON: Hold on, Hal, we're going to
9	get a microphone. Hal answering the question is the word
10	"breakage" new, or is it being used more often than
11	previously.
12	MR. STINCHFIELD: Hi, this is Hal Stinchfield.
13	MS. HARRINGTON: Or why am I hearing it all the
14	time this year, and I never really heard much about
15	breakage before?
16	MR. STINCHFIELD: That's a good question. It
17	refers to the financial model dealing with the subject of
18	mail-in rebates. And there are two terms here. One is
19	breakage, which is the enticement of a product sold as a
20	result of the enticement of a rebate offer but not
21	actually redeemed. So that's someone who intended to
22	redeem but didn't. And then the term "slippage" refers
23	to a reward issued that has never been cashed.
24	And it's fairly current today simply because of
25	all the legislation around the 42 state legislators going

after rebates as a form of (inaudible), and I think that has raised the visibility, as has the value of rebates over the past several years going from a hundred million dollars to six billion dollars.

MS. HARRINGTON: Thank you. Slippage, breakage, you know, disease-age, it sounds like we could be at a personal injury law conference.

One thing that I was interested in was Chris's comment that the online program he was describing has the potential to shift rebates from a breakage model to a redemption model. And I was just -- I thought back to Professor Silk's presentation about the finding that those who don't redeem are more likely to avoid the next offer, if I think I've characterized that -- and just, you know, how then if that's the case making that shift from breakage to redemption might be a smart thing from the manufacturer's point of view, would stands to reason, and would help to avoid what I guess Hal referred to as brand suicide, perhaps.

Then as I watched the presentation on how the online redemption works or might work, one thought that I had is that as whether for an online redemption or any other purpose a lot of information is gathered from the consumer who is going to make the redemption request, would there be instances where it would appropriate to

make disclosures about why the information is being collected? Would there be some need to talk about how that information is going to be used? Should there be a privacy policy included? And then we get into the whole question of how those policies are best disclosed. And, of course, the cardinal rule that you have to honor the privacy promises you make or we'll sue you.

Next thought that I had is particularly where in the example that we saw information is gathered, and consumers can go back on their E-bate [sic] account, or their E-Rebate account, and look at the history of their usage. There's a lot of information being collected there, and the general requirement that the party that holds that information have reasonable and appropriate procedures in place to protect any sensitive personal information that is included in the information that's available online would apply.

The FTC has brought 14 cases in the last couple of years challenging various entities failures to have in place reasonable and appropriate procedures to safeguard consumers' personal information. We've brought those cases also under Section 5 of the FTC Act. We think it's a law that's good for all seasons and all marketplace developments, including data security. And so if you are collecting that kind of information and it's available

online and accessible online you better make sure that you've got appropriate and reasonable procedures in place to safeguard it. We've brought some cases where highly reputable retailers have shockingly had information sitting on a network where the network wasn't protected from the most basic and commonly known of hacking programs and products. You've got to safeguard the data.

Another question that I had on the rebate option acceptance maximization program, where there are a number of screens that you go through until the first choice that you saw was -- the first -- there was a question about do you listen to XM radio or do you like XM radio or something, and I wondered, and I'm not really sure how we would view this. But the question that I had was whether it would be material, whether a material piece of information that might be included on that screen is like if you say yes you're not going to see the other choices, or if you say no you're going to see a bunch of other choices. That is, and I don't know how we would look at that, it's just a question.

But if consumers don't know what the consequences or the implications are for answering a question a certain way, and it would be material for them to know those consequences, then maybe there's a need for a little bit more information on that slide. And I

1	actually look forward over lunch to talking to some of my
2	colleagues about what they think about that. I asked the
3	question without offering a conclusion.

MR. QUINLAN: By the way, it does say that.

MS. HARRINGTON: It does?

MR. QUINLAN: Yes. It actually says, "no thanks, I prefer another payment option" if they click, "no."

MS. HARRINGTON: Okay. Well, good qualification, is that enough? Then that's my question, is that enough? Did I get it, would I get it, should I get it? I don't know.

Rebate cards offered. Gift cards. The FTC has recently announced settlements in a couple of gift card cases. There's been a shift we know in the gift card industry away from dormancy fees and expiration dates, but if there are on those, important to disclose.

And, finally, I was interested in the Master Card product, it says, "accepted wherever Master Card is offered." And I just had a question, I wondered, you know, really? Can you get a cash advance on that card, is that what that means? Or what does it mean to say, "accepted wherever Master Card is offered?" And, again, I look forward to talking to my colleagues about that.

So those were, Matt, my quick thoughts

For The Record, Inc.

1	listening	to	these	presentations	about	how	we	might	view
2.	them.								

[Applause.]

MR. GOLD: Thanks everybody for those presentations. I've gotten a number of questions from the audience, and we've got time for at least a couple of them.

First, following up, Eileen, with what you were discussing about the additional offers that are provided to consumers in PlusNet's model. One member of the audience wonders since the consumer signed up for a rebate and goes on to redeem the rebate, and Comp USA or PlusNet gives them the -- it says, 'requires consumers to submit to a sales pitch and see other promotions in order to get a rebate,' should this be disclosed somehow ahead of time. And the second question is, is this an unfair practice?

MS. HARRINGTON: Well, the nature of this whole site is marketing. I'm not sure that some disclosure that somebody is going to make offers on this site is material information, the disclosure of which is needed to prevent some kind of consumer injury or harm, or the likelihood of harm. So my initial response to that is no, no, and no.

MR. QUINLAN: The other thing is the consumer

For The Record, Inc.

1	always	has	the	option	
---	--------	-----	-----	--------	--

MS. HARRINGTON: Does anyone else think

otherwise from the FTC? We could have a little debate

right here.

MR. QUINLAN: The other thing is the consumer always has the option in the end and be to get the check. So if they go through the process and don't decide to purchase anything and/or don't decide to even a gift card they can get paper checks.

MR. GOLD: Okay. Another member of the audience, this one's directed to Matt Edwards. Talking about the Connecticut and Rhode Island laws, which prohibit essentially doing the math at a retail establishment. Is a website, do you know whether a website with an order page is considered a retail establishment under those laws?

MR. EDWARDS: No, I don't know.

MR. GOLD: And this one for Chris Quinlan. Do you, I think you mentioned during your presentation that even though you've got the online option, something like 28 percent of consumers still send in prefer to do it by mail, do you have any idea why 28 percent of consumers still want to do it the old-fashioned way rather than doing it online? And also is this number consistent or has it been changing?

For The Record, Inc.

MR. QUINLAN: Well, the first part is it's
definitely been changing, it's been going down. So the
online submissions have been rising. As I said, the
updated numbers throughout April 15th across three
different classes of trade, which is drug, grocery,
consumer electronics, is 75-25. One of the things that
we learned, and it's a while back, but with price line
there's a lot of backlash because people couldn't
actually go to a computer, and if they didn't have a
computer they couldn't bid on milk. So I'm assuming that
those same people don't want to go online and submit
their rebates, they want to just mail it in the old-
fashioned way. The only difference is it's a much more
simplified process, because all they really have to do,
and in some cases with their loyalty card number attached
we don't even need their name and address, we get that
file from the retailer with the transaction.

So all they actually have to do is drop the receipt into the mail and we process it for them. All we're doing is taking the receipt information on a mail-in and punching it into the system, data entering it.

MR. GOLD: Okay. And the question that I have for you, Chris, is I think part of your model or one of the attractive things parts of your model for consumers is the high percentage of consumers presumably who will

attempt to redeem, and the relatively low redemption rate -- low -- relatively high redemption rate and the relatively low denial rate. Have you gotten any pushback [sic] from clients or potential clients who were concerned about these things?

MR. QUINLAN: No, the redemption rates haven't changed materially. And I think, I forget who was talking, I think it might have been Tim Silk, the whole idea is it's the rebate ratio that drives the redemption. It's the percentage of the cash that they're going to get back whether they're going to mail it in or do it online really hasn't materially changed the rate, if you will.

So we have -- the other side of that coin is we can project, if a vendor has a budget and they were doing \$50 rebates but didn't have any visibility into that, we can actually give them visibility to actually show them what their potential redemption rate's going to be based on their historical PLS data. So we can actually help them manage that cash flow. So if redemption did go up, is my point, we could rachet back the potential rebate, and they'd understand it could still stay within that budget.

MR. GOLD: How about the other half, the low rate of, relatively low rate of rebate redemption denials?

For The Record, Inc.

1	MR. QUINLAN: Well, again, we got into the
2	business based probably on the consumer side of things,
3	more so. And our whole idea was to make it easier for
4	the consumer, so we don't have a rejection rate that's
5	very high because it's sort of infallible information
6	that's being passed back and forth between us in the
7	retail end or vendor.
8	MR. GOLD: Okay. I'd like to thank our panel
9	again. I think that's all we have time for.
LO	[Applause.]
L1	MR. GOLD: As we speak, a phone call is coming
L2	into the cell phone that it's vibrating, and there are a
L3	couple of calls that whoever's missed. Did anybody
L 4	misplace a Samsung telephone? I will continue to hold
L 5	onto it.
L 6	We're going to reconvene at 2:00 o'clock. You
L7	can leave your folders here.
L 8	[LUNCH]
L 9	
20	
21	PANEL 4: INDUSTRY SOLUTIONS: EXPLORING BEST
22	PRACTICES IN REBATE PROMOTIONS
23	MS. BADGER: My name's Linda Badger, and I'm a
24	staff attorney at the western region of the Federal Trade
25	Commission. And now that you're all full from lunch, I

For The Record, Inc.

was going to say now that you're all full from lunch we
can start with the meat and potatoes panel, which is
hearing practical solutions to the rebate problems we've
all been talking about this morning and this afternoon.

First, we're going to hear best practices from a manufacturer's point of view. Manufacturers are ultimately responsible for every aspect of rebate promotions, from designing and advertising them to funding them and to having them fulfilled. And to give us this front-line perspective we're very pleased to welcome Mr. Christopher Ekren, who is the Senior Vice-President and Deputy General Counsel of Sony Electronics.

So take it away, Chris.

15 [Applause.]

MR. EKREN: So thank you, Linda and Matt, and also everyone here. Sony views this area of great importance, and we really appreciate the chance to participate in this activity.

So obviously I'm with the law department at Sony. But the rebate responsibility is a corporate responsibility, it's not something that the law department owns or runs. But it's something that we're very intimately involved with, as a corporate culture we're part of a team. As an in-house lawyer I am part of

For The Record, Inc.

the senior management culture that we try to inculcate within our organization.

So the essential elements in any best practice obviously is that senior management support and visibility in a clear corporate culture. In our corporation our president gets metrics (phonetic) and gets reports, and holds people accountable for how we manage our programs. This is something that very consciously those around him inject him into that role and get him the information so that we can drive the culture that we need to be effective and have effective rebate programs.

Our program basically is one of selecting third party vendors, because we don't have a core competence in our company of managing the very specialized process of rebates. And we understand there are companies that have developed the expertise that have the infrastructure, and it's not cost effective for us to build in a staff and manage all of that. So we have to be then partnering with people. We go through a formal RFP process, we look at in depth capabilities, we've developed a questionnaire over time, we continue to add to it, looking at the organizational structure of who we're going to partner with and work with. During in person interviews, site visits and inspections, we build into the contract key

For The Record, Inc.

1 metrics and reporting.

The vendor selection is the most important aspect of this, because you really do have to put your company's reputation and your reputation with your consumers in the hands of a third party.

And we're a large company. So some of the things we're going to talk about here are perhaps not relevant to every organization. But from our perspective we felt, because we have many divisions that, for example, a camera division, or a PC division, etcetera, having an expertise in every division about how to do rebates in the best way was not cost effective, and it could lead to inconsistent implementations.

And so over time we decided we needed a central program management office, and we decided that rather than having someone loan from one department that probably had three other people pulling them in different directions, we were going to say there's going to be a dedicated coordinating head count.

Secondly, to standardize the process and to make sure that all of the issues were really thought of and thought of ahead of time, we developed a launch form that not only created a sort of internal directive for our program management office to proceed with the implementation, but also made sure the vendor was only

getting directions from a central point within our company. Because otherwise what will happen is you'll have 15 people that have different pieces of a promotion, you'll have a marketing manager, you'll have maybe someone in the sales office, some of them dealing with Costco, some of them dealing with Parago, and they're all separately communicating, and that can and is a recipe for miscommunications, and ultimately you don't know who the owner of a decision is.

This is an eye chart, I'm sorry, but there is a lot to talk about with training. We do work with our vendor account management teams to understand how our internal processes work. We work with the vendor customer services teams, and also how to handle the customer issues. Create exception guidelines for the customer reps. We have a confidential set of guidelines for escalation type issues. And, of course, we do monitor individual sample interactions with consumers to make sure that the overall standards we've agreed to are followed.

In terms of the actual rebate coupon, what a lot of the learning we've had is that you just have to keep things simple. And so we created standard coupon templates in terms and conditions. The reason why we did that is because if you have as in our company you do over

For The Record, Inc.

30 marketing groups, everybody tried to have their own coupon to fill slightly different parameters, different ideas of sort of what the marketing edict was going to be, what you are trying to drive there. And from an efficiency standpoint we found that once you learn certain lessons you should probably just continue to leverage those and not recreate the wheel.

But we also took into account what our vendor, I mean our resellers were telling us about what's easy for them to explain and administer, and what consumers can understand. And I think one of the lessons, and we constantly battle this, it's never one battle, is try to keep things very simple. Because while I think a lawyer can understand a certain level of language and perhaps I'd like to think most of our employees are sort of in the marketing area have college degrees and have a certain level of expertise in language, that isn't necessarily the demographic that's going to be interacting with the form.

One of the things we did as an online prequalification, and I know a number of vendors support this, it almost seems a little bit counter-intuitive to require or suggest, and it's actually a suggestion, not a requirement, somebody to go online and fill out or answer the questions they'd be answering anyways if they were to

For The Record, Inc.

fill out the coupon and mail it in, and then determine whether in fact they are qualified for the rebate.

Because if someone can fill out a coupon properly why would they have to go through an online process. So it's an optional thing, but what we often find is people don't read carefully the instructions. Sort of going through this process as part of the submission process actually helps them determine something that perhaps they can cure a better document so that they don't get rejected and they can get their money, or whatever they're looking for, as quickly as possible.

So I would recommend that. It's something that the team told me really is kind of a tweak to the process that may seem a little bit counter-intuitive, but really does seem to help. From a retailer's standpoint, and I think there's been a lot of progress in this area, a lot of legacy systems perhaps don't support every capability that you'd want to have to completely consistently represent rebate terms. So there's always an issue, well you only have 50 words, what can you fit in here, because we can only put so much on this little rebate slip. And that's how our company's going to do rebates, it's our way, or we're not going to do rebates with you, Sony.

I think that what it requires is teamwork and partnerships so that when the retailers are doing their

implementation and you do negotiate with them about what really the consumer has to see, and make sure that that does get supported through their IT people and their system people.

From an inventory standpoint, when you're having a product that people are seeking to receive, you obviously need to have the products available. And that may seem extremely simple, and why can't that happen, but in a place like Sony that has a very complicated supply chain and all the vagaries of suppliers, there is a certain -- we run out of products all the time when we're trying to sell them just generally to consumers, and it's bad demand planning, it's things are more popular than we expected.

When you're offering any rebate there's a certain breakage rate that might be assumed, and when you're offering any premium there's a certain amount of people you expect will want it. But whatever turns out that whatever (inaudible) you're looking at becomes the rage for children, because they absolutely have to have it, then suddenly it's 2X what you expected, and that can happen. Do you have the relationship with the supplier that can supply that? If supplier A is not going to be able to supply that, do you have a supplier B? So we try to create this certain amount of expectations to our

marketing people about what they have to line up before they put this offer out to the public.

And secondly, be able to give people an alternative to cash if we can't meet the expectation with, of course, the intent that we'll hopefully meet the expectation.

From an invoicing and funding standpoint, and this is something also, and again this is a big corporation type of issue, but we're talking about best practices and what we've had to do internally here to really satisfy what we think consumer expectations are. What we found is that a normal paid invoice in my bureaucratic company it takes an awful lot of people if it's a lot of money. And there's a lot of money that flows through rebate, so we needed to make sure that things weren't getting held up unless there was a real reason to hold it up.

And our internal processes were developed so that if someone wasn't moving on something fast enough, to pay a vendor, to fund something we promised consumers, we were going to assure that it got escalated to somebody else in the organization that could move the thing and move the process forward. So there is with a lot of internal controls, and I know every company here knows about <u>Sarbanes Oxley</u>, the need to not just have anybody in a company just say pay a large check to somebody.

For The Record, Inc.

Balancing that need with the need to be responsive to the deadlines that we've committed to is something that we spend a lot of time thinking about and put in the process for.

But anything that is customer related does take a priority from a vendor standpoint, and it's a slightly, it's a different process because vendors are commercial companies and we have a contractual relationship with them where we can build in exactly what the payment expectations might be.

beginning, in terms of how our CEO does get a roll-up report that talks about how we are performing to our promises, and also internally, you know, just some of the metrics we want to measure our internal people and how effective they are in running these processes. There's online access to it, it's prepared daily. There is a report that talks about how we're doing, and from the various standpoints the idea is to build enough of an alarm that if things aren't going right you can do an investigation and fix it before it actually gets felt by anybody.

From an inventory standpoint, again, the intent is knowing our supply chain, knowing the vendor relationships. Often -- I guess maybe we're unique in a

For The Record, Inc.

sense, in that a lot of our (inaudible) actually are other Sony products, but it isn't necessarily always, it could be like a backpack or something that is made by an out-source. So we do need to have the reporting there to keep that going properly.

So again, we have a couple other reports going on with detailed reasons and issues that are coming up.

One of the benefits is, is that if you see a trend going wrong you can -- in a sense you may not know the reason why but you can do an investigation, and perhaps the vendor is being a little bit too aggressive in looking at the exact requirements, and we can decide as a business decision, even though perhaps legally we don't have to give the customer the money, we're going to tell them, listen, from an expectation and a happiness standpoint it's just better if we relax those guidelines. And then that's a business decision that's made with the law department sometimes.

So that was just a really quick run-through. I know I have a limited time there. I know there's a Q&A session that we're hoping for. And I think it will be probably more interesting when you have the Parago perspective and Costco perspective to sort of synthetically add all this up and talk about how we work through the entire process to meet the customer

1 expectations

And I appreciate it, again, the chance to talk about those questions when they come.

[Applause.]

MS. BADGER: Well, thank you, Chris, very much for that presentation. And I want you to know that if you have questions just pass them to Matthew Gold here, and we can get those questions answered after the panel's over.

Now, I'd like to -- we're going to hear from Mr. Mike Reynolds, and he's the Executive Vice-President of Marketing Development and Strategy for Parago, Inc., a prominent national rebate processor fulfillment house.

Fulfillment houses, or rebate processors, really do the nitty gritty work in fulfilling and funding rebates, opening all the envelopes or looking at all the forms, and they're often caught in the middle when things go wrong.

So let's hear from Parago's Mike Reynolds about best practices from a fulfillment house's point of view.

MR. REYNOLDS: Thank you, Linda. I also would like to thank the FTC for putting this together today. It's a great opportunity really to discuss rebates end to end throughout the entire supply chain. And hopefully this is the beginning of many discussions going forward.

For The Record, Inc.

So we certainly appreciate the opportunity.

A little bit about Parago, for those who don't know. We were founded in 1999, and we are a promotional services company. We've really been focused on elevating industry standards since that time. The founders of the company did not come out of the rebate processing space, but we saw it as an opportunity really to improve what had been at the time a process that obviously was long and drawn out, had some issues, and technology could solve some of those. And so many of us came out of the technology space.

We're really focused in on four pillars with the company, that being integrity, service, leadership, and innovation. I'm going to give you a sense of that through some of my remarks today. The key here has been working very closely with our clients. As you've heard, it's really a collaborative effort to process rebates and to put rebates out into the marketplace. And so that partnership is critical in working together with the clients to achieve optimal results in terms of the promotion itself and the consumer satisfaction.

Finally, I mentioned that we use technology. We have invested a tremendous amount in our technology infrastructure. And the focus has been to increase the accuracy of rebate processing, as well as the speed. And

For The Record, Inc.

I'll show that a little bit later.

I do want to also add here there have been discussions throughout the morning regarding valids and invalids, and the rates, and those types of things. And while we're not yet to the 3 percent industry-wide that Hal mentioned, we're getting closer. And it's really the culmination of a couple of things, one has been the promotional design. And that's been talked about throughout the morning, how critical that is to really drive the percentage of invalid claims down lower and lower, because the promotion rules become much clearer, and it becomes much easier for the consumer.

We have also, through the technology, used a rules-based transaction processing engine that we developed, again, for accuracy. So the point is to really focus in on accurately processing the rebates, and if they are valid, pay them, pay them quickly. If they're invalid, notify the consumer quickly, and give them not only the reasons but how they might be able to rectify that situation.

As a result, we've seen invalid -- or valid rates increase to as high as 92 percent. So 8 percent invalid rates, with the top reasons for invalids typically being missing store receipt, missing UPC, postmark was out of range with the promotional rules, or

the purchase date was outside of the promotional rules.

You find those are the top four reasons for invalids. In a lot of cases the consumer, for instance, it was a missing store receipt, has the opportunity then to send that store receipt in and for that claim to be converted

from an invalid status to a valid status and get the

7 check out.

So there's a lot of best practices from a processing perspective. I'm just going to focus in on four today in recognition of the time here. Those four being paperless rebates, and we heard a little bit about that this morning; fast-turn times; submission scanning; and promotion design. All of these things are really best practices that tie back up to a consumer-centered approach to rebate processing, which is key, and obviously the basis for a lot of our conversations today.

So let me start with paperless processing. We got a good overview of this this morning, but the idea being eliminate the mail-in portion, and use the point of sale transaction data to validate the claim, and to do so very quickly. And certainly with the proliferation of the internet this is becoming more of an opportunity for the base of consumers in this country. So we have built solutions that really allow the consumer to go online, submit at that -- online at that time, and capture the

data that they've got. And in many cases, and I'm going to show you an example of the Staples situation, if that online process has happened within say a couple of hours after the actual purchase we already have access to the transaction data to be able to indicate to the consumer right there on the spot whether their claim appears to be valid or invalid, based on a combination of the transaction number as well as the products that were purchased in that transaction.

Once we've received the point of sale data and therefore have the transactional data, which is the proof of purchase for the rebate, then we can move it very quickly through the process. One of the things that we have to be very careful about is fraud. And one of the aspects that we look at specifically for paperless is returns. And so in many cases the submission will be in essentially a hold period for the term of the return window. Therefore, if the consumer were to take the product back they would get their full refund of the purchase price, we would be able to validate that against the transaction data and it wouldn't get the rebate.

And of course the flip side is true as well.

If they have not returned within that window, then the rebate check is sent out immediately. We obviously try to keep this a very tight window.

For The Record, Inc.

And then of course if it's invalid, and with paperless you see virtually no invalids because you're able to tell the consumer right there that the claim will be invalidated because the right product perhaps wasn't purchased within that transaction. But it also gives them an opportunity to correct that mistake, perhaps they've put in the wrong transaction identifier, as an example, so they can re-key that and it can be moved to the valid state.

There are many benefits to paperless rebates. Consumers obviously have a much better rebate experience. We are able to proactively notify them of the validation or whether it's invalid. Fast turn times, we're really able to contract that period of time. The client also sees tremendous benefits, virtual elimination of fraud. Fraud has been a big issue in the rebate industry. We at Parago, and my peers at other rebate processors, have been working diligently over several years now to remove as much as we can fraud out of the rebate industry. Paperless virtually eliminates that rebate fraud, so there's a big benefit there.

Also the accuracy of submissions. We get some handwriting that's very difficult to read. So when it's done online the beauty of that is that things like the consumer's address where the check is going to go is very

1 accurate.

And finally, brand extension. From that I mean that it really, because it's a good consumer experience, elevates the client's brand in the eyes of the consumer. And actually what we're finding is that this is driving loyalty, loyalty of that consumer, frequency and recency of purchases. And, in fact, one of our best clients, Ace Hardware, recently launched Ace Rewards, which is their loyalty program, and they have integrated paperless rebates into that solution so that their loyal members are receiving all of the benefits of paperless rebates.

The experience, you saw it this morning, this is very similar in the case of Staples easy rebates. And there was a comment made earlier about how Staples has done a good job of working through some of the consumer experiences, and we've worked with them since 1999 in partnership to really move that along quite quickly. Staples easy rebates, which most people do know, is really the culmination of those efforts, and is a solution that works very, very easily. There is very little information for the consumer to have to enter in. And the key here is Staples makes sure it is very, very clear on the rebate form the two pieces of information that are required in order to claim that rebate: that being the transaction number and the promotion code, both

of which are printed on the receipt.

Moving to turn times. The faster that we can pay the consumer the better the experience, no question there. We have been working diligently with our clients to bring that down, and we are now seeing in some cases turn times from the postmark date to the date they have the check in their hands as little as 21 days. So we've made substantial improvement there. There are many clients that are not there yet, that we continue to work on, and some that simply won't be able to get all the way down to 21 days, but that we can continue to make faster.

We have in the process removed several steps. You see in the middle, Linda commented on we're doing the nitty gritty, and in the middle you see some of that nitty gritty detailed. And we have removed several steps from 1999 till today, and automated those into the technology in order to compress that time frame.

To give you an idea, in 1999 it was estimated that the turn time as described, as I explained, was 12 to 16 weeks. In 2007 we now are best practices getting down under 4 weeks, which could represent up to 75 percent decrease in that turn time. We actually find with our clients right now across the board that north of 90 percent of valid claims the check is actually out the door and in their hands in less than 6 weeks. So we're

continually working to improve that, but it's coming down substantially.

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 third area is submission scanning. this is something that we've put in place here over the last couple of years. And rather than simply keying in the contents of the envelope and then bagging up the paper, if you will, and storing it out into a warehouse, we moved to scanning. This has allowed us to really literally take the entire contents of the envelope, as well as the outside of the envelope itself, create a digital image of all of that information, and key in off of the digital image. This actually has resulted in several benefits. The integration with data entry actually has yielded efficiencies, we're actually able to key the information in much faster, as well as improved accuracy. Rather than the data entry clerk looking down, they're literally they have the scanned image and the data entry screen side by side. And as a result we've actually seen a nice increase in data entry accuracy.

The other area of benefit is in the call center. The images are available to the customer services representatives within that transaction. So when a consumer calls the customer service representative can pull that up on their screen and they're looking at exactly what the consumer sent in. So while I'm not

going to talk about consumer best practices, certainly a consumer best practice that has been talked about a lot is photocopy everything that you mail in. The beauty of that is the consumer's now looking at the photocopy, the customer service representative is looking at exactly what was sent in, and we can resolve the issue, whether it's that the consumer did not send something in and we can discuss what they need to send in, or whether we, in the case Sony just described, you know, perhaps the error was not significant enough and we've been informed by our client to pay the rebate claim.

Third, we've talked a lot about this today, promotion design. And we've seen lots of examples, and certainly this is a horrible one, and blends in all of the instructions to the consumer as well as the terms and conditions into one big mess of text. We need to continue to improve on this. This is one example. This also is a Staples rebate form. And the key here is that the instructions are very, very clear. I know it's small, and I apologize, because it's a long form. But you can see the rebate begin date, end date, and postmark date are clearly called out at the top. In the middle, clearly called out the address where to send the rebate. And at the bottom, the expectations, in this case four to six weeks. And the ability to check the status of that

For The Record, Inc.

1	claim online. You know, we still have to get the terms
2	and conditions in there, but if you were to read these,
3	and you'll have an opportunity to when the presentation
4	is made available, it's quite simple, it's quite
5	straightforward, there's not a lot of difficult language
6	in there. So that certainly has helped tremendously,
7	versus burying it deep inside some terms and conditions.

So those are the four areas I wanted to talk about today. I, too, look forward to the question and answer session. We are making strides. We've made a lot of strides over the last eight years as an industry. There are still things obviously we can do to make this better. But just the fact that we're talking about it now is great. And the application of technology through a partnership between the clients and the processors is really going to help us get there. So thank you very much.

[Applause.]

MS. BADGER: Thanks, Mike. And that reminds me of our admonition that mouse print is for rats, so avoid it.

[Laughter.]

MS. BADGER: Our third panelist represents the retailer's point of view, and often retailers catch the heat for botched rebate programs even though they're just

For The Record, Inc.

selling through products that carry a manufacturer's rebate. Customer complaints are bad for business, and costly as well.

Costco has a really intriguing before and after saga of how it tamed the rebate beast. And here to tell you the story is Joe Grachek, Vice-President and Merchandise Accounting Controller for Costco Wholesale Corporation.

Thanks, Joe.

[Applause.]

MR. GRACHEK: All right. Good afternoon, everyone. I wanted to give you a little bit of a story about Costco's journey through the mail-in rebate world and how we've went down one pathway and ultimately by doing what we thought was the best for members, best for shareholders and our employees, and our suppliers, came to some conclusions that we probably didn't think we were going to come to.

So Costco's all about maximizing the value to our members, our customers, and minimizing the cost of the expense or the administration of doing business for ourselves and for our suppliers. So that's the fundamental principle that we begin this process with.

A few years ago Costco developed software and systems with our fulfillment partner to be able to use a

For The Record, Inc.

point of sale as the beginning of the rebate process. So we began using essentially printing a rebate receipt with each receipt at the warehouse. Many of you may have seen those if you shop at Costco. Initially it was a mail-in rebate program that was quite successful because it did make it easier for our members to submit rebates, but it's evolved into an electronic rebate program that has really become popular and have been a fan favorite with our members.

Essentially we worked with all of our suppliers, and with few exceptions our suppliers have joined us in this program where Costco has essentially manages all the rebate programs independent, so we don't have 200 supplier programs that are running through our warehouse. We have rebate programs that run through our warehouses to our members that Costco manages unilaterally, with few exceptions. All rebates are set up internally at Costco. The rebates are in the point of sale system, and they are electronically transmitted to our fulfillment partner who takes a submission from the members, bumps it up against the database at the point of sale, returns it to us for a validation process, and ultimately is funded and remits to the members. So it's a pretty quick and easy process.

One quick thing, the members this morning were

For The Record, Inc.

talking a little bit about security of information. The
system we developed resides within the Costco system, and
so it has all the same internal controls as all our
financial systems, and other internal company controls.
So it's very secure information. Plus because we're
fortunate enough to have a membership base that we're
dealing with, the members really aren't required to put
anything that's not already known, basically name and
address, into the system, and that's just for the
remittance of the check. So when the member files for a
reimbursement or rebate it's fulfilled to the address
they select, but no additional information has to go into
the system.

From an internal administration perspective,

Costco sets up the rebate program, Costco runs it through

our buildings, Costco charges the suppliers the expense

for running that rebate program, and Costco is then

essentially in the control of assuring the highest levels

of fulfillment as well as operating the program and

efficiently as possible to reduce everyone's expenses.

Here's a copy of the rebate receipt that's printed out on the membership, and I don't know how well you can see it, but it's pretty similar to other point of sale receipts that are printed out.

Our goal is to maximize the fulfillment, reduce

For The Record, Inc.

the rejections, and I think we've been real successful at 1 doing this. So successful, I might add, that I think 2 that was -- that's kind of where I'm going with this 3 4 discussion is that our success in the level of fulfillment has let us and our suppliers in a unified way 5 to say hey wait a second, there's a lot of inherent 6 7 administrative expenses to run mail-in rebate programs, and maybe our administrative dollars are better spent 8 9 somewhere else. And so maybe there's other programs out 10 there that might be more beneficial to our customers, 11 members, and to ourselves than a mail-in rebate program. 12 And I think that's the interesting shift in the paradigm is that the more efficient we become the more programs 13 are being changed to be more effective for everyone. 14 15 that's the unintended benefit of higher levels of 16 fulfillment.

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

What we did, we started the program in 2000, rolled out the U.S. and Canada by 2001, and then we went online in 2003 with our program. What we require for the Costco program is that it has to have significant value if we're going to run a mail-in rebate. And that's another thing that's maybe different for us and some others is that we have to have at least 20 percent of the product value as the value to our member, it has to be real simple, it has to be membership based. The

For The Record, Inc.

suppliers pay the set-up fee, the suppliers pay the transaction fee to administrate the program. So we want to make sure the suppliers are vested in the program financially in order for them to run a program through our systems.

Kind of our redemption rates as it stands today. It's a confusing slide. But basically if you look at \$5 rebates, in our automated system today we get a return of about 40 percent redemption, and that's with an easy online methodology, as well as the option to mail-in, about 40 percent. \$25 rebates, about 48 percent. \$100 rebates, right around 80 percent. So there's still a number of consumers that don't utilize the process even though it has become simple and easy to do.

We'll just see the higher redemption rates, the higher dollars. When members are paid the check goes to the member, and they can go cash it however they want, but they can also cash it at Costco. One thing that was integral to this program was making it fair to the members and easy on them, so if the check becomes staledated we'll still cash the check, if a member's rebate, for whatever reason, they don't process the rebate but they had a valid rebate even after the system is -- or even after the window of redemption is closed but the

For The Record, Inc.

1 supplier will still honor that rebate.

So we encourage our members to get the full value, and we're willing to eat some of that cost to make sure the members do get the value on top of the supplier's fulfillment requirements.

Now, if you see here, if you look at the bars you can see the number of redemptions over the last five years. The programs themselves have actually significantly declined. We had about six million rebate redemptions in fiscal '02, down to under two million redemptions in fiscal '06. And the reason for that is because, as I said earlier, suppliers and our merchants are realizing there's better ways to spend their administrative expense than on mail-in rebate programs. In the U.S. the average check amount is about \$15.10, if you look at all the rebates redeemed.

The other thing that members can do on our system is -- just I'm sure that most of our retail competitors are doing this online do about the same thing -- they can see, they can actually go in and see all the rebates that exist at the Costco they shop at. They can also see the status of their rebate, which I didn't show you here. They can see the status of their rebate, they can see the history of their rebate redemptions, and they can see all the rebates that exist

where they shop. Also, we do make sure that even on the
receipt that you get at the register, plus on our
website, if you're not satisfied with the electronic
submission, if you do want to make a phone call, we do
have members who still prefer to make phone calls and we
give them that opportunity. So and we have a call center
in our offices. Our fulfillment partner also has a call
center. And within those call centers, just so you know,
is a focus for us just to make sure we have excellent
service to our members, and so we have a real time
monitoring process that we can utilize from our
administrative offices to administrate or to monitor the
administration of the phone calls within our third party
provider, as well as internally at Costco. So we make
sure that the members are getting the right service from
on the phone lines too, even though that's not the
preferred methodology.

Here's just a snapshot of what the site looks like when they're looking at rebates. You can look at this when you get the presentation, I guess.

Here's all the rebates that are listed in the system for a warehouse that a member shops at.

We'll always reissue rebate checks if they're lost. Full customer service is a big important thing for us.

For The Record, Inc.

1	Let's see, I guess the biggest thing for us is
2	someone mentioned earlier today if the members have a bad
3	experience with a rebate program that might influence
4	their decision to purchase in the future. And I think we
5	take that really seriously at Costco. It's a big deal to
6	us. We don't want to offer any program that our members
7	can't be thrilled with, and that we can't support at the
8	highest level. So we feel like we've been able to do
9	that through our fulfillment partner and our internal
10	systems that we've developed, but also we're finding that
11	when you do it the right way there's just a chance there
12	might be a better way to spend those dollars between you
13	and your supplier partners.
14	And so stay tuned on that, and we'll see what
15	rebates go in the future. Thank you.
16	[Applause.]
17	MS. BADGER: Thanks, Joe. And just for all of
18	you that need some dessert after lunch we have some
19	cookies on the side here where the coffee was, and those
20	cookies were purchased from Costco.
21	[Laughter.]
22	MS. BADGER: So, thanks, Joe, on both accounts.
23	Finally, we're very pleased to welcome
24	Ms. Linda Goldstein. Ms. Goldstein serves as the Vice-

For The Record, Inc.

President of Government and Legal Affairs for the

25

Promotion Marketing Association, and is also a partner
with the law firm of Manatt, Phelps, and Phillips. And
in her remarks Ms. Goldstein will unveil for the first
time, your moderator hasn't even seen them yet, the PMA's
new guidelines for rebate promotions.

So welcome and many thanks for speaking with us today.

[Applause.]

MS. GOLDSTEIN: Thank you. And we're delighted to be here on behalf of the Promotion Marketing

Association. Every one of these events where we can get industry and government together to talk about the issues and collaborate on solutions, I think we have a wealth of experience in learning that it tends to solve the problem efficiently with everybody's interest in mind. So we're glad to be here participating at yet another stellar event.

Actually, let me just begin. I am here today representing the Promotion Marketing Association. And let me just tell you a little bit about who we are, because I think that will help explain some of the perspective that we took in defining best practices. We are the leading trade association representing the promotion marketing industry. Our members are quite diverse. We have a lot of package goods companies,

For The Record, Inc.

retailers, online marketers. But in addition to the marketing segment of the community we also have promotion agencies, fulfillment companies, and so really companies that touch the rebate process from different sectors come into play in our association. And so that forces, as you'll see, some of what we're trying to identify to be a little bit more general than the individualized specific programs that you've heard about thus far.

We're not new as an association to trying to deal with rebate issues. Actually for a very long time there's been a joint initiative between the PMA and the United States Postal Inspection Service, a rebate fraud data center whose objective was to detect, deter, and prevent rebate fraud, and actually they maintained a database of people who through a variety of parameters that were established were suspected of or were determined to have committed some kind of a rebate fraud. These people were identified and asked to sign voluntary assurances of discontinuance. And it's a quite effective program in combating consumer fraud.

And I think the point for us that we want to stress there is that consumer protection is an important objective in determining best practices, but also permitting policies and procedures that are designed to deter consumer fraud is also an issue, and rebate fraud

is a problem, a real problem for businesses.

So, as I said, some of our key learning points, just from that experience were that rebate fraud is real, that businesses can be victims too, and that ultimately consumer protection needs need to be properly balanced against the need to prevent customer fraud or fraud on the businesses.

In thinking about how to approach the best practices we took some considerations both from the marketer's side and from the consumer's side. We believe that rebates are a valuable promotional vehicle that benefits both marketers and consumers. For consumers there's a high perceived value, it's a genuine savings, and I think as you heard this morning, if the experience is good it's likely to stimulate future purchases.

For businesses, it's a highly effective marketing tool. I've put some numbers up here just to show the magnitude of rebates that are issued each year. I'm going to caveat it by saying these are unaudited figures, and really just designed to be illustrative rather than to be quoted.

I think the key issues for consumers, and what we've heard from our members where problems occur, are if the terms of the rebate offer are unclear or ambiguous, if the advertising fails to disclose material terms and

conditions, as well as the other forms that the consumer gets once they've made the purchase and are in the process of trying to claim their rebate. There have been numerous problems with advertising of pricing being misleading, and consumers not really understanding exactly what it is that they're going to have to do when they go to the checkout counter and dip into their pocket.

Contingent rebates are becoming increasingly popular, particularly in certain industry segments, so the need to disclose those contingencies we think is very important.

From an operational standpoint, problems can arise if the window for purchases is too short, or the time period for redemption is too short, if the claim procedures are too onerous, or the rebates are not issued on a timely basis. And I think that that all confirms very much what you've heard this morning.

Some of the issues that businesses are facing, that our members are facing, we're troubled by inconsistent state regulation. There are, particularly in the area of advertising, there are on the books now state statutes that are inconsistent, and if you're trying to do a national promotion that can be quite challenging in terms of developing your advertising copy.

And I think it's also important as we get into this
process to recognize that a one size fits all approach
doesn't work. I think the panel, this afternoon's panel
demonstrates it in and of itself that different
businesses, depending on their size, depending on the
nature of the products or services that they're offering
on their demographics, may have different approaches.
Online certainly is an efficient way, but for some people
that may not be an effective way for them.

So I think, again, we just looked at this from the standpoint of standardized language, standardized mechanical or operational procedures, could be problematic for all businesses concerned. And I think we also have to recognize that rebate practices are evolving, and as technology changes practices change to accommodate that. And so any regulation, legislation, or even best practices has to be sufficiently fluid to accommodate those evolving practices.

And we do need some conditions and restrictions to protect against consumer fraud, but those have to be balanced against the need to provide for appropriate consumer protection.

We are concerned, there has been a marked increase in legislative trends, rebate bills that have been proposed, many have not passed, but they continue to

come and they continue to become more restrictive. And from a business standpoint our concern is if as we've seen in other areas, like gift cards or sweepstakes, we end up with inconsistent state regulations, what that will likely mean is that marketers will offer these programs less frequently. And for consumers that's not a positive output.

And so we really hope that maybe today is the start of a process to see just how far self-regulation can go if different parts of the industry come together to develop best practices. And I really feel the need to say that what we're going to share with you today is just one group's point of view. And I think there are lots of different perspectives that will have to weigh in before we can finally get a complete picture.

So in developing these practices, which I also want to say continue to be a work in progress in part because we really wanted to hear a lot of what was discussed today and take that back to our members and see how we might improve on what we're thinking thus far, but we've focused on three aspects of the rebate offer: the structure of the offer; the communication of the offer; and the fulfillment of the offer.

There are some general overriding principles, they sound logical and intuitive, but I think they're

worth repeating. Three primary principles that rebate offers should be conducted in compliance with applicable laws and regulations, which we hope will be few and reasonable. That they should be designed in a manner to provide meaningful value to consumers. We're not going to specify a specific amount, but it should be a real value, they should not be illusory. And they should be conducted in a manner that deals with the consumer honestly and treats the consumer fairly.

In terms of the structure of the offer, the requirements should be reasonable and easy to follow. They should not be unduly onerous. And whatever terms and conditions are put on should have a rational business purpose, they should not be in there simply for the purpose of encouraging breakage or encouraging slippage. But if they can relate back to a rational business that the particular company has, we think it's appropriate for them to be included, and that will obviously vary by marketer.

Marketers should allow for a reasonable period of time between the purchase date and the submission deadline. We think that will address the short window period that consumers have expressed. And they should be designed to prevent fraudulent claims in a reasonable manner. In other words, again, whatever conditions are

imposed, or limitations, no duplicate copies, or things like that, have a reason or a basis to prevent fraud, those should be acceptable. But the idea of preventing fraud shouldn't be used as a basis to impose unreasonable conditions.

In terms of communicating the offer, and I think here is where we really need to have some flexibility, and we intentionally have not specified manner, time, or placement of disclosures, because it will vary. Some of the disclosures will be very material to the purchase decision. Other disclosures are very important once the consumer needs to go through the process of claiming the rebate, and that should dictate where and how those disclosures are made. But as a general rule, marketers should ensure that all relevant information about the rebate offer is communicated at the appropriate time. And, again, as I say, that can vary.

The terms of the rebate offer should be presented in language that's clear, that's unambiguous, and easy for the consumer to understand and follow.

We do think that there are certain material terms and conditions of the offer that should be disclosed in all instances. And those would include the time; the identity of the product or products, in other words, to be specific about which one, which products or

within a line the rebates apply to, to help reduce consumer error; the date by which the request has to be postmarked and/or received, and that should be indicated, whether it's a postmark or receipt date; date by which the product must be purchased; obviously the amount of the rebate; the manner in which the rebate will be provided. In particular we're seeing a growing trend towards providing rebates through other forums like gift cards or store value cards, or the like, and if it's going to be something other than a check the consumer should be told about it up front. And if it is something like a gift card or a store value card, any material limitations on the use of that should also be disclosed.

If the time for delivering the rebate, we use the mail order rule as a model here, is longer than 30 days, we think that should be disclosed, and details about who to contact with questions. The offer terms should advise the consumer if there are any additional purchases that they have to make, or any additional costs that they're required to incur, any additional conditions, any geographical limitations, any limits on the number of rebates: one per household, one per purchase, one per email address. Obviously the specific procedures that have to be followed. A very clear description of exactly what items the customer has to

For The Record, Inc.

provide in order to claim their rebate. And any material exclusions, limitations, or restrictions.

Two principles we wanted to highlight outside of the general requirements for clear and conspicuous disclosure of material terms, is to really focus on not misrepresenting the out of pocket cost to the consumer. So if the law permits we think it's a best practice to disclose both the pre-rebate price and a post-rebate price so that the consumer knows exactly what each element of the transaction is. And if the receipt of the rebate is contingent on the consumer fulfilling certain requirements, for example, if it's a rebate on a computer but you've got to be a member of an online service for a certain period of time, that should really be highlighted prominently in the advertising, because that may be a material inducement to the purchase.

On the fulfillment side, obviously the rebate offer should be fulfilled in accordance with the offer terms and conditions. They should be honored within the time period specified, which should be of a reasonable nature. They should be delivered to consumers in a manner that we can reasonably expect that the consumer will receive the rebate. So in some manner that's not likely to be perceived as junk mail by the consumer, but something that would indicate to the consumer that the

contents of that envelope are important and that it would be worth the consumer's while to open them.

If the marketer will be relying on a third party to handle the fulfillment, again, we don't think it's our role to set forth specific requirements for third party fulfillment, but we do believe that our members should conduct some due diligence on the third party to ensure that they have the financial resources and the personnel necessary to meet anticipated demands. And that there should be a formal contract with the third party that sets out the expectations of both parties and what the respective obligations of both parties would be.

We think that the marketers need to work with their third party fulfillment companies to make sure that when there's an expected surge of consumer requests or interest in the rebate that that third party fulfillment company knows. So often some of the problems occur because there's a lack of proper communication between the marketer and the fulfillment company. They don't know what the media schedules are and they don't necessarily know when to expect that that surge will hit to make sure they have appropriate forms and personnel necessary to handle that.

And the marketers also need to work with their retailers to make sure that they have proper inventory on

hand to meet those anticipated surges.

The marketers, or their third party fulfillment company should have reasonable processes and procedures in place to detect rebate fraud. We've learned through the experience from the rebate data fraud center experience that there are some indicators that you can give to your third party fulfillment company that can be early warning signs that there might be some fraud occurring.

The marketers should maintain clear records of the transaction. Consumers should be provided with reasonable cost-free method of making inquiries about their rebate, so there should be a cost-free customer service system in place with appropriate hold times and appropriate personnel to handle the inquiries in a timely manner.

And we think it's important to remember the privacy component, the data that's collected from consumers in connection with rebate offers should be used in accordance with the marketer's stated policies and applicable laws and regulations.

So those are our thoughts as of this moment. We welcome everyone's comments here and we will continue to keep you posted as we work these through. Thank you.

[Applause.]

For The Record, Inc.

MS. BADGER: After hearing from all of our
panelists on best practices, I think that we can sum it
up in one word, and that's CARE. And I came up with a
nemonic because I basically can't help myself. C, be
consumer friendly, make sure to keep the terms and
conditions simple, something that consumers can follow,
and communicate clearly with your consumer. A, be
attentive, look for signs that problems are starting and
nip them in the bud. R, be responsible, and we saw that
from our manufacturer and retailer panelists today. Take
responsibility for all the facets of rebate fulfillment,
don't just pass the buck, or rebate promotion. And E,
where possible use electronic submissions, they're really
great for consumers, speed up the process, keep them
informed, and it seems to cut back on the costs of rebate
promotions as well.
So with that, I want to thank the panel as I've
learned a lot today, and I know that everyone in the

audience has. And thanks for your great presentations.

[Applause.]

MS. BADGER: And we have a lot of questions. And we have several questions that focus on what happens when the rebate check is not cashed by the consumers. So perhaps Mike Reynolds from Parago could start first and tell us what the policy is from the rebate processor's

For The Record, Inc.

1 viewpoint.

MR. REYNOLDS: Well, I can certainly give you our process around that. The rebate checks that go out and are not cashed, first of all, there's two methods here in terms of receiving the funds and distributing those funds on checks. One is that we invoice our clients and they wire the money to us and then the checks are cut. The second is that the client in some cases has their own bank account and we write the checks off of their bank account.

In the case where it is being written off the Parago bank account then those funds, one of two things happens with those funds: one, they're returned back to the client; or two, in the case where they have elected to ask us to file that as unclaimed property with the appropriate states we provide that service to them. So it just depends on the client's situation, the clients sometimes take it upon themselves to handle the unclaimed property, and sometimes they ask us to do that.

MS. BADGER: Okay.

MS. GOLDSTEIN: I just wanted to add that on that issue is becoming an increasingly significant one on the state level. And state interests in escheating that property have escalated in the last several years. So all marketers that have any significant rebate program

For The Record, Inc.

1	really need to have in place a parallel program for how
2	that property will be handled for escheatment purposes.
3	And it's no longer a situation where that can be a
4	windfall to the marketer if those checks are uncashed.
5	In fact, it can create greater headaches and greater
6	potential liability for the marketers.
7	MS. BADGER: Okay. The next question again for
8	Mike I think is how can a manufacturer like Staples, one
9	of your clients, gain access to your reports on
10	redemptions and submissions and so forth?
11	MR. REYNOLDS: How can Staples get it?
12	MS. BADGER: Staples, one of your clients.
13	MR. REYNOLDS: How do they get the data?
14	MS. BADGER: Right.
15	MR. REYNOLDS: Not the manufacturers but
16	Staples themselves?
17	MS. BADGER: It says, 'How can a manufacturer
18	gain access to Parago's reports for redemptions,
19	submissions, etcetera?'
20	MR. REYNOLDS: Sure. We provide reporting,
21	extensive reporting back to our clients on a weekly
22	basis. So if the client is Staples then the reporting
23	goes back to Staples. In some cases the manufacturer who
24	may be sponsoring that rebate promotion through Staples
25	wants to get the data as well, and basically that's just

For The Record, Inc.

in cooperation with Staples. If our contract is directly with Staples it's their data, it's not ours, we don't have the ability to do anything with that without their permission. So typically what will happen is the manufacturer will work with Staples, and if that approval is given then we're more than happy to provide all of the data to the appropriate manufacturer. And our reporting system is designed in such a way that it's very easy to split out the reports by manufacturers.

MS. BADGER: Okay. And I'll throw this out to anyone who wants to answer it. One of our audience members wants to know, could you describe and/or give examples of what a contingent rebate is?

Linda?

MS. GOLDSTEIN: Well, there are many examples, but I think the one that is most common is you purchase product and that product may be linked to a service. So an example might be purchasing a phone and signing up for wireless service and the rebate you only become eligible for the rebate if you've remained a subscription member of that service for a certain number of months. So that the rebate -- the purchase itself is not qualifying you for the rebate, there's some additional obligation that has to be satisfied that won't occur until some point in the future.

For The Record, Inc.

MS. BADGER: Okay. And another audience member would like to know whether rebate checks are subject to the mail order rule, the FTC has a mail order rule, and it provides that if you're going to send something late you have to give notice, and also after a while you have to give an opportunity to cancel. It does not — although it could apply to or does apply to merchandise premiums.

So if it's a product, then it applies. But if it's cash, it doesn't.

And the second part of the question is what should a manufacturer do when it's not making the stated time period for mailing the rebate checks? And here the admonition is don't put down something that you can't meet. If you really can't meet the eight to ten weeks then don't make the claim, and certainly don't continue to make the claim if you find out that there's going to be major delays or problems in meeting your promise. And if something happens then use every reasonable effort that you can to notify consumers of what kind of delay they're looking at.

The next question is one for Mike Reynolds of Parago. And it says, 'Some fulfillment houses outsource data entry to data entry companies and use contracted home workers to enter data, and how does Parago control

For The Record, Inc.

that type of environment for accuracy and shrinkage of
lost materials?'

MR. REYNOLDS: That's a great question. At Parago we have never used home workers. And largely the industry has moved away from that practice. We have never had that. We do use some outsource partners for parts of the process. And those partners must meet specific guidelines in order to work with us, including things that would fall into the integrity camp, we do substantial checks on them before they're ever allowed to have any part of the rebate process.

But to the second part of the question, the key here is two things: one, the outsource partner must be keying directly into our transaction processing platform. They cannot key into their own technology and then send us a file, for instance. So it must be keyed directly in, and therefore we are able to control that experience, and control the accuracy of in this case the data entry component of that. And then, two, we actually have substantial measurements in metrics that we use for our outsource partners on a monthly basis. And where they may be under our service level requirements, then quite frankly they are released as a partner and we no longer work with them.

So we have some very, very stringent guidelines

For The Record, Inc.

in place. And the use of those partners has helped tremendously in terms of the speed and efficiency that I've talked to, as well as a comment that Linda made in terms of the seasonality of the business, and the peaks and valleys, if you will, in terms of the volume. It allows us to ramp up very quickly to accommodate the peak seasons and the peak volume that comes as a result.

MS. BADGER: Thank you for that. The other question we have is I think for Costco, and it says, 'Have you eliminated mail-in rebates totally?'

MR. GRACHEK: We still have a small percentage of the actual mail-in. It's eligible for everyone to mail in just because there could be and there are members that prefer that method of submitting. So the lion's share of all of our submissions are online, but we will still offer that to members because there's always a few members that prefer to do it that way. So it's member's preference over anything else.

MS. BADGER: And I think the second part of that question is, 'Do most of your manufacturers give equal rebates given your new procedures, or have they decreased the value of the rebates offered?'

MR. GRACHEK: I think that what happens is as you evaluate the system you look at the cost of the transaction, the cost of administration, and the

For The Record, Inc.

redemption amount. A lot of times our merchants and our manufacturers will sit down together and say how can we spend these dollars more effectively. And what Costco is kind of morphing into a little bit now, and it's not a direct transition, but what I see is a lot more instant rebates at the register because, number one, it's an instantaneous gratification for the customer; two, the data is available right away so you're not waiting for an outcome; and three, it's significantly less expensive to administrate for us and for our partners.

So if you go to Costco nowadays you're going to see coupon books and all that crazy junk out there, and you're going to see instant rebates noted on the signs, what the discussion was earlier today you'll see it netted on the signs because they're going to get it at the register. The register will show that rebate piece in the details so they know they got that as a rebate.

But I think the trend's going towards offering the instant rebate and reducing the number of mail-in programs in general.

MS. BADGER: Finally, and if I've butchered your questions you're going to have an opportunity to restate them in the next panel. But one consumer brought up the sticky problem of manufacturers or retailers requiring the original receipt, and the fact that then

down the process somebody can say well we lost your

submission, your rebate submission, and of course now you

don't have your original receipts so you're rejected.

And I was wondering if anyone on the panel has some ideas about that.

Joe?

MR. GRACHEK: Well, I just think that that's old school. And that was, you know, there was a fraud prevention concern with original data way back when. There's lots of consumer fraud especially in the low dollar rebates. We had people who understood the rules, they knew what levels of review were going on, and so you see lots of fraud if you didn't require original documentation.

Our strategy isn't to press the original documentation, and we're fortunate because we're a membership club, but now we just look at the system. I can tell what a member purchased and returned. And so we do fulfill the rebate on the original purchase, and then we have flags in our system and fraud detection routines that can tell if there was excessive amount of purchases, and then they tie in returns to those purchases, see if the rebates were fulfilled, and then go back to the member, or in some cases employee, who felt they saw a hole in the system and wanted to perpetrate a fraud.

For The Record, Inc.

So original information isn't nearly as important as it used to be because the system data allows us to do a much better job of protecting our dollars than the old manual way of asking for original data.

MS. BADGER: Isn't the retailer really in a very good position to use electronic rebate programs, because they have access to the data from consumers?

MR. GRACHEK: Well, I mean we're in a unique position because we're a membership club, and that makes it easier for us. I'm sure grocery would have another story to tell, or non-membership entities. But you can still tie your exposure to your purchases or to your sales to your customers, and you can tie it by location, by date, by name in some cases because there's warranty and everything else that has to go through it.

So I think for bigger dollar purchases with bigger rebates, even the non-member retailers have customer data that I think is helpful. So it's just kind of the focus from the retailer. You're right, the retailer has to focus on this because the manufacturer in most cases doesn't have the ability to focus on it.

MR. REYNOLDS: Can I just add two pieces there?

One, is that we have seen over the last few years many
retailers taking a best practice, that being that they
actually print out at the point of sale a specific rebate

1	receipt. Therefore, the original receipt, purchase
2	receipt, is still in the hands of the consumer, and the
3	rebate receipt is used for submission on the rebate.
4	That's point number one.
5	Point number two to your follow-up question,
6	Linda, is absolutely the beauty of the retailer is that
7	they've got the transaction data, and within that
8	transaction data it includes the purchased products and
9	their SKUs. So that is the best validation source by
10	far, and moving more to electronic submission is just a
11	logical approach. The difficulty is really for
12	manufacturers selling through a lot of different retail
13	channels, and that's much more difficult, because that
14	data is not readily available.
15	MS. BADGER: Okay. Well, we're out of time for
16	this panel. We'll have a 15 minute break. Come back at
17	3:30. I want to thank our panel once again for a
18	wonderful presentation.
19	[Applause.]
20	[BREAK]
21	
22	PANEL 5: THE REBATE DEBATE: LEGISLATE,
23	LITIGATE OR LOSE REBATES?
24	MS. FAIR: Thank you for taking your seats so
25	we can start our last panel of the day. I'm Lesley Fair,

For The Record, Inc.

I'm an attorney with the Bureau of Consumer Protection in Washington. And is there a better place for me to be on business for a couple of days than with my brothers and sisters with the West Coast Regional Office of the FTC.

I'm also honored to be joined by some real big names in this area. We've basically been tasked with one of two things. The first thing we've been told to do is either, here is our choice, come up with a solution to the rebate questions addressed all day. Or number two, I think it was figure out how Sanjay stayed so long on American Idol.

[Laughter.]

MS. FAIR: So we've decided to take the easier task, and these three panelists will be discussing potential solutions today.

I am honored first to my right is Norma Garcia, a Senior Staff Attorney with the West Coast Regional Office of Consumer's Union, the nonprofit publisher of Consumer Reports magazine. In the house I grew up in, second I guess to either Dear Abby or Holy Scripture, was Consumer Reports magazine. I think sometimes my mother thinks I work for Consumer Reports magazine. So let's keep that fiction. But it's a group for whom we at the FTC have the greatest amount of respect, and we're thrilled that Norma Garcia is here today.

For The Record, Inc.

Next to Norma is Ed Kabak, who is the Chief Legal Executive for the Promotion Marketing Association based in New York. Before he took that position he had extensive legal background in the advertising marketing and promotion area. Ed is also a published author, a book collector, and sort of a well-known raconteur, so we're looking forward to the comments that he has today.

Finally, at the end of the row, Jeff Greenbaum, a partner in the New York law firm of Frankfurt Kumit Klein & Selz. Jeff is the former chair of the Consumer Affairs Committee of the New York City Bar. He's also a member of the Promotion Marketing Association's Government and Legal Affairs Committee. He also, to be frank, has one of the most facile and interesting minds of any attorney I know, which means that both it's always interesting and stimulating to talk to him, and also by the end of the conversation I feel like I'm back in the middle of a law school exam. So we have a lot to look forward to from these three great panelists.

I want to call your attention to the little form, the results of our -- the questions that were asked today. But before I do that, I really want to share one form with you that I really thought had some amazing, amazing results. Let me just read it to you briefly. It said the top three problems, this person said the top

four problems, sorry, we're not doing that, but what we do know is according to our very unscientific study, what a shock, I'm not suggesting that there might be a little bit of home team bias here, but the number one problem, according to the attendees today, was drum roll please, consumer error. Second, drum roll, consumer rebate fraud. And then we had a tie about for third, complex and confusing offers, delays in processing, and the problems with inconsistent industry standards with a need for industry standards. As I said, were we to have a hundred consumers or a hundred law enforcement officers, a hundred other people in the audience, perhaps we might get a slightly different response. But certainly this lets us know a little bit about where folks are coming from.

Not Miss Cleo, we've already sued her, but something tells me when I ask Norma Garcia if she -- if her top three were the same as those top three, I don't think I'm going out too far on a limb, to suggest she might have some slightly different perspectives. Norma, what were your -- how do you perceive these top three?

MS. GARCIA: Well, I'm happy to say you're not on the limb alone. We certainly see these as concerns that would naturally arise in the context of individuals

who deal with this issue. But from the consumer perspective we have a slightly different take on it, and that is that we think that consumers really need to be able to get rebates easily, that there's too much difficulty involved in the process. And the obstacles that are in the way of consumers ultimately receiving those rebate checks for us is the number one problem.

Our second problem is we think that there are serious privacy considerations that are not being addressed in the consumer rebate process. And that is something obviously that hasn't been identified by this room as a top priority, but it is a top priority for us.

We also think that in terms of one of the best practices that is out there for consumers being able to receive the benefit of the rebate that they're offered, is the process that was described by the gentleman from Costco, where consumers can actually get the rebate at the cash register. We think that's number one, everyone should be doing that. So for us, best practices is also on the top of the list.

MS. FAIR: Ed, how about you?

MR. KABAK: Well, I actually come fairly close to the list you gave. In terms of getting the rebate at the cash register, I think that's difficult for a lot of reasons. One is it's necessary to detect consumer fraud,

For The Record, Inc.

but secondly, and again particularly coming from an era in which paper is now to some extent replaced by electronics, it takes a couple weeks basically to turn around in a rebate processing to the extent you have to batch process it, you've got to validate and verify unusual problems, and then start printing and mailing the drafts of the rebate checks in whatever form they exist. And I think we heard from the last panel that basically the process of clearing rebates has gone down to like 21 days or so from an even greater amount, and that's an achievement.

rebates made available at the cash register I think unfortunately would basically encourage additional consumer fraud, which is an incremental problem as well. But I do think that is a solution that doesn't really help anyone in the industry. But what certainly should take place is clear and concise offers, and much in line with our suggested policies and with sufficiently clear disclosure we are certainly opposed to people hiding the ball as was made evident in Dean Graybill's presentation. PMA is a trade association that really wants to be associated with honest and ethical practices and pretty much straight shooting all the way.

MS. FAIR: What about you, Jeff? Any reaction

For The Record, Inc.

L t	to the	se to	p thre	ee?
-----	--------	-------	--------	-----

MR. GREENBAUM: Well, I think that, and who knows whether this falls in the top three or not, but the advice that I give to clients is that, and I think it's a critical thing that really has to come out of this day, which just as an aside I'm so happy to be a part of this, this is really one of the most incredible days in terms of just the depth of the content, I mean the really unbelievable way we've covered this material, and I just really want to compliment you guys, because I feel like all I do is go to conferences on advertising and this is just, you know, one of the only ones that I've ever haven't left the room for two hours to make phone calls. So I really want to compliment you.

MS. FAIR: I'm a little concerned, because I'm often speaking at those conferences, Jeff.

[Laughter.]

MR. GREENBAUM: I would never, I would never leave the room for Lesley.

What I would want to say is I think the critical issue here is training. And it's training marketing people. In-house lawyers and outside lawyers when they're faced with these issues, if they're faced with a draft of a TV script or a produced TV commercial, or a draft of a print ad, or a program that's already

For The Record, Inc.

been developed and out there and now we're trying to
figure out how to advertise this thing. And if the
lawyers are getting involved in the process at this point
it's just way too late. We see all those disclosures
thrown up there on the screen and you go lawyers are
faced with programs that they're just not able to
advertise. So I think that one of the things that
lawyers really need to do is get with the marketing
people before these programs are developed and sort of
talk through, well if you're going to do this program
let's talk about what it's going to mean in terms of how
are we going to inform consumers in a clear and
understandable way how this program is going to work. If
you run a print ad with seven different rebate offers
with bundling eleven different products that involve
service credits and mail-in rebates, and in store instant
rebates in some circumstances, you're never going to be
able to advertise that thing properly.

So I think that one of the big messages here is that in order to get something clear you're going to have to start early on in the process. And if you teach the marketing people, you know, what are the limits of what you can advertise in a clear way, it's going to solve a lot of these other problems.

MS. FAIR: Let's talk about when we look at

For The Record, Inc.

every step of the way, let's talk first about consumer education. Regardless of whether this is an accurate reflection, I think we would all agree that it's just good policy, it's good business, to do whatever can be done to educate consumers. I think Marcy Sims already took the an educated consumer is our best customer, I would have preferred that for an FTC slogan, but they've already got that.

How do we educate consumers? Assuming that that's at least part of the issue here, what are the effective ways do you think, and let me start with you, Norma, to educate consumers?

MS. GARCIA: We think it's very important for consumers to be educated, but they need to be educated about something that really works. If we're talking about educating consumers about a process that's too complex or too cumbersome, then what's the point. In the first place, we have to have a process that works for consumers. Ultimately the consumer is your customer. When consumers are unhappy you're going to be unhappy. It's going to impact your bottom line. So I agree with Jeff. When it comes to making sure that the people who are responsible for getting the message out there have the advice that they need on the front end to do it effectively and to do it within the confines of the law.

For The Record, Inc.

Obviously to the extent that you can educate your consumers at the very beginning of the process of what's involved in a particular rebate process, assuming this is a sound process, and not a flawed one, that's the best thing.

We think that consumers need to know right up front, first point of contact, are you advertising a product and you're enticing consumers to come buy this product because you're offering a rebate? Well, right there and then in that advertising moment is when you should tell consumers what's going to be involved in the rebate process to get the full value of what is being offered to them.

Obviously we spend a lot of time educating consumers on a whole host of issues, but importantly, it needs to come from many sources. And the marketer in many cases is in the best place to give the most effective consumer education on the front end.

MS. FAIR: How would you respond, Ed or Jeff, about the role of the marketer in consumer education?

MR. KABAK: Well, I think the marketer certainly can get actively involved, even to the extent of using his website to publish simple guides as to how to respond to rebates. But I think ultimately even beyond that I don't think the process is necessarily that

cumbersome. One of the things that came out of, I guess
Tim Silk's presentation, is one of the main reasons why
rebates aren't fulfilled is procrastination on the part
of consumers. That doesn't excuse the failure to make
appropriate disclosure when those kinds of situations
take place.

But education is certainly something that can be done in little -- even in pamphlets or in a website posting, and I think PMA from its standpoint will probably do the same kind of thing on its website.

MS. FAIR: How many, how many consumers go to the PMA website, though?

MR. KABAK: You know, we have an educational foundation, so we are thinking actually of doing it, you know, going forward with actually a separate educational website. We do have the Consumer Week website as well, for National Consumer's Week, so we do have already a consumer website to deal with coupon counts, we deal with the coupon counts. Yeah, we're a trade association as well.

So, yes, the best solution for education really is self-reliant publication by the marketers I think, and that could be done in any number of a kind of ways.

MR. GREENBAUM: I would say that consumer education is absolutely consistent with what advertising

For The Record, Inc.

is about. Advertising is consumer education. And advertisers haven't done their job properly if they haven't clearly and accurately told consumers what it is they're going to get, and what the terms are, what the terms they're going to have to follow in order to get those things.

So what I would say is this is the third event that I've been to this week, and no one has asked the question that was asked at the other two events, which is how small can I make the disclosures in my advertising.

And, you know, the response is as you would expect, which is well you have to educate consumers, are consumers going to see the disclosures, are they going to read them, and are they going to understand them. And I think that consumers don't need to look to other places to other organizations to educate consumers, they actually have to do it in the advertising.

And I think the thing that I would say that's absolutely critical, and one of the speakers but I can't remember who said it, which is you got to listen to what the consumers are saying. One of the pieces of advice that I give clients is read your consumer complaints, aggregate your consumer complaints. If people are complaining that they're not getting their products on time you got to look at, you got to look at that problem.

If you're seeing too much, if you're seeing people not getting their mail-in rebates you got to fix the problem. I think your goal has to be improve the program each time you do it. And if that means making your offers clearer, if it means changing your offers, that's what you have to do.

And I think that companies are working toward that, because the reality is what my clients tell me is that if a rebate program doesn't work properly they don't have happy consumers and it causes problems. Certainly the statistics show that as well. So I think programs like this are excellent for helping marketers understand what the options are and what some of the problems are that consumers are running into, and I think it will help -- this day should help many, many people adjust some of their rebate terms to make them simpler.

MR. KABAK: I mean particularly if you want good customers, you don't want to give any consumer a bad experience because they're not likely to come back, not likely to come back to the same program. But it's also clear that consumers do enjoy rebates and manufacturers need them for a number of reasons, they're very, very valuable. I think the Hewlett Packard presentation made that clear, and basically it adds a tremendous amount of variety to the marketing mix, it's very, very helpful

with respect to trial offers of new products, and it's

particularly helpful when you're considering other

products as well that are somewhat challenged or

otherwise.

There are valid business reasons on both sides to continue a beneficial rebate relationships, and you don't want to basically lose your best customers by doing a bad program.

MS. FAIR: We've heard about bad programs,
Hal's phrase, "brand suicide." So it seems that we've
heard from real experts that the key is to give consumers
the information they need in a clear and conspicuous way.
Everybody seems to agree that's the right idea, and yet
we still have thousands of complaints from consumers. So
what needs to be done? What's the solution to the
problem about the kind of information to be given in the
ad?

MR. GREENBAUM: I think one thing I would say is that lawyers have to start to be a little bit less afraid. And what I mean by that is that often marketers today feel like they need to include more information in their disclaimers. And one thing that I do when I get an ad is I frequently cross-out disclaimers and I would say, look, a big block of text is probably not going to do you a lot of good, so let's look at this and make some hard

decisions about what consumers really need to know.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

consumers.

Often cases you can cut a disclaimer in half and suddenly turn it into something that is actually understandable to

> So I think the first thing I would say to a marketer is take a look at your disclaimers, are people really going to be able to wade through it, and if not, take a hard look and start to cross some things out, start to eliminate, find the right time to disclose each piece of information. The point that Linda made in her presentation about the best practices was there's no one right answer about when information needs to be disclosed. It's going to depend on the type of terms and the type of offer, and I think you have to take a hard look. If you take a one size fits all you create this giant long paragraph that, you know, sort of makes you feel better that you've included every possible scenario that could possibly need to be included, you're going to have a disclosure that's probably not going to make anyone happy.

> So I say start with less, and really figure out what are the critical things that consumers need to know.

MS. GARCIA: I think the governing principles have to be that the disclosure must be simple, it must be clear, and it must be accurate. And if you use those as

For The Record, Inc.

your guiding principles I think you will come to the sort of conclusion that Jeff is suggesting here, and that is you're making sure that people know what they should know in a way that they can actually understand it. Otherwise there's really no point to even writing the words if they're not words that can communicate meaning.

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

MS. FAIR: I think one thing that crossed my mind, I know a number of you in the audience were present about five or six years ago at an event called 'Disclosure Exposure' that the Federal Trade Commission put on with the National Advertising Division of the Better Business Bureau. And we gave kind of a bad example of an ad and had three leading ad agencies and their attorneys redo it. And I thought the interesting thing that they raised is the minute you start talking about what should be in the big block of text you're kind of on the wrong path already. That the best way to do it is to incorporate it into the offer itself, whether that's fonts, whether that's color, how that's done. how do you get the point across that disclosure doesn't have to be done at the bottom of the page or in a superscript, how do you convey that?

MR. GREENBAUM: I think one thing I would say is that just incredibly revealing study that the FTC did in connection with the review of the endorsement guides.

For The Record, Inc.

And for those of you who haven't read it, I suggest you take a look at the studies, it's on the FTC website.

SPEAKER: Is that an endorsement?

MR. GREENBAUM: It's more of a reference than an endorsement. But what the study showed, and it was really unbelievable, it was in the context of some weight loss ads and some business opportunity ads, and essentially the test ads had a disclosure in 14 point type in red in bold in the center of the ad, so, red, bold, center of the ad, not the bottom center, the center of the ad, and it was 14 point type. And what the study showed is that this disclosure was not effective.

So I mean unless all of you out there are using 14 point, red, bold disclosures in the center of your ad, you know, you have a potential issue out there.

So I think what I would say is that, Lesley, the point you're making is absolutely right. Which is that disclosures often aren't doing the job, and we have to look very closely at better ways to communicate that kind of information to consumers. And certainly the point that you raised is a good one, and it's one that I work with clients a lot about, which is how can we make the disclosure part of the offer? How can we tell people that instead of sort of communicating a message to people in two separate places, how can we make it all part of

one thing? And I think that those are difficult things to do, and it requires the lawyers getting involved early on in the process, and it requires some give and take on the creative side, and it may require, you know, some additional education in whatever forms to convince marketers that sometimes that's what's going to be required. But I don't think it's easy.

MS. FAIR: We've had a number of suggestions about possible solutions on the forms that attendees turned in. Let me just throw these out and whether you think this is a move toward a solution.

One proposed suggestion is more law enforcement actions at the federal and state level. How much effect do you think those have on changing company's policies?

MR. KABAK: I think if you're a legitimate company, as most of the companies are, and is engaging in any kind of commercial business, and you're a fly by night company, it has some effect. But really if you're a fly by night company, basically, it has a bigger effect to the extent that the people are caught. But I mean law enforcement is really not the solution. It's important that the FTC enforce Section 5, it's clearly important that they use the existing tools where there's empirical evidence of violation. But I don't think law enforcement

is a solution by itself.

What's important, really, is the kind of selfregulatory standard, and education, and compliance, and better knowledge by all the parties.

I just don't see it as a solution to deal with the problem. Because I think even in areas where there has been enforcement in many cases there's not necessarily intentional misrepresentation. But there are errors, and there are mistakes, and the FTC is a very judicious arbiter of when and under what circumstances to bring cases.

So I don't think using an increased law enforcement standard is necessarily the way to go.

MR. GREENBAUM: I think the thing I would say is certainly the law enforcement that's happened has been tremendously effective and influential to marketers, and I think that we hear you. I think that when the FTC takes action, whether it's a report, or whether it's a workshop, or whether it's a new guide to industry that's issued, I think we really hear you and we really try to make adjustments based on that, and try and learn from it. So I think that what the FTC's doing is working, and I think that this workshop -- or at least it's the beginning of a process that is working. And I think that something like this now is going to have some effect,

For The Record, Inc.

it's going to take some time for industry to digest it and work on technological changes, work on just different kinds of approaches. But I think it's a good productive process.

MR. KABAK: One more point. Coming from many years of being General Counsel different places, I mean when the FTC goes after a company, a significant company, or even a publically traded company and obtains a five to ten million dollar judgment from it, people pay attention to that. Lawyers and outside counsel usually walk around corporations with a news clip of that in their pocket. It's a very, very effective remedy when you're advising clients.

MS. GARCIA: From our perspective, law enforcement actions act as a deterrent to the sorts of practices that really take advantage of consumers. It sends a clear message to practitioners that they need to do something differently. So there's an educational component to it as well, as Jeff mentioned.

There's also another component that's really important from the consumer perspective. And that is that it creates consumer confidence in the regulatory agencies that are charged with protecting the public around these business practices. And from our perspective that's a really good thing as well.

For The Record, Inc.

MS. FAIR: Another thing that's been raised, I
guess kind of akin to the nutrition labeling on the back
of a can of soup or a can of beans, what about the
possibility some folks suggested of some kind of
standardized rebate form? Do you think that's part of
the solution, not part of the solution?

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

MR. GREENBAUM: I think it's not part of the I think that what we would say is that there's solution. a lot of different kinds of companies out there doing a lot of different kinds of offers with a lot of different kinds of products. I think the FTC has long believed in not stifling creativity, but basically using Section 5 as a way to look at practices and determine whether something's either deceptive or unfair. I don't think that, you know, either self-regulatory organizations or the government should -- needs to at this point set-up a nutrition label. I think there's lots of different ways that we can accomplish a goal of clear communication, and I think we have to continue to explore that.

MR. KABAK: I would just say the one size fits all does create a problem in a lot of areas, including the area of services, particularly when you're selling services, not just products, it's very, very complex.

MS. GARCIA: I think even if you're not moving towards standardized forms or language there should be an

effort to move towards standardized simplicity, and easing conditions for consumers in order to redeem their rebates.

MS. FAIR: Some other people suggested FTC guidance, possibly rule-making. What about that as a solution, a possible solution to the problem?

MR. GREENBAUM: I think this may be a good time to mention, again, sort of Connecticut and Rhode Island. I think that there is certainly concern on the industry part to the extent that the states started to continue, continue to get into the business of adding new rebate restrictions, new rebate requirements, that are conflicting with other states, and are conflicting with general industry practice. Because what you're going to end up with is companies being forced to add more disclosures and to make their offers more complicated.

And one of the questions that Eileen raised that I don't think we got an answer to, which I wanted to at least give my point of view on, which is that I think that the effect that we've seen in Connecticut and Rhode Island is that those statutes have in fact hurt consumers. Because of companies reacting by providing instant rebates, you know, you can't turn a nation-wide program into a 48 state plus District of Columbia program that easily, so the easiest thing to do is simply to void

Connecticut and Rhode Island.

So I think that the concern here is that by inconsistent regulation by various states it's really going to end up, there's a significant concern and I think we've already seen some evidence of that, of these offers not becoming available to consumers. So I think that the more easy we can make it for marketers to communicate this information in a simple way, and in a way that works the same everywhere we go, is going to make things easier --

Certainly encouraging other states not to add in things that are inconsistent. The sort of legislators that I've spoken to on this issue have really understood this idea. And I know that in some states they've specifically not gone down this road because they understand that prohibiting this sort of disclosure of the after rebate price is going to hurt consumers, because these offers are just not going to be made available to them.

So I think that, you know, anything we can do to help marketers do there -- make these offers in a consistent way, and give them easy guidance I think is a good one.

MS. GARCIA: I think if you have some standards promulgated by the FTC regarding what should happen with

For The Record, Inc.

rebates and if they're effective standards, I think you're going to see less movement in the states to try and pass laws to deal with the problems that arise in the states. So to the extent that the FTC can take a leadership role in creating standards that are protective of consumers but at the same time leave room for the marketplace to work, I think you're going to see a positive effect in the states.

Now, that being said, if the states perceive that nothing is being done on any other level to protect consumers, and the concerns are very real, the states are going to step in, and you are going to see perhaps inconsistent methodology of promulgating laws in different states, a patchwork quilt of law-making. But that's happening for a reason. That's happening because the problems are real and no one else is addressing them. So to the extent that you can take care of that, I think everyone will be in a better place.

MS. FAIR: What form would you see that kind of guidance or advice coming in, Norma?

MS. GARCIA: I think the FTC should set standards for what should happen with respect to how the rebates are advertised, how they're delivered, the systems that are required for consumers in order to redeem those rebates, the processes by which those

For The Record, Inc.

rebates must be fulfilled, the form in which those rebates must be fulfilled. I mean the idea of getting a check in the mail that looks like a piece of junk, I mean that's really bad, I've received that and geez I do this for a living. I almost threw mine away. And I can imagine a lot of people do. And there must be some ways that can be developed to protect consumers at every stage of the game and still provide room for this to be a viable industry.

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

It sounds to me a little bit MR. GREENBAUM: too soon for that. I think that certainly this workshop has been an important and useful dialogue. And I think we should look to industry to react and to develop its own guidelines, and to sort of track that and see how it's going. I also think technology is catching up. fact that we've seen these incredible online fulfillment systems and how incredible they are, I think it's going to take some time for those things to roll out and be made available to more and more companies. So to me I look at that and I go we shouldn't develop a system that starts to regulate, to the extent that it is broken, regulate a broken system when the system is in an incredible state of flux right now. And chances are mail-in rebates are going to look very, very different a few years from now than they do today.

For The Record, Inc.

So I think that what we're doing here is a
positive step. Letting regulations, letting self-
regulation have a chance, as Linda mentioned in her
presentation, is a good one. And I also think let
technology have an effect, because it think that it will
have a big one.

MS. GARCIA: Well, rebates have been around for a while and there have been many opportunities to self-regulate, and unfortunately those haven't always been successful. To the extent they have been successful, developing rules and guidelines really would be consistent with those best practices. So those companies that are already engaging in those practices really have nothing to fear by the passage of or adoption of additional rules.

mean obviously technology will evolve, and the FTC hopefully will be very cognizant of that and leave room in whatever rules they create to add some flexibility for those sorts of developments. But self-regulation from our perspective hasn't worked, and to the extent that it has worked it shouldn't conflict with any strong rules that are put in place by the FTC.

MR. KABAK: I would say going back to the same issue that it's important to give industry always a

chance to self-regulate before any consideration is given to the imposition of particularly a federal standard. And particularly where, as here, it seems clear from the standpoint of protecting against consumer fraud and maybe improper procedures as well by certain manufacturers, the

6 paperless kind of way of redeeming rebates may be a

7 very -- a solution to a lot of people's problems.

I don't think it's a good idea to go to a federal standard. I don't think this is a situation like we had with CAN-SPAM, where there are other reasons to federalize or preempt any states. I think the trend in laws of the states has been sort of, sort of a tendency to slowly grow in some areas. But I think the technology will probably make things happen a lot faster and in very simple ways will clear up a lot of the issues, along with self-regulation. I don't think this is an issue in terms of state laws like gift cards, where there's clearly a major desire on the part of all states to eliminate dormancy expenses and reduce and deal with expiration dates. It doesn't have the same kind of impetus. I think that it's much better to let it evolve in a natural way.

MS. FAIR: I'm interested in your comment, everyone's comments about electronic submissions. And certainly we've seen some great suggestions and some

1	intriguing ideas. What do we do right now, however, for
2	the 20 percent of Americans who are not online, typically
3	more likely to be older Americans or lower income
4	Americans?

MS. GARCIA: One way to deal with that is by offering a rebate right at the cash register. That's the great equalizer, right? It doesn't matter whether you have a computer at home or if you even know how to use one, you're going to get your rebate right when you purchase that product. So that's one way to do it.

Another way perhaps is to have the next best thing, which might be a kiosk located in a store that the consumer can then go to, punch in a code, get the rebate check. This is one way to certainly diminish the digital divide.

MR. GREENBAUM: I think the one -- a couple concerns that I have, the first that I'm concerned with any steps we take that is going to take -- that are going to take away the value of rebates to consumers who you're getting the greatest value to them. I admit that I bought an expensive electronic product recently and it had a fairly long rebate period and I said I'll get to it, I'll get to it, and I admit that I forgot to send the rebate form in. So, you know, I think that maybe I'm not the one, I'm not elderly, and I have online access, so

For The Record, Inc.

maybe I'm certainly not your target, but I do think that by adding all of these requirements, if we get in the business of telling marketers they have to do it a certain way and we're going to make it more expensive, we're going to make it more difficult, and we're going to tell them they only can provide programs where there's a rebate in store, we're just going to see fewer rebates available.

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

So I think that the answer is looking at what the problems are, encouraging companies to see where rebates are not happening, where consumers are not getting them, where the breakage is, where the slippage is, look at those problems and try to address those They're going to be different for every problems. company, they're going to be different for the types of products that are being sold, and encourage companies, continue to encourage companies to sort of address those problems. Because I think you're right, an online solution is not going to ever, at least in the foreseeable future, be the only solution, so we're going to have to continue to address ways to make rebates clear. And I think we saw some really helpful and impressive examples today of ways that can work.

MS. FAIR: Well, certainly our goal is to stop deceptionage [sic] through disclosureage [sic].

For The Record, Inc.

4	
1	[Laughter.]

MS. FAIR: But I think that raises the issue. I think Ed, he used -- he dropped the F bomb there, federal legislation. Some companies say, my gosh we have a crazy quilt of state by state legislation. Other folks are saying the response to that would be handling things at a federal level. How do you look at the prospect of whether federal legislation would be helpful or harmful in coming toward a solution?

MR. KABAK: How do I look at it? I don't think it necessarily would be helpful. I think it's basically there are plenty of laws on the books already. The FTC has more than enough statutory authority. So I don't think it needs to go beyond that with respect to its enforcement against companies that violate the law concerning rebates. I don't see it as necessary at all, and basically I don't think the state laws are that much yet a crazy quilt pattern that makes doing business impossible. Certainly to the extent that there are isolated cases where Rhode Island and Connecticut are examples, it does make doing business a little more difficult, but that's no reason to have a federal standard at this point.

MS. GARCIA: Well, from our perspective assuming that we're talking about an effective federal

For The Record, Inc.

law that protects consumers, isn't it a good thing that consumers in California have the same protections as consumers in New York or Connecticut? I mean that's not a bad approach. So obviously we have to look at what sort of federal proposal we're talking about here. But that's not necessarily a bad approach.

MS. FAIR: Well, I have a few final questions at the end, but I want to give the audience a chance to ask questions since we have such esteemed experts.

I also get to channel my inner Oprah, so let me get the microphone, and trust me, I do have an inner Oprah, to see what questions the attendees have for the three experts we have on the panel.

Ouestions? Dr. Silk?

MR. SILK: Maybe it's not fair, it's not really a question. But I think from a behavioral perspective, and I'm not condoning legislation either way, I look at behavior very neutrally. There's a real opportunity to embrace a standard. It's not a coincidence that stop signs look the same in every state. There's an opportunity here to help the industry. You're allowing a few bad apples to pollute the name of rebates. I don't believe there will be consolidation of standards because there's no consolidation in the industry, there's too many players. And so to say that there's been no chance

to give them a chance to self-regulate, I don't even think they've had a chance yet, it's not consolidated.

So like how long do we wait for that to happen?

So I know that you have to give freedoms to the firms. I want to give freedom to the firms. But there is a behavioral advantage for all consumers to be able to identify is this a rebate program. That's what you want to do, you're trying to target these promotions.

And I don't think the instant rebate is part of the issue, because rebates are a price discrimination tactic, and there's nothing wrong with that, we have senior's discounts. So to go so far as to say should everyone be redeeming, that's not the issue, it's up to the consumer's choice, we have to allow them to behave.

But I think there's an opportunity here that if you were to standardize the visual format to some extent that would help both the firm and the consumer side. So if you could have responses to that.

MR. GREENBAUM: All I can say is I thought your presentation this morning was absolutely fascinating, and the next time I get a call from the western region I'm bringing you as an expert to defend me that my complicated offer that only had seven days to redeem was actually better for consumers.

I think, I think the point is that these are

For The Record, Inc.

1	complicated issues and there isn't one obvious solution.
2	And I think that your research shows that we have to
3	really think very, very hard, and we have to sort of let
4	people explore various solutions. Because certainly your
5	research would show something very, very different than
6	what would be what people would expect laws to say.
7	So I think that we have to this isn't the
8	moment I think to legislate. There may come a time.
9	There may be sufficient reasons to do so. But certainly
10	Section 5 gives the FTC all the authority it needs to go
11	after the bad actors. But at this point I think it's
12	just not clear what any of that would say.
13	MS. FAIR: Other responses from Norma or Ed on
14	Dr. Silk's point?
15	MR. KABAK: No. I would agree, though, and
16	particularly since some of the material that was in the
17	presentation was really counter-intuitive, you have to
18	let the facts play out for themselves. And I don't see
19	any need for a federal standard at this point. I think
20	ultimately it will place sort of too heavy a hand on the
21	shoulder of the industry and probably hurt the consumer
22	in the end.
23	MS. FAIR: Other questions?
24	MS. GARCIA: I found your comment quite

25

interesting, and I really appreciated the example you

gave of the stop sign, and the reason why it's effective is because it actually communicates what it needs to communicate. So to the extent that rebates can be standardized to communicate essential information to consumers that's a good thing.

MS. FAIR: Other comments or questions? And if you could identify yourself?

MS. BIXLER: Diana Bixler. And I'm a marketing lawyer. And I would say that one of the things that rebates communicates to consumers, when you use that term, is that they need to submit something afterwards to obtain the dollar value benefit of that. So to the extent that you're suggesting that all, quote, rebates should be payable at the point of purchase you're essentially saying there will be no rebates, and basically removing that option from the option to promotional incentives that marketers have always enjoyed.

The idea, I mean absent saying instant rebate, everybody always assumes, or I hate to put thoughts into people's minds, but increasingly recently states have been adding a statutory definition of rebate, and in every case it calls for submission of something after the purchase to obtain the incentive to obtain the promotional value. And should you have to give it to

them at the point of purchase you really, you know, how you account for it and who actually funds it behind the scenes is irrelevant, because we're talking about the message to consumers, and that's telling consumers there won't be any rebates or you're changing the definition of it. And as Jeff just noticed, it will reduce the values that are offered in those rebates.

MS. FAIR: Comments from the panel?

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$ GREENBAUM: I think maybe we should go back to that slide, which I know conveniently was removed from the screen.

MS. FAIR: No, that's strictly our security 15 minute cut-off that you saw on FTC computers. Good advice for everybody, but nothing --

MR. GREENBAUM: But if you recall, the number one consumer the number one problem identified by this survey, admittedly unscientific, was consumer error. I think we do have to also react to the fact that look this is not all just a marketer problem, and that sometimes consumers are just not going to follow instructions, and they're going to make mistakes, and they're not going to do it right, and they're going to miss deadlines and they're not going to cash checks. And that is not something the marketer's responsible for. And you could put the Surgeon General's warning on the side of the

For The Record, Inc.

package but there's still going to be people that are going to smoke.

So I think it is important to realize that there are limits to what marketers can do. And we can be reasonable and we can be clear about our offers, and we can look to make them better and clearer and easier to redeem, but at some point we're going to have to say to consumers you also have to take -- you also have to be a partner in this enterprise and take some responsibility for reading the terms of the offer and complying with them.

MS. FAIR: But considering the definition of deception under Section 5, is what reasonable consumer interpretation is, isn't the fact that consumers are the ones being confused by that say more about the offer than about the consumer?

MR. GREENBAUM: Well, I guess, of course, you know, it's an objective standard as opposed to the way consumers are actually reacting. And so I would say objectively when we look at an offer, you know, is this something that a reasonable consumer should be confused by? I think that there's a lot of things that the majority of Americans do and believe that I wouldn't consider to be reasonable. So but that's really not the purpose of this, of this program today.

For The Record, Inc.

1	But I do think it's not just about the
2	empirical data, it's about what would a reasonable person
3	looking at that offer and that ad believe. And I think
4	that that's in some level equally important, if not more
5	so, because that's the legal standard, than what
6	percentage of the breakage there is.

MS. GARCIA: What happens when the consumer tries to follow instructions that are just so complex that no one can figure them out. I know of a case where an individual was trying to redeem her rebate, she couldn't figure it out, she went back to the store to get their advice on how to do it, they thought they gave her the right advice, and guess what, it was wrong, she couldn't collect. This happens.

So when we ask ourselves, our consumers of course consumers have an obligation to follow instructions. Everyone has that obligation. But what instructions are we giving them? Are they instructions that the reasonable consumer can follow? I certainly hope so, because if not they start complaining. And when they start complaining that adds heat under you, and that's not a good thing for you either.

MS. FAIR: We have a question here. If you'll identify yourself?

MR. WOODWARD: Hi, Greg Woodward, IMR Group. I

For The Record, Inc.

1	just wanted to make two comments. First of all, I agree
2	completely with the concept that technology is really the
3	solution. And the second piece that the industry should
4	regulate itself, and I think that's important.
5	The number one thing is to be able to make the
6	consumer happy while allowing the manufacturers to
7	benefit from the value of breakage, or the rebate versus
8	the instant discount. We've developed that solution.
9	And basically you mentioned something about the
10	microphone, you mentioned an in-store kiosk and that's
11	what we're going on lines with. We're preparing to
12	launch an online solution and an in-store solution, which
13	is real time, which operates as a service to the consumer
14	for a fee, like a Coin Star machine would. This model is
15	designed to stay ahead of legislation in the areas of
16	liabilities and things like that. More importantly, it's
17	protected by an international portfolio of patents and
18	also can be implemented in the retail space without
19	modifying any existing systems.
20	So there's a technology solution.
21	MS. GARCIA: Can I ask you a question? What
22	are you fees like?

MR. WOODWARD: We don't charge fulfillment fees 24 to the manufacturers.

25 MS. GARCIA: How about the consumer?

23

For The Record, Inc.

1	MR. WOODWARD: Eight percent.
2	MS. GARCIA: Eight percent of the total rebate?
3	MR. WOODWARD: Coin Star's 8.2. It's an option
4	to mail it in now. You can get a hundred percent on a
5	store gift card and the retailer pays the fee. So this
6	is something we started talking about at CES in January,
7	and hopefully the technology, hopefully your solution
8	will happen, the technology will solve the problems.
9	MS. GARCIA: Thank you.
10	MS. FAIR: Another question here?
11	MR. LAVERTU: Hi, my name is Fred Lavertu and
12	I'm from (inaudible). And I hope you'll allow me to be
13	your (inaudible) to your inner Oprah. It's a joke, I'm a
14	married man, I'm taken.
15	[Laughter.]
16	MR. LAVERTU: About the notion that the and
17	my wife will read this, true, and, hi, Suzy, by the way.
18	I'll be home tomorrow.
19	Given the comments that, and I'm glad to see
20	the panel, but anyways, Hal had said earlier that most of
21	the practices that we've been talking about, and I work
22	for (inaudible), we see complaints about these practices.
23	To give some context we're the (inaudible) to the FTC.
24	But in any event, given that Hal's comment that
25	a lot of these practices amount basically to brand

suicide, and yet they still go on, how realistic is it to expect the industry to regulate itself when the practices themselves are first of all hurting themselves but still go on, but obviously there's a profit motive behind it.

So how can we, or what can we or the industry offer to do, or prepare to do, to regulate itself?

MR. GREENBAUM: You know, I think those are obviously great questions, and I think that there are no easy solutions. And I think this is one step among many steps to try to look for a solution. I mean certainly you can post speed limit signs on the highway, but unless Lesley's driving you to work in the morning the federal government is not going to ensure that you don't go over the speed limits.

So I think that there is not one easy way to solve the problem and I think that federal legislation or a patchwork of state legislation is not going to solve the problem either. We're still going to have problems. We're still going to have offers that are confusing. And I think that the better solution is certainly this kind of discussion, education, and looking to technology to sort of enable marketers in a cost-effective way to make the consumer better.

 $$\operatorname{MR.\ LAVERTU}\colon$$ If I may just pursue my answer. While it may be true that federal regulation is not the

For The Record, Inc.

answer, and given that it's a U.S. problem I'm not going to comment on it, but what -- you've sort of answered my question, but what can the industry do? I mean I realize that you cannot stop me from driving my car 200 miles an hour if I feel like it, but as the people who are driving the car, what do you propose to do to help solve the matter? In other words, are you going to slow down? Or how are you going to do it.

MR. GREENBAUM: Well, you know, I'm not, look, I'm not here representing a specific company, so I don't think that I actually have specific proposals that I want to make on behalf of anyone other than to say that I think that these kinds of issues are the part of the discussions that companies are having. Companies really truly are looking for solutions and they don't want unhappy consumers. And I've never once had a discussion with a client ever where they said what can we do to make people not redeem this offer. And, you know, oh what great news, suddenly this rebate offer didn't cost us anything.

I think that the reality is these companies want repeat customers, they don't want the brand suicide. But I think the reality is is that change takes time and change is often very expensive, especially when you're talking about the redesign of big company systems and

websites and all that. But I think we're moving in the right direction. And I think some of the changes we've seen today are really incredible examples of what can be done, and I think that this is just the beginning of seeing a lot more of that, at least hopefully it is.

MS. FAIR: Time for one more question.

MR. GLASSER: Hi, Roy Glasser. I spoke before. I'd like to say first that as a consumer I think that something needs to be done. The regulation, I think there needs to be some kinds of it. But as far as the forms go, I think if they were templates and the manufacturers could say well we'll pick this, this, and those conditions from it, and the wording was understood, they could see the totality of what they might choose, and they could then pick whatever they want to be smaller. But there has to be something. This concept of getting a rebate in 21 days, that company's been telling me that since 2002, and I when I get a rebate in 21 days the other 10 rebates take a lot longer than it says on paper.

So obviously things need to be done. And I think that complete government regulation is probably not the right way to go at this point, but there need to be guidelines and the crooks have to be gotten out of it.

MR. GREENBAUM: Yeah, I just think there's one

For The Record, Inc.

good thing to say there, which is this is not about there's always going to be a small percentage of companies that are the bad guys. This is not about the bad guys. And we don't want to develop a system of best practices or legislate based on the sort of bad out-of-line acts of a few. We have to look at those people are going to be dealt with, there's sufficient authority both at the federal and state level to deal with it. And really what we're looking at here is for the people who are trying to do it the right way and who are looking for solutions how can we best help them to do that.

MR. KABAK: I would just say self-regulatory actions have taken place in a lot of industries, you've got (inaudible), you got NAD, Children's Food Initiative, and they need to be followed and dealt with, but they are an intelligent way of motivating people who have a real business and economic interest in proceeding fairly with consumers and honestly in a reasonable way to continue to do business with the consumers that also like this process, and without necessarily having the heavy hand of regulation and federal regulation brought down upon the industry.

MS. FAIR: We have, I'm sorry, Norma?

MS. GARCIA: One last comment on that.

Developing laws or regulations that are designed to get

For The Record, Inc.

at the practices of even just the bad actors, that's a good thing. If you're doing the right thing these are not going to impact you at all. They're going to clean up the industry, they're going to create greater consumer confidence, and that's all positive.

MS. FAIR: I'm sorry that we have advertised that we're finishing at 4:30, we're going to make that a truthful and substantiated claim. But Matt Gold will mention how to put additional material and information in the record, and how to get everyone's point of view mentioned.

I'd like just one last question for the panelists. Assume this is a magic wand. It was paid for with lowest government contract bid, so that's what you get. Norma, if you have the magic wand what one change or one activity, what would you like the result of this event today to be, if you had if it was your choice, where should we go from here?

MS. GARCIA: Consumer's Union believes that rebating at the cash register is the best possible solution for consumers. That's our wish.

MR. KABAK: If I had my wish I would wish for the continued acceleration of technology which would solve a lot of these problems, and for the creation of appropriate self-regulatory standards to take place, and

1	for the consumers themserves to be better educated and
2	learn to read better.
3	MR. GREENBAUM: I think this is a very, very
4	positive day, I think we got a lot of information, I
5	think that a lot of useful information was shared. And I
6	think it should be a continuing dialogue and we should
7	continue to learn from each other. And we should
8	continue to have these conversations. And we should
9	revisit them in the not-too-distant future and see where
10	we are and see what progress is being made.
11	MS. FAIR: Thank you very much. Thank you
12	speakers. Thank you all.
13	[Applause.]
14	MS. FAIR: And the last word goes to Matthew
15	Gold.
16	MR. GOLD: I'd just like to thank all our
17	panelists and moderators, and especially our audience. I
18	don't think I've ever been at an event like this where
19	there's so little afternoon drop-off. It's very, very

Please continue to check out our website. I apologize, I don't have the URL off the top of my head. But it's the Rebate Debate website it's accessible directly from www.FTC.gov. Right on the home page there is the logo for this event, and it will lead you to the

For The Record, Inc.

impressive.

1	web page. That web page will remain active for the
2	foreseeable future.
3	Like I said, all the Power Point presentations
4	will be up in the near future, as will the transcript of
5	the event once it's ready.
6	And most importantly, the email address that
7	many of you used to preregister will remain active. And
8	we urge all of the attendees here who were not able to
9	participate, who couldn't comment or question as they
LO	wish, to use that email address to submit a comment once
L1	you've digested what went on here, and please let us
L2	benefit from your thoughts on the matter. So anything
L3	you would like to send us by way of that email address we
L 4	would greatly appreciate.
L5	MS. FAIR: What's the email address?
L 6	MR. GOLD: The email address is:
L7	rebatesworkshop@FTC.gov; rebatesworkshop@FTC.gov. But
L 8	the safest thing to do is to access it from the website
L 9	because it's a link and it will be sure to get here. But
20	it's the same mailbox that was used for preregistration,
21	and virtually all of you used that.
22	So thank you, again, all, for coming.
23	[Applause.]
24	(ADJOURNED)
25	o0o -

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
L 0	
L1	
L2	
L3	
L 4	
15	
L 6	
L7	
L 8	
L9	
20	
21	TRANSCRIPTIONIST'S CERTIFICATION
22	
23	I, V, Oliver, a duly designated
24	transcriptionist, do hereby declare and certify under
25	penalty of perjury that the foregoing pages 1 through 224

1	constitute a true, complete and accurate transcript of
2	the electronic recording taken on April 27, 2007, FTC
3	Rebate Debate, in San Francisco, California.
4	
5	
6	
7	Executed May 9, 2007, at San Luis Obispo, California.
8	
9	
LO	
L1	
L2	V Oliver, Transcriptionist
L3	California Reporting LLC
L 4	
L 5	
L 6	
L 7	
L 8	
L 9	
20	