

The Big Picture: Comprehensive Online Data Collection  
Transcript  
December 6, 2012  
4:00 PM

Session 4

WE SHOULD LOOK AT IT AS AN A  
INNOVATION POLICY BECAUSE REALLY  
VIRTUALLY ALL OF THE INNOVATION  
ON THE INTERNET DEPENDS ONE WAY  
OR THE OTHER OF COLLECTION OF  
INFORMATION, DEVELOP A PRODUCT,  
IMPROVE THE PRODUCT OR PROVIDE  
FUNDING FOR IT.  
I THINK IT REALLY NEEDS TO BE  
LOOKED AT THAT IN CONTEXT.  
I APPROACH THE SUBJECT BASICALLY  
IN TERMS OF NONSENSITIVE  
INFORMATION, I'M NOT -- NOT  
TALKING ABOUT MEDICAL  
INFORMATION OR FINANCIAL  
INFORMATION TALKING ABOUT USE OF  
INFORMATION FOR OTHER COMMERCIAL  
PURPOSES ONLINE.  
THERE IT HAS TO BE HARM BASED.  
UNLESS -- I THINK NEED TO BE  
SOMETHING MORE THAN JUST A  
SELECTION OF THE INFORMATION,  
PER SE IS A HARM.  
BECAUSE I GUESS I THINK IT NEEDS  
TO TO BE SOMETHING MORE THAN  
THAT.  
LISTENING TO THE DISCUSSION  
TODAY I THINK PEOPLE GET A LOT  
OF MILEAGE OUT OF THE TARGET  
EXAMPLE ABOUT THE PREGNANT WOMAN  
I'M SURE WE'LL HEAR THAT EXAMPLE  
THE NEXT FIVE YEARS.  
BUT IT IS AN ANECDOTE.  
IT'S SOMEWHAT OF A NOVEL  
SITUATION, I THINK THERE NEEDS  
TO BE MORE SYSTEM AT A I CAN  
EVIDENCE OF HARMS.

>> I'M KIND OF THINKING ALONG THE SAME LINES AND ALISSA. I DON'T REALLY HAVE ANY SORT OF PRESCRIPTIVE ADVICE I WANT TO DIG IN TO THIS WHY THIS IS DUTCH HARD THING TO REASON ABOUT AN GO BACK ABOUT TWEETING THE FACT THAT I'M WEARING A TIE AND OTHER PANELISTS MAY OR MAY NOT BE. ONE OF THE BIG PROBLEMS IS THAT PEOPLE'S MENTAL MODELS OF HOW THEY INTERACT WITH OTHER ENTITIES, OTHER PEOPLE IN PHYSICAL WORLD DOESN'T MAP DIRECTLY TO THE ONLINE WORLD. BECAUSE A LOT OF THE ACTORS IN THE ONLINE WORLD ARE INVISIBLE, USERS DON'T PERCEIVE THEM. SO THERE'S THIS GAP BETWEEN WHAT PEOPLE THINK IS GOING ON AND WHAT IS GOING ON, THAT CAUSES SURPRISES, THAT CAUSES ANGST AND THE CREEPINESS FACTOR. THERE'S THIS CONCEPT OF CIVIL INATTENTION THAT I HEARD DANA BOYD TALK ABOUT, THE IDEA THAT I'M WALKING DOWN THE STREET, LATCH ON TO A BUNCH OF PEOPLE JUST START WRITING DOWN EVERYTHING THAT THEY DO, RIGHT? PART OF THE REASON IS THAT'S IMPRACTICAL TO DO THAT. IT WAISTS A LOT OF MY TIME. THE OTHER PART OF THE REASON IS IT'S KIND OF CREEPY. I PARTY IN CIVIL INATTENTION, I DON'T REMEMBER THE THINGS THAT THEY ARE DOING OR WEARING. THIS DOESN'T OCCUR AS A FREQUENTLY ONLINE BUT PEOPLE EXPECT IT TO HAPPEN BECAUSE THIS IS HOW THEY INTERACT WITH OTHERS IN THE REAL WORLD. THIS IS ONE OF THE REASONS IT'S SO HARD TO REASON ABOUT WHAT'S ACTUALLY WRONG HERE.

IT MAY NOT BE, I CAN NO LONGER  
BUY TIES BECAUSE I DIDN'T WEAR  
ONE ON A SPECIFIC DAY OR  
SOMETHING LIKE THAT.  
BUT THE PROBLEMS ARE MAYBE NOT  
AS EASY TO QUANTIFY AS A HARM.

>> CAN I FOLLOW UP ON THE HARM  
POINT.  
IT WAS MENTIONED THIS MORNING A  
HYPOTHETICAL EXAMPLE OF A HOTEL  
THAT HOSTED VERY SCANDALOUS ARC  
AUTISTS.  
AND THERE WAS A HARM DISCUSSION  
ABOUT THAT.  
WE ACTUALLY HAVE A REAL WORLD  
EXAMPLE, NOT OF THE HOTEL I  
THINK YOU'RE LAUGH ABOUT THE  
HOTEL.  
THERE'S A HOTEL IN NEW YORK THAT  
FITS THAT MODEL.  
BUT WE HAD A --

>> A COMPUTER COMPANY.

>> WE HAD A CASE INVOLVING A  
COMPANY THAT RENTED COMPUTERS.  
RINGTONE STORES RENT THE  
COMPUTERS, THE COMPUTE HE IS  
WERE CAPABLE OF REMOTELY  
ACTIVATING THE REMEMBER CAMS.  
RENT TO OWN STORES CAN ACTIVATE  
THE WEBCAMS, COULD TRACE THE  
LOCATION OF THE COMPUTERS,  
OSTENSIBLE TO RECOVER THE  
COMPUTERS IN CASE PAYMENT WAS  
NOT FORTHCOMING.  
AND THE CONSUMERS WERE NOT TOLD  
ABOUT REMOTE ACTIVATION  
CAPABILITIES.  
THE WEBCAMS WERE IN FACT  
REMOTELY ACTIVATED AND PEOPLE  
WERE OBSERVED IN VERY SENSITIVE,  
DELICATE SITUATIONS.  
I THINK EVERYBODY IN THE ROOM  
WOULD HAVE A REAL PROBLEM WITH

THAT.

THE QUESTION, THOUGH, BECOMES IS THAT HARM IN A LEGAL TEST.

I GUESS THERE ARE TWO QUESTIONS.

ONE, IS THAT HARM IF PEOPLE KNOW ABOUT IT IF THE CONSUMERS THEMSELVES FIND OUT THAT THEY HAVE BEEN VIDEOTAPED.

OR IS THERE ONLY HARM IF CONSUMERS ARE NOT AWARE OF IT AT ALL.

IF THE TREE FALLS IN THE NOR REST AND NO ONE HEARS IT, DOES IT MAKE A SOUND.

IF THE WEB CAME IS ACTIVATED, DATA IS NOT USED AT ALL.

INDIVIDUAL ARE OBSERVED BY THE RENT TO OWN STORES, DATA NOT BEING SOLD OR SHARED, CONSUMERS NEVER HEAR ABOUT IT.

IS THERE HARM?

ANYBODY CAN JUMP IN.

>> WHY IS THIS A USEFUL QUESTION?

>> I THINK IT GETS AT A THE POINT OF, IS THERE ACTUALLY A DEBATE ABOUT HARM.

SHOULDN'T WE ACCEPT THE FACT THAT HARM CAN OCCUR MERELY BY THE COLLECTION OF SENSITIVE DATA IN CERTAIN CIRCUMSTANCES, NOT BY USES ALONE.

NOT BY SHARING OF DATA.

NOT BY ACTUAL MEASURABLE IMPACTS ON INDIVIDUALS.

>> I'LL RESPOND TO THAT FROM A LEGAL PERSPECTIVE BUT ALSO FROM A COMMON SENSE PERSPECTIVE. THERE IS AN EXTENSIVE BODY OF STATE LAW ABOUT WHAT CONSTITUTES AN INVASIVE USE OF VIDEOING TECHNOLOGY. AND PLACES LIKE CHANGING ROOMS,

BEDROOMS AND BATHROOMS ARE ALL TRADITIONALLY CONSIDERED TO BE ZONES, TRUE ZONES OF PRIVACY. THE EXAMPLE OF A COMPUTER BEING PLACED IN SOMEBODY'S HOME WITHOUT THE INDIVIDUAL KNOWING, IN SOME CASES PEOPLE ACTUALLY HAVING BEEN VIDEOED NAKED WITHOUT THEIR KNOWLEDGE, IS A VERY TRADITIONAL NOTION OF A PRIVACY HARM. IT'S AN INTRUSION UPON SECLUSION. I DON'T THINK THIS HYPOTHETICAL IS APPLICABLE TO MORE COMPLICATED WORLD OF USERS GOING TO -- GETTING VERY VALUABLE WEB CONTENT FOR FREE ESSENTIALLY ON THE INTERNET IN THIS MARKETPLACE THAT LISA DESCRIBED WHERE THERE'S FAIR AMOUNT THAT'S GOING ON, AT LEAST THAT'S BEING MADE PUBLIC TO FAIR NUMBER OF PEOPLE. AND I DON'T THINK THAT THIS HYPOTHETICAL REALLY ADDRESSES THE MORE COMPLICATED -- I'M NOT SAYING UNCOMPLICATED, THE MUCH MORE COMPLICATED WORLD OF DATA COLLECTION AND TRACKING THAT'S OCCURRING ON THE INTERNET IN AREAS THAT ARE ESSENTIALLY PUBLIC MOST OF THEM.

>> CHRIS, DO YOU WANT TO WEIGH IN ON THIS POTENTIAL ANALOGY IF PERNICIOUS OR COMPREHENSIVE DATA COLLECTION CAN MAKE US UNWITTINGLY NAKED ONLINE.

>> NOT EXACTLY. WHAT I WANT TO SAY THAT CHRIS' QUESTION, AND ASHKAN'S DISCUSSION OF THIS IS PROFOUND THAT IT'S INTERESTING US WHY DO WE THINK THIS IS A PRIVACY PROBLEM. THINKING ABOUT THAT WE CAN

ELUCIDATE OTHER ACTIVITIES THAT WE ALSO THINK IS PRIVACY INVASIVE BUT THIS IS A LARGER POINT.

BUT THE FOCUS ON HARM IS TAKING AWAY OUR DECISIONS -- OUR DECISION-MAKING ABILITY TO DETERMINE THE SOCIETY WE WANT TO LIVE IN.

IT'S UNDEMOCRATIC.

WE'RE BASICALLY MOVING THE GOAL POST TO THE POINT UNLESS YOU CAN SHOW ECONOMIC INJURY, THAT IS THE ARGUMENT THAT THESE COMPANIES MAKE IN LITIGATION THERE IS NO STAPPING, YOU CAN'T GO TO COURT.

THIS HARM DISCUSSION IS ROBBING US OF THE CHOICE IS DEMOCRATICALLY SAY THAT WE FIND IT OBJECTIONABLE TO PUT A CAMERA IN OUR BEDROOM OR TO SPY ON US AS WE TRAVERSE THE WEB.

>> LET ME BUILD ON THAT AND TAKE IT OUT OF THIS DESIGNER WEAR WHICH THE NAME OF THE CASE.

>> IT'S AN IRONIC NAME.

>> TALK ABOUT MORE ABOUT THE INFORMATION ASYMMETRY I THINK THAT'S IN PART THE QUESTION THAT I WAS GETTING AT, PART OF THE ISSUE THAT CASE RAISED.

THERE ARE MORE AND MORE COMPANIES ABLE TO COLLECT DIFFERENT DATA POINTS, IT SEEMS LIKE THAT IS THE WAY THE COMPETITION IS MOVING.

AN A ELAND GOOGLE AND MICROSOFT ARE ATTEMPTING TO CAPTURE MULTIPLE DIFFERENT DATA POINTS THROUGH TABLETS, THROUGH MOBILE DEVICES, THROUGH THE DESKTOP. AND ATTEMPTING TO -- DO

CONSUMERS KNOW ABOUT THE SCOPE  
THAT HAVE DATA COLLECTION SO  
THAT THEY'RE ABLE TO MAKE THE  
SORT OF CHOICES THAT SID TALKED  
ABOUT, THE INFORMED CHOICES AND  
THEY UNDERSTAND THE BARGAIN.  
THAT'S REALLY THE QUESTION.  
NO POSSIBILITY FOR CONSUMERS AND  
DESIGNERWARE TO MAKE THOSE  
CHOICES.  
IS THERE A POSSIBILITY FOR  
CONSUMERS TO MAKE THAT IN OTHER  
CONTEXT.  
I THINK STU TALKED ABOUT THE DAA  
ICON.  
THAT INVOLVED BECAUSE -- PEOPLE  
DID NOT UNDERSTAND ONLINE  
BEHAVIORAL ADVERTISING.  
IS THERE A SIMILAR ASYMMETRY IN  
CORPORATION DIFFERENT DATA  
POINTS.

>> I THINK THE QUESTION IS, TO  
WHAT EXTENT YOU WANT THE  
GOVERNMENT TO ENGAGE IN  
REGULATION OF DESIGN OF THESE  
PRODUCTS.  
WHAT I THINK I HEARD ALISSA SAY  
THAT SHE THINKS SHE SHOULD HAVE  
THE RIGHT TO USE FIREFOX IN A  
PARTICULAR MODE, I DON'T WANT TO  
PUT WORDS IN YOUR MOUTH, TRY  
GOGGLE.  
GOGGLE OBVIOUSLY OFFERS AN  
INTERESTING RANGE OF PRODUCTS  
WHERE THEY TRY TO INDUCE YOU  
PROVIDING IDENTITY.  
SHOULD WE REGULATE THAT.  
WHEN MY COMPUTER IS ON, GOOGLE  
HAS MY I'D TIE.  
WHY, BECAUSE I USE GOOGLE  
READER, RSS FEEDS THAT'S ONLY  
WAY TO MAKE THAT SYSTEM WORK.  
I ACCEPT WHAT GOES WITH THAT.  
I COULD OPT OUT OF THAT.  
SHOULD WE REQUIRE THEM TO

ORGANIZE SOMEHOW DIFFERENTLY.  
THAT'S QUESTION WITH REGARD TO  
REGULATION OR WHETHER YOU THINK  
WE'RE GOING TO HAVE DOZEN  
BROWSERS, THAT'S WHAT THE EU  
THINKS IS OUT THERE, A DOZEN  
BROWSERS WE'LL LET MARKET  
CHOOSE.

>> I THINK 'SIS LA YOU WANTED TO  
RESPOND?

>> I'LL GIVE YOU THE COUNTER  
EXAMPLE WHICH IS MY FIX LINE  
BROADBAND PROVIDER.  
SHOULD I AB ABLE TO USE THE  
INTERNET IN MY HOME OVER A FIXED  
CONNECTION.  
WITHOUT HAVING EVERY -- THE URL  
OF EVERY WEBSITE THAT I VISIT  
RETAINED INDEFINITELY.

>> WHAT IS YOUR NUMBER, THAT'S  
MY QUESTION.  
WHAT I MEAN BY THAT HOW MANY  
COMPETITORS DO YOU THINK YOU  
NEED TO HAVE IN THE MARKETPLACE  
BEFORE YOU DECIDE YOU SAY IT'S  
NOT AN ISSUEF 12 IS GOOD ON  
BROWSERS AND TWO IS INSUFFICIENT  
ON LAND LINE WHAT'S YOUR NUMBER?

>> THERE'S NO PROSPECT OFREACHING REASONABLE NUMBER IN  
THE U.S. ANY TIME SOON.  
IT'S GOOD THAT WE'RE HAVING THIS  
CONVERSATION RIGHT NOW.

>> TURNING TO REALITY, ISB --

>> I DON'T KNOW WHAT THAT  
MEANS.

>> JUST THE FACTS OF ISPs  
RETENTION OF WEB LOGS, ISPs  
HAVE KEPT WEB LOGS FOR MORE  
THAN -- THE ISP INDUSTRY AROSE



IN THE UNITED STATES.

IT WAS NEVER CONSIDERED  
COMPREHENSIVE DATA COLLECTION  
UNTIL THE -- THESE TRIALS RAISED  
CONCERNS.

IT'S IMPORTANT TO KNOW THAT MOST  
ISPs DECIDED, I ADVISED NUMBER  
OF THEM, DECIDED NOT TO DO THOSE  
TRIALS BECAUSE OF THE IMPORTANCE  
OF THEIR CUSTOMER RELATIONSHIPS  
AND BECAUSE OF VARIETY OF  
DIFFERENT LEGAL ISSUES THAT ARE  
RAISED BY FORM AND NEVER WENT TO  
THE POINT OF BEING THE SUBJECT  
OF THIS HEARING, IT'S IMPORTANT  
TO KNOW THAT ONE SERVICE  
PROVIDER THAT WAS MENTIONED  
EARLIER WAS NEVER ACTUALLY RAN  
THE TRIAL, THERE WAS  
ANNOUNCEMENT THEY ANNOUNCED IT  
ED MARKEY'S CONGRESSIONAL  
DISTRICT.

THEY IMMEDIATELY TURNED TAIL.  
MANY ISPs DECIDED NOT TO GO  
FORWARD WITH THESE SORTS OF  
MODELS FINALLY, IN TERMS OF HOW  
LONG THE INFORMATION IS KEPT  
THERE HAVE BEEN CONGRESSIONAL  
HEARINGS WHERE MEMBERS OF  
CONGRESS DEMANDING THAT THEY  
KEEP LOGS LONGER IN ORDER TO  
FACILITATE INVESTIGATION OF  
CHILD PORNOGRAPHY.

WE'RE IN WORLD WHERE THE ISP  
BEING PUSHED BACK AND FORTH, NOT  
THAT THEY'RE CONSCIOUSLY  
DECIDING TO KEEP THIS  
INFORMATION FOR AS LONG AS THEY  
POSSIBLY CAN IN ORDER TO  
INNOVATE OR MARKET, THEY ARE IN  
THE MIDDLE AND THEIR CORE  
BUSINESS PROVIDING SERVICE TO  
CONSUMERS.

THEY NEED TO KEEP CERTAIN  
INFORMATION IN ORDER TO SECURE  
THEIR NETWORKS AGAINST MALWARE

AND HACKING THEN THEY HAVE THESE PRESSURES FROM LAW ENFORCEMENT. ON -- TO BE SHOT AT FROM BOTH SIDES I GUESS MAY MEAN THAT THEY'RE DOING THE RIGHT THING. THIS IS NOT A SITUATION WHERE WEB LOGS ARE THE FUTURE OF COMPREHENSIVE DATA COLLECTION, THEY'RE VERY MUCH LONG STANDING PRACTICE. ISPEST NETWORKS ARE CONFIGURED IN DIFFERENT WAYS SOMETIMES THEY CAN HAVE MORE INFORMATION FLOWING THEM OR LESS. TO SINGLE OUT THE ISPs THAT ARE DOING FAR, FAR LESS OF THIS THAN HOST OF PLAYERS ON THE INTERNET AND MOST OF ENTITIES OFF LINE THAT ARE IN THE BUSINESS OF SELLING INFORMATION ABOUT CONSUMERS TO THIRD PARTIES, DOESN'T MAKE A LOT OF SENSE TO ME.

>> YOU WANTED TO WEIGH IN.

>> JUST TWO POINTS AROUND CONSUMER CHOICE. THE MOST COMMON MODEL IS NOTICE AND CHOICE BUT GENERAL IS THAT NOTICES AREN'T READ. THEY GIVE REGULATORS CHANCE FOR OVERSIGHT OF EMERGING MARKETS AND COMPANIES THE OPTION TO LOOK LIKE THEY'RE COMPLYING BUT IN REALITY I THINK WE ALL AGREE THAT IT FAILS TO PROTECT CONSUMERS BECAUSE IT RELIES ON THAT THEORETICAL KNOWLEDGE AS OWE POSITIVISED TO PRACTICAL KNOWLEDGE. I SUGGEST THAT WE PROBABLY HAVEN'T DONE ENOUGH TO EXPLORE POTENTIAL OF NOTICE ESPECIALLY IN THE MOBILE ENVIRONMENT, WHAT WE HAVE DONE TAKEN THE WRITTEN

FORM OF LENGTHY NOTICES JUST TRIED TO CONTINUOUSLY ADAPT IT TO THE MOBILE ENVIRONMENT EVEN A LOT OF TWITTER NOTICES YOU'LL SEE RELY ON THE WRITTEN WORD. WHAT NOTICES COULD BE TO BE MORE EFFECTIVE IS MORE EX PER YEN SHALL.

SOME SCHOLARS HAVE TALKED ABOUT THE USE OF SHUTTER SOUND WHEN YOU HAVE APP THAT TAKES YOUR PICTURE.

USING SOUND TOUCH, WELL RECOGNIZED IMAGES COULD BE MORE EFFECTIVE QUICKER THAT IS SOMETHING THAT COULD BE EXPLORED MORE.

SECOND POINT AROUND CHOICE, PERHAPS BEYOND THAT, PRIVACY REGULATORS IN THE MAIN WHO HAVE ADOPTED SORT OF EXHORTATION OF BEST PRACTICES OR ALTERNATIVELY SHAME AND BLAME APPROACH WITH COMPANIES THAT VIOLATE PRIVACY REGULATIONS PERHAPS THEY NEED TO CONSIDER BETTER PROMOTION, EDUCATION OF TOOLS TO REGAIN CONTROL OVER ONE'S PERSONAL INFORMATION AND STEPS.

EMPOWERING PEOPLE TO ACTUALLY MAKE REAL CHOICES.

SO THAT THE QUESTION FOR POLICY MAKERS, IS ACCESS TO VIABLE CRYPTOGRAPHIC SOFTWARE, THAT THEY JUST WANT TO BE ABLE TO PARTICIPATE ONLINE WITH PRIVACY.

>> TOM THEN CHRIS.

>> THIS DISCUSSION OF ISPs I THINK SOMEWHAT ALONG THE LINES OF EARLIER DISCUSSIONS WHERE THERE SEEMS TO BE THIS ASSUMPTION THAT COMPANIES DON'T CARE WHAT THEIR CUSTOMERS THINK. ACTUAL PERCENT DO CARE, EVEN BIG

COMPANIES CARE WHAT THEIR CUSTOMERS THINK.  
PEOPLE SWITCH ISPs ALL THE TIME FOR REASONS OF PRICE, SPEED, ISPs.  
EVEN WITH TWO, THIS IS NOT THE PLACE TO GET IN TO A DETAILED -- IT'S MORE COMPETITIVE THAN THAT.  
IF THESE COMPANIES THEY CAN GET A COMPETITIVE -- THEY WOULD.  
I THINK THE REASON THAT WE DON'T OBSERVE IT IS BECAUSE MOST OF THEIR CUSTOMERS JUST DON'T CARE THEY DON'T SEE ANY HARM IN WHAT IS GOING ON.

>> ISN'T THAT -- DOESN'T THAT GO BACK TO THE INFORMATION ASYMMETRY.  
IF THEY'RE NOT AWARE OF WHAT IS GOING ON ARE THEY ABLE TO MAKE THE --

>> CONSUMERS ARE NOT GOING TO UNDERSTAND WHAT DAN WALLACH SAID.  
I THINK CONSUMERS UNDERSTAND THE ROUGH BARGAIN THEY'RE MAKING IN TERMS MUCH TRADING THEIR INFORMATION FOR CONTENT, USEFUL ADVERTISING, FRAUD PROTECTION, WHOLE BUNCH OF SERVICES.  
THEY DON'T UNDERSTAND HOW IT WORKS.  
IT'S PRETTY COMPLICATED HOW IT WORKS.

>> IT'S HARD TO COME TO THE CONCLUSION THAT PEOPLE DON'T CARE, WE HAVE TO KEEP IN MIND THAT PEOPLE ARE SOCIAL BUT AS SID POINTED OUT THE WEB IS ANOA SOCIAL PLACE.  
WE BRING TO IT OUR ASSUMPTIONS ABOUT THE WORLD, THAT PEOPLE WILL ACT IN CERTAIN WAYS.

ONE OF THE INTERESTING THINGS ABOUT ALAN WESTON'S RESEARCH OVER DECADES THAT HE ASKED CONSUMERS WHETHER THEY THOUGHT THAT BUSINESSES HANDLED INFORMATION AND ARE RESPONSIBLE AND CONFIDENTIAL WAY.

YEAR AFTER YEAR YOU FOUND THAT MORE THAN 50% OF AMERICANS BELIEVE THIS.

MY RESEARCH, WE'VE DONE THREE LARGE SURVEYS OF SURVEYS ON PRIVACY SUGGEST SOMETHING VERY SIMILAR.

PEOPLE THINK THAT THE COMPANIES THEY DO BUSINESS WITH ARE ACTUALLY ACTING IN A FIDUCIARY ROLE.

THEY BELIEVE THAT THOSE COMPANIES CANNOT SELL DATA TO THIRD PARTIES.

PERVERSELY THEY BELIEVE THAT IF A PRIVACY POLICY, MERELY HAS A PRIVACY POLICY IT MEANS THAT THE -- IT MEANS THAT ONE HAS RIGHT TO DELETE DATA AND IT MEANS THAT CAN SUE THAT WEBSITE.

YOU SAY PEOPLE DON'T CARE.

I WOULD ASK US TO REMEMBER, REMIND YOU OF THE DO NOT CALL SITUATION HERE.

THE DMA RAN A DO NOT -- TELEMARKETING DO-NOT-CALL LIST A TELEPHONE PREFERENCE SERVICE FOR A LONG TIME.

IN ITS HEIGHT IT HAD ABOUT FOUR MILLION ENROLLMENTS IN IT.

YOU MIGHT HAVE BEEN ABLE TO SAY, PEOPLE JUST DON'T CARE THEY DON'T ENROLL IN THIS THING.

WHEN THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION GAVE PEOPLE AN EASY TO USE SIMPLE CHOICE TO OPT OUT OF TELEMARKETING.

PEOPLE RUSHED TO IT.

THERE ARE 217 MILLION

ENROLLMENTS IN THE FTCs DO NOT  
CALL DATABASE.

IF WE GIVE PEOPLE INFORMATION  
AND ABILITY TO MAKE CHOICES I  
THINK THEY'RE GOING TO RUN TO  
THEM.

WHAT THIS DEBATE IS ABOUT IF YOU  
REALLY DIG DEEPLY IS THE FEAR OF  
GIVING PEOPLE SUCH CHOICES.

>> I REJECT THAT ASSUMPTION  
THAT -- I THINK IT WAS --  
ASSUMED IN TOM'S STATEMENT THAT  
PEOPLE RESPONDING TO IT.  
FIRST PARTY CUSTOMER  
RELATIONSHIP KNOWS THAT IT'S  
CUSTOMERS CARE.  
THINKS CAREFULLY AND VETS ITS  
USES OF PERSONAL INFORMATION AS  
WE'VE HEADED TOWARD THE END OF  
THE LAST DECADE IN TO THIS  
DECADE CAREFULLY.  
ARE NOT GOING TO RUN SELLING  
INFORMATION IN WILD WAYS THAT  
USERS WOULDN'T EX EXACT.  
I'D ALSO POINT OUT THAT THERE IS  
A HUGE COTTAGE INDUSTRY.  
GENERALLY THE COMPANIES THAT GET  
SUED, COMPANIES THAT ARE SUBJECT  
OF FTC ENFORCEMENT ACTIONS ARE  
COMPANIES THAT DO -- HIGHLY  
UNEXPECTED THINGS WITH REGARD TO  
CONSUMER DATA OFTEN MORE  
SENSITIVE CONSUMER DATA.  
THE WHOLE SERIES WATCH THEY KNOW  
SERIES IN THE "WALL STREET  
JOURNAL" IT'S BEEN REMARKABLY  
SUCCESSFUL IN BRINGING TO LIGHT  
UNEXPECTED USES OF CONSUMER DATA  
WITH SIGNIFICANT CONSEQUENCES.  
LOOKING AT THIS YOU CAN POINT TO  
SMALL PLAYERS THAT EXTENDS  
BEYOND FIRST PARTY ENTITIES,  
BECAUSE FIRST PARTY ENTITIES  
HAVE CONTRACTS WITH THIRD  
PARTIES ARE STARTING TO REQUIRE

THEM TO TAKE STRONG PRIVACY MEASURES.

I THINK WE'RE SEEING SIGNIFICANT CULTURE CHANGE ON THE INTERNET AND GREATER THOUGHT HOW INFORMATION IS BEING USED.

YES, YOU CAN POINT TO INCIDENTS LIKE THE PREGNANCY INCIDENT TO SHOW THAT COMPANIES ARE MAKING MISTAKES.

BUT THIS IS -- FIRST PARTY CONSTRAINTS HERE THAT THIS DISCUSSION REALLY NOT RECOGNIZED.

>> LET ME JUMP IN -- GO AHEAD, CHRIS.

>> WHY WAS IT A MISTAKE?  
WE HEARD FROM HOWARD BEALE, IS THAT KNOWING CAN'T BE THE HARM. WHAT WAS THE MISTAKE THAT TARGET ENGAGED IN BY KNOWING THAT THIS WOMAN WAS PREGNANT?

>> IT'S INFORMATION THAT ONE INFERS ABOUT PEOPLE'S HEALTH CONDITIONS, I THINK IN SOMEWHAT DIFFERENT CATEGORY THAN WHAT SOMEBODY IS WILLING TO PAY TO BUY A CAR.  
OR WHETHER THEY'RE LIKELY TO WANT A CAR.

>> I DIDN'T REALLY MEAN TO SAY THAT THESE BIG COMPANIES, THAT NOBODY CARES.  
I THINK THESE BIG COMPANIES CARE ABOUT THEIR CUSTOMERS AND CARE ABOUT THEIR REPUTATIONS IF THERE IS PRIVACY GLITCH THEY WANT TO AVOID IT.

>> LET'S TALK ABOUT THAT A BIT.  
BECAUSE THAT RAISES THE POINT OF TRANSACTION COSTS AND POTENTIAL

MARCEL IMBALANCE.

OBTAINING BENEFITS WITH BEING ABLE TO HAVE YOUR SERVICES PROVIDED ACROSS DIFFERENT DEVICES AND IN DIFFERENT PLACES.

BUT DOES THAT ALSO NOT CREATE TRANSITION COSTS IN TERMS OF YOUR ABILITY TO SWITCH SERVICES. DOES IT CREATE AN OPPORTUNITY FOR LARGE FIRST PARTY TO PUSH THE ENVELOPE TO INNOVATE, TO DO THINGS LIKE THE TARGET SCENARIO THAT IS PERHAPS IN A MURKY AREA AND NOT RISK LOSING CUSTOMERS BECAUSE THERE IS A LOCKED IN EFFECT.

>> IF NOTICE AND CHOICE IS OFFERED AND NOTICE IS REASONABLY CLEAR SO CONSUMERS UNDERSTAND THEN THERE IS NO ASYMMETRY OF POWER AND USERS HAVE A CHOICE AS TO WHAT IS OCCURRING.

ONE CAN GO TO OPT OUT CENTERS AND OPT OUT, ONE CAN DECIDE WHETHER OR NOT TO USE A SIGNED IN -- TO SIGN IN ON GOGGLE HAVE ALL ONE'S SURFING ARC AUTISTS BE RUN THROUGH THE GOOGLE SIGN IN. ONE CAN DECIDE WHETHER OR NOT TO DOWNLOAD DIFFERENT APPS ON DIFFERENT DEVICES.

THERE ARE SERIES OF CHOICES AVAILABLE.

WE CAN TALK ABOUT INFORMATION SHOULD BE CLEARER TO CONSUMERS AND CHOICES TO OPT OUT SHOULD BE CLEARER.

THE NOTION THERE IS A WORLD WHERE CONSUMERS POWERFUL TODAY MARKET POWER BY THESE PLAYERS THAT ARE DIVERSE FILING AND OFFERING DIFFERENT SERVICES TO CONSUMERS ALSO USING DATA IN ORDER TO INNOVATE MORE.



I THINK IS AN OVER  
SIMPLIFICATION OF WHAT IS GOING  
ON.

>> SID, DID YOU WANT TO JUMP IN  
HERE?

>> I THINK THERE IS A WHAT-IF  
THERE THAT IS IMPORTANT WHETHER  
OR NOT THIS NOTICE IS EFFECTIVE,  
RIGHT?  
THAT'S REALLY THE DISCUSSION.  
IS THERE AN ASYMMETRY OF POWER,  
THERE MAY BE ISSUES HOW CLEAR  
NOTICE SHOULD BE AND I'M ALL --  
MOST OF MY LAW PRACTICE INVOLVES  
COUNSELING CLIENTS ON PRIVACY  
COMPLIANCE.  
BUT I THINK THAT IS AN ISSUE HOW  
TO WRITE NOTICES BETTER.  
THERE IS RESEARCH THAT I THINK  
WAS AIRED TODAY THAT CAN  
SIGNIFICANTLY HELP WITH THAT.  
BUT THAT'S THE ISSUE.  
OR FACE OVERWHELMING COERCION.

>> I THINK THERE IS ALSO A  
SITUATION WHERE I MAY BE  
INTERACTING WITH ONE COMPANY  
ONLINE AND SO ARE ALL OF THE  
PEOPLE THAT I WANT TO  
COMMUNICATE WITH.  
THE ONLY WAY THAT I CAN  
COMMUNICATE WITH THEM IS THROUGH  
THAT ONE COMPANY.  
AND I MAY NOT LIKE THIS COMPANY  
BUT I HAVE A CHOICE TO MAKE AND  
IT'S NOT WHETHER OR NOT TO USE  
THIS COMPANY IT'S WHETHER OR NOT  
TO PARTICIPATE WITH MY FRIENDS.

>> I ACTUALLY THINK IF ONE  
DOESN'T LIKE A PARTICULAR  
SERVICE THERE ARE VARIETY OF  
TECHNOLOGY TOOLS.  
ONE CAN ALSO FIND E-MAIL

ADDRESSES OF YOUR FRIENDS OR  
SUGGEST THAT YOU MOVE TO A  
DIFFERENT SOCIAL NETWORKING SITE  
THAT IS MORE TO YOUR LIKING.  
I DON'T THINK YOU'RE WITHOUT  
WAYS, I KNOW PEOPLE THAT  
BREAK -- THEY CREATE FICTIONAL  
IDENTITY THEN CREATE -- VIOLATES  
THE TERMS OF USE BUT PEOPLE FIND  
WAYS TO DO THAT.

>> I WANT TO BE GOOD WEB  
CITIZEN NOT VIOLATE TERMS OF USE  
AND COMMUNICATE WITH MY FRIENDS  
WHO ONLY SPEND TIME.

>> IF THEY'RE YOUR GOOD FRIENDS  
YOU CAN TALK ABOUT GOING SOME  
OTHER PLACES.

>> I THINK JUST ONE THOUGHT  
THERE THAT I THINK THIS  
CONVERSATION REALLY NEEDS TO GEL  
WITH WHAT A ALESSANDRO WAS  
TALKING ABOUT, NOT NECESSARILY  
MATCHING TO YOUR EX-POST  
FEELINGS ABOUT YOUR CHOICE AND I  
THINK NETWORK AFFECTS ARE ONE  
WAY THAT THROWS WRENCH IN THERE,  
I THINK THERE IS OTHER SORT OF  
ASPECTS OF LOCK IN THAT CAN BE  
REALLY IMPORTANT IF YOU SIGN  
CONTRACT FOR TWO YEARS OR YOU  
BUY A DEVICE THAT YOU CAN'T TAKE  
TO A DIFFERENT NETWORK, RIGHT,  
OR JUST HAVE YOUR RUN OF THE  
MILL STATUS QUO BIAS REASONS WHY  
YOU DON'T WANT TO LEAVE A  
PARTICULAR SERVICE THEN COUNTER  
VAILING SERVICE THAT YOU BOUGHT  
IN THAT MAKE YOU FEEL LIKE YOU  
DO.  
THEN -- TO ME THAT'S WHY FULL  
SET OF FITS ARE SO IMPORTANT YOU  
HAVE TO ASK, WHAT ARE THE OTHER  
PROTECTIONS THERE THAT ARE

HELPING TO SERVE YOU.  
IS DATA BEING IDENTIFIED.  
IS IT NOT BEING SHARED BROADLY,  
IS IT BEING DELETED AFTER PERIOD  
OF USE THAT'S WHY ALL OF THOSE  
AFTER THE FACT PROTECTIONS ARE  
SO IMPORTANT BECAUSE YOU'LL GET  
PLENTY OF CONSUMERS.  
THEY FEEL LIKE THEY CAN'T LEAVE  
FOR OTHER REASONS EVEN THOUGH  
PRIVACY ASPECT MAKES THEM  
UNCOMFORTABLE.  
JUST RELYING ON NOTICE AND  
CHOICE -- IF YOU DON'T HAVE A  
CHOICE IT'S NOT REALLY ADEQUATE.

>> I AGREE THAT THERE ARE OTHER  
INFORMATION PRACTICES THAT CAN  
BE HELPFUL HERE.  
THE SITUATION THAT INVOLVES USE  
OF DATA, IDENTIFIED TO THE  
EXTENT THAT IT'S DIFFICULT IF  
NOT TECHNICALLY IMPOSSIBLE TO  
REIDENTIFY, IT CAN BE USED FOR  
INNOVATIVE PURPOSES AND TALKING  
ABOUT THE MOST IMPORTANT PART OF  
THE ECONOMY THAT OFFERS  
CONSUMERS 'NORM MUSS AMOUNTS OF  
SERVICES AND A CONTENT AT NO  
CHARGE AND IT'S IMPORTANT TO  
BALANCE THE INNOVATION AND  
SOCIAL GOODS WITH THE PRIVACY --  
LEGITIMATE PRIVACY CONCERNS OF  
CONSUMERS.  
BUT NOT TO ASSUME THAT THE  
DEFAULT HAS TO BE NEVER SHARE.  
DEFAULT HAS TO BE ALL DATA IF  
IT'S TECHNICALLY -- TO  
REIDENTIFY IT.  
THERE ARE VERY IMPORTANT  
ECONOMIC IMPLICATIONS OF HOW ONE  
REGULATES PRIVACY ON THE  
INTERNET TODAY AND IT'S  
IMPORTANT TO PROCEED CAUTIOUSLY  
AND TO PROCEED WHERE POSSIBLE  
THROUGH SELF REGULATION AND

THROUGH HIGHER LEVEL PRINCIPLES  
RATHER THAN HIGHLY SPECIFIC  
STATUTORY REGULATIONS.

>> I WANT TO FOLLOW UP ON THE  
POINT ABOUT pHIPPS.  
THIS IS AN ISSUE THAT COMES UP  
IN TERMS OF COMPETITION, THERE  
ALREADY SECTORAL LAWS IN PLACE  
THAT GOVERN CERTAIN INDUSTRIES  
IN TERMS OF PRIVACY.  
SO ARGUABLY THERE'S ALREADY A  
POTENTIAL IMPAL, THERE'S THE  
CABLE PRIVACY ACT, THE CPMI  
LAWS.  
THERE ARE COMPANIES WHO WILL  
ARGUE THAT THEY'RE NOT ABLE TO  
DO WHAT OTHER COMPANIES IN THE  
SPACE ARE ABLE TO DO.  
THAT BEGS THE QUESTION, IS THE  
ANSWER TO THAT PROBLEM A MORE  
GENERAL SET OF RULES OR  
PRINCIPLES OR STANDARDS THAT  
WOULD APPLY ACROSS THE BOARD.  
ALISSA, DO YOU WANT TO ADDRESS  
THAT?

>> YES.  
[ Laughter ]

>> YOU FIND THIS A RELEVANT  
QUESTION.

>> THIS IS A VERY RELEVANT  
QUESTION.  
I THINK IF WE CAN GO BACK TO THE  
BEGINNING HAVE BASELINE LAW  
INSTEAD OF SEC MATERIAL LAW.

>> I'M GLAD YOU ASKED THAT  
QUESTION BECAUSE IF YOU LOOK  
WHAT IS GOING ON IN  
JURISDICTIONS AROUND THE WORLD,  
BANKS AND MOBILE NETWORK  
OPERATORS ARE ENTERING IN TO  
PARTNERSHIPS TO CREATE MOBILE

PAYMENT SYSTEM.

THAT ISSUE, THAT DEVELOPMENT  
WILL CRYSTALLIZE A LOT OF WHAT  
WE'VE TALKED ABOUT TODAY.

IN OTHER JURISDICTIONS, FINDING  
BUYING TELECOMMUNICATION  
COMPANIES TO BE PART OF THE GAME  
OF MOBILE PAYMENTS.

AND TWO TRENDS ARE FORGING AS  
LINK BETWEEN COMPETITION OR  
ANTI-TRUST ISSUES, FIRST IS WHAT  
WE'VE TALKED ABOUT ON THIS  
PANEL.

ECONOMICS OF ONLINE ADVERTISING  
WAY INTERNET GOODS AND SERVICES  
ARE MONETIZED THEN SECONDLY, THE  
RISE IN WHAT YOU CAN LARGELY  
CALL INTERNET INTERMEDIARY,  
SEARCH ENGINE, SOCIAL MEDIA  
COMPANIES, ISPs USE OF  
INFORMATION ABOUT CONSUMERS THAT  
FLOWS TO THEM AS PART OF THE  
SERVICES THEY RENDER.

JUST PICK UP ON WHAT WE'VE  
TALKED ABOUT EVERYBODY KNOWS OR  
HEARD OF SQUARE WALL APP FOR  
STARBUCKS.

IT'S A HUGE CONVENIENCE FACTOR  
TO PAYING FOR A LATTE WITH YOUR  
PHONE.

SOMETHING ELSE IN PLAY.

MOBILE PAYMENTS IF YOU LOOK HOW  
THEY HAVE BEEN DEPLOYED IN  
DEVELOPING ECONOMIES HAVE BEEN  
REALLY ECONOMIC DRIVERS FOR THE  
CASH LIGHTENED ECONOMIES THAT  
THEY CREATE A.

BUT IN MORE DEVELOPED ECONOMIES  
WITH GREATER ACCESS TO BANKS  
WHAT HAPPENS ALMOST IMMEDIATELY  
WITH THE INTRODUCTION OF MOBILE  
PAYMENTS IS MOVE TO COUPONING,  
ALSO YOUR LOYALTY CARD.

THE APP KEEPS TRACK OF HOW MANY  
TIMES YOU VISITED THAT STORE,  
WHAT YOU PURCHASED, INFORMATION

THEN USED TO GENERATE OFFERS,  
DISCOUNTS, COUPON THAT KEEP YOU  
COMING IN TO STARBUCKS.  
IT'S THIS EASE OF COUPONING,  
REDEEMING REWARDS THAT ARE  
DRIVING ACCEPTANCE OF THIS BUT  
ALSO REALLY RICH TERRAIN FOR  
BEHAVIORAL ADVERTISING.

>> TOM?

>> I DON'T THINK -- I DON'T SEE  
ANY RATIONAL TO HAVE SEPARATE  
PRIVATE REGIME.  
A FUNCTION OF THE LEGACY  
REGULATORY SYSTEM THAT IS OUT OF  
DATE MANY CHARACTERISTICS.  
I DON'T THINK THAT NECESSARILY  
IMPLIES THAT WE SHOULD HAVE  
GENERAL PRIVACY LAW.

>> ANYONE ELSE WANT TO WEIGH IN  
HERE?

>> THE INTERNET COMMERCE  
COALITION INCLUDES BOTH E  
COMMERCE COMPANIES THAT ARE NOT  
ISPs, IT INCLUDES ADVERTISING  
COMPANIES INCLUDES JOB SEARCH  
SITES AND IT INCLUDES ISPs.  
THAT INCLUDES NOT JUST ISPs  
WHO ARE TELECO AND CABLE  
OPERATORS BUT E-COMMERCE  
COMPANIES.  
THE REGULATORY SYSTEM IS OUT OF  
DATE AND IDEALLY IF THERE IS A  
CODE OF CONDUCT THAT'S  
IMPLEMENTED IN THIS AREA IT  
WOULD BE GREAT IF IT SUPERSEDED  
EXISTING SEC MATERIAL REGULATION  
BECAUSE IT DOESN'T MAKE SENSE TO  
HAVE TWO DIFFERENT OVERLAYS OF  
REQUIREMENTS THAT IN SOME CASES  
CAN CONFLICT AT THE VERY LEAST  
CAN BE CONFUSING.

>> SHOULD THERE BE OVERARCHING THEN PRIVACY LAW IF WE REMOVE THE SEC MATERIAL APPROACH DO REGULATORS AND LAWMAKERS -- I GUESS THE FCC ACKNOWLEDGING THAT NOT PARTICULARLY PRODUCTIVE FOR IT TO BE VERY ACTIVELY INVOLVED IN PRIVACY WHEN THE FTC IS LEADING AGENCY TO BE ENGAGED IN THE ISSUE. BUT IN TERMS OF WHETHER LEGISLATION -- DEPENDS WHAT IT SAYS RIGHT NOW LOOKING AT A CONGRESS IT APPEARS UNLIKELY THAT CONGRESS WILL MOVE A BASELINE PRIVACY LAW BUT AS WITH ALL PROPOSALS THERE CAN BE WAYS TO IMPROVE THE LAW JUST I'M NOT HOLDING MY BREATH FOR LEGISLATION TO PASS CONGRESS THAT WOULD SUPERSEDE THE EXISTING SECTORAL COMMUNICATIONS LAWS. I THINK THAT IS PROBABLY A WAY OFF.

>> PART OF HOW YOU ASSESS IT HAS TO BE, I'D ASK YOU THOUGH I DON'T EXPECT AN ANSWER, WHICH IS HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT THE SCHEME YOU'RE RUNNING RIGHT NOW. THE SCHEME YOU'RE RUNNING RIGHT NOW IS A SCHEME WHERE WHAT HAPPENS IS, SOMEONE MAKES A MISTAKE, IT'S NOT CLEAR THAT CONSUMERS HAVE SEEN THAT MISTAKE, HAVE ENGAGED WITH THAT MISTAKE, YOU LABEL THAT A DECEPTIVE PRACTICE. YOU THEN ASK FOR CONSENT DEGREE, YOU THEN REGULATE THEM FOR 20 YEARS, MYSPACE MUST BE DELIGHTED TO KNOW THEY WILL BE AROUND FOR 20 YEARS, THAT SEEMED OPTIMISTIC. THAT'S THE SCHEME WE'RE RUNNING.

IS THAT A SCHEME YOU LIKE?

>> WE DO LIKE THAT SCHEME.  
[Laughter] THAT SCHEME IS  
NECESSARY BUT PERHAPS NOT  
SUFFICIENT.

>> RANDOM AND EPISODIC.

>> THE QUESTION MAY BE ALSO  
WHETHER THE BASELINE PRIVACY  
REGULATIONS PASSES WITHOUT ANY  
FTC REGULATORY DISCUSSION.  
FEDERAL TRAIT COMMISSION NEEDS  
TO THINK ABOUT WHETHER THAT SORT  
OF MODIFIED VERSION OF SECTION  
FIVE NOW WITH MUCH CLEARER OR  
OVERARCHING BUT MORE SPECIFIC  
REQUIREMENTS IS A GOOD  
REPLACEMENT FOR THE FTC EXISTING  
AUTHORITY.  
I DOUBT THAT RESULTING PRIVACY  
LEGISLATION WOULD GIVE FTC BROAD  
RULE MAKING AUTHORITY OVER  
PRIVACY IN THE END.

>> BUT ALL WITH OUR ENFORCEMENT  
AUTHORITY.

>> CERTAINLY WOULD HAVE  
ENFORCEMENT AUTHORITY.

>> THERE IS AN INTERESTING  
NARRATIVE HERE WRITTEN BY TWO  
PEOPLE AT A BERKELEY DISCUSSING  
ADVANTAGES OF OUR EPISODIC FTC  
ENFORCEMENT.  
THEY ARGUE THAT THE INDETERMINE  
NANCY OF ENFORCE SYSTEM CAUSING  
COMPANIES TO ACT MORE  
RESPONSIBLY THAN THEY WOULD IF  
THEY HAD CLEAR SINGLE LAW THAT  
CAUSE COMPLIANCE ONLY.

>> THIS IS A VISION THAT THE FTC  
CAN OCCASIONALLY --



>> THIS IS ACTUALLY WHAT THE CONGRESS GAVE FTC. CONGRESS WAS WISE IN ITS GIFT IF YOU WILL -- CAN'T LEVY HUGE FINES AGAINST THESE COMPANIES. IT CAN NEGOTIATE AGREEMENTS THAT GET WORKED OUT, THAT DEALS WITH SOME OF THE DUE PROCESS CONCERNS BUT AT THE TURN OF THE CENTURY, THROUGHOUT THAT -- IT'S VERY DIFFICULT TO MOTIVATE CONGRESS TO PASS A SINGLE LAW TO DEAL WITH THESE DIFFERENT PREDATIONS.

>> YOU WOULD THINK THAT DEMOCRATIC THING WOULD BE FOR CONGRESS TO DO SOMETHING THAT'S WHERE DEMOCRACY SHOULD TAKE PLACE NOT JUST AT THE FTC.

>> SID, I WANT TO ASK YOU THIS QUESTION AS A WELL, YOU'RE IN THE TECH INNOVATION SPACE. YOU'RE ALL ABOUT TECHNOLOGICAL SOLUTIONS TO GIVE CONSUMERS CONTROL. AND YOU'RE WITH A COMPANY THAT IS COMPETING ON PRIVACY IN MANY RESPECTS. IS IT YOUR VIEW THAT THE THE COMPETITIVE EFFORTS TO PROVIDE CONSUMERS WITH PRIVACY ARE GOING -- ARE LIKELY TO PREVAIL AND ARE LIKELY TO BE SUFFICIENT OR DO YOU THINK THAT ADDITIONAL MEASURES MIGHT BE NECESSARY TO ADDRESS SOME OF THE ISSUES THAT HAVE BEEN TEED UP TODAY.

>> I WISH I HAD AN EASY ANSWER TO THAT QUESTION. I THINK THAT'S TOUGH. I THINK PEOPLE THAT KNOW BEST HOW TO OPTIMIZE, THE BALANCE BETWEEN PRIVACY AND

FUNCTIONALITY AND OF THINGS, ARE  
THE PEOPLE MAKING THE THINGS.  
THE PEOPLE IN KNOW RATING.  
THE PEOPLE WHO BEST KNOW HOW TO  
COMPETE FOR CONSUMERS' INTERESTS  
ARE THE ONES IN THAT MARKETPLACE  
COMPETING FOR IT.  
AND CERTAIN EXTENT AS FAR AS  
ONLINE GOES YOU CAN GO CROSS  
SECTOR TO PEP PEOPLE PROTECT  
THEIR PRIVACY.  
IT GETS FUZZY BECAUSE WE CAN --  
WE CAN MAKES WEB LESS ATTRACTIVE  
THERE IS LESS INNOVATION.  
THERE'S NO REAL EASY TECH  
SOLUTION TO SAY, THIS IS GOING  
TO SOLVE ITSELF.  
AND I CAN'T PREDICT THE FUTURE,  
I WISH I COULD, I REALLY DO, I'D  
BE INVESTING HEAVILY RIGHT NOW.  
I THINK THERE'S SOMETHING TO BE  
SAID ABOUT COMPETITION IS  
AFFECTING PRIVACY IN A POSITIVE  
WAY.  
SOME COMPANIES ARE COMPETING ON  
PRIVACY, IT'S NOT ENOUGH.  
TAKE IT AS A YOU WELL THAT'S  
COMING FROM MOZILLA.  
TECHNOLOGY CROSS SECTOR CAN HELP  
OUT A BIT BUT I DON'T KNOW WHAT  
WE NEED.

>> LET ME ASK YOU A DIFFERENT  
QUESTION.  
IN YOUR VIEW TO ENGAGE IN  
ADDITIONAL INTEGRATED DATA  
COLLECTION OR IS THERE STRONGER  
INCENTIVE FOR COMPANIES TO  
COMPETE ON PRIVACY.  
JUST YOUR OUTLOOK ON THE LOAN.  
WHERE IS THE INCENTIVE STRUCTURE  
WHERE DO YOU SEE COMPANIES  
MOVING.

>> THOSE ARE APPLES AND  
ORANGES, RIGHT, COMPANIES ARE

GOING TO COMPETE ON PRIVACY IF  
THEY WANT TO AND COLLECT DATA IF  
THEY WANT TO USE THE DATA.

>> SO HOW MANY -- QUANTIFY IT.  
DO YOU SEE MORE AN A ELSE THAN  
ORANGES?  
APPLES BEING COMPANIES WANTING  
TO INNOVATE BY COLLECTING  
MORE --

>> I SEE A LOT OF MAC BOOKS IN  
HERE.  
I CAN'T QUANTIFY IT.  
I DON'T KNOW.  
I'M SORRY.

>> REAL QUICK.

>> I WOULD SAY THAT COMPANIES  
THAT HAVE STRONG RELATIONSHIPS  
WITH CONSUMERS, FIRST PARTY  
RELATIONSHIPS BALANCE THOSE  
INTERESTS VERY CAREFULLY AND DO  
PRIVACY REVIEWS BEFORE DECIDING  
WHETHER TO MOVE FORWARD WITH  
G.O.P. RATIONS OF CHANNELS.  
THE FIRST PARTY RELATIONSHIP  
DOES VERY MUCH COME IN TO PLAY  
HOW CONSUMERS ARE GOING TO  
RESPOND IS VERY IMPORTANT FACTOR  
AND THERE ARE MANY MORE  
MARKETING NEWS THAT ARE  
REJECTED.  
THEY'RE REJECTED VERY OFTEN FOR  
PRIVACY REASONS.

>> IF I MAY SHARPEN YOUR POINT.  
YOU OFTEN SEE BETTER BEHAVIOR  
FROM FIRST PARTIES BUT SEE BEST  
BEHAVIOR FROM PARTIES THAT YOU  
ACTUALLY PAY.  
THE COMPANIES WHOSE BUSINESS  
MODEL IS FREE ARE OFTEN HIDING  
PRIVACY AS PART OF THE PRICE IF  
YOU LOOK AT LET'S SAY DIFFERENCE

BETWEEN AN A ELAND GOOGLE.  
VERY DIFFERENT INCENTIVE  
STRUCTURE FOR COLLECTION OF  
NOBODY AND TREATMENT OF  
CONSUMERS.

WE RECENTLY HAD A SPEAKER AT  
BERKELEY DISCUSS GOOGLE FROM THE  
INDUSTRY, HE SAID, GOOGLE WANTS  
INTERNET TO BE FREE SO IT CAN  
TELL ADVERTISING.

WHICH I THOUGHT WAS ACTUALLY IS  
A PRETTY PROFOUND POINT.

ONE OF THE POINTS I'VE MADE IN A  
RECENT ARTICLE WITH JAN IS WE  
NEED TO THINK ABOUT PAYING FOR  
MORE ITEMS, MORE SERVICES, ET  
CETERA.

BECAUSE IF WE WERE ACTUALLY  
PAYING THESE COMPANIES THERE  
WOULD BE BETTER INCENTIVE  
ALIGNMENT.

THAT MIGHT BE A WAY OF AVOID CAN  
REGULATION HAVING THE MARKET  
SHAPE THESE PROBLEMS IN A WAY  
THAT IS MORE PRIVACY FRIENDLY.

>> DID YOU WANT TO WEIGH IN ON  
THIS ANY MORE THEN WE'RE GOING  
TO FINAL --

>> I WAS JUST GOING TO JUMP IN.  
I'M AN ENGINEER I WAS GOING TO  
ANSWER LIKE AN ENGINEER TO SAY  
20% OR 40% THAT'S WHY I CAN'T  
QUANTIFY IT.

WHAT'S BEEN SAID SINCE I  
ADMITTED LACK OF KNOWLEDGE THERE  
WAS THAT THE TRUST DOES PLAY IN  
TO THIS A LOT.

COMPANIES CAN COMPETE ON TRUST,  
PRIVACY AND SECURITY INPUTS IN  
TO HOW MUCH PEOPLE WILL TRUST  
THE COMPANIES.

IF YOU HAVE CONSUMERS WHO AREN'T  
GOING TO LEAVE YOU FOR ANY  
REASON YOU DON'T NEED THE TRUST

AS MUCH AS YOU DO IF YOU'RE  
COMPETING.  
AND I THINK A LOT OF COMPANIES  
ARE COMPETING ON TRUST NOW AND  
PRIVACY IS PART OF THAT.  
I DON'T KNOW HOW MUCH BUT I'D  
LIKE TO SEE IT MORE.

>> WE ARE RUNNING OUT OF TIME.  
I'M GOING TO GIVE EACH OF YOU AN  
OPPORTUNITY, 30 SECONDS TO A  
MINUTE TO WRAP UP YOUR THOUGHTS  
ON THIS VERY BROAD TOPIC.  
WE'LL JUST GO STRAIGHT DOWN THE  
LINE.

>> I'VE BEEN HERE THE WHOLE DAY  
ONE THING THAT STRUCK ME WAS HOW  
DIFFERENT INDIVIDUALS'  
ASSUMPTION ARE ABOUT THE  
MARKETPLACE AND HOW THINGS WORK.  
ON ONE HAND WE'RE SEEING SOME  
ARGUMENTS THAT ARE VERY RATIONAL  
WITH THE IDEA THAT WE'RE ALL  
AUTONOMOUS INDIVIDUALS JUST  
BEHAVING IN THE MARKET.  
THAT WHAT APPEARS IS GOOD.  
VERSUS PEOPLE WHO WANT TO LOOK  
MORE AT THE ENVIRONMENT AND  
STUDY HOW THE ENVIRONMENT SHAPES  
OUR UNDERSTANDING OF  
POSSIBILITIES HOW THE  
ENVIRONMENT SHAPES OUR  
DECISIONS.  
I WAS AT A THE ZOO THE OTHER DAY  
WITH MY TWO-YEAR-OLD AND WE SAW  
SANTA CLAUS, MAYBE WE'LL GO TALK  
TO SALT LAKE CITY, ASKED DO YOU  
WANT FOR CHRISTMAS MY SON SAID,  
GRILLED CHEESE.  
WE WERE ACTUALLY IN A  
RESTAURANT.  
THERE IS -- I THINK THE CONTEXT  
TOLD HIM TO ASK FOR THAT.

>> SOUNDS LIKE A GOOD DEAL FOR

MOM AND DAD.

>> THAT'S MY REACTION, TOO.

>> MY POINT IS IN THINKING ABOUT CONSUMERISM AND EXPECTATIONS WE DON'T KNOW ABOUT ALL THE POSSIBILITIES. THERE ARE VERY PRIVACY PROTECTIVE ALTERNATIVES BUSINESS MODELS TO THIS MASSIVE COLLECTION OF DATA BY THIRD PARTIES. BUT WE'RE TREATING THE CURRENT PATH AS THE ONLY ONE. WHEN I HEAR ABOUT ALL A THE RICHES AT A THE END OF THE OBA PATH I'M REMINDED OF THE MIRACLE OF INSTANT CREDIT. ALL THE PROMISES AND HOPE THAT WERE UNSUBSTANTIATED THERE.

>> I'VE BEEN SAYING IT'S AN INTERESTING DAY. WE SEEM TO HAVE SPENT MOST OF THE DAY ON THE FAILURE OF THE MARKETPLACE WHICH IS NOT MY AVERAGE DAY'S TAKE. THAT'S BEEN INTERESTING. I THINK IT'S IMPORTANT TO FOCUS ON POTENTIAL HARMS. I THINK IT'S IMPORTANT NOT TO LOSE THE EYE ON ALL THE BENEFITS THAT THE SYSTEM GENERATED FOR US. I DON'T THINK WE SHOULD TREAT THE GOVERNMENT AS BEING FREE. IT NEVER IS.

>> I'D CLOSE WITH POINT ON INTERSECT BETWEEN ANTI-TRUST AND PRIVACY. GIVING USERS BACK CONTROL OVER THEIR OWN INFORMATION AND PRESSING FOR THINGS SUCH AS GREATER USER CONTROL OVER IT,

THE RIGHT TO BE FORGOTTEN ON THE INTERNET.

RIGHT TO ANONYMOUS ACCESS MORE GENERALLY EMBEDDING ACCEPTED FIT PRINCIPLES IN TO EMERGING TECHNOLOGIES, PICKING UP ON WHAT CHRIS SAID PERHAPS OPTIONS TO PAY WITH MONEY OR PERSONAL INFORMATION.

DOING THOSE THINGS MAY ACTUALLY SERVE TO INCREASE COMPETITION WHICH COULD INTERN LEAD TO GREATER INNOVATION.

>> I CONCLUDE BY SAYING THAT THE POINT -- THE OVERALL PURPOSE OF THIS WORKSHOP WAS TO LOOK AT WHETHER THE FTC'S NOTICE AND CHOICE FAIR INFORMATION PRACTICES MODEL THAT WAS DEVELOPED THROUGH THE STAFF DRAFT THEN THE REPORT WAS ISSUED IN MARCH SHOULD BE CHANGED DUE TO THIS MODEL OF --

COMPREHENSIVE DATA COLLECTION IS THE WRONG WORD THIS DEFINITION SHOULD NOT -- WHOLE TOPIC SHOULD NOT BE COMPREHENSIVE.

A LOT OF DATA COLLECTION.

AND I THINK OVERALL MY TAKE AWAY FROM THIS IS THAT THERE SHOULD BE CERTAIN USES OF INFORMATION THAT ARE COLLECTED IN THIS MANNER THAT SHOULD BE PROHIBITED AND THAT IT'S IMPORTANT FOR BUSINESSES THAT ENGAGE IN COLLECTING A LOT OF INFORMATION LOOK CAREFULLY AT THE TRANSPARENCY THAT THEY PROVIDE TO CONSUMERS THAT THEY'RE OVERALL DATA PRACTICES, HOW LONG THEY'RE KEEPING DATA, WHAT SORT OF NOTICE THEY'RE PROVIDING CONSUMER CHOICE, THOSE ARE THE SORTS OF TAKE AWAY, IS THAT I THINK WE SHOULD DRAW FROM THIS

DAY.

I THINK THAT LOT OF SPEAK HE IS  
WERE VERY DIFFERENT POINTS OF  
VIEW ALL WELL EXPRESSED.

IN TERMS OF AN ACTION ITEM I  
CONTINUE EDUCATION AND TO LOOK  
AT BARRING CERTAIN USES IF  
THEY'RE NOT ADD AEQUATLY BARRED  
BY SELF REGULATORY FRAME WORKS  
TODAY.

I'LL CONCLUDE WITH THAT.

>> THE FIRST IS THAT THINK  
REFLECTING EVERYBODY WAS THAT  
NOT REALLY PRIVACY FRAMEWORK  
THAT I KNOW OF OR ANY PARTICULAR  
REGIME AND ANY SECTOR THAT  
ALLOWS FOR UNJUSTIFIED,  
UNEXPLAINED LIMITLESS COLLECTION  
AND INDEFINITE RETENTION.

I DO THIS THERE IS SOMETHING TO  
BE SAID FOR THE FACT THAT  
HISTORICALLY THAT FRAMING HAS  
BEEN ACCEPTED AS A RISK.

AND A REASON TO TRY AND BUILD IN  
SOME LIMITS.

SO I THINK THAT'S AN ACCEPTABLE  
FRAMING FOR THIS CONVERSATION.

THE SECOND POINT IS THAT GETTING  
TO TOPIC THAT WAS RAISED EARLIER  
TODAY WHICH IS ABOUT TECHNOLOGY  
AND NEUTRALITY I THINK WE HEARD  
A LOT, DPI AND WE DIDN'T HEAR  
VERY MUCH AT ALL ABOUT CONTENT  
DELIVERY NETWORKS OR ANYONE WHO  
OPERATES DOMAIN NAME SERVER OR  
ANYONE WHO OPERATES A WEB PROXY  
AND THERE'S ALL KINDS OF  
TECHNOLOGIES THAT CAN BE USED  
FOR ESSENTIALLY VERY SIMILAR  
PURPOSES NOT JUST ON SECTOR BY  
SECTOR WHAT CAN A NETWORK  
OPERATOR USE, OPERATING SYSTEM  
USE WHAT CAN DEVICE -- WE SHOULD  
STAY AWAY FROM TRYING TO  
EVALUATE THESE PRACTICES ON THE



BASIS OF WHICH TECHNOLOGIES IS  
BEING USED IN PART BECAUSE I  
THINK DPI DOES HAVE A BAD NAME  
NOW NOR VARIOUS REASONS AND ONE  
THING THAT ENCOURAGES IS  
COMPANIES TO CALL WHAT THEY'RE  
DOING SOMETHING ELSE.  
SO THAT IT DOESN'T ATTRACT THE  
ATTENTION THAT DPI WOULD  
ATTRACT.  
I'M NOT SAYING THAT'S HAPPENING.  
BUT CERTAINLY SOMETHING THAT  
DOES HAPPEN I THINK EXTREME  
CAUTION NECESSARY ON TRYING TO  
BE TECHNOLOGY SPECIFIC.

>> DON'T BEAT A DEAD HORSE IS  
THE OTHER RULE.

>> I WOULD LIKE TO JUST RETURN  
BRIEFLY TO THE COMPETITION ISSUE  
WHICH IS OBVIOUSLY IMPORTANT TO  
THE FTC AN I DON'T THINK  
PROBABLY HAS BEEN DISCUSSED  
ENOUGH TODAY.  
WHEN -- IF YOU LOOK AT SOMEHOW  
APPLYING SPECIAL RULES TO A  
SUBSET OF ENTITIES, HOWEVER IT'S  
DEFINED BUILT WHO ARE PRESUMABLY  
ALL MAJOR PLAYERS IN THE  
INTERNET ECO SYSTEM.  
I DON'T THINK WE WANT TO MAKE  
MORE DIFFICULT OR PERHAPS EVEN  
IMPOSSIBLE FOR THOSE ENTITIES TO  
USE INFORMATION IN ORDER TO  
INNOVATE AND COMPETE AND  
PARTICULARLY COMPETE IN AREAS  
LIKE ONLINE ADVERTISING.  
SEEMS TO ME YOU WANT ALL THESE  
COMPANIES TO BE COMPETING WITH  
EACH OTHER.

>> THIS IS DANGEROUS GIVING THE  
COMPUTER SCIENTIST THE LAST  
WORD.  
AND SECOND TO -- THIRD TO LAST

WORD.

THIS HAS BEEN REALLY INTERESTING  
DAY FOR ME.

I'VE LEARNED A LOT, I LEARN A  
LOT EVERY TIME I ATTEND ONE OF  
THESE.

WHAT I'M TAKING AWAY FROM IT IS  
THAT FIRST PROBLEM WE SHOULD  
SOLVE IS THIS GAP BETWEEN WHAT  
PEOPLE THINK IS GOING ONLINE AND  
WHAT'S ACTUALLY HAPPENING.  
BECAUSE WE NEED TO GET CONSUMERS  
BACK IN TO THE PICTURE AND  
CONNECTED WITH WHAT IS GOING ON  
SO THAT THEY CAN VOICE THEIR  
CONCERNS.

AFTER ALL THAT'S WHAT WE NEED TO  
DEAL WITH, RIGHT?

THEIR CONCERNS.

AND IN FACT THERE'S NO WEB  
WITHOUT THEM, THERE'S NOTHING  
EXCEPT BUNCH OF COMPANIES TRYING  
TO SELL TO EACH OTHER.

WE NEED THOSE INDIVIDUALS TO  
PARTICIPATE, WE NEED THEIR TRUST  
FOR INNOVATION AND FOR ACCURATE  
EVERYTHING ONLINE.

THERE'S NO SILVER BULLET YET TO  
MAKE THIS HAPPEN.

WE NEED TO WORK ON THAT.

ULTIMATELY LIKE LISA SAID, FIRST  
STEP IS GIVING CONSUMERS BACK  
CONTROL OVER THEIR DATA.

THE INTERNET IS COMPLEX.

THIS COMPREHENSIVE DATA  
COLLECTION PROBLEM IS NOT  
TRIVIAL, NOT IN THE LEAST,  
THAT'S WHY WE'RE SPENDING SO  
MUCH TIME ON THIS.

THAT'S WHY WE'RE HERE TODAY WE  
NEED MORE DATA TO FIGURE IT OUT.

>> THANKS.

I WANT TO THANK EVERYONE.

I HOPE THAT PEOPLE DID NOT  
APPROACH THIS THIRD PANEL WITH

THE EXPECTATION THAT WE WERE  
GOING TO RESOLVE BY CONSENSUS  
THE PROBLEMS OF EITHER  
COMPREHENSIVE DATA COLLECTION OR  
A LOT OF DATA COLLECTION.  
BUT HOPEFULLY WE DID EXPLORE  
SOME OF THE ISSUES IN ENOUGH  
DETAIL AND I DO EXPECT WE'LL BE  
ELICITING COMMENTS.  
THERE MAY BE CONSENSUS IS ISSUE  
OF PROHIBITED USES, THERE SEEMS  
TO BE SOME CONSENSUS THAT THERE  
ARE SOME USES THAT OUGHT TO BE  
PROHIBITED.  
WE DIDN'T GET A CHANCE TO REALLY  
EXAMINE WHAT THOSE ARE.  
HOPEFULLY THAT WILL BE SOMETHING  
THAT WE CAN GET VIA COMMENT.  
I WANT TO THANK EVERYBODY ON THE  
PANEL, TURN IT OVER TO THE  
ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR OF THE  
PRIVACY DIVISION GOING TO GIVE  
SOME BRIEF CLOSING REMARKS.  
[ Applause ]

>> SINCE I'M THE OPTIMIST IN  
THE GROUP I THOUGHT I'D CLOSE BY  
KIND OF OWING SOME OF THE  
CONSENSUS POINTS THAT I HEARD  
TODAY.  
BEFORE I DO THAT I JUST WANT TO  
THANK EVERYBODY IN THE AUDIENCE  
FOR BEING WITH US TODAY,  
STICKING IT OUT TO THE LAST  
PANEL, THOSE ON WEBCAST WHO HAVE  
BEEN WATCHING ALL DAY I  
ESPECIALLY WANT TO THANK ALL OF  
OUR PANELISTS WHO TOOK TIME FROM  
THEIR BUSY SCHEDULES TO ENGAGE  
IN THE DISCUSSIONS, ROLL UP  
THEIR SLEEVES, I THOUGHT THE  
DISCUSSIONS HAVE BEEN REALLY  
LIVELY.  
I ESPECIALLY THINK THEIR  
CONTRIBUTIONS ARE IMPORTANT  
BECAUSE WE DID INVITE A LOT OF

THE COMPANIES TO SPEAK TODAY WHO HAVE CAPABILITY TO ENGAGE IN ONLINE COMPREHENSIVE DATA COLLECTION.

MANY DECLINED TO PARTICIPATE. BUT WE DO WANT TO HEAR FROM YOU WE'RE GOING TO KEEP THE RECORD OPEN FOR THIS WORKSHOP WE'RE GOING TO ARC A SEPTEMBER WRITTEN COMMENTS SO YOU CAN GO OUR WEBSITE FOR THE WORKSHOP WHICH IS [FTC.GOV](https://www.ftc.gov) FIND INSTRUCTIONS HOW TO COMMIT WRITTEN COMMENTS. I WOULD ENCOURAGE TO YOU SUBMIT COMMENTS.

WHAT DO I SEE IS THE AREAS OF CONSENSUS THAT HAVE EMERGED TODAY.

LET ME JUST POINT TO FIVE OF THEM.

FIRST, I THINK THAT WE TALKED ABOUT HERE COMPREHENSIVE DATA COLLECTION VERSUS LOT OF DATA COLLECTION.

WE ALL AGREE THAT BUSINESS MODEL, IS THAT ARE OUT THERE THAT CAN PERMIT ENTITY TO GET A PRETTY COMPREHENSIVE WINDOW IN TO CONSUMER BROWSING BEHAVIOR. SOME DISAGREEMENT HOW COMPREHENSIVE THAT DATA COLLECTION IS.

WE HEARD FROM ASHKAN THAT GOOGLE, FOR EXAMPLE, CAN GET 88% OF YOUR BROWSING BEHAVIOR. ANOTHER PANELIST, EMPHASIZED CONSUMERS THAT ACCESSING THROUGH ALL SORTS OF DIFFERENT CHANNEL AT WORK, AT HOME, THROUGH THEIR MOBILE DEVICES YOU DON'T NECESSARILY HAVE ONE ENTITY WITH COMPREHENSIVE PICTURE OF PEOPLE'S BROWSING BEHAVIOR. YOU CAN GET PRETTY COMPREHENSIVE. SECOND AREA OF CONSENSUS THAT

THERE ARE NUMEROUS BENEFITS OF TRACKING.

WE HEARD A LOT TODAY, GOOGLE ANTICIPATING FLU TRENDS, CITIES USING TRAFFIC FLOW DATA TO FIGURE OUT WHERE TO PUT TRAFFIC LIGHTS.

WE HEARD THAT PEOPLE CAN GET MORE ACCURATE PERFORMANCE INFORMATION AND OF COURSE WE HEARD ABOUT THE FREE CONTHEN ADVERTISING FUELS.

THIRD CONSENSUS POINT, ALONG WITH THE BENEFITS THERE ARE ALSO RISKS TO COMPREHENSIVE TRACKING. THIS IS WHERE I'M GOING OUT ON A LIMB.

I HEARD FROM HOWARD BEALES NOT ONLY POTENTIAL -- FINANCIAL PHYSICAL HARMS ARE NOT NECESSARILY ONLY HARMS THAT WE MIGHT WANT TO CONSIDER LOOKING AT THIS AREA.

THERE'S ALSO REPUTATION FALL HARM.

WE HEARD PORN HOTEL EXAMPLE, WE HEARD LOT OF OTHER EXAMPLES OF REP COMPUTATIONAL HARM.

WHERE THE CONSENSUS TENDS TO BREAKS DOWN THAT THERE SEEMS TO BE DISAGREEMENT OVER WHETHER COLLECTION ITSELF IS A HARM.

WE'VE HEARD FROM SOME PEOPLE, CHRIS HOOFNAGLE TALKED ABOUT THE CONCEPT OF INTELLECTUAL PRIVACY AND IDEA THAT I SHOULD BE ABLE TO ASK A QUESTION ON THE INTERNET WITHOUT -- TO MY FRIENDS WITHOUT THAT QUESTION BEING BROADCAST ALL OVER TOWN.

THERE WAS SOME LACK OF CONSENSUS ON THE ISSUE OF WHETHER COLLECTION ITSELF IS A HARM.

FOURTH AREA OF CONSENSUS IS NEED FOR TECH NEUTRALITY, WE CAN'T PICK WINNERS OR LOSERS.

WE HEARD LOT ABOUT FACT THAT  
COMPETITION ON PRIVACY SHOULD BE  
A GOAL, MAYBE WE'RE NOT THERE  
YET.

BUT THAT'S SOMETHING THAT WE  
SHOULD BE STRIVING FOR.

ENCLOSING I THINK MOST IMPORTANT  
PART OF WHAT I WANTED TO DO AND  
MY CLOSING REMARKS IS THANK THE  
FTC STAFF WHO MADE THIS WORKSHOP  
SUCH A SUCCESS, I WANT TO START  
CAN DAVID WHO IS IN THE CORNER  
THERE WHO SPEARHEADED THIS WHOLE  
WORKSHOP.

[APPLAUSE]

ALONG WITH KATIE, CANDY, PAUL,  
CHRIS, DOUG, CHERYL.

ALSO THANKS TO SAMANTHA, T.J.,  
WAYNE, OUR PARA HEELS AND MEDIA  
TEAM.

THANK YOU AGAIN FOR COMING.