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MS. KATHRYN DEAN: Yes, Your Honor. Kathryn Dean from Fake Review Watch is attending.

JUDGE FOELAK: Okay. Do you intend to cross-examine?

MS. KATHRYN DEAN: No, Your Honor.
JUDGE FOELAK: Okay. Very good. Okay. Please proceed again, Mr. Tiffith. Yes, sir.

MR. MICHAEL OSTHEIMER: Your Honor, this is Michael Ostheimer from the Federal Trade Commission representing BCP, and I do not intend to cross-examine. That will be by Mr. Atleson.

JUDGE FOELAK: Okay. Please proceed, Mr. Tiffith.

MR. LARTEASE TIFFITH: Okay. Great. Thank you, Your Honor. Again, I'm Lartease Tiffith, executive vice president for public policy at the Interactive Advertising Bureau. Again, we were founded in 1996 and headquartered in New York. Our members, which are 700 of the leading companies in brand marketing agencies and technology companies in the digital
regulatory alternatives. IAB is concerned that the superficial analysis of cost and a notice of proposed rulemaking has prevented the Commission from considering alternatives that could achieve the same benefits as the current proposed rule while imposing drastically lower costs of legitimate companies.

As IAB has previously explained, a narrowly-tailored rule that incorporates a higher knowledge standard and narrower language would effectively target bad actors while avoiding imposing significant uncertainty and risk on legitimate companies.

Today I plan to present the evidence IAB has gathered on a disputed issue of material fact designated by the presiding officer, whether their compliance costs for businesses will be minimal.

The Commission's preliminary regulatory analysis posits that in a heightened compliance review scenario, large companies will spend approximately $\$ 492$ to comply with a proposed rule. It comes to this conclusion by assuming lawyers at large
advertising and marketing space, together our members account for approximately 86 percent of the online expenditures with respect to ads in the United States.

We work with our members to do a bunch of things, including critical consumer and market research. We educate our brands and agencies in the wider business community on the importance of digital marketing.

You know, I thank you today for giving us an opportunity to present, once again, information. We appreciate your careful consideration of IAB's arguments and evidence thus far.

Additionally, IAB would like to reiterate its support for this rulemaking's goals. The integrity of consumer reviews is important to both consumers and businesses, and IAB supports a rule targeted at those bad actors that abuse consumer reviews for their own gain.

But it is also important for the Commission to engage in a reasoned analysis of the costs and benefits of a proposed rule, so they can make an informed decision among

The evidence IAB has gathered to date shows that the Commission has vastly underestimated the proposed rule's cost to businesses. An alternative more targeted rule could generate the same benefits to consumers while reducing the compliance burden legitimate businesses would face.

And I will first focus on the initial survey. In response to the presiding officer's February 13th order inviting further submissions concerning the two disputed issues of material fact proposed by IAB, IAB conducted an initial survey of its members that included questions about estimated compliance costs. 18 members --

JUDGE FOELAK: Sir, let me get. I would just like to interrupt there. Up until now in your presentation it's been more of a presentation of argument. If you are going to start testifying as a witness, then I should swear you in.

MR. LARTEASE TIFFITH: That sounds great. We'll do that, and then I will continue my -- continue on. So I will put my hand up.

Even a conservative reading of this result shows that estimated compliance costs for companies would be far greater than the amount the commission assumed in the preliminary regulatory analysis.

The initial survey results also suggested businesses would change existing practices in response to the proposed rule.

For example, over half of respondents stated that they would be somewhat or very likely to change their current review process to delete, suppress, or otherwise display fewer consumer reviews in light of proposed Section 465.2 . Additionally, nearly 90 percent of businesses, 15 out of 17 , indicated they would be somewhat or very likely to require reviewers to submit more information to authenticate their identity before leaving a review.

In response to proposed section 465.2's imposition of liability on a business that knew or should have known a review it purchased or procured or a testimony it disseminated was written by an individual who did not exist.

## JUDGE FOELAK: Okay, good.

(Witness was sworn.)
JUDGE FOELAK: Thank you, please proceed.
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* \quad * \quad *
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LARTEASE TIFFITH,
after having been duly sworn, testified as follows:

MR. LARTEASE TIFFITH: So in regards to the first initial survey, over half of respondents estimated their initial compliance costs, including costs related to employee time, seeking advice of counsel, and technological investments would be at least $\$ 1,000$ if the proposed rule goes into effect.

Excluding the respondents who didn't know the cost of their business, 10 out of 12 respondents estimated the cost would be at least $\$ 1,000$, and 8 of 12 estimated a cost would be at least $\$ 10,000$.

Further, one-third of respondents who provided an estimate responded that initial compliance costs would be over $\$ 50,000$, which is over 100 times the Commission's estimate.
which we submitted to the Court yesterday, once the presiding officer issued the order designating whether the compliance costs for businesses would be minimal as a disputed issue of material fact, IAB circulated a second survey to its membership to gather more detailed information about members' estimated compliance cost. 19 members responded to the second survey.

The survey first asked respondents whether they allowed customer reviews to be posted on their website or used or solicited customer reviews for testimonies to market their products. All 19 members answered yes to each -- to at least one of these questions, and so zero respondents were screened out.

The survey first asked respondents to consider whether they would adopt or alter their business practices in order to comply with the proposed rule, including procuring updated technology, creating new policies, and enhanced support from staff. These are practices that companies state they would
implement or change in response to the proposed rule and thus are additive to any efforts needed to comply with existing law.

As discussed in several comments to the notice of proposed rulemaking, many businesses already have robust practices dedicated to fighting fake reviews. But as IAB has pointed out on several occasions, due to the proposed rule's breadth and vague language, many companies will be forced to invest significant resources into their compliance programs in order to ensure that they will not be held liable or subject to civil penalties under the proposed rule.

So in spite of these existing practices, the majority of members would adopt or strengthen at least one business practice in response to the rule, with many anticipating needing to adopt or strengthen several practices in order to comply.

The survey presented a list of 10 specific practices that companies may adopt or strengthen in response to the proposed rule. Those practices were, one, technology designed to monitor, detect, and prevent

Eight, technology processes and staffing to monitor, investigate, and enforce internal policies when employees, officers, agents, or their family members violate them.

Nine, audit and testing capabilities.
And, ten, legal support to ensure compliance with local regulations as applicable and/or to take actions against bad actors violating business policies.

For each practice, at least six companies indicated they would adopt or strengthen that practice.

The survey then asks companies about the types of employees and contractors that would be involved in implementing these practices. The responses show that a significant variety of employees would be needed, including, for example, web developers, business analysts, human resource personnel, review moderators, in-house counsel, compliance analysts, and customer experience executives.

The Commission's cost estimate was significantly more limited and simply assumed that only lawyers at large companies or
submission publishing and possible further dissemination of fake reviews or testimonials at scale.

Two, identity collection and other vetting processes and tools for users submitting reviews and testimonials.

Three, tools for collecting reports of reviews from external parties.

Four, creation and maintenance of public facing policies addressing practices prohibited by the rule that align with relevant local regulations.

Five, staff tasked to moderate reviews according to business policies and investigate reports of abuse or other signals detected by proactive mechanisms.

Six, enforcement policies and mechanisms that address actions of bad actors.

Seven, creation of internal policies, contractual obligations, and/or training programs for employees, officers, and agents to prevent them and any of their relatives from writing reviews about the business without appropriate disclosure.
owners of small companies would spend a meaningful amount of time reacting to the proposed rule. The survey then asks about the costs to implement the identified practices. The estimates provided in response to these questions clearly demonstrate the cost of compliance would be considerably higher than minimal.

First, seven respondents of the 10 that answered the relevant question anticipated they would need to hire new employees to implement these practices. The cost of hiring and training new employees was noticeably absent from the Commission's cost estimates in a preliminary regulatory analysis.

In addition, the median number of employees that respondents expected would need to be engaged in implementing these practices was 10 , and the median number of hours was 100 , which significantly exceeds the Commission's heightened compliance review estimate of eight hours.

Furthermore, of those respondents who provided an estimate of how much it would
cost to have employees or contractors spend the time necessary to implement responsive practices, the median estimated cost was 121,000 , a figure significantly higher than the Commission's $\$ 492$ estimate in the preliminary regulatory analysis.

Five members also estimated that it would cost them from $\$ 5,000$ up to 200,000 to bill or acquire new tools, equipment, software, or other materials to implement these practices.

Additionally, of the 13 companies that anticipated needing to consult counsel, five of the seven that provided an estimated number of hours counsel would spend advising on the proposed rule expected to need at least 15 and up to 4,000 hours of counsel's time to advise on the response to the proposed rule.

The cost of counsel is particularly relevant given the vague language in the rule such as "disseminate" and "procure," as well as the use of the, quote/unquote, "knew or should have known" standard.

Companies may need the assistance of
maintain the responsive practices.
Results from both surveys demonstrate that there is a broad range of responsive practices that different businesses anticipate they will specifically need to implement in consideration of the proposed rule on top of any current practices they might already conduct.

In addition, factors such as long-term ongoing costs, the impact of which can be substantial, must be considered in any thorough analysis of the proposed rule impact. The Commission did not consider such costs at all in its analysis.

As IAB has explained in prior submissions, these high costs are likely driven by many of the vague terms and overbroad provisions included in the proposed rule, which creates uncertainty and risks for many legitimate companies. Companies must manage uncertainty regarding how the rule will be interpreted and enforced once implemented.

If the Commission had conducted a more robust analysis of compliance costs and
counsel to access -- assess possible interpretations of the standard and to navigate the uncertainty that a vague, unexplained legal standard creates.

Survey results also highlight the Commission's failure to consider the ongoing costs of compliance in the preliminary regulatory analysis at all. The median number of employees that respondents expected to be engaged in annually maintaining these practices was five, and the median estimate for hours spent by these employees maintaining these -- the practices was 100 hours.

The survey shows that at least some members anticipate ongoing annual costs. Seven members estimated that it would cost the company at least $\$ 20,000$ annually to have employees or contractors maintained in responsive practices, with four of those estimates surpassing over $\$ 100,000$.

Additionally, six members estimated that they would spend upwards of $\$ 15,000$ annually to maintain tools, equipment, software, or other materials necessary to
properly assessed reasonable alternatives, it would be clear that a more narrowly-tailored rule focused on the activities of bad actors could achieve the same benefits the Commission seeks while imposing a significantly lower compliance burden on legitimate companies. But because of the flawed analysis of costs in the Commission's preliminary regulatory analysis, the Commission has not been able to engage in a reason analysis of the potential alternatives and their associated costs and benefits.

With that, that is -- concludes my remarks. We look forward to further development of these issues in support of, and issues of a clearer and more tailored rule. Thank you, Your Honor.

JUDGE FOELAK: Do you want to move the admission as an exhibit of your submission of March 5th?

MR. LARTEASE TIFFITH: Yes, I would. I would like to include the submission that we -- be submitted, be so.

JUDGE FOELAK: Okay. Your March 5th submission is admitted as an
exhibit.
(Exhibit 1 was marked.)
JUDGE FOELAK: Okay. Mr. Atleson?
MR. MICHAEL ATLESON: Thank you. CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MR. MICHAEL ATLESON:
Q. Mr. Tiffith, let's start with the first IAB survey of its members and look at the survey document you provided with your February 20th submission. Please go to the section on Page 4 titled "Compliance Costs." Can you please read the first bullet under that section?
A. Yeah. Give me one moment. I'm going to pull that up. I'm on that submission, and you said which page, Page 4, I think I heard, or --
Q. Yes.
A. Are you looking at the survey results itself or the attachment?
Q. The survey document that you provided on February 20th.
A. Okay. Give me a moment to pull that up. Sorry. If you have it in front of you, it may be easier, so we both are
is -- and we've had this debate before, and I would just --
Q. I'm just asking you whether you agree with that?
A. Yeah. I disagree with your assertions that it's a mischaracterization. It's not true. It's -- actually, that's taken from the NPRM.
Q. Do you admit that courts may not impose civil penalties for FTC rule violations based on a "knew or should have known" standard?
A. Again, if you disagree with what the -- what's -- again, we're referring to what's in the NPRM.
Q. I'm not asking you about the NPRM. I'm asking you if you agree that courts may not impose civil penalties for FTC rule violations based on a "knew or should have known" standard?
A. Under the current law, correct. But again, we're talking about the NPRM, which is the Commission looking to change that.
Q. Do you admit that the correct
looking at the same document, if you want to share your screen and share the document.
Q. I cannot share my screen currently.
A. Okay. I am now looking at it. And I'm going to Page 4 again. Okay. I'm at the top of Page 4, which starts with, "Change its current review process."
Q. Please read the first bullet under the section titled "Compliance Cost"?
A. The FTC's proposed rule on reviews and testimonies will allow the FTC to obtain civil penalties for certain activities the FTC has determined are unfair or deceptive, including where the violator knew or should have known that a certain act or practice violated the rule.
Q. You admit that this is an incorrect statement of law?
A. No. I disagree with that.
Q. Do you admit that courts may not impose civil penalties for FTC rule violations based on a "knew or should have known" standard?
A. Well, based on the NPRM, which
civil penalty standard for rule violations is under section $5(\mathrm{~m})(1)(a)$ of the FTC act?
A. That is part of it, yes. But again, we don't disagree about what the current status of the law is. The real point at issue is what is the NPRM seeking to do.
Q. You think we can change the law through a rule?
A. I think you can -- I think the rule that you're looking to propose and how you're going to interpret the law, yes, you can do that.
Q. Okay. Do you admit that Section 5(m)(1)(a) of the FTC Act requires a showing of actual knowledge or knowledge fairly implied on the basis of objective circumstances, that an act is unfair or deceptive and is prohibited by such rule?
A. That is what the FTC Act requires. But again, we're talking about how the agency is seeking to change. And again, it's the NPRM.

If you're saying you're not going to hold companies to the "should have
known" standard, I advise you to change the NPRM. That would be the easiest way to do that, is to say, whether than you -- whether than bringing in extraneous information that has nothing to do with the NPRM -- because, again, that's what we're talking about and what's bound to it -- that if you say that we're not going to -- we don't plan on enforcing that, we won't do that, things like that, why didn't the agency put that in the NPRM so that all parties are aware of how the agency is going to enforce the rule?
Q. Did the NPRM state that the FTC would impose civil penalties on companies that merely knew or that merely should have known of a violation?
A. It uses the language "should or should have known" in there.
Q. Right. For violation --
A. And it's about --
(Multiple speakers.)
MR. LARTEASE TIFFITH: It's about the enforcement action. Again, I don't think this gets to the factual determination issue, which we are here to address.

## 26

person reading that would find that to be true. Thank you.
Q. Okay. On March 5th, you provided an Excel chart with some information about the survey, but --
A. I think it would be helpful for you to show me what you're looking at, because I have to then --
Q. This is what you --
A. Yeah. If you could --
Q. There are not that many documents that you submitted. We're talking about the Excel chart that you submitted yesterday, about the first survey.
A. And I submitted more than one document. I just want to make sure -- more than one survey result, too, which has already been provided. So I'm just going to go through each of the attachments --
Q. The Excel chart --
A. Yes. Each of the attachments.
Q. It's the Excel chart that you provided yesterday with respect to the first survey. Let me know when you've got it.
A. And are you talking about --

BY MR. MICHAEL ATLESON:
Q. I'm getting there, but this is actually relevant.
A. I don't think it is. I think that you're seeking to, you know, again, address legal determinations, which we've already briefed.
Q. It's a legal determination that you put in your survey, right?
A. You may -- why don't you -- you may have -- you may disagree with that, but that is taken from the NPRM, which is the relevant document at issue here.
Q. The statement that you read is taken directly from the NPRM?
A. It's taken from there, which is the "should or should have known" standard.
Q. The bullet point that you read is --
A. Obviously, we --
Q. You characterized?
A. We summarized it.
Q. Okay. We'll move on.
A. But you may disagree whether it was true or not, but I think a reasonable
there's two Excel spreadsheets that I attached yesterday.
Q. The Excel spreadsheet with respect to the first survey.
A. Okay. Good.
Q. Got it?
A. I have it open.
Q. So you provided this chart with some information about the survey, but you haven't provided any of the actual 18 responses to the survey, correct?
A. No. I disagree. We have the answers to the responses that are in there. That's what the percentages are. So if you look at the column --
Q. No. I'm asking you whether you provided each company's response, as opposed to you or someone at IAB filling in the numbers and the percentages based on those responses. You didn't provide us the 18 companies' actual responses, correct?
A. No. Because the --
Q. It was this chart?
A. It was a survey of companies in which they didn't have to -- we didn't want
to discourage people from filling out the survey, so we just asked them to do it. It's from, you know -- it's from our members. And in order to allow for them to provide answers without feeling like other people would know who they were, we just gave them the link to the survey to fill out and they filled it out. I don't know which of my members filled this out.
Q. Okay. So --

JUDGE FOELAK: Could I ask one question?
(Multiple speakers.)
JUDGE FOELAK: Mr. Tiffith, so they just answered like yes or no to each question, or they --

MR. LARTEASE TIFFITH: No, no. There's a bunch of questions. So we follow the -we follow the process by which they would -they had the questions. And then each member was allowed to fill in and submit the response to that. So this is where I think it would be helpful, Judge, if we actually was publishing the document that we're talking about at the same time. Because
narrative?
MR. LARTEASE TIFFITH: So the thing that we did -- and I think that was attached to the -- the first survey, mind you, we submitted back on the 20th. And I believe in the document, which we're not using now -- we're going to the Excel file. But in the -- the list of questions that were presented in a separate attachment, it shows the language we were using there.

And, you know, I don't know if counsel wants to bring it up, but, again, I think it should be something where -- if we're going to talk about a document, it should be presented and published for both the -- you know, the Court's viewing, as well as for the public's.

JUDGE FOELAK: Okay. But my -- my question is more simple. It's like, could the person responding you say -- you know, answer, no, however, blah, blah, blah for another paragraph, explaining. That's my question. Could they do that on your survey?

MR. LARTEASE TIFFITH: No. We asked --
you're not able to see what he -- the BCB staff and I are looking at.

And normally when you have cross-examination and you want to use a document, you show it so that everyone is on the same page. I'm looking at something. I'm looking at the attachment I have to it. And it says, "Survey Questions." So it says -- you know, Question 1 -- and this is just an example. I'm not going to read all of it. But I'm going to give you just an example of what the sort of information that is provided through the survey results is.

Does -- the first question is, does your business allow customer reviews to be posted on the business's website? And so there are three possible responses to that. There's, yes, and we had 10 people who said that, which is 55.6 percent of respondents. We have a no, which is 6 , which is 33.3 percent, and then don't know, which is 2 percent and 11.1 So that's how that first question is presented.

JUDGE FOELAK: Okay. What I was getting at, was there any opportunity for a
on this one we had -- on this survey, which is different. The second survey was more open-ended, but here we have specific responses that people had to -- had to code in. Yeah.

JUDGE FOELAK: Okay. Thank you. BY MR. MICHAEL ATLESON:
Q. So, Mr. Tiffith, you don't know who any of the 18 companies are other than the fact that they're IAB members; is that right?
A. That's right. Because we sent -- they had to be an IAB member to take the survey, but I don't know which of the 18 or which companies among our membership.
Q. So you don't know the size of any of the companies?
A. Well, based on the number of reviews and other things like other -- I have a way of determining the varied sizes of it, but I actually don't know like -- for instance, like one company is X and the other one is Y . I don't have that information.
Q. And you don't know the specific
types of products or services any of these companies offer, correct, other than that they would fall within IAB's membership?
A. They would fall within the IAB membership. There was also some questions proposed that would move them -- if they didn't do customer reviews for their products and services, they would be removed from it, right, so...
Q. How many companies did you send this first survey?
A. To all of our members.
Q. How many members is that again?
A. We have 700 -- approximately 700, maybe a little bit over.
Q. Okay. Of the companies that chose not to respond, how many of them so chose because they didn't think the rule would have a substantial impact on the business?
A. I have no way of telling you that, because we didn't ask them to say why they did or did not. And I would also kind of add in another very important point here is, again, we were given a very limited

NPRM. We put together very robust filings and submissions regarding this. And now, until this time, have we narrowed it down to this issue. And that's based on briefings we've done and the fact that the Judge has decided that this is an area in which she would like to see more evidence put forth. And we've done it, and we've put together two survey results.

I would also mention that the Judge also asked and invited the FTC to put forth some explanation of its assumptions and other things, and you didn't do that.

## Q. Okay.

A. And you've had eight months as well to prepare for this.
Q. Are companies who responded to the survey statistically representative of all businesses affected by the proposed rule?
A. We believe they are representative of our membership. And generally we are -- like I said in the beginning, we have over 700 member companies. We are also about 80 percent -sorry, 86 percent of the online advertising
amount of time to provide evidence here, okay? So if we had more time, I think we would have had a lot more responses. But given the very, very small amount of time we had, we weren't able to get everybody to fill out a survey.
Q. The proposed rulemaking was made public over eight months ago, wasn't it?
A. That is true. However, eight months ago we were talking about a number of other issues. And at that time, the Court had not identified, as the judge has done now, that the compliance cost is a disputed issue of material fact.
Q. And you have been raising that issue for months.
A. Along with a lot of other issues we've been raising for months about the process by --
Q. You specifically asked for commenters to provide specific evidence to help with costs, right; that was over eight months ago?
A. Again, there was a lot of other things that were also being considered in a
marketing place in the United States. So I feel like it is a -- generally, a very good survey.
Q. Is it statistically representative of all businesses affected by the proposed rule?
A. I believe it's a good representation. Now, we could talk about statistically, and I'm happy to do that. But again, given that the FTC has put forth no -- no evidence on its side to share -- to refute this and we --
Q. That's -- you're just -- let's keep it to the questions, okay? So I'm asking you whether these 18 companies are statistically representative of all businesses affected by the proposed rule? You're saying they're representative of your membership --
A. And generally --
(Multiple speakers.)
Q. But aren't there lots of other businesses in the country that are affected by this rule that are not companies that would be -- fall within, you know, the
membership parameters of IAB?
A. One, again, I think this is a good reflection of generally the member companies -- not only the member companies, but generally the companies that would be affected by this. It's not an insignificant amount. And again, I would also say that --
Q. 18 is not an insignificant amount?
A. I don't think so, no. When you consider that -- when we look at the -- when we look at the -- the range of responses in terms of the impact that the -- the proposed rule would have on the survey respondents, it's clear to me that it's a -- that is a variety of member companies.
Q. Even though you don't know who they are?
A. Even though I don't know who they are.
Q. All right. When you sent out the survey to your members, did they know that the survey was intended to support IAB's arguments made in connection with this ruling?
members very much abreast of.
Q. Did you suggest to the survey recipients that they read the proposed rule?
A. I believe -- I will have to go back and look at that. This is where I need to pull this up, because I don't have it. I'm looking at the spreadsheet in front of me right now and not the actual other attachment that we had. And again, I think it would be helpful for me, rather than having to dig through my computer to figure out, if you have a document that you want to show -- and I believe the screen share is available -- that you share that document, so that I don't have to take time to kind of find where you're looking at.
Q. I'm not asking a question based on a document. I'm asking you whether in one of the documents you've provided or otherwise, did you suggest to the survey recipients that they read the proposed rule?
A. One second. I believe we did. I don't have it in front of me, but I believe that we -- we -- in providing a description of it, we provided a link. But
A. They were told that we had to respond to the Court's order, which they were aware of, which asked for IAB to present additional evidence about how the rule would impact them as it pertains to compliance and compliance costs. That's what we provided.
Q. When you sent out the survey to your members, did they know what IAB's concerns were about the proposed rule?
A. Well, first of all, let me -back up a little bit. We communicate regularly with our members about ongoing issues like this with the FTC. So we have been from -- starting from the first admission we did over the summer in July, we've been updating our members about this process.

> So, yes, so they have been
following along, and members have been knowing for -- since the beginning. That's what we regularly do as a regular course of business, is to update our members on ongoing situations like this. The Negative Option Rule is another one that we also keep our

I would have to double check that. Again, I don't have everything that -- I would have to look through to find that, but I believe that we did.
Q. Did you suggest to them that they read the NPRM or any part of it?
A. I believe that's the same thing. We provided them with -- that they should read the proposed rule, which is the NPRM.
Q. The NPRM consists of a lot of pages and the proposed rule, right?
A. Well, that's where the proposed rule is, and that's where we would point them to.
Q. Do you know whether any of them did read the proposed rule itself when completing the survey?
A. I don't. Again, it was something that members didn't have to -we're not tracking who each of the --
Q. Right.
A. -- folks are among our membership.
Q. Let's go to the first page of the survey document, the one that was
attached to your February 20th submission. And look at the first two threshold questions. Can you please read those aloud?
A. Again, I'm going to ask that you share your screen.
Q. I don't have the facility to do that right now.

MS. TABOR: This is the secretary. Actually, all participants have the ability
to screen share. It's been enabled.
MR. MICHAEL ATLESON: I can attempt to do that on my computer or, Mr. Tiffith, through your documents, you could do that as well.

THE WITNESS: I would prefer that you do it, because it's your questioning, and I prefer that you bring it up. Thank you.

JUDGE FOELAK: You could use the green button on the controls that says share screen.

MR. LARTEASE TIFFITH: So I'm viewing your document, I believe.
BY MR. MICHAEL ATLESON:
Q. Okay. It's up.
A. Yeah.
Q. It's going to take me a little bit of time for each one, but all right. So this is the first page of the survey questions from the first survey that you submitted on February 20th; is that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. And -- okay. So we're looking at the first two threshold questions. And now we need to pull up the Excel charts. I'm not sure I can do both at the same time.

So let's just look at this one here for now. On the -- on the Excel chart that you submitted yesterday, it says that 10 people, 10 companies answered yes to the first question, and 15 companies answered yes to the second question, right?
A. Again, if you could pull up the document, so we're -- we're both referring to the same thing, that would be great. You're referring to a document. I would like for you to pull it up.
Q. Are we seeing the chart?
A. Yeah. I see it. So the first question, Does your business allow customer reviews to be posted on the business
question? Do you have a specific question in mind, or are you just talking about the questions in general?
Q. I'm talking about the last two questions down here, Question 7 and 8. Those are the two questions about cost -- specific costs.
A. Uh-huh.
Q. And I'm asking whether there's a way you can tell --
A. Can you go back down to Question 7 and 8?
Q. Uh-huh.
A. I just want to finish reading it.
Q. Do you understand the question?
A. I believe I am getting it, but I just -- you were kind of moving between the two. I just wanted to kind of finish reading what you were looking at. Okay. You can continue.
Q. Okay. So from this chart, we can't match up any company's response to the threshold questions with the same company's answers on these last two questions; is that
right?
A. That's correct. We're not able to tell, of the ones who said yes to the first two questions, whether -- who also said -- how they may have answered this question.

We do know that we have 18 respondents to this question, but we're not able to say who answered what among them.
Q. Okay. And I see here -- let's go back to Questions 1 and 2. So for each -Question 1 and Question 2, we have two companies saying, don't know, right?
A. Of the 18 , that's correct.
Q. Do you know whether those are the same two companies?
A. I don't know.
Q. Okay. So you have somewhere between two and four of your 18 respondents who completed the whole survey despite not knowing whether their companies posted reviews on their websites or --
A. Let's be very --
(Multiple speakers.)
MR. LARTEASE TIFFITH: Let's be very
statement on the prior page that we already talked about relating to liability for companies?
A. They were doing it based on what it would take for them to come into compliance with the proposed rule. That's the question we asked them, and that's actually in this question itself. And they were responding to that.
Q. Well, don't both of these questions about costs start with, "In light of the above"?
A. Yes. All of the above.
Q. Right. And isn't that an implicit direction for respondents to consider what you just said in the same section on the prior page about civil penalty liability?
A. I believe -- on the first -this first one we said right here, in light of the above and considering your answers to Questions 1 and 2, please estimate that. And in the second we do the same, considering all other questions. So just as it is read there, in light of the above in
clear. Let's go back to Question 7 and 8 again. So we have again six and seven, who said, don't know. It very well goes to -or potentially four, are also the same ones who are saying no to this question.
BY MR. MICHAEL ATLESON:
Q. But you don't know, right?
A. I don't know, but I would -- I
would think that was probably a -- I would
feel like more than likely, since they didn't know the first two, they probably didn't know that one either.
Q. We're going to go back to the survey document. And let's go to the compliance cost section again.
A. Are we -- so are we doing a different question now, not still focusing on Questions 7 and 8?
Q. We are. We actually are going to go to the last two questions. Those are the same seven and eight here on the last page.

Okay. Were the survey
respondents basing their answers to these two questions, at least in part, on your
considering your answers to all other questions in this survey, then answer that question. So, yes, that's how we did it. I think the questions themselves are very clear about what we asked them to do. And they provided a response.
Q. As far as you know though, they considered your statement about civil penalty liability in determining which of the answers they were going to pick on these last two questions, right?
A. I assume they considered everything we provided them, but I can't say they only considered one thing or the other. But I would imagine they considered everything that we asked them to consider.
Q. All right.
A. Yeah.
Q. Now, I need to go back to the chart again. Okay. And we're going to go on the chart back to Question 7 and Question 8. On Question 7, 6 of the 18 gave no estimate, right?
A. They say, don't know. That's right.
Q. And Question 8, 7 of the 18 didn't give an estimate, right?
A. That's right. They quoted, don't know.
Q. And you don't know, again, how many of those six or seven people were the same companies that said I don't know to one or both of the threshold questions?
A. That's right. And the other thing I would add, if I may finish my answer, is that, again, because of the judge's order asking for specifically more -- asking for evidence related to cost, the second survey which we haven't gotten to yet is --
Q. Right. We'll get to the second survey.
A. -- a lot more detailed than the first survey was.
Q. Back to Question 7 again. For the two companies that apparently answered with the option of estimated cost between $\$ 1,000$ and 9,999 , you don't know whether their actual estimates would have been closer to the lower number or the higher number,
right?
A. No. They were asked to choose a range, and that's the range.
Q. And the same is true of the four companies between $\$ 10,000$ and 49,999 ?
A. That's correct.
Q. Okay. And you don't know how any of these respondents actually calculated their estimated costs, right?
A. I don't.
Q. You don't know how much time or effort any of the respondents put into those calculations, right?
A. I don't.
Q. You don't have any breakdown of how any of the respondents calculated the cost of different tasks to make up those totals, right?
A. Not based on this question right here, no.
Q. Okay. And you don't know which provisions of the proposed rule might be attributable to any portion of the estimates that they gave?
A. That's correct.
Q. If this survey misstated any provision or aspect of the proposed rule, that could affect the calculation of compliance costs, right?
A. I'm sorry. Repeat the question.
Q. If the survey misstated any provision or aspect of the proposed rule, that could affect the calculation of compliance costs for purposes of Question 7 and 8 , right?
A. If -- if the survey question -if the survey questions had, then, yes. But -- you know, again, or characterization and interpretation is that it's accurate.
Q. Might some respondents have understood the proposed rule to impose liability based on merely the hosting of fake or false consumer reviews?
A. Some could have. That would also be why interpretation -- I think that's also part of the concern we have here, is that based on this lower standard, "should or should have known," which means that if -- and not actual knowledge, is that many businesses are going to have to do things to
figure out how best they could comply with that standard.

That includes some may decide -like you say, they may do -- you know, do something in one area or all areas. I have no way to know, based on their estimate, what they considered in that. But again, that is something that's going to be subject to each of the companies.

And again, all of the companies who are going to have this are going to do the same kind of calculations to figure out how they're going to do it.
Q. Do you know who in each company answered the survey?
A. We sent it to the companies and sent it to the -- the individuals best able to answer the question, so who would be able to determine the cost. So people who are working --
Q. You don't know who they are?
A. I don't know who they are, no.
Q. Do you know --
(Multiple speakers.)
MR. LARTEASE TIFFITH: We directed it
to them.
BY MR. MICHAEL ATLESON:
Q. Do you know whether any person answering the survey consulted with others at their company with relevant knowledge?
A. I would assume they did, but I don't know. Because, again, I -- you know, as I've stated from the beginning, it was not a survey where we know each of the individuals who did it.
Q. Right. So you also don't know the factual basis, if any, that the people answering the survey had for their answers?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. I'm going to move to the second survey. Give me a moment to bring that up. Okay. So do you see it?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. This is a rather long document, literally long, like this (showing), so I'll try and move it around as best as I can. This is by the way the Excel chart that you produced yesterday with respect to the second survey; is that right?
correct, just this chart?
A. That's right. Again -- again, we -- you know, for the same reasons as the first survey.
Q. And like the last one, you didn't identify any of the 19 companies that responded to the survey, right?
A. That's right.
Q. And you don't know the -- do you know who they are?
A. No. I do not know. One thing I will say that we have in there in the written document, is that we do include, kind of -- maybe it's hard to read on the document itself, the Excel spreadsheet, but in the -- the written submission, we do have, like, the questions more clearly identified and the written submission, along with the results of that. So I just want to --

## Q. Okay.

A. -- let you know that there's more there that's not -- that's in the written submission.
Q. So as with the first survey,
A. That's correct.
Q. Okay. Now, for the second survey, you didn't provide us with a copy of the actual survey document itself, did you?
A. I don't think so. This time, again, as you will recall, we were kind of pushed to get our stuff in the record. I had -- originally, our plan was that we had more time to do that. So I didn't attach everything at the same time because I was trying to meet this truncated deadline. But, no.

So the things that we provided yesterday were the submission itself, which I think had some of that in there. So we should go to the actual written document. And the two survey -- sorry. Two Excel files that were attached.

So let me -- let me look and see if that would actually -- because I don't have that in front of me at the moment. Let me take a look at that from yesterday.
Q. So while you're looking, as with the first survey, you didn't provide us with any of the individual companies' responses,
you, I take it, don't know the size of any of these companies?
A. No. Don't know the size. But I will say, if you still have the document up, is that I can tell that there's -- there's a variety of -- of companies that have responded based on the amount of customer reviews that they use in their business.

So right now I can only see the first 11 or -- 10 or 11 data points. But I see there is some who've done 1,$000 ; 1,200$. There's some in the $10,000 \mathrm{~s}$. There's some in the millions.
Q. Right. You don't actually know?
A. I just -- I would imagine that reflects a different size organization, but I don't know who they are.
Q. Okay. And -- and similarly as the first survey, you don't know the specific types of products or services that any of these companies offer, except that they would be presumably something that an IAB member would offer?
A. Correct. Yeah.
Q. Did you send this survey to all
of your members as well?
A. We did. Just like we did for the first survey.
Q. How many of the companies responding to the second survey also responded to the first survey?
A. I have no way of knowing.
Q. Okay. Of the companies that chose not to respond, I take it you don't know how many so chose because they didn't think the rule would have a substantial impact on the business?
A. I don't know, one, whether they saw the survey, because, again, we were doing it on a very truncated time schedule. I don't know if they saw it. And if they saw it and decided not to respond or whether they -- whatever. I actually couldn't answer what they were thinking, whether they even saw it. But I can only talk about the 19 that we actually had that provided answers.
Q. Okay. When you sent out this survey to your members, did they know that it was intended to support IAB's arguments made
the phrase, "Considering the information you just reviewed about the FTC's proposed rule," right?
A. Yeah.
Q. Okay. Whatever that information was, you didn't provide that, right?
A. So, again, like I said before, I believe we provided them with the NPRM, and -- which is -- and asked them to review it. And provide responses based on their -you know, their own answer to the questions based on having that. And that's what we say in the actual question itself.

And we were asked -- they were asked to do that, and so they provided a response.
Q. I'm sorry.
A. The question says right here, considering the information you just reviewed about the FTC's proposed rules.
Q. Right. But we don't know what information they just reviewed about the proposed rule?
A. They reviewed the rule. That's what they were asked to do.
in connection with this ruling?
A. Similar to the first one, we let people know -- and, again, we do regular updates with our members about ongoing issues like this. We -- I let our members know that the judge in this -- the presiding officer wanted to have more evidence presented related to compliance costs and we needed their help to help by, you know, filling out the survey, so that we could provide that evidence to the judge.
Q. And did you tell them at that time that IAB's concern was that costs were not as minimal as the FTC had suggested?
A. I don't believe we did that, no.
Q. Okay. But they knew that from prior updates?
A. They would have -- I mean, I would assume that all our members are aware of public policy matters because we regularly send news letters and other updates about what's going on. So I would presume that they were aware of the issue.
Q. Okay. So Question 4 on the survey, according to this chart, starts with
Q. How do you know?
A. I don't know if they did do that, but they were asked to review the rule.
Q. Where was it they were asked to do that?
A. I believe when we asked them to complete the survey, it was part of that, asking them to take a look.

So but -- I would have to -again, I would have to go back and try to find that. But I don't have that in front of me. I don't know what the -- I don't know what the point of this question is. I told you, I don't know who the respondents are. I've already acknowledged that. And --
(Multiple speakers.)
BY MR. MICHAEL ATLESON:
Q. -- their answers, depending on what they reviewed about the proposed rule, and you've shown us this question indicating that you gave them something to review, but you didn't tell us what it was that they reviewed.
A. As I said earlier, we give
regular updates to our members on ongoing matters, including this one. So earlier when I said, you can assume they were aware of where IAB is with respect to this. So I
Q. This is, considering the information you just reviewed. So I take it that at some part of this survey that you didn't provide but for this chart, you gave them information to review. And I'm still trying to figure out what information it was that you asked them to review. We don't know.
A. We --
Q. You don't --
A. We don't know. I think that's probably the best answer right now.
Q. Okay. Did you -- what specifically did you tell members receiving the survey about civil penalty liability?
A. Again, I asked -- we asked them to refer to the rule. So -- and I think they would have -- as we've already -- and I have told you I've briefed. We've briefed people that the FTC is seeking penalties and
maybe a little hard to get them all up on a screen at once here.
A. If you want to just do the questions, I think the written submission should have generally the questions in a column and the respondent, if you want to consider that.
Q. Yeah. That won't be exactly what I'm asking here. But let's just see if we can do this. So the questions on the survey that ask for specific cost estimates are $9,12,15$, and 16 ; is that right?
A. You said 9, 12 -- what was the other question?
Q. 9, 12, 15, and 16. Those are the ones with cost estimates that members put in ; is that right?
A. Yes. But I would also say the other ones also include some kind of cost estimate, too, eventually. But, yes.
Q. That doesn't include the numbers of employees or hours?
A. Exactly. Yeah. The word "cost" is actually in those questions, yes.
Q. Okay. So for Question 9 --
under a "should or should have known" standard.
Q. Okay. You told them --
A. But --
Q. -- for this survey.
A. But -- but -- not for this
survey. This again goes to communications generally about updates about what we're doing. So --
Q. Okay. Okay. Good enough. So this survey did or didn't contain any text besides the questions in this chart?
A. I think there was a -- there would have been additional texts just to say, here's a survey, you know; can you complete this? Here's a due date when we need to get this by in order to present it to the judge. That sort of thing.
Q. It didn't have any statements about the rule provisions?
A. I will have to go back and look at it, but I believe, you know, generally.
Q. So now let's turn to questions that ask for specific cost estimates. Let's see if I can get to those. It's going to be
A. And if you could just refer to -- go back up to nine, and then can you go back up to the top, so I can read that question again?
Q. Okay.
A. Okay. Go ahead.
Q. 11 of the 19 respondents gave no estimate at all; is that right?
A. Based on this, yes, that's right.
Q. Okay. And for Question 12 -- go back up to the top.
A. Yeah. Because I can follow the column. That's good. And I can see which one we're talking about.
Q. Again, 11 of the respondents gave no estimate at all and a 12 th respondent said the amount was zero dollars; is that right?
A. Say that again. Yeah. Say that again.
Q. 11 of 19 respondents to Question 12 gave no estimate at all and a 12 th respondent said the amount was $\$ 0$; is that right?
A. I believe -- so let me actually look at the written submission, because I think we actually say how many people responded to the various questions. And that way I don't want to say anything that's not accurate. And go back up. I'm going to look at this and look at the number -- for the sake of argument, I'm going to agree that you counted the entries correctly.
Q. Okay.
A. I'm going to say that's correct, yeah.
Q. So Question 15, 13 of the 19 respondents gave no estimate at all and a 14th respondent said the amount was $\$ 1$; is that right?
A. Yes. Go back down a little further down. Because I think -- go to the bottom. That looks correct. Yes.
Q. Okay. And finally, for Question 16, 12 of the 19 respondents gave no estimate at all and a 13 th respondent said the amount was $\$ 1$; is that right?
A. That's -- that looks correct.
Q. Okay. For the few companies

## knowledge?

A. That's correct.
Q. And you don't know the factual basis of any of the people answering the survey had for these answers?
A. That's correct. I don't know what went into their determination.

MR. MICHAEL ATLESON: I have no further questions, Your Honor.

JUDGE FOELAK: Mr. Tiffith, a redirect, as it were?

MR. LARTEASE TIFFITH: You know, Your Honor, I think, again -- you know, I would just say that again, you know, just as you mentioned before, and in your order, we were given time to submit some evidence and we undertook that under a very tight schedule.

I think that, you know, counsel earlier made light of that there is 18 respondents in the first survey and 19 respondents in the second survey. But again, if you look at the customer reviews and the second one, you can see that there's a range of businesses who participated in it. And I
that did answer any of those four questions, you don't know how exactly any of them actually calculated any of their estimated costs, right?
A. I -- I don't. Just as I said before, I don't know what they -- what each company did to come up with their figure.
Q. Right. And you don't know how much time or effort any respondent put into their calculations, right?
A. I do not. No.
Q. You don't know which provisions of the proposed rule are attributable to any portion of any of these estimated costs, right?
A. Correct.
Q. And you don't know who at each company answered this survey; is that right?
A. Well, I know that we directed to the person who was most likely to be able to answer the question, but I don't know who that person is.
Q. Okay. And you don't know whether any of those people did or did not consult others at the company with relevant
do believe it to be reflective of our overall membership, and I think in general a reflection of the companies.

And, you know, I would also just, again, echo that the burden here on establishing that they had considered the benefits and costs and also alternatives, which the FTC never did. They essentially only considered whether they would go forward with the proposed rule or not. But they didn't consider lesser alternatives, including only actual knowledge as being the standard they would hold companies by, which, you know, I believed would have significantly lessened the compliance costs and actually could create the same benefits for consumers. And by law, they're required to kind of do those considerations.

And I think, as you discovered from this process, that again the FTC has not put forth any details about the assumptions to assume, nor have they carried out the requirements of the Magnuson-Moss, in terms of considering reasonable alternatives.

And with that, I will just conclude
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