

ABA-User Fee—American Bankers Association
 Red Cross-User Fee—American Red Cross
 ARDA-User Fee—American Resort Development Association
 ATA-User Fee—American Teleservices Association
 Community Bankers-User Fee—America's Community Bankers
 Ameriquest-User Fee—Ameriquest Mortgage Company
 Celebrity Prime Foods-User Fee—Celebrity Prime Foods
 CBA-User Fee—Consumer Bankers Association
 DialAmerica-User Fee—DialAmerica Marketing, Inc.
 DMA Letter-User Fee—Direct Marketing Association
 DMA Comments-User Fee—Direct Marketing Association
 Discover-User Fee—Discover Bank
 ERA/PMA-User Fee—Electronic Retailing Association and Promotion Marketing Association (joint comment)
 Household-User Fee—Household Bank (SB), N.A. and Household Bank (Nevada), N.A. (joint comment)
 Hudson Bay-User Fee—Hudson Bay Company of Illinois, Inc.
 ICTA-User Fee—Industry Council for Tangible Assets
 InfoCision-User Fee—InfoCision Management Corporation
 ITC-User Fee—Interactive Teleservices Corporation
 MPA-User Fee—Magazine Publishers of America
 MasterCard-User Fee—MasterCard International, Inc.
 NACDS-User Fee—National Association of Chain Drug Stores
 NAR-User Fee—National Association of Realtors
 NASUCA-User Fee—National Association of State Utility Consumer Advocates
 NEMA-User Fee—National Energy Marketers Association
 Not-For-Profit Coalition-User Fee—Not-For-Profit and Charitable Coalition
 SBC-User Fee—SBC Communications, Inc.
 Tennessee-User Fee—Tennessee Regulatory Authority
 SBA-User Fee—United States Small Business Administration, Office of Advocacy
 Visa-User Fee—Visa U.S.A., Inc.
 Wells Fargo-User Fee—Wells Fargo & Company

Concurring Statement of Commissioner Orson Swindle in *Telemarketing Sales Rule*, File No. R411001

I wholeheartedly support the amendments to the Telemarketing Sales Rule ("TSR"), because I believe that they will help protect consumers from deceptive and abusive telemarketing practices. In particular, these amendments will give consumers the ability to avoid the sheer volume of unwanted telemarketing calls that many consider to be a nuisance. I write separately to explain my views on two issues — how the Commission determines whether an act or practice is

"abusive" for purposes of the TSR, and the national do-not-call registry.

Abusive Telemarketing Acts or Practices

The Telemarketing and Consumer Fraud and Abuse Prevention Act ("Telemarketing Act") directs the Commission to promulgate rules that prohibit "deceptive telemarketing acts or practices and other abusive telemarketing acts or practices." 15 U.S.C. 6102 (a)(1). To determine what constitutes an abusive telemarketing practice, the Commission for the most part has used the examples of abusive practices that Congress provided in the Telemarketing Act and principles drawn from these examples. I agree that this is an appropriate analysis, and in light of the rulemaking record as a whole, I fully support the TSR amendments that fall within these parameters. These amendments include, among other things, the provisions involving the national do-not-call registry, transmission of caller identification information, and abandoned calls and predictive dialers.

When the Commission seeks to identify practices as abusive that are less distinctly within the parameters of the Act's examples and their emphasis on privacy protection, the Commission employs its traditional unfairness analysis.¹ I understand the Commission's intention to narrow the potentially expansive scope of the term "abusive" by using its unfairness analysis. However, given the broad ordinary meaning of the term "abusive," I believe that the standard for determining what constitutes an abusive telemarketing practice likely is broader than the stringent definition of the term "unfair." Therefore, I would have preferred it had the Commission looked to the plain meaning of the term "abusive" and then formulated a separate standard to identify abusive

telemarketing practices for purposes of the Telemarketing Act and the TSR.

Nevertheless, I agree with the Commission's conclusion that a telemarketing practice that meets the strict unfairness standard will constitute an abusive practice for purposes of the Act and the TSR. In light of the rulemaking record, I therefore support the TSR amendments that are analyzed under this standard. This includes the requirement that telemarketers obtain consumers' or donors' express informed consent before causing their information to be submitted for payment. The rulemaking record evidences the harm that results from unauthorized billing, the need for the consent requirement, and the need to mandate specific steps that telemarketers must take to obtain consumers' consent in transactions involving preacquired account information.

In addition, the record supports the prohibition on the disclosure or receipt, for consideration, of unencrypted account numbers for use in telemarketing (except to process a payment for goods or services or a charitable contribution pursuant to a transaction). I do not believe that the mere disclosure of personal financial information, without more, causes or is likely to cause substantial consumer injury. In this situation, however, the rulemaking record provides a basis for concluding that trafficking in unencrypted account numbers is likely to cause substantial consumer injury in the form of unauthorized billing. Industry comments state that there is no legitimate reason to purchase unencrypted lists of credit card numbers. Therefore, there is a strong likelihood that telemarketers who do engage in this practice will misuse the information in a manner that results in unauthorized charges to consumers' accounts. The Commission's law enforcement experience corroborates this conclusion.² As a result, I conclude that this practice is abusive for purposes of the Telemarketing Act.

The National Do-Not-Call Registry

The Telemarketing Act and the TSR recognize consumers' "right to be let alone." See, e.g., *Olmstead v. U.S.*, 277 U.S. 438, 478 (1928) (Brandeis, J., dissenting) (stating that the "right to be let alone" is the "most comprehensive of rights and the right most valued by

¹ Given that nothing in the language of the Telemarketing Act or its legislative history indicates that Congress intended the Commission to use its unfairness standard to determine which practices are abusive, I previously raised concerns about this analysis and requested comment on this issue.

Concurring Statement of Commissioner Orson Swindle in Telemarketing Sales Rule Review, File No. R411001, available at (www.ftc.gov/os/2002/01/swindletsrstatement.htm). Although some comments agreed with this concern, they did not offer an alternative analysis of abusive practices beyond suggesting that the Commission's authority is limited to the examples of abusive practices included in the Telemarketing Act and its legislative history. See *Statement of Basis and Purpose* at 100, n. 428. However, because the Act does not limit the Commission's authority to identify abusive practices to the examples in the Act, the Commission may prohibit other practices that it identifies as abusive.

² See *Statement of Basis and Purpose* at 97-98. In addition, given the evidence that the use of encrypted account information in telemarketing can result in unauthorized charges, there is an even greater likelihood that injury will occur when a telemarketer has obtained, for consideration, consumers' actual credit card numbers.