

MARKLE FOUNDATION
IDI #14
FINANCIAL COMPANY SENIOR MANAGER
JUNE 13, 2000

MODERATOR-- INTERNET. WHAT DO YOU WANT TO FIX ABOUT IT?

I'm always concerned about the speed issue, just making it better, bigger, faster and better. More interactive.

MODERATOR--OF THE CHALLENGES, THE INTERNET AND THE PUBLIC USE OF IT, IN THE BROADEST SENSE: WHAT IS THE SINGLE BIGGEST CHALLENGE THAT MUST BE MET IN THE NEXT TEN YEARS?

I think it's a confidence issue. It's a confidence issue from consumers, among businesses. To build confidence you need to have education awareness. Those types of things. But you need to have the initial structure in place; you need to have the controls and conditions. Information practices or business practices; alternative disputes.

MODERATOR--SO THE BIGGEST CHALLENGE IS IN E-COMMERCE CONSUMER CONFIDENCE OR PUBLIC CONFIDENCE, NO MATTER WHAT KIND OF USE OF THE INTERNET.

No matter what kind of use of the Internet; whether it's purchasing or buying. This is the consumer perspective or business to business or the collaborative uses of the Internet. It's not just all going to be about buying. It's more than that, its collaboration. Everybody is relying on somebody else's service now; you have confidence in that service. Whether it's providing all the right confidentiality, privacy, integrity, availability and reliability, authenticity, accountability, especially with this whole concept of exchanges. How can you make sure that this middleman that you're dealing with now in your business or even in your consumer relationship is accountable to you?

MODERATOR--DO YOU THINK THE INTERNET WORLD IS SO DIFFERENT THAT IT REQUIRES A NEW SET OF RULES SEPARATE FROM THOSE IN THE OFF-LINE WORLD?

I think the philosophy of the off-line rules, in general, applies. They sometimes need to be translated and interpreted differently for the Internet.

MODERATOR--BUT IT'S NOT SUFFICIENTLY DIFFERENT TO HAVE WHOLE NEW RULES.

I think, in general, I would answer that question as not sufficiently different, but there are probably areas of exception.

MODERATOR--GENERALLY SPEAKING, DO YOU THINK THE PUBLIC HAS MORE PROTECTIONS OR FEWER PROTECTIONS ON-LINE, RELATIVE TO OFF-LINE.

I think about the same. I think people are more fearful about on-line; but they have just – from a privacy perspective, they have just as many avenues-chances of having their privacy treated in ways that they are not intending or don't care for in an off-line world. We can all open our mailboxes for an example of that. It is probably easier to deal with your privacy – the best actors, good actors of the on-line world. The top 100 sites, the top 2,500 sites to manage your privacy is far easier to manager your privacy on-line than it is off-line with those good actors.

MODERATOR-- REGARDLESS OF WHETHER THE PUBLIC DOES HAVE MORE OR LESS PROTECTION ON-LINE RIGHT NOW. DO YOU BELIEVE THE PUBLIC SHOULD HAVE A DIFFERENT LEVEL OF PROTECTION ON-LINE RELATIVE TO OFF-LINE?

No, I actually – again, this is not is going to be non-accountable. I believe that we are shooting for a high – government and public advocacy groups are shooting for a higher level of corporate accountability for on-line privacy than there exists in the off-line world. I believe the off-line world should have its bar raised to the same level. I think they should be equivalent.

MODERATOR--BUT HIGHER?

Higher than they are.

MODERATOR-- DO YOU THINK THE PUBLIC UNDERSTANDS WHAT PROTECTIONS THEY HAVE?

Absolutely not.

MODERATOR-- TO WHAT EXTENT DO YOU SENSE THAT PEOPLE ARE STAYING OFF OF THE INTERNET BECAUSE OF CONCERNS ABOUT ENTERING A NEW MEDIUM THAT HAS FEW REGULATIONS?

I think that those are silly people who are staying off because of those kinds of fears. That they haven't – I don't believe that they've done enough reading, they might be the ones who are waiting for the UFO behind the comet to come and take them away. There are enough things that you should exercise care over on the Internet as much as you should in real life. There are streets you just don't walk down, there are businesses you don't buy from, like buying wristwatches from some guy on the street corner and believing that they're the real thing. You don't give them your credit card and buy those wristwatches out of his coat pocket. The same kind of practices needs to be taken here. There are brands on the Internet that you can trust.

MODERATOR--DO YOU KNOW OF ANYBODY WHO IS STAYING OFF?

No, not somebody who owns a computer and a modem. If they own a computer and a modem, they're on-line.

MODERATOR--HERE ARE THESE QUESTIONS ABOUT REGULATION. I'M SURE YOU KNOW THE FTC ASKED CONGRESS TO GIVE IT AUTHORITY ON PRIVACY. WHAT'S YOUR VIEW OF THIS REQUEST?

Again, personal view, not official. Personal view – will I be listed as contributor?

MODERATOR--THE TRANSCRIPT IS MADE AND WHEN THE PEOPLE ARE MAKING THE TRANSCRIPT, AT THAT POINT, THEY KNOW THAT IT'S YOU. THE ANSWER GETS COALATED IN A PILE WITH NO NAME. AT THE MOMENT, THEY'RE NOT EVEN GOING TO LIST THE PEOPLE IN THE BACK.

Okay, I don't mind being listed in the back.

MODERATOR--BUT I THINK THE PLAN IS NOT TO DO THAT AND CERTAINLY NOT IN CALCULATING THE ANSWER.

So my 15 minutes of fame won't happen here. I'm comfortable with that. Basically, I think it's a good thing that the FTC and other regulatory bodies are going to eventually take a stronger role in this. I'm not one for over-regulation; but I think that this scenario, in a minimum standard, should be set. Most of the companies, especially most of the companies that engage our services, are already doing the minimum; so it won't be doing anything more than solidifying into law regulation. What that does is that means every slacker who isn't doing it and not making the investment will not get away with it anymore. It will put them in a much more competitive position.

MODERATOR--YOU THINK IT'S GOING TO BE GOOD FOR BUSINESS TO COMPLY WITH SOME KIND OF A MINIMUM STANDARD.

It will make it easier to demonstrate that they're good actors and it will mean that the bad actors can't get away with it anymore. If you comply with the regulation, and you're spending time and energy living up to it, at least that minimum standard. The other people aren't spending the time and energy; they're giving it away to somebody. It's not necessarily a level playing field.

MODERATOR--HAS SELF REGULATION OF THE INTERNET WORKED?

I believe that self-regulation is working, does work; but it should be – going back to the question you asked before; there is a hybrid approach that the FTC does have some authority on their accepted trading practices on the privacy policy. Don't do what I say I do in my policy. Action could be taken under separate practices; I've got a self-regulatory environment; but I've also got some regulations. The banking industry is the same thing. I've got some self-regulation; but I've also got some regulations. So a hybrid approach is important; and I think industry should be able to set sector by sector standards or different standards -- like TRUSTe is a self-regulatory regime. Nobody needs to join it; it's a standard of crossing the street.

MODERATOR--YOU VISUALIZE THAT THE ISSUE OF SELF-REGULATION IS GOING TO VARY BY SECTOR. IN OTHER WORDS - THEY'RE BUILT FROM DIFFERENT

APPROACHES TO SELF-REGULATION IN DIFFERENT SECTORS, SUCH AS BANKING AND RETAIL.

Banking versus retail versus children versus health. When we look at these all side by side; we see that there are a lot of similarities and you can come up with a least common factor for all of them and that's fair information practices.

MODERATOR--WHAT IS YOUR REACTION TO THE FTC CLAIMS THAT FEW COMPANIES CURRENTLY FOLLOW THE AGENCY'S VOLUNTARY INTERNET PRIVACY GUIDELINES?

What they discovered were that few companies disclose all fair information practices on their web site's privacy policy. Again, the leading companies do a wonderful job at it, non-leading companies are doing a poorer job at it; and I think that industry has a long way to go to make up for that. There are also some statements in the fair information practice, especially in the security aspect, where it isn't clear what you should state and how much you should state regarding the security of your site or your service, so we're not sure what level of . . .

MODERATOR—YOU'RE SAYING THAT WHEN THEY SAY, FEW OF FOLLOWING, IT'S NOT CLEAR HOW TO FOLLOW THAT.

It's not clear how to say what you're doing. It's not clear that you should say; would you want to announce in an ad the kinds of locks you have on doors at home and whether you have an alarm system or not?

MODERATOR—THEY'RE SAYING THAT FEW COMPANIES ARE FOLLOWING THE PARAMETERS. I'M NOT SURE THAT WAS LIMITED TO STATING THAT THEY FOLLOW; BUT ANYWAY.

They couldn't have tested in their survey whether they have firewalls or internal controls or anything like that.

MODERATOR--SO THE SURVEY WAS A SURVEY OF SITES RATHER THAN OF PRACTICES.

Exactly, of stated disclosures from a security prospective. Of stated disclosures; and maybe if there was a secure page when you register or access or begin a secure session; but they did not do any kind of review of what goes on behind the scenes.

MODERATOR-- IF REGULATIONS GOVERNING THE INTERNET WERE TO INCREASE, WHOM WOULD YOU TRUST TO MAKE THE RULES OR LAWS? I'VE BEEN GIVEN A LIST, AND I'M GOING TO ASK IT AS A MULTIPLE CHOICE; IT'S NOT ALL EITHER/OR. THE PRIVATE SECTOR, SUCH AS A DOT.COM COMPANY OR ISP; GOVERNMENT, WHICH COULD BE CONGRESS OR EXECUTIVE AGENCIES LIKE FTC OR FCC; STATE GOVERNMENT; NON-PROFITS; NGOS OR ICANN OR WCCC; I'M

ADDING TO THAT THE WTO. SOMEBODY BROUGHT THAT UP THE OTHER DAY. THEY AREN'T EXCLUSIVE OBVIOUSLY.

It's also a confidence and whose interest is it kind of perspective. Ultimately, I think a U.S. Federal level law coming out of Congress, that's well thought out. See, the worry is that Congress will pass something quickly that is either too narrow or careless/reckless that will have to be implemented. So a well thought out congressional action requiring one or more agencies to issue regulations is probably unlikely. Nobody trusts Congress or the government; but I think that is where it needs to be. It can't be at the state level because there is too much room for discrepancies. Ultimately, we want some harmony with International bodies so that global trade, global commerce and global interaction can be sustained in a reasonable fashion.

MODERATOR--WHAT DO YOU THINK ABOUT ICANN?

They're not a player in this. They dish out addresses, they don't know anything. It's not in their charter; they have a hard trouble matching the address face in all these countries that they would not be effective.

MODERATOR--YOU KNOW ABOUT OPT OUT AND OPT IN. IF A LAW MANDATED THAT INTERNET USERS COULD EASILY OPT OUT BY DOING WHAT YOU NEED TO DO TO OPT OUT, WHOM WOULD YOU WANT TO ENFORCE IT?

Again, if it were encoded into a law; it would be that enforcement authority; hopefully, again, it would be a federal level. I'm also a believer in alternative dispute resolution; so if the party is a company, the web site was part of an enforcement program like TRUSTe, it would be on-line, something like that. You could issue their dispute to that kind of body. That would be better than having to take everybody to court. If you had a grievance, there should also be some sort of grievance, mediation type law. It really comes down to the consumer and merchant and that relationship should be the first stopping place. It shouldn't go to the courts or the FTC.

MODERATOR-- WHAT ABOUT THE LOVE VIRUS SITUATION. DO YOU THINK IT WAS HANDLED CORRECTLY BY NOTIFYING PEOPLE, GETTING THE GUYS?

One, it's not really a privacy issue. This virus is not a privacy issue. It was a computer security issue. The Federal Government and state government were investigated. State law enforcement agencies and federal law enforcement agencies were a part of the investigation. They don't need to defend us from this; we need to the right thing, of course.

MODERATOR--YOU MEAN TO VOLUNTARILY FIX THE PROBLEM.

They're reactive; they can't be proactive in this case. They cannot go out and find out who is writing virus software and try to stop that, I think that it's a problem; but they could be promoting anti-virus solutions for us all. Educating us.

MODERATOR--WOULD YOU WANT TO SEE THE FEDS AND THE STATE DOING THAT, DOING MORE PROMOTION OF ANTI-VIRUS SOFTWARE?

Anti-virus is a huge security. I think just like the Federal Trade Commission, Department of Commerce, this is from the National Association of the Attorneys General. The guide to sightseeing on the Internet, the director marketing association gets cyber savvy. There are a lot of outlets already.

MODERATOR--THIS IS A PUBLICATION CALLED CYBER SAVVY, A FAMILY GUIDE, PUT OUT BY THE DIRECT MARKETING ASSOCIATION, DMA.

It's available on their web site. There is a publication from the Federal Trade Commission and the State Attorney Generals Association called: "Sightseeing on the Internet, Consumer Guide to Travel and Cyberspace." These kinds of things already exist. Government issued, organizationally issued a number of companies have joined up like: "Get Net Wise.com"; "Get Net Org", I guess it is to how parents, for example, can get savvy and protect themselves and their kids; to the level they want to protect.

MODERATOR--YOU SEE A LOT OF OPPORTUNITIES FOR EDUCATING PEOPLE TO BEING MORE PROTECTIVE.

Yes.

MODERATOR--WHO WOULD YOU DEFINITELY NOT WANT TO BE MAKING AND ENFORCING RULES CONCERNING THE INTERNET, AND WHY? I THINK YOU SAID SOMETHING ABOUT STATE GOVERNMENT.

I don't mind them enforcing it. I think uniform laws and rules are important for Interstate Commerce; for global issues. Not just commerce, just Interstate activity. I don't mind if it has to be – if some offense or violation gets turned over to some state police agency for other law enforcement agency for enforcement. Enforcement, ultimately is not an issue, it's really common rules.

MODERATOR--MAKING LAWS, ENFORCING IS OKAY AT LOCAL LEVEL IS APPROPRIATE BUT MAKING THE RULES SHOULD BE MORE NATIONAL OR INTERNATIONAL? WHO DO YOU THINK THE PUBLIC WANTS TO BE MAKING AND ENFORCING RULES CONCERNING THE INTERNET?

I know what some of the surveys have said. They say basically that they seem to trust government to make the rules; but don't want increased government regulation.

MODERATOR-- HOW DOES THE PUBLIC INTEREST INFLUENCE WHAT RULES WE HAVE FOR THE INTERNET, IF WE KNOW WHAT THE PUBLIC INTEREST IS?

I don't want to answer that question.

MODERATOR--HOW MUCH OF A ROLE SHOULD THE PUBLIC INTEREST HAVE?

I think the public interest should have – we are a representative of democracy. I think that's an important aspect; but the public, at large, doesn't understand necessarily all the nuances; have all the insight. That's why we have a represented environment so that ample people can act. I think it should play the same kind of part as it plays in other laws and regulations.

MODERATOR--WHAT ABOUT PUBLIC INFLUENCE ON THE INFRASTRUCTURE THAT WE'RE BUILDING FOR THE INTERNET; HOW DO YOU SEE THE PUBLIC INFLUENCE IN THAT?

I never think of it as having much direct influence on how the cell phone industry is filling out. It's going to build something that will carry the traffic and provide the conductivity and ultimately the service; and you can decide whether to use it or not; but there are not many options. I don't think the public interest is going to change what the telecom industry is going to be rolling out as an infrastructure. You're going to be putting in pipes; you're either going to sign up or not. There might be some splinter, you get an organization, some small ISPs or small telecom companies that offer you a choice around it; but they will be less convenient and they won't be available to everybody.

MODERATOR--SO YOU DON'T SEE A LOT OF COMPETITION.

I see a lot of competition; but it's all kind of vanilla. You can go to AT&T; PSI Net; MCI; Sprint whoever, you get the same package. It's like the automobile industry; you can go to Ford and get these five different cars. You can go to GM and get five different cars.

MODERATOR--I SEE; BUT THEY'RE NOT GOING TO GET AN ELECTRIC CAR.

Exactly. You can, you will pay more for it and it will be harder for you to use it.

MODERATOR--WHEN YOU MAKE DECISIONS ABOUT WHAT THE INTERNET SHOULD BE ON A DAY TO DAY BASIS. DO YOU CONSIDER WHAT THE PUBLIC WANTS? I'M NOT SURE HOW WELL THIS APPLIES TO YOU. YOU PROBABLY MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS TO YOUR CLIENT'S.

About what the public believes and how the public reacts.

MODERATOR--SO IT DOES APPLY TO YOU. WHEN YOU MAKE DECISIONS ABOUT WHAT THE INTERNET SHOULD BE ON A DAY TO DAY BASIS, DO YOU CONSIDER WHAT THE PUBLIC WANTS?

Yes, we would put customer consumer expectations into our recommendations.

MODERATOR--CUSTOMER RIGHTS.

Typically, our position is, except under Fair Credit Reporting Action; we don't call them rights, we call them good practices, best practices and leading practices from a company's perspective

or you want to meet expectations or manage expectations. We deal with customer expectations and business practices, kind of.

MODERATOR-- WHAT COULD HAPPEN ON THE INTERNET THAT WOULD PAY MORE ATTENTION TO WHO GOVERNS IT, OR PERHAPS TAKE A BIGGER ROLE CONCERNING POLICY?

More and more media firestorms about privacy. I have been traveling and going to a Newsstand in an airport. I have stuff at home as well.

MODERATOR—YOU'RE THINKING MORE SCANDALS INVOLVING PRIVACY.

I think that's probably . . .

MODERATOR--THESE QUESTIONS ARE DIRECTLY ABOUT PRIVACY. WHEN YOU VISIT SITES ON THE WEB, WHAT ARE THINGS YOU LOOK FOR IN A PRIVACY NOTICE OR CONTRACT.

I look for choice. If they don't have a privacy, I look, but that's my business and I look for choice and I usually exercise that choice not to be contacted for secondary purposes. I get Newsletters, I get updates. I get a J Crew announcement every month, I haven't turned it off, saying what the sales are. I'll do that when I want to; but not for the other hundred web sites that I go to. So I like site choice.

MODERATOR--CHOICE TO NOT GET THEIR E-MAIL.

For example, or not have my name put on a list that's rented.

MODERATOR--WITH CONTRACTS. HAVE YOU BOUGHT ANY SOFTWARE ON-LINE?

Yes, I group will review customer agreements and other things like that from a privacy perspective and we'll look for confidentiality. Usually we'll look for reference, the privacy policy. That wasn't a very good answer.

MODERATOR--WHEN YOUR READING A CONTRACT ON-LINE, WHAT DO YOU LOOK FOR?

Typically, you don't look for too much. They are all pretty much the same. They say you have no rights, as it, limited liability . . . you take it or leave it. The same thing with the Internet infrastructure, you take it or leave it.

MODERATOR--PUBLIC DOESN'T INFLUENCE IT, NOT YET. OKAY, THIS GET BACKS TO YOUR EXACT BUSINESS THIS NEXT QUESTION. OF THE GROUP THAT PROVIDE THEIR STAMP OF APPROVAL THAT A WEB SITE IS SECURE OR OBSERVES PRIVACY OR OTHER GOOD PRACTICE. WHICH SERVES THE PUBLIC BEST. THE LIST SAYS TRUSTE OR BETTER BUSINESS BUREAU ON-LINE.

The big difference between TRUSTe and BBB on-line, they are fairly similar programs. I think BBB on-line has the benefit of having a well established dispute resolution and reporting function and see things about the companies that their dealing with. The way I would recommend it, if the client wanted one or the other, they are purely Internet plague right now, they don't have any experience with Better Business Bureau as their local Chapter, they should lean more towards the TRUSTe type approach. If they are highly consumers are eccentric, there may be a traditional business moving on the web, it has history; good history especially, they should stay where they are.

MODERATOR--WITH BBB.

With BBB.

MODERATOR--WHAT ELSE. ARE THERE OTHERS.

Price Waterhouse Coopers has better web product, which is a TRUSTe approach. You say you live up to the standard and they look at your site, they don't give you any independent testing and they'll issue you a seal. That necessarily doesn't have the enforcement mechanism; even a weaker enforcement mechanism so that the TRUSTe. There are a whole series of other web seals; that could be applied. Good Housekeeping has a web certification now a days. Good Housekeeping seal of approval might be very relevant to a site that gears toward homemakers/women. In their standards, they want to make women comfortable on the web. That's their demographics. Entertainment software ratings boards, people put violence and sexuality standards for Entertainment software have a privacy certification. That again, you can claim you live up to; but you wouldn't do that unless you were doing software. Of course, the power of the CPAs through the Web Trust product is the highest standard because it requires third party verification.

MODERATOR--THIS IS THE CPA ASSOCIATION.

American Institute of CPAs and the Canadian Institute of Charter Accountants came up with this. It's now been accepted in a number of our countries as well. So it's gone global. Better Business Bureau is targeted to . . .

MODERATOR--THEY HAVE A THIRD PARTY, THEY THEMSELVES GO IN A CHECK.

Certified Public Accountants who are licensed by these organizations can do that. Ernst & Young are one of those. Each of the big five has people who can deliver services based on the standards of the CPA Web Trust. There are a number of other sites.

MODERATOR--WHAT ELSE IS THERE ON THAT PAGE. PRIVACY.

Privacy Bought is a company that issues trust mark that says that this site protects according to the Children's on-line privacy protection act. You pay \$30 for that. BBB on-line, TRUSTe, Good Housekeeping and E-Nonymous.

MODERATOR--HOW DOES E-NONYMOUS WORK?

E-Nonymous is – I think you can get to them at privacyratings.org. What they've done is they've surfed out to 10's of thousands of web sites and they have a different rating scale. Star base rating scale, zero to four stars, they try to assess your site based on your privacy disclosure. I personally don't feel that their standard, how do you get one star, two, three or four star, is reasonable. One of the interesting things, the EPIC, The Electronic Privacy Information Center, only got a two star rating. Junk busters, only got a two star rating. Oh, we got a two star rating; we have a privacy statement that implements all the parent information rights.

MODERATOR--WHY WOULD THAT BE?

Because we will release information to third parties; but we give choice, so. It's not a realistic measure.

MODERATOR--WHAT'S ON THE FAR LEFT.

TWC Better Web Seal.

MODERATOR--THAT'S THE BETTER WEB SEAL.

Why we separate or seal our certification from this tier, except for the Web Trust, is that all these, except for the Web Trust, are self-certified. Self asserted, I claim that I meet the standard when our approach requires an independent third party verification as testing side of it. That these don't require, none of these require testing minus the CPA. It's a claim, I claim that I need it.

MODERATOR—SO, ERNEST & YOUNG AND CPA. THAT'S IT.

Each of the big five issued – can issue. Not Better Web, Better Web is a non-attest. No attestation was issued. They can also issue an attestation.

MODERATOR-- YOU'RE OWN CONCERNS WHEN YOU'RE ON-LINE. FOR EXAMPLE, IF YOU HAVE TO CLICK THROUGH ONE OR MORE PRIVACY NOTICES WHEN ENTERING A SITE OR AGREES TO CONTRACT WHEN INSTALLING WHEN INSTALLING SOFTWARE. HOW FREQUENTLY OR THOROUGHLY DO YOU READ THEM?

Only. I look at privacy policy because that's my life here. I look at other agreement only when I'm buying into a lot and I don't already know the company. If it's Yahoo!, . . .

MODERATOR--YOU LOOK AT THEM IF YOU DO KNOW THE COMPANY OR IF YOU DON'T.

If I don't know the company. If it's Yahoo!, I ignore it, I just believe that there are a million other people that could be looking at it and ten consumer advocates who are looking at it and they'll catch anything that I don't catch. I really rely upon the Consumer Advocacy Groups in that sense. I think that they're a good role for them to play in helping us watchdog the situation.

MODERATOR--IF YOU WERE TRADING STOCKS ON-LINE, WOULD YOU TAKE TIME TO READ A PRIVACY STATEMENT?

Absolutely.

MODERATOR--DO YOU TRADE STOCKS ON-LINE?

My wife and I are getting into it. We do for other companies; we do privacy statements for on-line traders.

MODERATOR--SO YOU HAVE TO READ IT. YOU'RE THE GUY WHO ACTUALLY MAKES THESE THINGS. IF YOU WERE LOOKING TO PURCHASE MEDICINE ON-LINE?

Yes, I'd review. I wouldn't do it if I again went to Gap's on-line store; bought a pair of jeans. I was asked to register and when I was filling out the checkout I'd unclick, possibly unclick, my choices, but I wouldn't necessary read the privacy policy. If I was going to Joe Bag of Donuts.com, order donuts on-line, I may.

MODERATOR--BECAUSE I DIDN'T KNOW THEM. HAVE YOU EVER DECIDED NOT TO MAKE A TRANSACTION OR PROVIDE PERSONALLY INFORMATION ON-LINE BECAUSE OF A PRIVACY STATEMENT?

I probably have.

MODERATOR--BECAUSE OF A PRIVACY STATEMENT OR FOR WHAT?

Trust and competence issues. Privacy is a big concern. Sometimes if you go to a site and all they have is one paragraph and they don't give you much confidence, those are usually not the leading sites.

MODERATOR--HOW DO YOU THINK THE PUBLIC LOOKS AT OR UNDERSTANDS PRIVACY STATEMENTS?

They don't look at them, they don't understand.

MODERATOR--DO YOU THINK PRIVACY STATEMENTS SHOULD BE MANDATORY?

Yes, I think its part of good business practices.

MODERATOR--BY MANDATORY, WOULD YOU LIKE IT MANDATORY VOLUNTARY OR MANDATORY IN THE FTC MINIMUM RULES?

I think that I'd like to be able to see them, I don't care how they get there.

MODERATOR--TWO RATHER DIFFERENT QUESTIONS AT THE END. REGARDING SPAM, DO YOU THINK LAWS SHOULD BE INACTED TO PUT LIMITS ON SPAM?

I don't know.

MODERATOR--DO YOU THINK PEOPLE WANT LIMITS ON SPAM?

Yes. I don't want to get spammed; but I don't know how you'd make a law. We have some companies in our stable client, who are very well meaning who have been accused of spamming the customers or even one customer in their customer base. I think it's a misunderstanding and this wrong expectation. I think that I don't want, what I believe spam, but . . .

MODERATOR--ONE PERSON'S SPAM IS ANOTHER PERSON'S MARKETING.

Absolutely. It's my deal, the deal of the week for me where I can save 10 dollars or 15 percent or something. I don't know if I want the law, but I don't want to be annoyed.

MODERATOR--WHAT ABOUT ELIMINATING ANONYMITY ON THE INTERNET?

No, I think that there should be just like in real life, there are ways for you to be more or less anonymous and there are ways for you to be known. I can walk in the mall and be fairly anonymous. If I make a purchase and I use cash, I can be fairly anonymous. If I use a credit card, I will be known or if I go to the same store over and over again, I will be known.

MODERATOR--WHAT ABOUT THE PUBLIC, DO YOU THINK THEY WOULD BE WILLING TO TRADE ANONYMITY ON-LINE FOR MORE ACCOUNTABILITY?

I think they're willing to trade their anonymity for a variety of things. Incentives to individual companies, they shouldn't have to unmask themselves forever; but they should be able to select their relationship.

MODERATOR--WHAT DO YOU THINK THEY WANT?

Money, savings.

MODERATOR--THEY WOULD TRADE ANONYMITY FOR SAVINGS.

Absolutely. Discounts or any kind of offer like that. We do that religiously.