In the Matter of:

Consumer Messaging in Connection with Online Transactions Involving Copyrighted Works

April 18, 2017 Public Meeting

Condensed Transcript with Word Index



For The Record, Inc. (301) 870-8025 - www.ftrinc.net - (800) 921-5555

Public Meeting Consumer Messaging in Connection with Online Transactions Involving Copyrighted Works

4/18/2017

				3
1			1	WELCOME REMARKS
2			2	MS. ALLEN: Good afternoon. We're ready to get
3			3	started if everyone could please have a seat.
4			4	MS. PERLMUTTER: Good afternoon, everyone. For
5	DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE		5	those who don't know me, I'm Shira Perlmutter, the Chief
6			6	Policy Officer and Director for International Affairs
7	CONSUMER MESSAGING IN CONNECTION		7	here at the USPTO. And I wanted to begin by welcoming
8			8	all of you here, both those of you who are here
9	WITH ONLINE TRANSACTIONS INVOLVING COPYRIGHTED WORK	s	9	physically and those watching online.
10			10	Today's meeting is the latest installment of
11	PUBLIC MEETING		11	the work of the Department of Commerce's Internet Policy
12			12	Task Force. For those of you who aren't familiar with
13	TUESDAY, APRIL 18, 2017		13	the Task Force, it was formed all the way back in 2010 to
14			14	look at the policy and operational issues impacting the
15			15	private sector's ability to realize the potential for
16	U.S. PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE		16	economic growth and job creation through the internet.
17	600 DULANY STREET		17	The USPTO and NTIA have together led the Task
18	ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA 22313-1450		18	Force's work on copyright issues, and we've produced two
19			19	papers now: a green paper back in 2013 on copyright
20			20	policy, creativity, and innovation in the digital economy
21			21	and a white paper at the beginning of last year that made
22			22	a number of policy recommendations looking at issues that
23			23	had been raised in the green paper.
24			24	Many of you know, because you participated,
25			25	that we held extensive public consultations leading up to
	,	2		4
1	INDEX	-		both of those papers, including on the issue of whether
1	INDEA		1	the first sale doctrine of copyright law should be
2 3	AGENDA ITEM: PAGE		3	extended to cover the distribution of works by means of
4	Welcome Remarks	3	4	digital transmissions.
5	Presentation: Overview of Copyright in Digital		5	Now, during the course of all those public
6	Transactions and the Online Marketplace	6	6	consultations, we heard a number of concerns expressed
7	Research Presentation: What we Buy When We Buy	Ĭ	7	about the level of consumers' understanding of what they
8	Now		8	have purchased when they pay for copies of works
9	Discussion: Reactions to Research Presentation 3	5	9	delivered online. The Task Force, therefore, concluded
10	Series of Presentations: Informative Perspectives 6	2	10	that consumers would benefit from more information on the
11	Designing and Evaluating Disclosure in a		11	nature of these transactions, including whether they're
12	Digital World 6	3	12	paying for temporary access to content or for the
13	Consumer Perceptions: Communications		13	ownership of a copy with the long-term goal of instilling
14	Research Trends 7	1	14	greater confidence in the online marketplace and
15	Consumer Disclosures: An Overview 8	0	15	enhancing participation.
16	Discussion: Communicating Copyright Terms in		16	So we're here today to discuss that specific
17	Digital Transactions to Consumers 9	0	17	issue and to determine together whether there is a good
18	Presentation: Software Enabled Consumer Products		18	way forward to make progress, perhaps through a multi-
19	Study 12	8	19	stakeholder process as we suggested in the white paper,
20	Discussion: What Are the Next Steps? 13	9	20	although we're open to hearing all options.
21	Closing Remarks, Wrap-Up 16	3	21	We'll begin by hearing a number of academic
22			22	presentations on different aspects of consumer messaging
22			22	
22			23	in the online marketplace and have the opportunity for
			23 24	in the online marketplace and have the opportunity for panel discussions of those presentations, as well as of
23				

	5		7
1	important to communicate to consumers and how this can	1	concluded and what we analyzed when we addressed the
2	best be done.	2	first sale doctrine in the white paper process. So let's
3	We will also hear from the U.S. Copyright	3	start by explaining what the first sale doctrine is. And
4	Office, which recently conducted a study on embedded	4	before I do that, let me again just say this is by way
5	software in consumer devices and, in doing so, looked at	5	of background this conference isn't about the first
6	the possibility of establishing best practices for end-	6	sale doctrine, but it certainly gives you the context.
7	user license agreements in that specific context.	7	We are not here to debate the role of the first
8	And, then, finally, we'll conclude with a	8	sale doctrine or what it should be in the digital network
9	discussion of what, if any, next steps could be fruitful.	9	environment again, why we spent an incredible amount
10	We very much look forward to your input, and I will now	10	of time leading up to and in preparing and releasing the
11	turn the floor over to David Carson, who is Senior	11	white paper doing just that. Today's goal is to address
12	Copyright Counsel here at the PTO.	12	how to help consumers better understand what they may and
13		13	may not do with the copies of creative works that they
14		14	obtain online and to understand that the rules that
15		15	govern what I may do with a paperback book don't
16		16	necessarily apply to what I may do with an e-book.
17		17	In fact, there are some things I may do with
18		18	the hard copy book that I may not do with the e-book; and
19		19	there are also some things I may do with the e-book that
20		20	I may not do with the hard copy. And those differences
21		21	are, in part, due to copyright law and, in part, due to
22		22	different business models and licensing terms and
23		23	conditions.
24		24	Copyright law provides the copyright owner with
25		25	a number of exclusive rights, and you see the statutory
	6		8
1	PRESENTATION: OVERVIEW OF COPYRIGHT IN DIGITAL	1	text right up here. The first sale doctrine is an
2	TDANGACTIONS AND THE ONE INF MADIZETDIACE		text fight up here. The first sale docume is an
	TRANSACTIONS AND THE ONLINE MARKETPLACE	2	important limitation on one of the most important of
3	MR. CARSON: Thank you, Shira. We just need to	2 3	
			important limitation on one of the most important of
	MR. CARSON: Thank you, Shira. We just need to	3	important limitation on one of the most important of those rights the exclusive right to distribute copies
4 s	MR. CARSON: Thank you, Shira. We just need to witch to a different presentation.	3 4	important limitation on one of the most important of those rights the exclusive right to distribute copies to the public by sale or other transfer of ownership or
4 s ⁴ 5 6	MR. CARSON: Thank you, Shira. We just need to switch to a different presentation. (Brief pause.)	3 4 5	important limitation on one of the most important of those rights the exclusive right to distribute copies to the public by sale or other transfer of ownership or by rental, lease, or lending. That's Section 106(3) of
4 sv 5 6 7 S	MR. CARSON: Thank you, Shira. We just need to witch to a different presentation. (Brief pause.) MR. CARSON: Well, thanks very much. As	3 4 5 6	important limitation on one of the most important of those rights the exclusive right to distribute copies to the public by sale or other transfer of ownership or by rental, lease, or lending. That's Section 106(3) of the Copyright Act.
4 s ⁴ 5 6 7 S 8 E	MR. CARSON: Thank you, Shira. We just need to switch to a different presentation. (Brief pause.) MR. CARSON: Well, thanks very much. As Shira's mentioned, this meeting follows up on the	3 4 5 6 7	 important limitation on one of the most important of those rights the exclusive right to distribute copies to the public by sale or other transfer of ownership or by rental, lease, or lending. That's Section 106(3) of the Copyright Act. Only the author of a work or the entity to whom the author has assigned the copyright or the distribution
4 s ⁴ 5 6 7 S 8 E 9 s ⁴	MR. CARSON: Thank you, Shira. We just need to switch to a different presentation. (Brief pause.) MR. CARSON: Well, thanks very much. As Shira's mentioned, this meeting follows up on the Department of Commerce's white paper on remixes, first	3 4 5 6 7 8	 important limitation on one of the most important of those rights the exclusive right to distribute copies to the public by sale or other transfer of ownership or by rental, lease, or lending. That's Section 106(3) of the Copyright Act. Only the author of a work or the entity to whom the author has assigned the copyright or the distribution
4 s ⁴ 5 7 S 8 C 9 sa 10 th	MR. CARSON: Thank you, Shira. We just need to switch to a different presentation. (Brief pause.) MR. CARSON: Well, thanks very much. As Shira's mentioned, this meeting follows up on the Department of Commerce's white paper on remixes, first sale, and statutory damages. That's the you can see	3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 important limitation on one of the most important of those rights the exclusive right to distribute copies to the public by sale or other transfer of ownership or by rental, lease, or lending. That's Section 106(3) of the Copyright Act. Only the author of a work or the entity to whom the author has assigned the copyright or the distribution right, such as a publisher or a record company or a movie
4 s ⁴ 5 7 S 8 E 9 s ³ 10 tt 11 d	MR. CARSON: Thank you, Shira. We just need to switch to a different presentation. (Brief pause.) MR. CARSON: Well, thanks very much. As Shira's mentioned, this meeting follows up on the Department of Commerce's white paper on remixes, first sale, and statutory damages. That's the you can see hat on the right on the screen and in particular, the	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 important limitation on one of the most important of those rights the exclusive right to distribute copies to the public by sale or other transfer of ownership or by rental, lease, or lending. That's Section 106(3) of the Copyright Act. Only the author of a work or the entity to whom the author has assigned the copyright or the distribution right, such as a publisher or a record company or a movie studio, has the right to distribute copies of the
4 s ^s 5 7 S 8 C 9 sa 10 tt 11 d 12 q	MR. CARSON: Thank you, Shira. We just need to switch to a different presentation. (Brief pause.) MR. CARSON: Well, thanks very much. As Shira's mentioned, this meeting follows up on the Department of Commerce's white paper on remixes, first sale, and statutory damages. That's the you can see hat on the right on the screen and in particular, the discussion of the first sale doctrine, which we spent	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 important limitation on one of the most important of those rights the exclusive right to distribute copies to the public by sale or other transfer of ownership or by rental, lease, or lending. That's Section 106(3) of the Copyright Act. Only the author of a work or the entity to whom the author has assigned the copyright or the distribution right, such as a publisher or a record company or a movie studio, has the right to distribute copies of the author's work to the public. But the first sale
4 s ⁴ 5 6 7 S 8 E 9 s ³ 10 t ⁴ 11 d 12 q 13 la 14	MR. CARSON: Thank you, Shira. We just need to switch to a different presentation. (Brief pause.) MR. CARSON: Well, thanks very much. As Shira's mentioned, this meeting follows up on the Department of Commerce's white paper on remixes, first sale, and statutory damages. That's the you can see hat on the right on the screen and in particular, the discussion of the first sale doctrine, which we spent quite a bit of time on over a period of about two years eading up to the white paper. We had a number of public meetings in 2013 and	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 important limitation on one of the most important of those rights the exclusive right to distribute copies to the public by sale or other transfer of ownership or by rental, lease, or lending. That's Section 106(3) of the Copyright Act. Only the author of a work or the entity to whom the author has assigned the copyright or the distribution right, such as a publisher or a record company or a movie studio, has the right to distribute copies of the author's work to the public. But the first sale doctrine, which is codified in Section 109 of the
4 s ⁴ 5 6 7 S 8 E 9 s ³ 10 t ⁴ 11 d 12 q 13 la 14	MR. CARSON: Thank you, Shira. We just need to switch to a different presentation. (Brief pause.) MR. CARSON: Well, thanks very much. As Shira's mentioned, this meeting follows up on the Department of Commerce's white paper on remixes, first sale, and statutory damages. That's the you can see hat on the right on the screen and in particular, the discussion of the first sale doctrine, which we spent quite a bit of time on over a period of about two years eading up to the white paper.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 important limitation on one of the most important of those rights the exclusive right to distribute copies to the public by sale or other transfer of ownership or by rental, lease, or lending. That's Section 106(3) of the Copyright Act. Only the author of a work or the entity to whom the author has assigned the copyright or the distribution right, such as a publisher or a record company or a movie studio, has the right to distribute copies of the author's work to the public. But the first sale doctrine, which is codified in Section 109 of the Copyright Act, provides that the owner of a particular
4 s ⁴ 5 5 7 S 8 E 9 sa 10 tt 11 d 12 q 13 la 14 15 2	MR. CARSON: Thank you, Shira. We just need to switch to a different presentation. (Brief pause.) MR. CARSON: Well, thanks very much. As Shira's mentioned, this meeting follows up on the Department of Commerce's white paper on remixes, first sale, and statutory damages. That's the you can see hat on the right on the screen and in particular, the discussion of the first sale doctrine, which we spent quite a bit of time on over a period of about two years eading up to the white paper. We had a number of public meetings in 2013 and	$ \begin{array}{c} 3 \\ 4 \\ 5 \\ 6 \\ 7 \\ 8 \\ 9 \\ 10 \\ 11 \\ 12 \\ 13 \\ 14 \\ 15 \\ 16 \\ \end{array} $	 important limitation on one of the most important of those rights the exclusive right to distribute copies to the public by sale or other transfer of ownership or by rental, lease, or lending. That's Section 106(3) of the Copyright Act. Only the author of a work or the entity to whom the author has assigned the copyright or the distribution right, such as a publisher or a record company or a movie studio, has the right to distribute copies of the author's work to the public. But the first sale doctrine, which is codified in Section 109 of the Copyright Act, provides that the owner of a particular copy, lawfully made under this title, is entitled without the authority of the copyright owner to sell or otherwise dispose of the possession of that copy. So if I go into
4 s ^s 5 7 S 8 C 9 sa 10 tt 11 d 12 q 13 la 14 15 2 16 ra	MR. CARSON: Thank you, Shira. We just need to switch to a different presentation. (Brief pause.) MR. CARSON: Well, thanks very much. As Shira's mentioned, this meeting follows up on the Department of Commerce's white paper on remixes, first sale, and statutory damages. That's the you can see hat on the right on the screen and in particular, the discussion of the first sale doctrine, which we spent quite a bit of time on over a period of about two years eading up to the white paper. We had a number of public meetings in 2013 and 2014 that discussed copyright law and policy issues	$ \begin{array}{c} 3 \\ 4 \\ 5 \\ 6 \\ 7 \\ 8 \\ 9 \\ 10 \\ 11 \\ 12 \\ 13 \\ 14 \\ 15 \\ 16 \\ 17 \\ \end{array} $	 important limitation on one of the most important of those rights the exclusive right to distribute copies to the public by sale or other transfer of ownership or by rental, lease, or lending. That's Section 106(3) of the Copyright Act. Only the author of a work or the entity to whom the author has assigned the copyright or the distribution right, such as a publisher or a record company or a movie studio, has the right to distribute copies of the author's work to the public. But the first sale doctrine, which is codified in Section 109 of the Copyright Act, provides that the owner of a particular copy, lawfully made under this title, is entitled without the authority of the copyright owner to sell or otherwise dispose of the possession of that copy. So if I go into a bookstore and buy a book, I'm free to sell it to you
4 s ^s 5 7 S 8 E 9 ss 10 th 11 d 12 q 13 la 14 15 2 16 ra 17 is 18 ra	MR. CARSON: Thank you, Shira. We just need to switch to a different presentation. (Brief pause.) MR. CARSON: Well, thanks very much. As Shira's mentioned, this meeting follows up on the Department of Commerce's white paper on remixes, first sale, and statutory damages. That's the you can see hat on the right on the screen and in particular, the discussion of the first sale doctrine, which we spent quite a bit of time on over a period of about two years eading up to the white paper. We had a number of public meetings in 2013 and 2014 that discussed copyright law and policy issues relating to the first sale doctrine, as well as other ssues. And we stated our conclusions and ecommendations in the white paper, which was issued a	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 important limitation on one of the most important of those rights the exclusive right to distribute copies to the public by sale or other transfer of ownership or by rental, lease, or lending. That's Section 106(3) of the Copyright Act. Only the author of a work or the entity to whom the author has assigned the copyright or the distribution right, such as a publisher or a record company or a movie studio, has the right to distribute copies of the author's work to the public. But the first sale doctrine, which is codified in Section 109 of the Copyright Act, provides that the owner of a particular copy, lawfully made under this title, is entitled without the authority of the copyright owner to sell or otherwise dispose of the possession of that copy. So if I go into
4 s ⁴ 5 6 7 S 8 E 9 s ³ 10 th 11 d 12 q 13 la 14 15 2 16 ra 17 is 18 ra	MR. CARSON: Thank you, Shira. We just need to switch to a different presentation. (Brief pause.) MR. CARSON: Well, thanks very much. As Shira's mentioned, this meeting follows up on the Department of Commerce's white paper on remixes, first sale, and statutory damages. That's the you can see hat on the right on the screen and in particular, the discussion of the first sale doctrine, which we spent quite a bit of time on over a period of about two years eading up to the white paper. We had a number of public meetings in 2013 and 2014 that discussed copyright law and policy issues relating to the first sale doctrine, as well as other ssues. And we stated our conclusions and	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 important limitation on one of the most important of those rights the exclusive right to distribute copies to the public by sale or other transfer of ownership or by rental, lease, or lending. That's Section 106(3) of the Copyright Act. Only the author of a work or the entity to whom the author has assigned the copyright or the distribution right, such as a publisher or a record company or a movie studio, has the right to distribute copies of the author's work to the public. But the first sale doctrine, which is codified in Section 109 of the Copyright Act, provides that the owner of a particular copy, lawfully made under this title, is entitled without the authority of the copyright owner to sell or otherwise dispose of the possession of that copy. So if I go into a bookstore and buy a book, I'm free to sell it to you afterwards or to give it to you free of charge or to lend it to you.
4 s ^x 5 6 7 S 8 E 9 sa 10 th 11 d 12 q 13 la 14 15 16 ra 17 is 18 ra 19 li	MR. CARSON: Thank you, Shira. We just need to switch to a different presentation. (Brief pause.) MR. CARSON: Well, thanks very much. As Shira's mentioned, this meeting follows up on the Department of Commerce's white paper on remixes, first sale, and statutory damages. That's the you can see hat on the right on the screen and in particular, the discussion of the first sale doctrine, which we spent quite a bit of time on over a period of about two years eading up to the white paper. We had a number of public meetings in 2013 and 2014 that discussed copyright law and policy issues relating to the first sale doctrine, as well as other ssues. And we stated our conclusions and ecommendations in the white paper, which was issued a	$ \begin{array}{c} 3 \\ 4 \\ 5 \\ 6 \\ 7 \\ 8 \\ 9 \\ 10 \\ 11 \\ 12 \\ 13 \\ 14 \\ 15 \\ 16 \\ 17 \\ 18 \\ 19 \\ 20 \\ \end{array} $	 important limitation on one of the most important of those rights the exclusive right to distribute copies to the public by sale or other transfer of ownership or by rental, lease, or lending. That's Section 106(3) of the Copyright Act. Only the author of a work or the entity to whom the author has assigned the copyright or the distribution right, such as a publisher or a record company or a movie studio, has the right to distribute copies of the author's work to the public. But the first sale doctrine, which is codified in Section 109 of the Copyright Act, provides that the owner of a particular copy, lawfully made under this title, is entitled without the authority of the copyright owner to sell or otherwise dispose of the possession of that copy. So if I go into a bookstore and buy a book, I'm free to sell it to you afterwards or to give it to you free of charge or to lend it to you.
4 s ^x 5 6 7 S 8 E 9 sa 10 th 11 d 12 q 13 la 14 15 16 ra 17 is 18 ra 19 li 20 is	MR. CARSON: Thank you, Shira. We just need to switch to a different presentation. (Brief pause.) MR. CARSON: Well, thanks very much. As Shira's mentioned, this meeting follows up on the Department of Commerce's white paper on remixes, first sale, and statutory damages. That's the you can see hat on the right on the screen and in particular, the discussion of the first sale doctrine, which we spent quite a bit of time on over a period of about two years eading up to the white paper. We had a number of public meetings in 2013 and 2014 that discussed copyright law and policy issues relating to the first sale doctrine, as well as other ssues. And we stated our conclusions and ecommendations in the white paper, which was issued a ittle over a year ago. Our discussion today, however,	$\begin{array}{c} 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ \end{array}$	 important limitation on one of the most important of those rights the exclusive right to distribute copies to the public by sale or other transfer of ownership or by rental, lease, or lending. That's Section 106(3) of the Copyright Act. Only the author of a work or the entity to whom the author has assigned the copyright or the distribution right, such as a publisher or a record company or a movie studio, has the right to distribute copies of the author's work to the public. But the first sale doctrine, which is codified in Section 109 of the Copyright Act, provides that the owner of a particular copy, lawfully made under this title, is entitled without the authority of the copyright owner to sell or otherwise dispose of the possession of that copy. So if I go into a bookstore and buy a book, I'm free to sell it to you afterwards or to give it to you free of charge or to lend it to you.
4 s ^x 5 6 7 S 8 E 9 sa 10 th 11 d 12 q 13 la 14 15 16 ra 17 is 18 ra 19 li 20 is 21 c	MR. CARSON: Thank you, Shira. We just need to switch to a different presentation. (Brief pause.) MR. CARSON: Well, thanks very much. As Shira's mentioned, this meeting follows up on the Department of Commerce's white paper on remixes, first sale, and statutory damages. That's the you can see hat on the right on the screen and in particular, the discussion of the first sale doctrine, which we spent quite a bit of time on over a period of about two years eading up to the white paper. We had a number of public meetings in 2013 and 2014 that discussed copyright law and policy issues relating to the first sale doctrine, as well as other ssues. And we stated our conclusions and ecommendations in the white paper, which was issued a ittle over a year ago. Our discussion today, however, s about consumer messaging, that is, about improving	$\begin{array}{c} 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ \end{array}$	 important limitation on one of the most important of those rights the exclusive right to distribute copies to the public by sale or other transfer of ownership or by rental, lease, or lending. That's Section 106(3) of the Copyright Act. Only the author of a work or the entity to whom the author has assigned the copyright or the distribution right, such as a publisher or a record company or a movie studio, has the right to distribute copies of the author's work to the public. But the first sale doctrine, which is codified in Section 109 of the Copyright Act, provides that the owner of a particular copy, lawfully made under this title, is entitled without the authority of the copyright owner to sell or otherwise dispose of the possession of that copy. So if I go into a bookstore and buy a book, I'm free to sell it to you afterwards or to give it to you free of charge or to lend it to you. The copyright owner cannot prevent me from doing that and isn't entitled to any compensation when I do that. The copyright owner of the exclusive
4 sr 5 6 7 S 8 E 9 sa 10 th 11 d 12 q 13 ld 14 15 15 2 16 re 17 is 18 re 19 li 20 is 21 c 22 re	MR. CARSON: Thank you, Shira. We just need to switch to a different presentation. (Brief pause.) MR. CARSON: Well, thanks very much. As Shira's mentioned, this meeting follows up on the Department of Commerce's white paper on remixes, first sale, and statutory damages. That's the you can see hat on the right on the screen and in particular, the discussion of the first sale doctrine, which we spent quite a bit of time on over a period of about two years eading up to the white paper. We had a number of public meetings in 2013 and 2014 that discussed copyright law and policy issues elating to the first sale doctrine, as well as other ssues. And we stated our conclusions and ecommendations in the white paper, which was issued a ittle over a year ago. Our discussion today, however, s about consumer messaging, that is, about improving consumers' understanding of license terms and	$\begin{array}{c} 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ \end{array}$	 important limitation on one of the most important of those rights the exclusive right to distribute copies to the public by sale or other transfer of ownership or by rental, lease, or lending. That's Section 106(3) of the Copyright Act. Only the author of a work or the entity to whom the author has assigned the copyright or the distribution right, such as a publisher or a record company or a movie studio, has the right to distribute copies of the author's work to the public. But the first sale doctrine, which is codified in Section 109 of the Copyright Act, provides that the owner of a particular copy, lawfully made under this title, is entitled without the authority of the copyright owner to sell or otherwise dispose of the possession of that copy. So if I go into a bookstore and buy a book, I'm free to sell it to you afterwards or to give it to you free of charge or to lend it to you.
4 sr 5 6 7 S 8 C 9 sa 10 th 11 d 12 q 13 ld 14 15 15 2 16 re 17 is 18 re 19 li 20 is 21 cc 22 re	MR. CARSON: Thank you, Shira. We just need to switch to a different presentation. (Brief pause.) MR. CARSON: Well, thanks very much. As Shira's mentioned, this meeting follows up on the Department of Commerce's white paper on remixes, first sale, and statutory damages. That's the you can see hat on the right on the screen and in particular, the discussion of the first sale doctrine, which we spent quite a bit of time on over a period of about two years eading up to the white paper. We had a number of public meetings in 2013 and 2014 that discussed copyright law and policy issues relating to the first sale doctrine, as well as other ssues. And we stated our conclusions and recommendations in the white paper, which was issued a ittle over a year ago. Our discussion today, however, s about consumer messaging, that is, about improving consumers' understanding of license terms and restrictions in connection with online transactions	$\begin{array}{c} 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ \end{array}$	 important limitation on one of the most important of those rights the exclusive right to distribute copies to the public by sale or other transfer of ownership or by rental, lease, or lending. That's Section 106(3) of the Copyright Act. Only the author of a work or the entity to whom the author has assigned the copyright or the distribution right, such as a publisher or a record company or a movie studio, has the right to distribute copies of the author's work to the public. But the first sale doctrine, which is codified in Section 109 of the Copyright Act, provides that the owner of a particular copy, lawfully made under this title, is entitled without the authority of the copyright owner to sell or otherwise dispose of the possession of that copy. So if I go into a bookstore and buy a book, I'm free to sell it to you afterwards or to give it to you free of charge or to lend it to you. The copyright owner cannot prevent me from doing that and isn't entitled to any compensation when I do that. The copyright owner of the exclusive

	9		11
1	otherwise distributed, the copyright owner's distribution	1	transaction, and it's still there at the end of the
2	right, with respect to that particular copy, disappears.	2	transaction. But a second copy of the book is now
3	That's a well established principle of copyright law.	3	residing on my iPad or my Kindle, or perhaps both. It's
4	But in the last quarter-century, more and more	4	the transmission of that second digital copy that creates
5	works of authorship have been distributed not only in the	5	complicated questions that we don't have with the single
6	form of hard copies, such as books, CDs, DVDs, and so on,	6	particular copy of, say, a paperback book.
7	but they've also been distributed by means of digital	7	Those complications, again, are not what we're
8	transmissions, for example, by downloading a book from	8	here to talk about, but for background information, it's
9	Amazon.com, downloading music from iTunes, or downloading	9	important to understand why copyright laws that apply to
10	apps from Google Play. Those digital works are also	10	digital distribution do so in a way that's different in
11	eligible for copyright protection, and the copyright	11	some respects to the way they apply to the traditional
12	owner has the same exclusive rights that the copyright	12	distribution of physical goods.
13	owner has with respect to hard copies.	13	Let's talk about licensing, because that's
14	But certain rules that applied in the pre-	14	really what governs many of the terms and conditions of
15	digital world don't necessarily apply in the online	15	what one can do when one obtains a copy by means of
16	environment. Notably for our purposes today, the first	16	digital transmissions, at least in the commercial world.
17	sale doctrine does not permit the resale or	17	Digital distribution models differ from traditional
18	redistribution of a copy that was obtained by means of a	18	brick-and-mortar models for other reasons. Because of
19	digital transmission.	19	the different nature of an e-book or a song or video
20	There are a number of reasons for this, but the	20	file, we access them differently than we do in hard copy.
21	most obvious one is that when you download a copy, you're	21	When I want to get a book or a movie online,
22	implicating more than the distribution right. When you	22	it's not the same kind of transaction as a transaction I
23	transmit a copy of a work online, you're implicating	23	enter into at a bookstore or a video store. Not only
24	another of the copyright owner's exclusive rights.	24	that, but making works available online opens up all
25	That's Section 106(1), the right to reproduce the	25	sorts of new options that allow consumers to experience

10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1	copyrighted work in copyrights [sic] or phonorecords.
2	What we call while we call a transmission
3	over the internet a distribution, it's actually much more
4	than that. After all, the actual copy that's sitting on
5	the server doesn't move from the server to the
6	recipient's device. Instead, a transmission is made that
7	results in reproduction of the bits and bytes that
8	together make up a copy of the work. And the first sale
9	doctrine does not apply to the reproduction right.
10	I can't take the time to go into all of our
11	analysis on the issue, and there's really not reason
12	that's not what we're here to talk about for the most
13	part, but let me take a minute or two to give you a sense
14	of some of the other reasons that led to our conclusions.
15	When I go into a bookstore to buy a book, I
16	take the book off the shelf, I pay for it, and I walk out
17	of the store with it. At the beginning of the
18	transaction, there was only one book; and at the end of
19	the transaction, there's still only one book. The
20	particular copy of the book has just been removed from
21	the bookshelf in the bookstore, and it ends up on my
22	bookshelf.
23	But when I download an e-book, the copy that is
24	sitting on the server at Amazon or Barnes & Noble doesn't
25	go anywhere. It's there at the beginning of the

works of authorship without owning and sometimes without even possessing copies. Some of those experiences may feel very similar to the experiences we have with hard copies like books, DVDs, and CDs. You pay money; you get a copy; and you can read or watch or listen to it whenever you want. But when you obtain that copy by means of an online transmission, almost inevitably the transaction is going to be accompanied by a license called an end-user license agreement, or EULA. You'll have to -- you'll have an opportunity to read that agreement typically. You usually will have to click on a link to read it, and you will have to do something to indicate your consent, most likely. But as we looked at the issue while we were working on the white paper, the consensus seemed to be that it's very rare that anyone actually reads the EULA or even looks at it. I don't think anyone came forward with any evidence as to how frequently customers read them, but I also don't think anyone actually disputed that proposition. That's not surprising. EULAs are frequently very lengthy; they're detailed; and they're not

necessarily easy to read. But it's the EULA that will tell you whether you actually own the copy, how many

3 (Pages 9 to 12)

1	copies you can make, and on how many and what kinds of
2	devices you can put them; whether you can give your copy
3	to somebody else, whether you can provide access to
4	somebody else, and so on.
5	Of course, this isn't an issue only with
6	respect to issues that relate to copyright. There are
7	all sorts of terms and conditions in EULAs that have
8	nothing to do with copyright. And I would imagine that
9	consumers are just as knowledgeable or unknowledgeable
10	about those terms and conditions as they are about the
11	terms that relate to copyright.
12	They can vary also from vendor to vendor and
13	perhaps also from copyright owner to copyright owner.
14	Different services may offer different terms and
15	conditions based on their understanding of what it is
16	that consumers want or on what they believe makes
17	economic sense, and all also based on the contract they
18	have with the copyright owner.
19	We'll have representatives of online platforms
20	and copyright owners on our first panel, and perhaps we
21	can learn some more from them about this. Now, the white
22	paper described an online marketplace that's evolving
23	from services involving the distribution of copies to
24	those in which consumers are offered different levels of
25	access at a choice of price points and an exchange for

1 ownership or of the ability to resell or give away copies 2 just doesn't come up, because you never actually have a 3 copy. But other questions do come up depending upon the 4 business model. For example, on how many devices or what 5 kinds of devices may I access the work? Can I give 6 access to my family or friends? 7 We also heard assertions that some of the terms 8 and conditions set forth in EULAs, such as provisions 9 barring redistribution of copies by consumers, are at 10 odds with the ordinary expectations of consumers, 11 especially when the consumer consummates the transaction 12 by clicking on a button that says "buy." Others 13 disagreed, expressing the view that the particular 14 contexts in which those transactions take place, 15 consumers are likely to understand that they're paying 16 for something that falls short of ownership. That's 17 something we'll be exploring a little later today. 18 But nobody came forward with hard evidence as 19 to what consumers actually understand they're getting 20 when they obtain copies of works online. Many 21 participants on all sides agreed that consumers are entitled to clarity and that more should be done to 22 23 communicate what rights they are or are not getting when 24 they enter into a transaction involving digital 25 transmissions of copies.

14

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

13

1	benefits that may not be available or necessary in the
2	physical world. For example, software patches and
3	upgrades.
4	Indeed, the RIAA recently announced that in
5	2016, for the first time ever, streaming music platforms
6	generated the majority of the U.S. music industry's
7	revenues. But it's not just about making more money for
8	copyright owners. The marketplace, in fact, is
9	responding to consumer demands and taking advantage of
10	new opportunities and flexibilities that digital
11	technology offers. The music business is probably the
12	furthest along this path toward access-based models, and
13	the motion picture industry is probably close behind. In
14	other industries, such as book publishing, the prevailing
15	model is still based on giving the consumer a copy of the
16	work, whether it's in hard copy form or a digital copy.
17	Access-based models also come in a number of
18	different kinds of offerings. There are subscription
19	services that give you access to a large number of works
20	for as long as you have the subscription. Think of
21	Spotify, for example, or Netflix. There are 24-hour or
22	48-hour rentals in which we're given access to a work for
23	a relatively short period of time. Such arrangements are
24	popular, for example, with motion pictures.
25	In these access models, the question of

Based on what we heard, we reached the following conclusion in the white paper. We concluded that there's a need to provide consumers with more clarity about the nature of the transactions they enter into when they download copies of works. And the purpose of this meeting is to explore whether there's a need for further action and, if so, what kind of action would be appropriate. So that's what the meeting's about, and that brings us today to the rest of the program, in which we've brought together various stakeholders to explore the issues and to share their views surrounding consumer messaging relating to online transactions involving copyrighted works. The question is whether we need to do

more to let consumers know what they may or may not do
with the copies they obtain online and helping them
understand the rules of the road when they engage in
digital transactions for copyrighted works.
We don't have a particular process or a
particular outcome in mind, but we want to, at the very

particular outcome in mind, but we want to, at the very
least, start a conversation on the topic. We heard from
some stakeholders that renting and not owning will become
the primary way that people consume content in the
future. I've already alluded to that when I talk about
online subscription services, for example.

15

20

21

22

23

24

25

those terms are.

topics in this room. But for the purposes of this

exercise, we're taking for granted that the terms are

And with that, let me introduce our next

presenter, Aaron Perzanowski. Professor Perzanowski is a

what they are. The question isn't what they ought to be but rather how do we best communicate to consumers what

	17		19
1	As the digital marketplace continues to evolve	1	professor of law at Case Western Reserve University of
2	to include a wide variety of license-based business	2	Law. He was an active participant at one of our white
3	models, clear communication of relevant terms to	3	paper roundtables, and he's written extensively on the
4	consumers can help facilitate commerce and establish	4	first sale doctrine. But what he has to talk what
5	trust in the online marketplace.	5	he's here to talk about today is not the first sale
6	Copyrighted works form a substantial portion of	6	doctrine.
7	online commercial transactions, and they contribute	7	Instead, he's here to address another
8	significantly to U.S. commerce, but the issues we're	8	conclusion in the white paper, the one I've just been
9	discussing today are not unique to the United States.	9	talking about, which is the conclusion that there's a
10	They're being explored by governments around the world.	10	need to provide consumers with more clarity about the
11	For example, Europe has come up with suggested guidelines	11	nature of the transactions they enter into when they
12	for a way to communicate with consumers. What you see	12	download copies of works.
13	are some suggested guidelines that the European	13	Professor Perzanowski is the coauthor of an
14	Commission has come up with.	14	article published in January in the University of
15	When looking at solutions, we need to be	15	Pennsylvania Law Review, entitled "What we Buy when we
16	forward-looking because what may be cutting edge to	16	Buy Now." It's the only study we're aware of that looks
17	today's consumers may be commonplace tomorrow, and the	17	into what consumers believe they acquire when they buy
18	day after tomorrow, they may be absolutely old-fashioned.	18	digital media goods. The article suggests that adding a
19	Solutions also need to make sense. If a virtual	19	short notice to digital product pages, a notice that
20	assistant like Alexa or Google Home has to read out	20	explains what consumers may and may not do with the
21	lengthy EULAs before playing music or streaming	21	copies they obtain, would improve their understanding of
22	television, consumers' enthusiasm for using those	22	what they're buying.
23	assistants could decrease substantially, to put it	23	Following Professor Perzanowski's presentation,
24	mildly. So there's a real problem between mediating	24	we'll have a panel of four commenters who will react to
25	between the need to give information to consumers and	25	what he has to say, and I think it's fair to say we'll
	18		20
1	giving consumers the ability to get to what they're	1	hear a variety of viewpoints. But whether you would
2	really looking for, which isn't necessarily that	2	disagree or agree with Professor Perzanowski, his article
3	information.	3	should be the basis for a very lively discussion.
4	But, thankfully, we don't have to reinvent the	4	So with that, I hand it over to Professor
5	wheel. In addition to representatives from online	5	Perzanowski. And hopefully someone with more skill than
6	platforms and copyright industry associations and public	6	I can find his PowerPoint.
7	interest organizations, we have with us today people with	7	
8	significant experience in consumer messaging and in other	8	
9	fields such as privacy disclosures and computer science.	9	
10	And they, hopefully, can help us provide some insight	10	
11	into relevant considerations as we explore consumer	11	
12	messaging.	12	
13	Finally, we want to make sure that everyone	13	
14	understands this meeting is not about what terms and	14	
15	conditions should be imposed on consumers any more than	15	
16	it's about what the rules of copyright law should be. We	16	
17	understand that reasonable minds can differ on those	17	
18	topics, and I'm sure there's a variety of views on those	18	
10		10	

19

20

21

22

23

24

	21		23
1	RESEARCH PRESENTATION: WHAT WE BUY WHEN WE BUY NOW	1	Volkswagens that were sold over the past decade or so and
2	MR. PERZANOWSKI: Bear with me for just a	2	claim that that's evidence that consumers really love
3	moment here.	3	pollution, right? And I think in the same way it's not
4	So thanks so much for giving me the opportunity	4	clear that we can point to this shift away from
5	to talk about this project today, thanks to all the folks	5	ownership-based models of media acquisition to more
6	at the PTO and at NTIA and everyone involved in	6	temporary, more conditional forms of access and claim
7	organizing this event. So this paper, as David just	7	that that is a reflection of consumer preferences, unless
8	mentioned, is one that I cowrote with Chris Hoofnagle.	8	consumers have accurate information.
9	It was recently published in the University of	9	So what did we do in this study? We created
10	Pennsylvania Law Review. And my comments today are	10	this sort of fictitious marketplace called Media Shop and
11	really going to be focused on kind of explaining the	11	surveyed just under 1,300 consumers about their
12	design of this study and outlining the conclusions that	12	understanding of this "buy now" language. We created a
13	we drew from this data.	13	set of screening questions to make sure that all of our
14	So as a starting point I have two machines	14	survey respondents were online shoppers, in the market
15	to keep track of here. As a starting point, I imagine a	15	for either digital books, music, or movies. And the
16	lot of you remember this incident from a few years ago	16	sample that we came up with was designed to be
17	where Amazon remotely deleted all of the copies of George	17	representative and was representative in terms of sex, in
18	Orwell's 1984 from the devices of consumers who had	18	terms of age, and in terms of income. It was also
19	purchased that book. This is, I think, a really stark	19	roughly representative when it came to race, region of
20	example of the ways in which consumers' relationships	20	the country, and education, as well.
21	between or consumers' relationships with digital	21	So on the basis of those screening questions,
22	products differs from their relationship when it comes to	22	we sorted consumers into three different categories, and
23	physical books. It just isn't a thing that could happen	23	within each one of those categories, we focus on a
24	when it comes to physical books.	24	different media type, right? So we had books, music, and
25	And it is one of a number of incidents that I	25	movies here. Here we have an example of an e-book.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

21

1 think illustrate this point. The removal of purchased 2 Xbox fitness videos in the last year or so is probably 3 the most recent example. 4 So some have argued that consumers understand 5 that when they click that "buy now" button on the Amazon 6 webpage that what they're really purchasing isn't a copy 7 of a book but a license to access content. And I've 8 always suspected that that is a rather optimistic 9 assessment of how well consumers understand these sorts 10 of transactions. So what Chris and I set out to do was 11 to test exactly what consumers are taking away from these 12 advertising messages. 13 And I think that question is important for a 14 couple of reasons. First, from a purely consumer 15 protection point of view, we want to make sure that 16 consumers have accurate information when they're making 17 choices in the marketplace. We don't want them to be 18 making a purchase, expecting one set of rights and then 19 acquiring a lesser and in some ways inferior set of 20 rights. But more broadly, if we value the marketplace as 21 a source of information about consumer preferences, then 22 we need to make sure that the decisions that consumers 23 are making are actually an accurate reflection of what 24 they want, right? 25 So you can't point to all of those diesel

ach one of those categories, we focus on a t media type, right? So we had books, music, and here. Here we have an example of an e-book. 24 We also gave consumers a choice between a number of different media titles. We wanted to sort of ensure that they were engaged. We also wanted to ensure that our measures of materiality in some way reflected

something that approximated the actual marketplace, right? So if I put a book in front of you that you'd never consider reading, that makes it a lot harder to measure things like materiality.

9 So someone who was sorted into the e-book 10 tranche here and selected The Martian would have seen one 11 of four different variations on this page. They may have 12 seen a digital book sold with a "buy now" button. They 13 may have seen a digital book offered with a "license now" 14 button. They may have seen -- it's a subtle shift there 15 -- "buy now, license now." Some people also saw a 16 paperback version of the book with the "buy now" 17 language. We'll come back to that in a bit. There's the 18 "license now" variation. And here we have our fourth 19 condition, a short notice, rather than the "buy now" or "license now" button. 20 21

The price that was reflected on these pages was taken from the current Amazon price for these products, so there were differences between the digital and physical versions of the book. Sometimes the digital versions were cheaper, but not always, right? So we

22

23

24

25

	25		
1	wanted to replicate market prices as closely as we could.	1	resale.
2	If you notice, down there at the bottom, there	2	But if we're
3	is a link to the license terms that govern these	3	kind of the lens the
4	transactions. And we tracked how many people actually	4	results here, if we
5	clicked on that link. We did pretty well in terms of a	5	false advertising la
6	response rate on clicking this link 1.4 percent of our	6	fast percentage wh
7	survey respondents clicked on this link, which, if you've	7	case, but a typical
8	read the literature on that question, is higher than	8	15 percent or so is
9	usual.	9	frankly, resale her
10	So our short notice was designed, and I'll come	10	We also ask
11	back to the details here in a bit, to provide sort of	11	make copies for of
12	clear and conspicuous language that told consumers what	12	not entitled to do u
13	rights they were acquiring and which they were not.	13	sanity check on ou
14	So a few of our kind of key findings here.	14	possible exception
15	Three, I think, key takeaway points. One, the data	15	response rates to the
16	support the notion that the "buy now" button misleads a	16	So what hap
17	substantial portion of consumers about the particular	17	to "license now"?
18	rights they acquire in digital media transactions.	18	first question we a
19	Second, those misperceptions are material to their	19	have just paid for?
20	purchasing decision. Consumers would behave differently	20	So we're comparin
21	if they had full and accurate information. And, finally,	21	now" results with
22	we saw a significant improvement in consumers'	22	books, we see a hu
23	understanding of their rights when we replaced the "buy	23	they own this thing
24	now" button with this short notice.	24	of complex legal c
25	So how did the survey itself operate? So after	25	falsifiable result, b
		1	

26

25

1 the respondents were given an opportunity to view and 2 interact with those product pages I just showed you, they 3 were asked a series of questions about what rights they 4 believe they acquired in these transactions, right? So, 5 here, the question is, "After clicking 'buy now' and 6 paying for the e-book, can you lend it to a friend?" So 7 can you lend it, can you resell it, can you leave it in 8 your will, can you give it away as a gift, can you read 9 it on the device of your choice? 10 And I want to briefly summarize the results, 11 starting with what we found for the consumers who saw the 12 "buy now" button for digital goods. So what we see here 13 is that it turns out a very high percentage of consumers 14 believe that they are getting rights that are expressly 15 denied to them under these license terms. People think 16 they're getting the right to lend their digital 17 purchases, to give them away, and even, for a not 18 insubstantial number of consumers, to resell those goods. 19 We see really high affirmative response rates 20 here for the ability to keep these purchases for as long 21 as you would like the ability to use them on your device 22 of choice. And more than 40 percent of our respondents 23 believe they had the right to lend those digital 24 purchases and to give them away. A smaller percentage 25 responded yes to leaving them in their will and to

e thinking about this, and this is hat we use in the paper to analyze the e think about this through the lens of law, you know, there's not a hard-andhen it comes to a false advertising al rate of -- typically a rate of above is good evidence of deception. And, ere is the only close call. ked people if they had the right to other people, something they're clearly under copyright law, as a sort of our results. And, in fact, with the on of MP3s, we saw the lowest affirmative that question. ppens when we switch from "buy now" ? Something interesting happens. The ask, "Do you own the thing that you ?," we see a massive decrease, right? ing here in the -- on the left the "buy h the "license now" results. For enuge drop in the number of people who say ng, but, of course, ownership is a sort conclusion, right? It's not really a

but we do think it gives us a sense

	28
1	of kind of overall consumer perception of the
2	transaction.
3	Beyond that, though, very little changes,
4	right? There are no substantial statistically
5	significant shifts that happen when we shift from "buy
6	now" to "license now." That's true here for e-books. I
7	could show you the slides for MP3s and movies. It's
8	pretty much the same thing.
9	What about our short notice intervention here,
10	right? One thing to say about the short notice, first of
11	all, is neither Chris nor I are professional designers.
12	We are not trained in user interface design. I, frankly,
13	spent about 15 to 20 minutes putting this little thumbs-
14	up, thumbs-down thing together. And we thought we'd see
15	how it works, right? And there are obvious ways to
16	improve it.
17	In our open-ended questions in the survey, we
18	had a number of people who said, Uh, you know, that
19	notice was good, but the typeface was too small, it was
20	too hard to read, right? So maybe it needs to be, like,
21	you know, 11-point instead of 9-point or something along
22	those lines.
23	So we think there are ways to improve upon the
24	results that we found, but the results were significant.
25	So this is what happens when we compare the "buy now" and

1	
1	short-notice conditions for e-books. We see that similar
2	drop in the people who think they own the digital good,
3	but we also see significant drops in affirmative
4	responses for lending, gifting, willing, and reselling.
5	And this is after only a single exposure to this short
6	notice for no more than, you know, 30 seconds at most.
7	We made a mistake, frankly, and didn't track
8	how long people were on that particular page, which we
9	should have done, but the average response time for the
10	entire survey, which had lots of steps in it, was ten
11	minutes, right? So people were not spending a great deal
12	of time looking at that product page. We think that with
13	repeated exposures we might see more pronounced results.
14	So those are the results there for e-books.
15	A similar story plays out for MP3s. We see
16	drops in much of the same places. Interestingly, though,
17	we saw very little effect when it came to movies.
18	Consumers did not respond in quite the same way. And, to
19	be honest, we're not entirely sure why that's the case.
20	It might be something unique about movies. My best guess
21	is the demographics of the people who self-selected into
22	the movie purchaser category were different than the
23	other two categories. There were fewer people over the
24	age of 65 in the movie category, and there were fewer
25	women in the movie category. And people over the age of

30

25

1	65 and women tended to understand their rights more
2	accurately than younger men. Conclude from that what you
3	will.
4	So we also wanted to sort of quantify
5	respondents' performance on these questions, right? Not
6	only descriptively what did they believe, but were they
7	right or wrong? And so we scaled each respondent
8	there were seven questions. We scaled them on this zero
9	through seven scale based on essentially what is our
10	little grading chart here. And here is what we found,
11	right? Here's how people performed.
12	So the lowest scores on average were the people
13	who encountered the "license now" condition, right? That
14	just introduced in some ways additional confusion. One
15	thing that was interesting about "license now" and in
16	some ways I saw this as a success more people answered
17	"I don't know" to the "Do you have the right to do this
18	or not." And in some ways, I don't know, like, that's
19	the most correct answer. It's the most honest answer, in
20	a sense. So "license now" kind of shook people's
21	confidence, but in terms of correct answers, we saw a
22	lower rate.
23	Marginally better, although not statistically
24	significant, was the result for "buy now." That
25	difference was not significant.

1	The short notice performs markedly better than
2	the "buy now" button, right? This was a quite
3	significant result but still far short of the pretty
4	accurate, although not wholly accurate, but the largely
5	accurate average score when it came to people who saw the
6	"buy now" button as attached to a hard copy, right?
7	So this has so far just been kind of
8	summarizing the accuracy of these beliefs that consumers
9	expressed. We were also interested in the question of
10	materiality, right? Do these potential misperceptions
11	about their rights actually matter to consumers? Would
12	they behave differently if they knew the truth?
13	And we tried to do that in a few ways, right?
14	We tried to measure when it came to three of the
15	particular rights. We didn't have time in the survey to
16	ask about all of them because it adds significantly to
17	the time, lowers your completion rate, lowers the
18	attentiveness of the respondents, so we focused on three
19	of them: lending, reselling, and using on the device of
20	your choice.
21	So the first way we tried to measure
22	materiality was to ask people about their preferences.
23	Would you strongly prefer an e-book that you can lend to
24	a friend, or would you, you know, somewhat prefer one
~ ~	

that you can't lend to a friend, right? So here's what

	32
1	we found. And what I think is interesting about this is
2	not only did the vast majority express a mild or strong
3	preference for more than one of these three rights, the
4	format didn't seem to make much difference.
5	Those preferences were just as strong when you
6	were talking to someone who was shopping for a physical
7	book as when you were talking to someone who was shopping
8	for a digital book. Same for music and movies, as well.
9	And, in some cases, counterintuitively, the preference
10	was stronger for the digital good, right?
11	You can see that for the ability to lend music,
12	55 percent say they have a preference for lending an MP3
13	as opposed to 48 percent for a compact disk. This is
14	just another sort of metric for capturing that same data.
15	We scored everyone on a negative 6 to positive 6 scale,
16	so positive 6 would be someone who expressed a strong
17	preference for all three rights; negative 6 would be
18	someone who expressed a strong preference against the
19	right in each of the three instances.
20	And you see the distribution there. The
21	majority of people express these preferences for
22	additional rights. So that's well and good, but how does
23	this relate to consumer behavior in the marketplace? Are
24	they going to make purchasing decisions differently on
25	the basis of these preferences? And it turns out when

	33		35
1	you ask people about their willingness to pay, to put a	1	DISCUSSION: REACTIONS TO RESEARCH PRESENTATION
2	dollar value on these preferences, this is what we found.	2	MR. CARSON: Can we have our panelists come up?
3	Most of our respondents were willing to pay	3	We have a hard stop on this panel at 2:20, so I'd like to
4	more, and we asked this question in the most conservative	4	get started.
5	way possible, right? We didn't ask how much less would	5	Thank you very much, Professor Perzanowski.
6	you pay for something where these rights are taken away	6	We're going to have you come up here in a few minutes to
7	from you. We asked how much more would you pay to get	7	join the panel, but first we're going to ask essentially
8	this right that you're not currently entitled to. And	8	for people to react to what they've heard Professor
9	most respondents were willing to pay something. The	9	Perzanowski say, and following that, with a little bit of
10	median increase in price was a dollar; the average price	10	discussion, we'll open it up to questions from the
11	increases were significantly more, right?	11	audience. At that point, we'll ask Professor Perzanowski
12	Now, we weren't asking people to spend real	12	to come up, because, of course, he hasn't had a chance to
13	money, right? If you said you'd spend \$5 more, we didn't	13	answer any questions yet. We might also have him
14	take \$5 away from you, right? So I don't know that this	14	interact with the rest of the members of the panel as
15	is a perfect simulation of what consumers would do in the	15	well. As I said, we have to move on because we do have a
16	marketplace, but it gives us some sense that they attach	16	hard stop at 2:20.
17	a dollar value to these rights.	17	So what I'm going to do is just introduce
18	One last slide here, and then I will wrap	18	everyone by name and title and then just have each of
19 20	things up. We tried to measure materiality in one more	19	them tell us a little bit about who they represent and
20 21	way. We tried to ask people if these rights are not	20	give us an overview of their reaction and what we just
21	available to you, might you consider would you be more likely to acquire media through some other means. And we	21 22	heard from Professor Perzanowski. So we'll start with John Bergmayer, who is with
22	asked about two of them. We asked people whether they'd	22 23	Public Knowledge and go to Greg Barnes with the Digital
23 24	be more likely to get their music from a streaming	23	Media Association; Mark Fisher from the Entertainment
25	service, for example, if they did not if they could	24	Merchants Association; and Ben Sheffner from the Motion
25		2.5	Merenants Association, and ben shermer from the Motion
	34		36
1	not in the marketplace acquire the right to lend digital	1	Picture Association of America.
2	copies.	2	So let's just go down the line. Again, let us
3	And here are the results that we saw for books,	3	know who you represent, who your organization represents,
4	music, and movies. So likelihood of streaming is on the	4	and give us an overview of your reaction to what we
5	right. A considerable percentage of consumers see	5	heard.
6	streaming as a more attractive, more viable option in the	6	MR. BERGMAYER: Sure. Hello? So I'm with
7	absence of these rights that we associate with ownership.		Public Knowledge. We're a Washington, DC-based consumer
8 9	And I think, more disturbingly, about a third of our	8	digital rights advocacy group. Just so you know where I'm coming from policy-wise, you know, I'm a big
9 10	respondents said if I can't get the rights that I think are valuable, I am more likely to download that material	10	supporter of digital first sale, but obviously, like we
10	illegally.	11	said, we're not here to discuss the fundamental policy of
12	So I think there is a measurable desire for	12	first sale and things like that.
12	additional rights on the parts of consumers, and I'm	13	You know, I think getting to my preferred
14	hopeful that our conversation today can move us forward	14	policy would take a lot of work and rethinking how
15	in a way to kind of figure out how to reconcile these	15	copyright law works, in particular, you know, formulating
16	perceptions that consumers have about what's happening in	16	some new concept of a digital copy that you own that is
17	the digital marketplace with the reality. Thanks.	17	somehow distinct from the sort of physical media it's
18	MR. CARSON: Thank you, Aaron.	18	embedded in because as I'm sure everyone here knows, you
19		19	know, there's intellectual property rights and then you
20		20	own a copy, which is defined as a physical item, and when
21		21	we're talking about digital media, people always talk
22		22	about this concept of, oh, I got a copy, I downloaded a
23		23	copy, which is not really how the term "copy" works in
24		24	copyright law. So getting to my preferred outcome would
25		25	be really difficult.

	37		39
1	So in the meantime, I'm totally in favor of	1	of notice could be used across different media platforms.
2	things that I think pragmatically help consumers. And	2	And it would mean the same thing, more or less, legally.
3	one of the key things, as Aaron discussed, is, you know,	3	Now, you know, one of my issues with this is
4	consumer education and disclosure to people about what it	4	there's a big graphic design component, as Aaron pointed
5	is they're buying, what it is they can do so we can see	5	out, and maybe having lawyers decide how to describe what
6	if maybe in the marketplace if there is the ability to	6	is important to disclose to consumers and how to present
7	offer people more rights than they currently have, if	7	it is not always the best idea, because you ask a lawyer,
8	they prefer to spend money on those things, and maybe we	8	what are the important components of this EULA that ought
9	could have more of a marketplace reaction.	9	to be explained to consumers, it's, like, all of them.
10	You know, there are a couple of other policy	10	That's why we wrote it in the EULA, the important parts
11	ideas, which I think would be great, like if a company is	11	are the things we wrote down.
12	claiming that it is going to provide access to a work to	12	And you need to have some kind of flexibility
13	consumers, then that obligation on the part of the	13	to have someone with a nonlegal perspective with just a
14	company is ongoing. So we've had instances before where	14	more pragmatic simplified perspective, you know, try to
15	companies say, you know, you're just buying rights to	15	communicate to consumers how to understand things, while
16	this and, you know, you can access it on these devices,	16	at the same time there is a legal question. You need to
17	and then the company goes out of business. Then people	17	make sure that it's a safe harbor where if people
18	either lose the ability to authorize new devices or	18	misunderstand, if the EULA is accurate but the disclosure
19	things like that.	19	isn't and it's a disclosure that people thought was good
20	Meanwhile, we've seen with the case of Pebble,	20	enough but it turned out it wasn't in this one Edge case,
21	which is a smart watch company, they got bought; their	21	you know, we don't also want to hold people responsible
22	business wasn't looking so great; they issued one final	22	where we're telling them to provide simplified
23	software update to their hardware product, which says,	23	information to consumers and then all of a sudden because
24	okay, we've made it so you can continue to use this, even	24	that simplified information didn't have all the same
25	after all of our servers shut down.	25	information as the EULA you're holding them liable for

1	I think things like that would be great, where	
2	if you are buying something from a company and it's just	
3	access and then the company, for whatever reason, changes	
4	its business model, the consumer ought to still be able	
5	to have access if you transfer it to another company, if	
6	you give them a DRM-free version of that thing that they	
7	had bought access to so there's no longer a need for	
8	ongoing support, things like that I would support too.	
9	And also I'll just point out from a policy	
10	perspective there's this fun legal concept called	
11	numerous clauses where you have a defined set of rights	
12	that are recognized by the law, and if you had, like,	
13	more of just a menu of the kinds of rights that companies	
14	sell to consumers, it's easier to disclose.	
15	So getting into the sort of consumer	
16	understanding perspective, I think if you know, if	
17	every different digital media company doesn't reinvent	
18	the wheel and come up with new kinds of rights with	
19	little exceptions here and there where it varies pretty	
20	significantly from company to company and what you've	
21	learned about how Apple works is not the same about how	
22	Amazon works, but instead you had just a simplified menu	
23	of the kinds of rights that consumers can have, I think	
24	then it would be very much easier to have consumer	
25	education and, you know, that, for example, the same kind	

somehow deceiving consumers. So I think there's a little
bit of a balance there.
And this is my final point, and I'm happy that
the Copyright Office is here today to discuss the
consumer the embedded software issue, because I think
a lot of the same legal doctrines, first sale and
copyright, apply to the consumer products that have
software embedded. They have EULAs; you have the same
disclosure issues; you have the same consumer
understanding issues as applies to digital media.
And, in fact, I think that a lot of the
instincts that consumers have with regard to what did I
buy the right to do are even stronger in the case of
physical goods that used to not have software or no
significant software and now are associated with this
EULA where consumers expect if I buy a good I can pass it
along in my will, I can sell it to a friend, I can lend
it out, I can repair it. I can repair from an
unauthorized repair shop. I can make small modifications
to it.
And all of those legal doctrines that we're
talking about with respect to just things like music
downloads I think will also could end up having
effects on those areas too. So I think, you know, that's

1	aware of. Thank you.
2	MR. CARSON: Thanks, John. I think you've
3	raised enough issues to keep us busy for the rest of the
4	afternoon.
5	Greg, want to raise some more?
6	MR. BARNES: I've taken a lot of notes. So as
7	David pointed out, my name is Greg Barnes. I'm General
8	Counsel for the Digital Media Association. DiMA
9	represents several of the major online distributors of
10	digital content, including movies, music, and books. We
11	see ourselves as playing a key role in the online
12	ecosystem connecting fans with those individuals who
13	actually create the copyrighted works.
14	I guess I had a lot of thoughts, and I tried to
15	jot down a couple of notes when John was speaking. Let
16	me try to kind of summarize because I know we're in
17	limited time. I think the study is interesting, but I
18	think it's too limited to really draw meaningful
19	conclusions. For example, the research fails to account
20	for clear contradictions. The main argument of the study
21	appears to be that the use of the "buy now" button lends
22	itself to consumer confusion in that online purchases of
23	digital content lead individuals to believe that they
24	bargained for greater rights than they actually obtained.
25	However, if you look at the study, the research

1	
1	actually undermines that very argument when the authors
2	examine purchasers who made the physical content. In
3	those instances, the authors note that consumers often
4	underestimate benefits they will receive as a result of
5	transactions involving the "buy now" button.
6	So same button, two contradictory outcomes.
7	"Buy now" button associated with physical purchases,
8	sometimes the rights are underestimated. Use of the "buy
9	now" button in certain instances with digital content,
10	the rights are overestimated. Now, that can lead some to
11	ask the question, How can that be? Well, the authors
12	attempt to explain the latter occurrence by pointing to
13	external factors that contribute to the misperceptions.
14	But they fail to make similar concessions with respect to
15	purchases of digital content.
16	And from our perspective, this oversight is
17	important and something that's worth studying because if
18	lack of awareness or appreciation of relevant law can
19	explain why consumers underestimate their rights with
20	respect to physical purchases, it could equally be true
21	that they overestimate because lack of awareness of law
22	lends to overestimation.
23	So I think this is a point that if we're going
24	to look at this study and we're going to make policy
25	recommendations or conclusions based upon the study, we

1	should be giving that some thought.
2	A second problem with the study is that it
3	fails to adequately consider consumer motivations. Our
4	research speaking for companies that I work with and
5	talk to on a regular basis our research indicates that
6	when consumers purchase, let's just say, the latest
7	Taylor Swift song, for example, they aren't buying that
8	song with the thought of maybe 40 years down the line I
9	can actually gift that to a relative.
10	They are actually making that purchase for one
11	of five reasons. Reason one is instant gratification.
12	They want to be able to immediately consume and enjoy
13	that content that they just purchased. Convenience. For
14	those who used to buy physical products, you would have
15	to make a trip to your local store, drive, depending upon
16	where you live, 5, 10, 20 minutes, fork through the
17	aisles to actually purchase content. Now you can do all
18	of that online.
19	Access to massive libraries. For those who
20	actually went to their record store or went to their
21	local Walmart to purchase a CD or a DVD, they often had
22	the experience where they might be out of stock. Well,
23	the online digital storefronts have changed all that

because now we have access to massive libraries, and we

actually sell in the context of music about 50 percent of

	TT
1	what we call catalog, meaning we actually sell old music
2	just as much as we sell newer music. That didn't exist
3	when you actually bought music off the shelf, so that's
4	the important thing that motivates consumers.
5	Affordability is a big issue. Digital content
6	is often priced cheaper than physical products. And the
7	last thing that motivates consumers deals with
8	portability. For those who actually purchase music
9	videos, books, if you purchased them in the physical
10	world, you actually have to take them with you, carry
11	them. In this new environment, as long as you have the
12	device, you always have access to those purchased works.
13	And, so, those are five important factors that
14	tend to influence consumer purchases. And the last thing
15	I would suggest on that issue is if, in fact, consumers
16	were being misled or deceived, as often is suggested, we
17	wouldn't see the same level of repeat customers that the
18	digital storefronts experience. Not only are we actually
19	not only do we actually have a loyal fan base, we
20	actually are growing the number of consumers.
21	And we think if this weren't the case, people
22	would actually probably have complained. And as Aaron
23	pointed out, they probably would actually go and pursue
24	alternative means of actually accessing content, but we

don't see that happening. We actually see the legitimate

	45		47
1	online marketplace growing right now.	1	Finally, I'll touch upon a point that Aaron did
2	The final point I'll make, and it's probably	2	point out, is this short notice, it could actually move
3	the most important, is I think not only is the short	3	people away from legitimate online marketplace. It could
4	notice unwarranted, I think it could easily lead to	4	actually decrease sales and increase piracy. And I think
5	additional problems. And I've kind of cataloged three	5	those are two things that we don't want.
6	problems. First off is fueling increasing consumer	6	Speaking again for the online platforms, we've
7	confusion. The authors tend to suggest that this short	7	done tremendous work and dedicated a lot of time to build
8	notice would be short and simple, and I don't think	8	a legitimate online marketplace. Everybody can think
9	either is true.	9	back, who follows this industry, to the days of Napster
10	It wouldn't be simple in that this licensing	10	where consumers were convinced content should be free.
11	environment is very complex, and it differs depending	11	We've actually changed that dynamic and convinced them
12	upon the actual platform and the copyright holder that	12	now that it should be purchased. And we would hate to
13	we're negotiating with. There's an entirely different	13	see anything disrupt that status quo.
14	agreement that develops between independent music and	14	So I think I'll wrap up there. I'll say the
15	actually major record labels. Those agreements look very	15	research is a good starting point, but it definitely
16	different than the types of agreements that we enter into	16	warrants further research and more discussion.
17	with the major motion picture studios. And those	17	MR. CARSON: Thank you, Greg.
18	agreements look different than the agreements with book	18	Mark, what do you have say?
19	publishers.	19	MR. FISHER: I am there we go. Good
20	And, so, when you try to and I think John	20	afternoon. I am Mark Fisher, the President and CEO of the
21	touched upon this kind of briefly, when you're trying to	21	Entertainment Merchants Association. Personally, I've
22	create a simple notice, it actually wouldn't be simple,	22	spent 35 years in the home entertainment business, both
23	nor would it be short. David talked, I think, in his	23	as a retailer a retail executive and currently as a
24	introductory a few minutes ago about EULAs, you know,	24	trade association executive.
25	people not liking EULAs. John chimed in and said, yeah,	25	The Entertainment Merchants Association is the
	46		48
1	but they actually are long because they include important	1	trade association supporting the retailing of home video
2	information, and that's true.	2	and video games. Our numbers run the spectrum from
3	And when you try to move into this short notice	3	digital retailers to physical retailers, brick-and-mortar
4	environment, any any attorney worth his salt is going	4	retailers, online retailers, the home entertainment
5	to actually tell you, you better be careful. You better	5	divisions of all the major studios and movie studios and
6	include all of the important data because anything you	6	many industry dealers as well, video game publishers and
7	leave out can actually expose you to a Section 5	7	all of those associated service technology companies that
8	proceeding. So we think that's something to be mindful	8	support our industry.
9	of.	9	Our members that are engaged in the digital
10	A second problem with the short notice, and I	10	space are involved in electronic sell-through business or
11	struggle with how to put it nicely, but I think it's a	11	the sale of digital content, TVOD, transactional VOD, the
12	proposal that's probably five or ten years behind it's	12	rental of video content, as well as SVOD, which is
13	time. Again, turning to David's introductory remarks, he	13	subscription video on demand, and AVOD, advertising video
14	talked a little bit about voice-activated assistance.	14	on demand.
15	Right now, all major technology not all. Several	15	The digital marketplace as the home
16	major technology companies are experimenting: Alexa,	16	entertainment digital marketplace, home video
17	Bixby, Cortana, Siri, Hello Google.	17	marketplace, is over a \$10 billion business, or was in
18	It's not clear in the next decade if we'll	18	2016, and for the first time in 2016 surpassed the
19	actually even have screens where people can actually view	19	physical home video marketplace. Of that, more than
20	these notices that we're discussing. And as I think	20	more than half of it is subscription video-on-demand
21	David mentioned, would you want to have some kind of	21	business and the remainder splits down the middle between
22	voice-activated system reading back a EULA to you? I	22	electronic sell-through and transactional video on
23	don't think you'd want that, and I don't think you'd want	23	demand. All three of those of those of those

- 24 it reading back this short notice that we're talking
- 25 about right now.

- business practices have actually grown over the past
- 25 year, 2016 versus 2015, albeit that that subscription

	49		
1	video-on-demand business has grown significantly more and	1	and it's not confusing, not deceptive.
2	has experienced double-digit growth over the past several	2	It's important to keep in mind that the
3	years.	3	majority of the terms that limits the consumer's
4	To address the buy-button issue, according to	4	ownership or usage and the transfer privileges are
5	the Merriam-Webster dictionary, I'll read it, the	5	established back by the content providers, and the
6	definition of "buy" is to acquire possession, ownership,	6	rights are only offered by content providers on a
7	or rights to the use of to the use or services of by	7	basis, and they're due to the sheer number of co
8	payment, especially of money. So the plain meaning of	8	providers that occasional retailer is working with
9	"buy" is really an appropriate term across all content	9	licensing requirements are they vary. And they
10	formats. Consumers buy consumer software, even though	10	too much to be able to be covered in a in one si
11	they're licensing it. They buy video on demand, even	11	- one simple message to the consumer to be cover
12	though they know that they're renting a movie. And they	12	properly.
13	buy movie tickets, even though they're simply buying an	13	Retailers do a really good job of communic
14	admission to a public performance.	14	to their consumers what their consumers need to
15	Consumers have been buying digital media	15	Retailers don't exist because they're attempting to
16	digital video since the beginning of this century.	16	deceive the consumer. Retailers exist and develo
17	Movielink and CinemaNow started in I think it was	17	relationships with a consumer when the consume
18	1999. Consumers today are accustomed to digital rights.	18	coming back.
19	This isn't a this isn't a new business. And	19	In order to do that, the retailer has to have a
20	consumers, they appreciate the fact that with the digital	20	really good idea of what their message to their
21	content they have as Greg said, they have portability	21	consumer, what they're offering, and the content
22	and they have immediate access to content. They don't	22	they're that they're carrying on their sites. And
23	have to leave their house and go to a store to access the	23	believe that they need the flexibility to be able to
24	content. They appreciate those benefits of digital	24	that and to do that as best they can, as they can be
25	content.	25	should say.
	70		

50

1	Consumers understand, as David was saying in
2	his opening, that buying content in one format versus
3	another offers different benefits and different
4	limitations. And if somebody buys a DVD of a movie, they
5	know that they can resell it when they no longer want to
6	keep it, but the owner of a digital copy of that same
7	movie, I think they know that they can't resell it.
8	The owner of a digital copy of a movie that's
9	stored in the that's stored in the cloud, on the
10	Amazon cloud or Ultra a service like UltraViolet,
11	knows that they can access that content wherever they
12	might be remotely, but the owner of the DVD knows that
13	they have to have the DVD with them when they when
14	they view the content.
15	In the study that we just saw presented by
16	Professor Perzanowski, the it cited the buy button is
17	confusing and the buy button is deceptive, but when the -
18	- when the respondents were presented with the with
19	the short notice of rights for video content
20	specifically, there really wasn't statistical a
21	statistically significant difference in what they
22	perceived their rights to be.
23	So I believe that this demonstrates that
24	consumers really aren't confused and deceived by the "buy
25	now" button for digital movies. It's an acceptable term,

ansfer privileges are nt providers, and those tent providers on a license e sheer number of content iler is working with. The they vary. And they vary ered in a -- in one simple onsumer to be covered

od job of communicating consumers need to know. they're attempting to ers exist and develop great when the consumer keeps

retailer has to have a message -- to their ng, and the content that g on their sites. And we tibility to be able to do can, as they can best, I

1	So for the reasons stated, the EMA believes
2	that there that there is not need to establish best
3	practices for consumer messaging in connection with
4	online transactions involving copyrighted works. We
5	don't believe that's necessary. We don't believe it's
6	desirable. And we believe it will confuse the market.
7	MR. CARSON: Thanks, Mark.
8	And, finally, Ben, let's get the perspective of
9	the motion picture industry.
10	MR. SHEFFNER: Thank you, David, and thank you
11	to the PTO and NTIA for hosting us today. So, so far,
12	we've heard, in addition to John, we've heard from two
13	sets of retailers: from DiMA and from EMA. I represent
14	the motion picture studios, the major motion the six
15	major motion picture studios. Generally speaking, they
16	are not in the retail business; instead, they are in the
17	wholesale business, meaning they don't have the direct
18	relationship with customers.
19	I should have a I should state a caveat that
20	there are some experiments going on with on a
21	relatively small scale at the moment of direct
22	relationships via websites operated directly by the
23	studios, but speaking generally, the way that our members
24	make their works available to the public is through these
25	online platforms that Mark's and Greg's associations

	53		55
1	represent Amazon, Apple, Walmart/VUDU, et cetera. So	1	'98 or '99.
2	it is not the movie studios that have the direct	2	In 2015, they used consumers used those
3	relationship with the consumer who visits these websites	3	services to access 76.1 billion with a B television
4	or these platforms to obtain access to the materials.	4	episodes online, compared to 48.8 billion three years
5	It's also important to note that the motion	5	earlier; and lawfully accessed 8.4 billion with a B
6	pictures and television shows that eventually end up on	6	movies compared to 4.4 billion in 2012.
7	iTunes and Amazon, et cetera, are the result of hundreds,	7	I think what this says is that consumers are,
8	perhaps thousands, of individually negotiated agreements.	8	overall, satisfied with the current state of affairs.
9	So one of my one of our studios, for example, Fox,	9	Those numbers are going up. Now, Professor Perzanowski
10	they will have separate negotiations with Apple, with	10	had a sort of a prebuttal to the argument that he
11	Amazon, with Walmart. So will Disney; so will Warner	11	probably suspected I was going to make and said, well,
12	Brothers, et cetera.	12	you know, Volkswagen sold these millions of cars and they
13	So we're talking and each of those	13	lied about the emissions that were going to be coming out
14	agreements may not cover their entire catalog. There may	14	of them. That doesn't mean that all those those
15	be different negotiations covering different catalogs.	15	millions of Volkswagen buyers are satisfied with those
16	So, again, it's hard to talk uniformly about everything.	16	transactions. And that's true, but there's a big
17	I obviously haven't seen all these hundreds or perhaps	17	difference.
18	thousands of agreements. So what I'm going to be talking	18	I suspect that most of those Volkswagen
19	about here is the general rule, although it won't shock	19	purchasers will be one-time purchasers.
20	me if somebody can find a particular exception out there.	20	PROF. PERZANOWSKI: (Off-microphone comment.)
21	One thing I've learned in researching and	21	MR. SHEFFNER: And I suspect you and probably
22	preparing for this event is, you know, I want to know,	22	most of those others will be will be one-time VW
23	well, how exactly does this page on Amazon.com or on	23	purchasers. As others have alluded to, the people who
24	Apple get to be that way. Is it because Amazon or Apple	24	are buying or obtaining access to let's use that term
25	or is it because the particular copyright owner whose	25	for the moment all of these billions of movies and
	54		56

	• •		
1	works are being offered designed that particular page?	1	television shows, they're obviously repeat customers.
2	And it probably won't surprise people in this room to	2	There's simply there are not enough people in the
3	learn that Amazon designs its own webpages; Apple designs	3	world for it to be one-off purchases.
4	its own webpages. That is not the subject of agreements	4	So they are hitting the buy button or the rent
5	between the copyright owner and the platform.	5	button or whatever it happens to say on their particular
6	As I understand it, it's generally not the	6	platform, they are paying a few dollars, and they are
7	subject of any negotiation or discussion. Apple can	7	watching or obtaining more permanently the movie, and
8	and Amazon, they consider it that their real estate.	8	they are coming back. And they are doing it again and
9	They don't want others they don't want others	9	again and again. And I suspect they would not be coming
10	designing it, both in terms of the graphics and in terms	10	back again and again and again if they felt that they
11	of the particular words that are used to describe the	11	were being tricked or deceived or weren't getting what
12	transaction.	12	they thought they were getting when they when they hit
13	So let me just take a minute to sort of	13	that button.
14	describe the current state of the marketplace because I	14	I know we're short on time. Let me just take
15	think it bears on whether consumers are being confused by	15	one or two minutes to talk for a second about the buy
16	what they're presented with. As others have alluded to,	16	button and what I think is going on here. I'm a defender
17	consumers obviously have a choice between obtaining or	17	of the buy button. I'm not here to tell the online
18	obtaining access to copyrighted works, online or through	18	platforms that they should not be using the buy button,
19	traditional hard goods like DVDs or Blu-ray disks in our	19	but I think we I think I want to just put a little
20	industry.	20	perspective how I think we should think about the word
21	In 2015 the end of 2015 which is the	21	"buy."
22	latest figures that I have available at the moment, there	22	I started thinking about this. You know,
23	were 121 legal services over the internet that people	23	there's a lot of instances on the internet where we use
24	could access movies and television shows, compared to	24	terms that are borrowed from very familiar terms from the
25	only 80 in 2012, and of course zero going back to 1988	25	offline world. Just a few examples. We use email.
		1	

pay for something and I get something, whether it's a

personal experience, but I think obviously we should

conversation, I'll often say, I just bought an album on

iTunes. What it meant is that I paid about ten bucks,

I'm talking like -- and I'm thinking like and talking

and all of a sudden, a bunch of songs showed up on my

TV at home so I can listen to it on my home stereo. And

like a normal human being who talks about, you know, I

If I were to step away from my sort of normal

human-beingness and think about it as a lawyer, I'm sure

I could write a 10 or 20-page memo analyzing, well, I

paid for something, what exactly did I get? Did I get

Did I -- did I buy the copyright? I think we'd all

probably cost millions of dollars to buy any of the

actual copyrights that we're talking about.

physical ownership of a copy? Did I license something?

probably agree, no, I didn't buy the copyright. It would

And there's sort of no problem. I mean, it's

when we say, wow, "buy," you know, that carries specific

iPhone or my -- on my iPhone and my computer and my Apple

extrapolate widely from, you know, in casual

And, you know, I just -- again, an example from

physical object or access to something.

paid some money and I got this thing.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

59

	57		59
1	Obviously, everyone's familiar with old-fashioned mail	1	legal meaning that means, you know, can you do X or Y or
2	that you get in your mailbox, and we have this newfangled	2	Z that we sort of and, you know, that we're sort of
3	thing where you get messages, and it's kind of, sort of	3	inventing a problem that doesn't really exist.
4	similar to old-fashioned mail, so we call it email.	4	I mean, I know I'm probably running long, but
5	When we open up our computer and we are looking	5	just one final thought in closing. You know, in it's
6	for stuff that we have saved, we talk about folders and	6	one thing to run an experiment and then sort of grill
7	files sitting on the desktop. Now, obviously, those are	7	people, well, did you think you were getting this; do you
8	those are kind of metaphors for very familiar things	8	think you were getting that; how much would you have paid
9	that we're familiar with from the physical world, from	9	for, you know, something else versus the experience in
10	our officers.	10	the real world.
11	Amazon has this thing called a shopping cart.	11	I mean, I gave you a bunch of statistics about
12	We're all familiar with shopping carts. It's where you	12	sort of how many billions of these transactions are going
13	sort of tentatively decide you're going to buy something,	13	on. You know, in preparing for this event, I spoke a
14	and you put it in your cart, and then you check out at	14	little bit with Mark and with Greg, and we kind of
15	the end. Obviously, on when you go to Amazon.com,	15	compared notes. And, you know, this question that we had
16	there's not a physical thing that you wheel around, but	16	for each other is, well, you know, are your members
17	it's this metaphor that approximates what you are you	17	getting complaints from the public about these
18	know, what you've experienced in the offline world.	18	transactions? Did they say, oh, you know what, I hit
19	That is, I think, how we should think about the	19	buy, but then I found out, well, you know what, maybe I
20	buy button. You know, it's a colloquial word, as	20	wasn't getting the same exact rights that I would have
21	Professor Perzanowski, I think, accurately said at one	21	gotten if I had bought a physical book or a DVD or a CD.
22	point, both in his paper and in his presentation a few	22	And the answer that I think all of us share is
23	minutes ago. Ownership is both a complex legal	23	no. And I think it was you know, Greg mentioned to
24	conclusion and an intuitive claim about an individual's	24	me, hopefully I won't misquote him, you know, online
25	relationship to a product. I think that's another way of	25	online purchasers are very quick to complain and make
	58		60
1	saying it's a colloquial word that we use to say, okay, I	1	their views known if they are unhappy. They do not

57

1	
1	their views known if they are unhappy. They do not
2	hesitate to go on, whether it's the review pages on
3	Amazon or message boards or whatever. And if they don't
4	like the way they are being treated, they are not shy
5	about complaining. And I'm sure they've complained about
6	other things, but they simply do not complain about this
7	issue.
8	And we're the members at the MPAA are a step
9	removed from these transactions, but I can report that it
10	is the same from our perspective. People are not saying,
11	you know what, I hit the buy button but I didn't get what
12	I thought when I was doing it. So with that, I think
13	I'll close and happy to respond to any questions later.
14	MR. CARSON: Well, somebody is obviously
15	speeding up the clock, and we're going to look into this,
16	but, Aaron, I can give you 60 seconds and literally not a
17	second more, and I'm really sorry, but we've run out of
18	time.
19	PROF. PERZANOWSKI: That's fine, I can talk
20	fast. So this idea that "buy" the term "buy" kind of
21	functions as a metaphor, I think that gets back to a
22	point that we heard earlier about this idea of the
23	numerous clauses principle. We simply don't have a word
24	to succinctly describe these kinds of transactions to
25	consumers. I don't know what the word "buy" means.
	······································

4/18/2017

	61		6.
1	That's why I went out and asked people what they believe	1	for another commitment after her presentation, so we
2	that it means, right?	2	would like to thank Lorrie in advance for making the time
3	It leverages a set of expectations that have	3	to be with us today.
4	been developed in the physical world where people have	4	DESIGNING AND EVALUATING DISCLOSURES IN A DIGITAL WORL
5	been buying things for a long time. And I think there is	5	PROF. CRANOR: Thank you. All right. So most
6	a set of assumptions built into that terminology. If we	6	of the work that I've done with disclosures is in the
7	want to construct a different kind of transaction that	7	privacy space. You may recognize some of these privacy-
8	has a different nature, we need to communicate that. And	8	related disclosures and symbols, and these are all
9	maybe in time we'll develop another word for it and we	9	examples of disclosures that myself or my students in my
10	can use a single word shorthand. I don't think we're	10	lab have been involved in doing some evaluation, to see
11	there yet, and I think the data that we uncovered sort of	11	how effective are they. And that's what I'm mostly going
12	bears that out.	12	to talk about today.
13	I have so many other things that I could say.	13	If you want to know whether disclosures are
14	MR. CARSON: We're going to stop here. I'm	14	effective, you need to put some thought into actually how
15	really sorry.	15	to do the evaluation. And we've done that. We've looked
16	MR. PERZANOWSKI: That's all right.	16	at some of the cognitive models that have been put
17	MR. CARSON: We just have a hard stop right	17	forward about how people process disclosures in their
18	here.	18	brain.
19	MR. PERZANOWSKI: Sure.	19	And this is a simplified version of one that
20	MR. CARSON: Thanks very much. We could have	20	was put forth by Michael Wogalter. I've simplified it
20	gone on much longer, clearly, but we can't.	20	here, but if you imagine that an individual is presented
22	Next panel, please.	22	with a disclosure in some way, and the first question is
22	ivext patiet, piease.	22	whether they actually even noticed that the disclosure is
23 24		23	there. And if so, do they fix their attention on it. If
24		24	it's visual, do they read it? Or if it's audio, do they
25		25	it's visual, do they read it." Of it it's addit, do they
	62		64
1	SERIES OF PRESENTATIONS: INFORMATIVE PERSPECTIVES	1	listen to it?
2	MR. ZAMBRANO: Hi, everyone. My name is Luis	2	If they have actually looked at it, then do
3 2	Zambrano. I'm a Policy Analyst at NTIA. Thank you for	3	they understand what it means? Do they understand the
4 0	coming here. When we were planning this meeting, many		
		4	words? Do they understand the symbols? Then, if they
	pointed to work that has been done in other areas that	45	words? Do they understand the symbols? Then, if they understand it, do they believe it? Do they think it's
5 j	pointed to work that has been done in other areas that involved consumer messaging, for example, privacy and		
5 j 6 i	-	5	understand it, do they believe it? Do they think it's
5 j 6 i	involved consumer messaging, for example, privacy and	5 6	understand it, do they believe it? Do they think it's important? Do they trust it? Do they think it's relevant to them? Do they think they personally should
5 j 6 i 7 i 8	involved consumer messaging, for example, privacy and food and nutrition.	5 6 7	understand it, do they believe it? Do they think it's important? Do they trust it? Do they think it's relevant to them? Do they think they personally should pay attention to it, or is it somebody else's
5 j 6 i 7 i 8 9 j	involved consumer messaging, for example, privacy and food and nutrition. We also realized that there were many	5 6 7 8	understand it, do they believe it? Do they think it's important? Do they trust it? Do they think it's relevant to them? Do they think they personally should pay attention to it, or is it somebody else's responsibility to do that?
5 1 6 ii 7 ii 8 9 1 10 1	involved consumer messaging, for example, privacy and food and nutrition. We also realized that there were many perspectives in these areas of expertise that fed into	5 6 7 8 9	understand it, do they believe it? Do they think it's important? Do they trust it? Do they think it's relevant to them? Do they think they personally should pay attention to it, or is it somebody else's responsibility to do that? And then are they motivated to do something
5 1 6 5 7 5 8 9 1 10 1 11 1	involved consumer messaging, for example, privacy and food and nutrition. We also realized that there were many perspectives in these areas of expertise that fed into this discussion, and we have asked our next presenters to	5 6 7 8 9 10	understand it, do they believe it? Do they think it's important? Do they trust it? Do they think it's relevant to them? Do they think they personally should pay attention to it, or is it somebody else's responsibility to do that? And then are they motivated to do something with the information that they have just learned from
5 1 6 ii 7 ii 8 9 1 10 1 11 1 12 0	involved consumer messaging, for example, privacy and food and nutrition. We also realized that there were many perspectives in these areas of expertise that fed into this discussion, and we have asked our next presenters to provide us with a bit of information about consumer	5 6 7 8 9 10 11	understand it, do they believe it? Do they think it's important? Do they trust it? Do they think it's relevant to them? Do they think they personally should pay attention to it, or is it somebody else's responsibility to do that? And then are they motivated to do something
5 1 6 ii 7 ii 8 9 1 10 1 11 1 12 0 13 0	involved consumer messaging, for example, privacy and food and nutrition. We also realized that there were many perspectives in these areas of expertise that fed into this discussion, and we have asked our next presenters to provide us with a bit of information about consumer disclosures from different perspectives, including how to	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	understand it, do they believe it? Do they think it's important? Do they trust it? Do they think it's relevant to them? Do they think they personally should pay attention to it, or is it somebody else's responsibility to do that? And then are they motivated to do something with the information that they have just learned from this disclosure? And, then, finally, do they actually do
5 1 6 ii 7 ii 8 9 1 10 1 11 1 12 0 13 0	involved consumer messaging, for example, privacy and food and nutrition. We also realized that there were many perspectives in these areas of expertise that fed into this discussion, and we have asked our next presenters to provide us with a bit of information about consumer disclosures from different perspectives, including how to design and evaluate disclosures in a digital world,	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	understand it, do they believe it? Do they think it's important? Do they trust it? Do they think it's relevant to them? Do they think they personally should pay attention to it, or is it somebody else's responsibility to do that? And then are they motivated to do something with the information that they have just learned from this disclosure? And, then, finally, do they actually do it? Do they make decisions based on the information
5 1 6 ii 7 ii 8 9 1 10 1 11 1 12 0 13 0 14 0	involved consumer messaging, for example, privacy and food and nutrition. We also realized that there were many perspectives in these areas of expertise that fed into this discussion, and we have asked our next presenters to provide us with a bit of information about consumer disclosures from different perspectives, including how to design and evaluate disclosures in a digital world, communication research trends, and to speak a little bit about the legal framework for disclosures.	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 understand it, do they believe it? Do they think it's important? Do they trust it? Do they think it's relevant to them? Do they think they personally should pay attention to it, or is it somebody else's responsibility to do that? And then are they motivated to do something with the information that they have just learned from this disclosure? And, then, finally, do they actually do it? Do they make decisions based on the information they've just gained? Do they change their behavior in some way, or do they choose not to change their behavior
5 1 6 ii 7 ii 8 9 1 10 ii 11 1 12 6 13 6 14 6 15 ii 16	involved consumer messaging, for example, privacy and food and nutrition. We also realized that there were many perspectives in these areas of expertise that fed into this discussion, and we have asked our next presenters to provide us with a bit of information about consumer disclosures from different perspectives, including how to design and evaluate disclosures in a digital world, communication research trends, and to speak a little bit	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	understand it, do they believe it? Do they think it's important? Do they trust it? Do they think it's relevant to them? Do they think they personally should pay attention to it, or is it somebody else's responsibility to do that? And then are they motivated to do something with the information that they have just learned from this disclosure? And, then, finally, do they actually do it? Do they make decisions based on the information they've just gained? Do they change their behavior in some way, or do they choose not to change their behavior but from an informed perspective?
5 1 6 ii 7 ii 8 9 1 10 ii 11 1 12 0 13 0 14 0 15 ii 16 17 0	involved consumer messaging, for example, privacy and food and nutrition. We also realized that there were many perspectives in these areas of expertise that fed into this discussion, and we have asked our next presenters to provide us with a bit of information about consumer disclosures from different perspectives, including how to design and evaluate disclosures in a digital world, communication research trends, and to speak a little bit about the legal framework for disclosures. And with that, I would like to introduce to you one of our our first speaker today. Lorrie Cranor is	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	understand it, do they believe it? Do they think it's important? Do they trust it? Do they think it's relevant to them? Do they think they personally should pay attention to it, or is it somebody else's responsibility to do that? And then are they motivated to do something with the information that they have just learned from this disclosure? And, then, finally, do they actually do it? Do they make decisions based on the information they've just gained? Do they change their behavior in some way, or do they choose not to change their behavior but from an informed perspective? So that's the cognitive path that we expect
5 1 6 ii 7 ii 8 9 1 10 ii 11 1 12 0 13 0 14 0 15 a 16 17 0 18 a	involved consumer messaging, for example, privacy and food and nutrition. We also realized that there were many perspectives in these areas of expertise that fed into this discussion, and we have asked our next presenters to provide us with a bit of information about consumer disclosures from different perspectives, including how to design and evaluate disclosures in a digital world, communication research trends, and to speak a little bit about the legal framework for disclosures. And with that, I would like to introduce to you one of our our first speaker today. Lorrie Cranor is a professor of computer science and of engineering and	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 understand it, do they believe it? Do they think it's important? Do they trust it? Do they think it's relevant to them? Do they think they personally should pay attention to it, or is it somebody else's responsibility to do that? And then are they motivated to do something with the information that they have just learned from this disclosure? And, then, finally, do they actually do it? Do they make decisions based on the information they've just gained? Do they change their behavior in some way, or do they choose not to change their behavior but from an informed perspective? So that's the cognitive path that we expect people go through when encountering a disclosure, and
5 1 6 ii 7 ii 8 9 1 10 ii 11 1 12 0 13 0 14 0 15 ii 16 1 17 0 18 ii 19 1 19 1	involved consumer messaging, for example, privacy and food and nutrition. We also realized that there were many perspectives in these areas of expertise that fed into this discussion, and we have asked our next presenters to provide us with a bit of information about consumer disclosures from different perspectives, including how to design and evaluate disclosures in a digital world, communication research trends, and to speak a little bit about the legal framework for disclosures. And with that, I would like to introduce to you one of our our first speaker today. Lorrie Cranor is a professor of computer science and of engineering and public policy at Carnegie-Mellon, where she is a director	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 understand it, do they believe it? Do they think it's important? Do they trust it? Do they think it's relevant to them? Do they think they personally should pay attention to it, or is it somebody else's responsibility to do that? And then are they motivated to do something with the information that they have just learned from this disclosure? And, then, finally, do they actually do it? Do they make decisions based on the information they've just gained? Do they change their behavior in some way, or do they choose not to change their behavior but from an informed perspective? So that's the cognitive path that we expect people go through when encountering a disclosure, and there are three points here that I'm going to focus on,
5 1 6 ii 7 ii 8 9 1 10 ii 11 1 12 6 13 6 14 6 15 ii 16 17 6 18 ii 19 1 20 6	involved consumer messaging, for example, privacy and food and nutrition. We also realized that there were many perspectives in these areas of expertise that fed into this discussion, and we have asked our next presenters to provide us with a bit of information about consumer disclosures from different perspectives, including how to design and evaluate disclosures in a digital world, communication research trends, and to speak a little bit about the legal framework for disclosures. And with that, I would like to introduce to you one of our our first speaker today. Lorrie Cranor is a professor of computer science and of engineering and public policy at Carnegie-Mellon, where she is a director of the CyLab Usable Privacy and Security Laboratory and	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 understand it, do they believe it? Do they think it's important? Do they trust it? Do they think it's relevant to them? Do they think they personally should pay attention to it, or is it somebody else's responsibility to do that? And then are they motivated to do something with the information that they have just learned from this disclosure? And, then, finally, do they actually do it? Do they make decisions based on the information they've just gained? Do they change their behavior in some way, or do they choose not to change their behavior but from an informed perspective? So that's the cognitive path that we expect people go through when encountering a disclosure, and there are three points here that I'm going to focus on, and that is looking at whether people notice the
5 1 6 ii 7 ii 8 9 1 10 ii 11 1 12 0 13 0 14 0 15 ii 16 17 0 18 ii 19 1 20 0 21 0	involved consumer messaging, for example, privacy and food and nutrition. We also realized that there were many perspectives in these areas of expertise that fed into this discussion, and we have asked our next presenters to provide us with a bit of information about consumer disclosures from different perspectives, including how to design and evaluate disclosures in a digital world, communication research trends, and to speak a little bit about the legal framework for disclosures. And with that, I would like to introduce to you one of our our first speaker today. Lorrie Cranor is a professor of computer science and of engineering and public policy at Carnegie-Mellon, where she is a director of the CyLab Usable Privacy and Security Laboratory and co-director of the MSIT Privacy Engineering Masters	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 understand it, do they believe it? Do they think it's important? Do they trust it? Do they think it's relevant to them? Do they think they personally should pay attention to it, or is it somebody else's responsibility to do that? And then are they motivated to do something with the information that they have just learned from this disclosure? And, then, finally, do they actually do it? Do they make decisions based on the information they've just gained? Do they change their behavior in some way, or do they choose not to change their behavior but from an informed perspective? So that's the cognitive path that we expect people go through when encountering a disclosure, and there are three points here that I'm going to focus on, and that is looking at whether people notice the disclosure, they comprehend it, and do they act on it.
5 1 6 1 7 1 8 9 10 1 11 1 12 0 13 0 14 0 15 1 16 1 17 0 18 1 19 1 20 0 22 1	involved consumer messaging, for example, privacy and food and nutrition. We also realized that there were many perspectives in these areas of expertise that fed into this discussion, and we have asked our next presenters to provide us with a bit of information about consumer disclosures from different perspectives, including how to design and evaluate disclosures in a digital world, communication research trends, and to speak a little bit about the legal framework for disclosures. And with that, I would like to introduce to you one of our our first speaker today. Lorrie Cranor is a professor of computer science and of engineering and public policy at Carnegie-Mellon, where she is a director of the CyLab Usable Privacy and Security Laboratory and co-director of the MSIT Privacy Engineering Masters Program.	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 understand it, do they believe it? Do they think it's important? Do they trust it? Do they think it's relevant to them? Do they think they personally should pay attention to it, or is it somebody else's responsibility to do that? And then are they motivated to do something with the information that they have just learned from this disclosure? And, then, finally, do they actually do it? Do they make decisions based on the information they've just gained? Do they change their behavior in some way, or do they choose not to change their behavior but from an informed perspective? So that's the cognitive path that we expect people go through when encountering a disclosure, and there are three points here that I'm going to focus on, and that is looking at whether people notice the disclosure, they comprehend it, and do they act on it. And, so, I have three very quick studies to share with
5 1 6 1 7 1 8 9 10 1 11 1 12 1 13 1 14 1 15 3 16 1 17 1 20 1 21 2 22 1 23 1	involved consumer messaging, for example, privacy and food and nutrition. We also realized that there were many perspectives in these areas of expertise that fed into this discussion, and we have asked our next presenters to provide us with a bit of information about consumer disclosures from different perspectives, including how to design and evaluate disclosures in a digital world, communication research trends, and to speak a little bit about the legal framework for disclosures. And with that, I would like to introduce to you one of our our first speaker today. Lorrie Cranor is a professor of computer science and of engineering and public policy at Carnegie-Mellon, where she is a director of the CyLab Usable Privacy and Security Laboratory and co-director of the MSIT Privacy Engineering Masters	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 understand it, do they believe it? Do they think it's important? Do they trust it? Do they think it's relevant to them? Do they think they personally should pay attention to it, or is it somebody else's responsibility to do that? And then are they motivated to do something with the information that they have just learned from this disclosure? And, then, finally, do they actually do it? Do they make decisions based on the information they've just gained? Do they change their behavior in some way, or do they choose not to change their behavior but from an informed perspective? So that's the cognitive path that we expect people go through when encountering a disclosure, and there are three points here that I'm going to focus on, and that is looking at whether people notice the disclosure, they comprehend it, and do they act on it.

	65		67
1	notices in an Android app. And she posited that whether	1	said they thought more ads would pop up if you clicked.
2	or not people notice the notice might depend on when they	2	That's wrong.
3	actually see the notice. And, so, she developed an app	3	Forty-five percent thought that it was a Your-
4	with a little quiz game, and she developed different	4	Ads-Here sort of thing, that they could buy ads on the
5	versions of it where the privacy notice, which is what	5	website. That's also wrong. Only 27 percent of people
6	you see in the middle, appeared at different points. In	6	had the correct answer, which is it will take you to a
7	some, it appeared in the app store; in some, it appeared	7	page where you can opt out of tailored ads.
8	right after you download the app; in some it appeared	8	Now, when we tested other tag lines, we got
9	it interrupted you in the middle of playing the game; in	9	different results. So if we changed the tag line to
10	some, it appeared at the end of the game.	10	"configure ad preferences," you can see now we go from 27
11	She had a bunch of different versions,	11	percent of people have the correct answer to 50 percent
12	including one that had no privacy notice. She had people	12	of people having the correct answer. Now, 50 percent is
13	download the app, play the game. She gave them a survey,	13	still not very good, but it's about twice as good as what
14	which they thought was about how much they liked the	14	we were doing before. So this shows you that what words
15	game, but somewhere in there she had some questions about	15	you put next to the icon actually make a big difference
16	the privacy notice. And that's what she was really after	16	in how people comprehend the meaning of this icon.
17	was to find out whether they could correctly answer those	17	Okay, the last study that I want to share with
18	questions.	18	you is looking at whether these disclosures actually
19	And, basically, what she found is that the	19	change people's behavior. So this is back to Android
20	people who saw the privacy notice in the app store did no	20	apps, and one of my students developed this privacy facts
21	better than the people who did not see it at all.	21	notice that was designed to be put on in the Android
22	However, any of the other places that she put it, people	22	app store. And it gives you a quick summary of some of
23	were more likely to be able to correctly answer	23	the privacy information related to apps.
24	questions. So that shows that the exact same notice,	24	So the way he decided to do this test is he
25	whether people notice it and pay attention to it, depends	25	developed a mock-up of the Android app store; he
	66		68

1

1	on the timing of when they actually encounter it.
2	All right, the next study focused on
3	comprehension. We looked at this blue triangle icon.
4	It's known as the AdChoices icon, and you can see it's
5	positioned in the corner of these ads. And you'll see it
6	in the corner of many of the ads that you see on the
7	internet. Well, we noticed in our research that most
8	people seemed to be unfamiliar with it and didn't know
9	that it was even there, let alone what it meant.
10	So we did a study where we recruited about
11	1,500 people online, and each one of them was exposed to
12	one version of this icon and an associated tag line. We
13	showed them a picture of The New York Times front page,
14	and you can see there are several ads, and each ad has
15	the icon and tag line there. And then we asked them some
16	questions about the icon and tag line. And you can see,
17	here's a list of the different versions of the tag line
18	that we tested. Some are versions that are actually used
19	on ads; some are versions that we made up for the study.
20	And the questions we asked were things like,
21	well, what do you think would happen if you clicked on
22	the icon, and we gave them some examples of things that
23	might happen, and we asked them if they agreed or
24	disagreed that those would happen. So, when we gave this
25	icon and the AdChoices tag line, 56 percent of people

populated it with a bunch of apps; and he invited 2 participants into our lab. And he told them to imagine 3 that they had a friend who had just bought their first 4 Android phone and was asking for assistance in selecting 5 apps. And the friend wanted an app for dieting, an app 6 for travel, a bunch of different types of apps. 7 And there were exactly two of each of these 8 apps in the app store. Now, half of the participants 9 visited an app store that had privacy facts, and half the 10 participants visited an identical app store without 11 privacy facts. And we looked to see which apps did they 12 select and what was their reason. 13 Now, what we found was that the people who saw 14 the privacy facts were more likely to select the more 15 privacy-protected apps than those who did not have that 16 privacy information. And that was in most cases. 17 However, we did some exceptions. We specifically 18 designed these pairs of apps in ways to test different 19 hypotheses, and in one case, we would pair a privacy-20 protective but completely unknown brand against a known 21 brand that did not have such good privacy. And what we 22 found is the well-known brand often was more popular, 23 despite their privacy rating. So we can see that there 24 are different factors at play here that actually impact

25 people's behavior.

	69		71
1	So when I was at the FTC last year, this was	1	electronic commerce, and law and economics. Her
2	also a topic of interest to the FTC, but not just about	2	published research has addressed various problems
3	privacy disclosures, but all types of disclosures. And	3	associated with standard form contract online such as the
4	we had a meeting where we invited people who do work on	4	effectiveness of disclosure regimes, delayed presentation
5	nutrition labels and drug fact labels and mortgage labels	5	of terms, and whether people read the fine print.
6	and all sorts of different types of disclosures.	6	She's currently working on a large empirical
7	And you can read a report of that workshop,	7	project on consumer privacy policies online and on the
8	which is on the FTC website, but two key takeaways I want	8	effectiveness of current consumer privacy protections.
9	to share. One was that our experts, regardless of what	9	Florencia?
10	domain they were in, said it's really important to test	10	CONSUMER PERCEPTION: COMMUNICATIONS RESEARCH TOOLS
11	disclosures before you put them out there to see if	11	PROF. MAROTTA-WURGLER: Thank you.
12	they're effective. And even if you have a low budget,	12	Hi, thank you very much. Let me just access my
13	some testing is better than no testing at all.	13	slides.
14	And then the other key takeaway is that when	14	Okay, so, I'll talk a bit about some work I've
15	you test them, it's not just enough to test, do people	15	done on I've been focusing on fine print for over a
16	understand these words, but you actually have to run a	16	decade now, specifically on software end-user software
17	test where you can test comprehension in the context that	17	license agreements. I thought I'd focus on the contract
18	makes sense for this particular disclosure.	18	that is the most dense and less likely to be read
19	The last thing I want to say before I wrap up	19	because, you know, academics have a lot of free time.
20	is I wanted to put out the idea of computer-readable	20	So I'll talk a bit about that and about some of
21	disclosures. Some of our speakers earlier today	21	the findings that I've some of the evidence that I
22	mentioned the problem of do you really want Alexa reading	22	found I do empirical work and then some of the
23	a disclosure to you, and, of course, we don't really want	23	takeaway points from my work and other people's work. So
24	to listen to these long disclosures. However, if you	24	the first one is that very few people read standard
25	make these disclosures computer-readable so that Alexa	25	terms. You know, the motivation of the talk at the
	70		72

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1	and all of your other digital assistants can read them
2	electronically to themselves, not out loud to you, you
3	can do all sorts of useful things now.
4	So your personal assistants can read them.
5	They can use this information to discover whether there's
6	something unusual in this disclosure, or is this the same
7	disclosure you've already seen a zillion times before.
8	You might set your personal preferences to say, alert me
9	only if there's something unusual in this disclosure; or
10	alert me the first time I've seen this disclosure; after
11	that, just say it's the same one you've seen before.
12	You can also use this for searching. You know,
13	I would like this hot new song, but I want it from the
14	company that will give me these particular rights. And
15	you could have your personal privacy assistant find the
16	vendor that will offer it to you with those rights. Lots
17	of really useful things you can do once you put these
18	disclosures in an electronic and computer-readable form.
19	And I'll end there. Thank you.
20	MR. ZAMBRANO: Thank you, Lorrie.
21	Our next presenter is Florencia Marotta-
22	Wurgler. She's a professor of law at New York University
23	School of Law and the director of the NYU Law School
24	Study Abroad Program in Buenos Aires. Her teaching and
25	research interests are contracts, consumer privacy,

beginning was that nobody really focused on whether people actually read fine print, and I thought I'd address that a little bit. So very few people read fine print. Increasing disclosure barely changes the rate of readership. And I'll put a caveat on that. There's certain types of disclosure. The traditional forms of disclosure don't really work at all. I'll present some evidence as to that as well. But even requiring assent, presenting the terms in a box and making you click on "I agree," doesn't really work so much. But there's some lessons learned. So shortening, simplifying, framing effects and the just in time, the timing of disclosures, as Lorrie just said,

seem to help tremendously in making disclosures more effective, and I'll focus on what effectiveness means in a second.

So, first, I'll focus on the studies -- the findings of a first study, worked together with two coauthors. We look to the extent to which people read fine print, not in a lab setting, not in a survey, but in a real market. What -- we look for something that in law and economics we call an informed minority, which is a critical number of people that is sufficiently large to affect a market, to affect sellers into offering terms

	15	1	
1	that buyers want.	1	these findings basically lump in different kinds of
2	So and we focused on the market for shopping	2	disclosures. Sometimes it's at the bottom of the page
3	for software online. EULAs are rich, quintessential type	3	sometimes it takes fewer clicks to access. What if t
4	of standard form contract, and for the purposes of this	4	disclosure is more salient? Maybe with increased
5	audience and this talk, they include most of the terms	5	disclosure we see more likely to see readership.
6	related to intellectual property rights, in addition to	6	And this is what I evaluated in a subsequent
7	many others. The average EULA is 2,700 pages long, and	7	study, where I say, well, maybe when contracts are
8	they have grown an average of 30 percent over the last	8	likely to be read meaning that they take fewer clic
9	decade. So clearly a highly dense contract and which is	9	to access then we're going to see more readership
10	constantly evolving.	10	And what this so we do the same, the same thing,
11	So what we do is we measure all the visits by	11	this is one way of measuring access. So one is whe
12	40,091 households to 66 software companies across a	12	you know, you have to click times in a page, but
13	number of different markets, including games, word	13	sometimes there is there is basically you have t
14	processing, antivirus, from large to very small from	14	acknowledge that you agree to a license.
15	highly competitive to more concentrated markets, and see	15	What if we require assent, meaning that you
16	the extent to which the shoppers click on the URLs that	16	can't escape the contract no matter where where
17	correspond to EULA. So we use click-stream data for this	17	go. So there's this one form of requiring assent.
18	that basically captures all of the URLs of all of these	18	Basically you have to click on "I agree" at the end of
19	visitors during their visits to these companies so we can	19	the of entering all the terms. So, what you kno
20	track very carefully how where they visit and how long	20	do you really want to bother about figuring out what
21	they spend on each particular page.	21	is that you've just agreed to. And the other times, in
22	And we say and we have very detailed	22	right there for you, right? All you need to do is just
23	demographic information for each particular user, and we	23	basically scroll down and see what happens.
24	track all of the URLs that correspond to EULAs and	24	So maybe what if readership is increased whe
25	measure the extent to which they click on these contracts	25	we basically require consumers to agree to particula

73

74

ures. Sometimes it's at the bottom of the page; mes it takes fewer clicks to access. What if the ure is more salient? Maybe with increased ure we see more likely to see readership. And this is what I evaluated in a subsequent where I say, well, maybe when contracts are more to be read -- meaning that they take fewer clicks ss -- then we're going to see more readership. hat this -- so we do the same, the same thing, and one way of measuring access. So one is whether, ow, you have to click times in a page, but mes there is -- there is -- basically you have to vledge that you agree to a license. What if we require assent, meaning that you scape the contract no matter where -- where you there's this one form of requiring assent. lly you have to click on "I agree" at the end of of entering all the terms. So, what -- you know, really want to bother about figuring out what it you've just agreed to. And the other times, it's ere for you, right? All you need to do is just ly scroll down and see what happens. So maybe what if readership is increased when

	, .		10
1	and how long they spend on this. And we say that a	1	terms? And, here again, we have EULAs and company visits
2	reader is somebody who spends at least one second in	2	as a function of how many clicks it takes to access the
3	these contracts. So that's that's as much as you need	3	contract. So clicking as a function of disclosure. And,
4	to be a reader. It's highly beneficial.	4	ideally, as the number of clicks goes down, you might
5	And, here, you can see a bit of how this how	5	want to have readership go up. That's the goal of
6	this looks like. So, here, we have for retail and	6	increased disclosure.
7	freeware sites we thought, well, maybe if somebody's	7	And, indeed, you do find this, right, when you
8	getting something for free they're more likely to know	8	have when the EULA is six clicks away, nobody accesses
9	that there might be strings attached, so you can see that	9	them, but when it's one click away, it's true, EULAs are
10	for retail firms we have the 40,697 visits. And then we	10	more likely to be read, but the number is basically not
11	have some of the characteristics about the particular	11	distinguishable from zero, right? It's .32 percent.
12	visit, but the most interesting findings are on the right	12	And, again, the median time spent is extremely low,
13	side of the panel, and particularly the one that's framed	13	right? So one out of 200 shoppers even glances at the
14	in red.	14	EULA, let alone understands it, reads it, or reacts to
15	And we can see that out of the 40,697 visits,	15	it.
16	only 49 click on the EULA. These are shoppers. These	16	So we look at whether readers actually react to
17	are people who are actively searching to shop. And those	17	what they read, and I find no such indication. And,
18	who click on the EULA spend a median time of 29 seconds	18	well, how about requiring readership? How about those
19	on a contract that is twenty over 2,700 words long.	19	clickwraps? So it turns out that those aren't that
20	So clearly this is a very small number, about	20	helpful either. So .23 percent click on hyperlinks on
21	one in 1,000, and with some very generous parameters,	21	EULAs that they're forced to acknowledge exist. You have
22	maybe .17 percent. So one in 1,000 bothers to access the	22	to click on "I agree," but nobody bothers to click on the
23	terms, but they're barely, barely read.	23	hyperlink next to it.
24	So I thought I'd ask, well, how about, you	24	And when you have a EULA in a checkout page,
25	know, maybe these software license agreements, all of	25	nobody spends that much enough time to actually scroll

19 (Pages 73 to 76)

75

And, finally, there's a very interesting study

on framing effects. So, for example, when a contractual

they're more likely to read them, but also to comply with

obligation is framed in moral rather than legal terms,

consumers are more likely to be drawn to them, and

the terms that are being presented, to comply with a

particular contractual term in this particular example.

-

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

4/18/2017

Consumer I	Messaging in Connection with Online Transactions Involving Copyrighted Works		4/18/2017
	77		79
1	down and read through the terms. It's about 94 seconds,	1	Similarly, when terms are likely to be read,
2	but consider that that time includes entering personal	2	they're also more likely to be complied with, which is
3	information with phone I'm sorry, name, address, and	3	sometimes you know, not shocking, but shorter
4	credit card information. So the bottom line is that even	4	disclosures are also more likely to be read, especially
5	with required assent, almost nobody reads the fine print,	5	if they're framed in not a very legalistic manner. That
6	and this is true in other contexts as well.	6	being said, legalisting information, just when you
7	But it turns out that, so, these traditional	7	structure something in a legalistic way, consumers seem
8	disclosures are not so helpful, but there's some	8	to be more committed to a particular deal. So context
9	evidence, and Lorrie has talked about some, that when	9	and the framing framing effects matter a lot, not only
10	disclosure might work. So EULAs, not so likely to be	10	in comprehension but also in understanding what the role
11	read, but what happens if we shorten simplified	11	of the consumer is in fulfilling a particular contractual
12	disclosures that are made at the right time tend to be	12	duty.
13	more likely to work.	13	So to conclude, the traditional disclosures are
14	And then there's very interesting research that	14	not very effective, right? So hardly any anybody
15	finds that the framing effect, depending on how you frame	15	reads these long contracts. Increased disclosure, the
16	the terms, is it more in a moral sense or in a colloquial	16	traditional way, the legally enforceable way, some of
17	sense or in a highly legal sense affects not only the	17	these clicking "I agree's" are the gold standard in terms
18	likelihood to be read but also the perceptions about what	18	of what courts will enforce. And what's costly really is
19	the nature of the obligation is.	19	the reading and comprehension, not access, and the
20	So there's some very interesting and	20	disclosure effectiveness could be improved by shortening,
21	encouraging evidence from the restaurant grade card	21	simplifying, framing the just in the timing, and
22	experiments that seems to have found restaurant hygiene	22	finally and most importantly, empirically testing these
23	cards actually reduce the number of emergency room	23	particular initiatives.
24	admittances for food poisoning, and this has been in L.A.	24	Thank you.
25	in 1997. And also a recent study in New York seems to	25	MR. ZAMBRANO: Thank you, Florencia.
	78		80
1	have the same the same types of types of things.	1	Our next speaker is Deborah Lodge. Deborah is
2	There are other initiatives that this	2	a partner at Squire Patton Boggs and specializes in
3	conversations in this area I could learn from. So the	3	intellectual property, privacy, and internet law. Among
4	FTC's dot-com disclosure seems to seemed to borrow or	4	her diverse clients are financial institutions,
5	adopt these types of lessons learned. The CFPB has been	5	communications and media companies, retailers, and
6	testing and experimenting with this. Smart disclosures	6	technology pioneers. With her broad legal experience and
7	in the U.K. nudge units, they're all in different	7	practical business perspective, Deborah helps clients
8	settings, and the disclosures vary tremendously, but what	8	achieve their strategic goals while complying with the
9	they have in common is that they all test their	9	legal regulations that govern privacy, e-commerce, and
10	disclosures, not only in a room, but also they do field	10	advertising.
11	studies.	11	CONSUMER DISCLOSURE: AN OVERVIEW
12	The Nudge Unit in the U.K. actually does field	12	MS. LODGE: Hello, and I'm delighted to be here
13	studies with small samples of the population to test the	13	on this on part of this discussion, and I guess when I
14	extent to which different types of disclosures work in	14	was asked to be on this, I said, oh, okay, now there
15	effectively communicating information to consumers and	15	should be the law because there may be some usefulness in
16	affecting their behavior ultimately affecting their	16	reviewing some of the basics. There's been allusion to
17	behavior. So testing is a key component, no matter where	17	the Federal Trade Commission and other laws that govern
18	these particular disclosures are made.	18	this space, and actually, I'm delighted to be here
10		10	

20 (Pages 77 to 80)

because my practice melds all of these interests, and

technology -- here we go. So here we are. So the

Federal Trade Commission, of course, is the primary

enforcer of truthfulness in advertising and disclosures.

it's fascinating because, as technology changes, so the

disclosures and the law affecting them has to change too.

So, now, how do I go next? We'll figure this

19

20

21

22

23

24

	81		83
1	And there, the basic law is Section 5 of the FTC Act,	1	But from the FTC's perspective, the medium does
2	which prohibits unfair or deceptive acts or practices in	2	not matter because print, online, broadcast media, social
3	or affecting commerce.	3	media as well, the basic principles of Section 5 apply to
4	And that language is extremely flexible and has	4	all of the different platforms and media on which these
5	been, you know, interpreted in different ways to address	5	disclosures are made. And as I referenced, the dot-com
6	various technologies. An act or practice generally is	6	disclosures, which were updated in March 2013, really
7	deemed unfair if, A, it is likely to cause substantial	7	give further guidance to all us practitioners in terms of
8	consumer injury, which a consumer could not reasonably	8	how to make effective disclosures online.
9	avoid, and it is not outweighed by the benefit to	9	One of the issues that we were dealing with
10	consumers. And an example of that is in the recent	10	today and Professor Perzanowski's study addressed is, you
11	privacy area of the Wyndham decision where the Federal	11	know, what is material, what is likely to influence a
12	Trade Commission said it was unfair of the hotel company	12	purchasing decision. That clearly depends on the nature
13	not to take greater precaution to protect privacy	13	of the product or service that is being advertised and
14	interests of its hotel guests.	14	offered, and the basic questions are are disclosures
15	On the deceptive side, an act or practice is	15	needed in order to address consumer expectations, what
16	considered deceptive if it misleads consumers who are	16	are the consumer's expectations? Obviously, they're
17	acting reasonably under the circumstances and is material	17	going to differ very much from whether there's a physical
18	to the purchase or use decision. And that definition	18	object involved or probably whether there is something
19	comes out of the FTC's policy statement on deception,	19	that is just online or communicated via, you know, audio
20	which is still used as a guide. Obviously, it's filled	20	or other kinds of messaging.
21	with many issues there because what is acting reasonably	21	And what is the consumer's perception of the
22	and what is material to the purchase or use decision.	22	advertisement on the offer? That really is very critical
23	In reviewing messaging, the FTC evaluates the	23	to an FTC assessment. And, also, you know, what are the
24	message or offer by looking at all the elements of the	24	total costs to receive or use the products or services?
25	promotional offering material. And as we've heard today,	25	Does the consumer understand what the pricing is and what

82

1 1 net impression is critical. What is the disclosure, and 2 2 what is the consumer's understanding of what the 3 3 disclosure means? 4 4 Notably, if there's a deceptive net impression, 5 5 the FTC will find the ad to be misleading, even if 6 6 specific individual claims or presentations are not 7 7 misleading. And that's the critical issue here, 8 obviously, in terms of buy now. What does it mean? And, 8 9 9 you know, are there various misleading statements or 10 impressions that are associated with that? 10 11 11 In the FTC land, actual injury is not a 12 prerequisite because something can be deemed to be 12 13 13 misleading and harmful to consumers, even if there is no 14 actual injury shown. The key issue is what are 14 15 15 consumers' perceptions and expectations. 16 16 If a claim would not be -- if a claim would be 17 17 deceptive unless information is provided in addition to 18 the basic claim, then under the FTC's view, disclosures 18 19 must be provided, and there was already reference to the 19 20 FTC's dot-com disclosures. I have them here because 20 21 21 they're incredibly helpful and, you know, the FTC has 22 tried to deal with the issue of the transfer of much of 22 23 23 our shopping and consumer experiences to the internet, 24 24 and online deception is obviously one of the issues that 25 25 we're all trying to deal with in different contexts.

goes along with those pricing points?
Sales terms, including return or refund
policies, or in the digital context, certainly, you know,
whether or not something is going to be available for a
short term, forever, whatever. And the omission of
critical information that relates to these points can, in
the FTC's view, be deemed material or deceptive.

The FTC's dot-com disclosure guidelines really focus on clear and conspicuous disclosures and the import of making them so that they do draw consumers' attention. And I thought that the prior statements and presentations were critical on this because that is what I think, you know, we're all looking for in terms of the utility of any disclosures.

The FTC has adopted what are called the four Ps for online effective disclosures where they need to be prominent, large enough for a consumer to notice and read -- hopefully they'll read; presentation, you know, what wording and format, is it easy to understand; placement, the information or the link should be easy to find; and proximity, it should be close to the claim that the disclosure qualifies.

Audio and visual disclosures, particularly in advertising contexts, have related issues that are in addition to those because a listener needs to be able to

83

1	hear and comprehend the disclosure. And on-screen
2	disclosures, I mean, I see many sort of flip across the
3	screen, and, you know, the question is whether they are
4	really noticeable and whether they're legible and whether
5	they're comprehensible. You know, those are all very
6	critical issues. And in the FTC's parlance, you know,
7	the disclosures should be repeated in the advertising if
8	they are necessary to the comprehension.
9	I also put together a few examples of FTC
10	actions in this area. And, p.s., there aren't a lot.
11	You know, the FTC's recent actions have been more in
12	disclosures in native advertising or in endorsements and
13	testimonials, but there have been a few cases in the
14	digital rights area. And one was in 2007, where the FTC
15	brought an action against Sony BMG Music for the practice
16	of selling CDs without telling consumers that they
17	contained content-protective software that limited the
18	number of devices and the number of times that the
19	particular music could be downloaded and played or
20	shared. And, p.s., this is 2007, already obviously the
21	marketplace has changed. This was not streaming; this
22	related to, you know, the CDs that one had to put into
23	some kind of device in order to access the music.
24	And the FTC found that the failure to disclose
25	or the complaint alleged that the failure to

1	downloaded the first time, but the closing letter noted
2	that the MLB Advanced Media company had, you know, made
3	significant changes in terms of disclosing the fact of
4	the digital rights management and what the consumer was
5	getting prior to purchase, so they were satisfied and
6	there was you know, everyone was pleased with that.
7	But it's interesting because there was also
8	part of that in the closing letter, the FTC noted that
9	the Commission has the challenge of ensuring in the
10	context of sales of digital products that consumers are
11	provided sufficient information prior to purchase so they
12	understand any inherent limitations on the use of the
13	products they buy. And that obviously is what we're
14	discussing today.
15	But one issue is that the boilerplate terms and
16	conditions or EULA licenses, according to the FTC's view,
17	may not be sufficient disclosure if the consumer does not
18	have the understanding of what they're getting.
19	Going back a couple of years before that, there
20	were a few other cases where Hewlett-Packard and
21	Microsoft, for instance, were selling personal digital
22	assistants that actually at that time were competitors
23	to the Palm, but the products came with access built
24	in the advertisements, you know, proclaimed you could
25	get your email, you could get all of your access to the

85

disclose the fact that the consumer downloaded the 1 2 content-protective devices and software when the CD was 3 loaded on to the device was a material omission of a 4 critical fact and that the consumers might not have 5 purchased the music or the rights or whatever it was had 6 they known that it would come with software that, A, 7 restricted their ability to use it and, p.s., also 8 downloaded certain facts that were relating to the 9 consumer's actual use of the music. 10 So there was a consent order in which Sony BMG 11 agreed to clearly and prominently disclose the 12 limitations, either on the front of the product's 13 packaging and also with further directions on the back of 14 the product packaging and agreed not to install content-15 protective software without the consumer's affirmative 16 consent. 17 Another one -- and this was a closing letter, 18 actually, that was issued against Major League Baseball's 19 Advanced Media, LP, MLB Advanced Media, in which the FTC 20 closed an investigation of digital download sales of MLB 21 games that were subject to a digital rights management 22 system. The advertising had said, "Don't just watch the 23 game, own it." 24 And the license, the digital rights management 25 software, downloaded on a computer when the material was

1 internet, but there was no clear disclosure that a 2 consumer needed to purchase separately a modem and 3 utilize the modem in conjunction with the advertised 4 device. And the Federal Trade Commission received a 5 consent order from the company saying, no, you know, we 6 will make that more prominent because obviously in order 7 to utilize what the consumers had bought, they needed to 8 have this other device. 9 And the Gateway Corporation similarly, there 10 was another consent order where the FTC had challenged as 11 deceptive ads for "free internet" when there was 12 disclosure in very fine print that consumers would have 13 to incur additional telephone charges, even if they were 14 calling to the toll-free number. And, you know, in the 15 FTC's view, that was not a clear or conspicuous enough 16 disclosure to avoid any deception. 17 So from the FTC's dot-com disclosure guidance, 18 I think there are certain, you know, things that the 19 FTC's views are reflected in by their saying that they 20 will continue to enforce the consumer protection laws to 21 ensure that even in the new media the products and 22 services are described accurately and truthfully online

and the consumers understand what they're paying for. And I think that that is exactly the crux of what we're talking about now, what is consumer

88

23

24

25

	80		0
	89		9
1	perception. It may be that it's significant and more	1	talked about disclosure, so I work on disclosures and
2	shall be disclosed, I'm sure, because the all of this	2	consumer and not only on what's in standard form
3	enforcement, in the FTC's view, also ensures competition	3	contracts but also how consumers behave to them in the
4	in the market and the dissemination of additional, you	4	next area that I'm interested in is understanding, well,
5	know, products and services and different media to	5	now that we know that disclosing a huge amount of
6	consumers, which obviously, you know, is for the	6	information doesn't really that doesn't really work.
7	betterment of all the consumer interests.	7	The question is, well, what is it that we disclose. And
8	So that's it, and I know that this is sort of	8	I think that the research, at least in legal academia and
9	the underlying kind of issue of what is the law on the	9	also in some finance departments when we have to deal
10	consumer protection side, and in addition to the FTC, I	10	with financial disclosures, is to elicit or try to get a
11	just wanted to mention that there are, of course, state	11	sense of what is it that needs to be disclosed.
12	little FTC laws as well as sector-specific. And, you	12	And there are several formulas, but the
13	know, with the proliferation of class actions and other	13	approach is about the same. So one is given that not
14	groups, you know, asserting false advertising rights, you	14	everything needs can be disclosed, one of the most
15	know, this is clearly an area that, you know, all sectors	15	important things of all, maybe we can disclose what
16	have important stakes in.	16	consumers find most important. But this might vary by
17	So I'm pleased to be here. Thank you very	17	context. So one way of doing that, and this is work that
18	much, and this is great.	18	Zev Eigen and I have been working on, is we did it in
19	MR. ZAMBRANO: Thank you, Deborah. And thank	19	terms of the preferences regarding terms of use for
20	you again, Lorrie, and Florencia, for your presentations.	20	social networks, is maybe to survey consumers online and
21	I think now we're going to take a ten-minute break and	21	get a sense of what types of terms they consider to be
22	reconvene at 3:14. So thank you.	22	the most important, have them rank them in particular
23	(Brief recess.)	23	order.
24		24	And, so, the terms that are the highest ranks
25		25	might be the ones that are more likely to be disclosed,
	90		92
1	DISCUSSION: COMMUNICATING COPYRIGHT TERMS IN DIGITAL	1	but the highest rank terms maybe are terms that are
2	TRANSACTIONS TO CONSUMERS	2	unknown to consumers. So there is there's another
3	MS. ALLEN: Okay, we're ready to begin the next	3	philosophy, which is, well, maybe what we need to
4	panel. So good afternoon. We've just had a lively	4	disclose is not those terms that are the ones that are
5	discussion followed by presentations about different	5	most important to consumers but those that but those
6	aspects about how consumer disclosures and perceptions	6	that consumers are most confused about.
7	can be evaluated based on the experience in other fields.	7	
7 8	*	7	And in a recent paper at The Stanford Law
	We turn now to a panel discussion, followed by		And in a recent paper at The Stanford Law Review, Professors Alan Schwartz and Ian Ayres from Yale
8 9	We turn now to a panel discussion, followed by participation from the audience, both in-person and	7 8 9	And in a recent paper at The Stanford Law Review, Professors Alan Schwartz and Ian Ayres from Yale Law School did exactly that, also in terms of the in
8 9 10	We turn now to a panel discussion, followed by participation from the audience, both in-person and online, to cover first how to determine what copyright-	7 8 9 10	And in a recent paper at The Stanford Law Review, Professors Alan Schwartz and Ian Ayres from Yale Law School did exactly that, also in terms of the in regards to the terms of use of Facebook. So they tried
8 9 10 11	We turn now to a panel discussion, followed by participation from the audience, both in-person and online, to cover first how to determine what copyright- related terms and conditions are important to communicate	7 8 9 10 11	And in a recent paper at The Stanford Law Review, Professors Alan Schwartz and Ian Ayres from Yale Law School did exactly that, also in terms of the in regards to the terms of use of Facebook. So they tried to elicit information regarding the terms to which
8 9 10 11 12	We turn now to a panel discussion, followed by participation from the audience, both in-person and online, to cover first how to determine what copyright- related terms and conditions are important to communicate to consumers in the online environment, and then we'll	7 8 9 10 11 12	And in a recent paper at The Stanford Law Review, Professors Alan Schwartz and Ian Ayres from Yale Law School did exactly that, also in terms of the in regards to the terms of use of Facebook. So they tried to elicit information regarding the terms to which consumers were most confused about, meaning that they had
8 9 10 11 12 13	We turn now to a panel discussion, followed by participation from the audience, both in-person and online, to cover first how to determine what copyright- related terms and conditions are important to communicate to consumers in the online environment, and then we'll talk about and then we'll discuss how best to ensure	7 8 9 10 11 12 13	And in a recent paper at The Stanford Law Review, Professors Alan Schwartz and Ian Ayres from Yale Law School did exactly that, also in terms of the in regards to the terms of use of Facebook. So they tried to elicit information regarding the terms to which consumers were most confused about, meaning that they had wrong perceptions about what was in those terms. So, for
8 9 10 11 12 13 14	We turn now to a panel discussion, followed by participation from the audience, both in-person and online, to cover first how to determine what copyright- related terms and conditions are important to communicate to consumers in the online environment, and then we'll talk about and then we'll discuss how best to ensure that license terms related to copyright are clearly and	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	And in a recent paper at The Stanford Law Review, Professors Alan Schwartz and Ian Ayres from Yale Law School did exactly that, also in terms of the in regards to the terms of use of Facebook. So they tried to elicit information regarding the terms to which consumers were most confused about, meaning that they had wrong perceptions about what was in those terms. So, for example, related to Aaron's really interesting paper.
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	We turn now to a panel discussion, followed by participation from the audience, both in-person and online, to cover first how to determine what copyright- related terms and conditions are important to communicate to consumers in the online environment, and then we'll talk about and then we'll discuss how best to ensure that license terms related to copyright are clearly and effectively communicated.	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	And in a recent paper at The Stanford Law Review, Professors Alan Schwartz and Ian Ayres from Yale Law School did exactly that, also in terms of the in regards to the terms of use of Facebook. So they tried to elicit information regarding the terms to which consumers were most confused about, meaning that they had wrong perceptions about what was in those terms. So, for example, related to Aaron's really interesting paper. So, for example, to what extent do consumers
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	We turn now to a panel discussion, followed by participation from the audience, both in-person and online, to cover first how to determine what copyright- related terms and conditions are important to communicate to consumers in the online environment, and then we'll talk about and then we'll discuss how best to ensure that license terms related to copyright are clearly and effectively communicated. Our panelists will share a variety of different	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	And in a recent paper at The Stanford Law Review, Professors Alan Schwartz and Ian Ayres from Yale Law School did exactly that, also in terms of the in regards to the terms of use of Facebook. So they tried to elicit information regarding the terms to which consumers were most confused about, meaning that they had wrong perceptions about what was in those terms. So, for example, related to Aaron's really interesting paper. So, for example, to what extent do consumers understand what "buy now" means? Maybe more in a sense
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	We turn now to a panel discussion, followed by participation from the audience, both in-person and online, to cover first how to determine what copyright- related terms and conditions are important to communicate to consumers in the online environment, and then we'll talk about and then we'll discuss how best to ensure that license terms related to copyright are clearly and effectively communicated. Our panelists will share a variety of different perspectives from industry and academia. I invite them	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	And in a recent paper at The Stanford Law Review, Professors Alan Schwartz and Ian Ayres from Yale Law School did exactly that, also in terms of the in regards to the terms of use of Facebook. So they tried to elicit information regarding the terms to which consumers were most confused about, meaning that they had wrong perceptions about what was in those terms. So, for example, related to Aaron's really interesting paper. So, for example, to what extent do consumers understand what "buy now" means? Maybe more in a sense of a binary choice or other types of terms and then
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	We turn now to a panel discussion, followed by participation from the audience, both in-person and online, to cover first how to determine what copyright- related terms and conditions are important to communicate to consumers in the online environment, and then we'll talk about and then we'll discuss how best to ensure that license terms related to copyright are clearly and effectively communicated. Our panelists will share a variety of different perspectives from industry and academia. I invite them each to introduce themselves quickly, and then let them	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	And in a recent paper at The Stanford Law Review, Professors Alan Schwartz and Ian Ayres from Yale Law School did exactly that, also in terms of the in regards to the terms of use of Facebook. So they tried to elicit information regarding the terms to which consumers were most confused about, meaning that they had wrong perceptions about what was in those terms. So, for example, related to Aaron's really interesting paper. So, for example, to what extent do consumers understand what "buy now" means? Maybe more in a sense of a binary choice or other types of terms and then disclose in a bit of a warning box type thing only those
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	We turn now to a panel discussion, followed by participation from the audience, both in-person and online, to cover first how to determine what copyright- related terms and conditions are important to communicate to consumers in the online environment, and then we'll talk about and then we'll discuss how best to ensure that license terms related to copyright are clearly and effectively communicated. Our panelists will share a variety of different perspectives from industry and academia. I invite them each to introduce themselves quickly, and then let them give any initial thoughts about how to determine what	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	And in a recent paper at The Stanford Law Review, Professors Alan Schwartz and Ian Ayres from Yale Law School did exactly that, also in terms of the in regards to the terms of use of Facebook. So they tried to elicit information regarding the terms to which consumers were most confused about, meaning that they had wrong perceptions about what was in those terms. So, for example, related to Aaron's really interesting paper. So, for example, to what extent do consumers understand what "buy now" means? Maybe more in a sense of a binary choice or other types of terms and then disclose in a bit of a warning box type thing only those terms, up to three or five, to which consumers are not
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	We turn now to a panel discussion, followed by participation from the audience, both in-person and online, to cover first how to determine what copyright- related terms and conditions are important to communicate to consumers in the online environment, and then we'll talk about and then we'll discuss how best to ensure that license terms related to copyright are clearly and effectively communicated. Our panelists will share a variety of different perspectives from industry and academia. I invite them each to introduce themselves quickly, and then let them give any initial thoughts about how to determine what terms are important to consumers. And then we'll go	$7 \\ 8 \\ 9 \\ 10 \\ 11 \\ 12 \\ 13 \\ 14 \\ 15 \\ 16 \\ 17 \\ 18 \\ 19 \\ 20 $	And in a recent paper at The Stanford Law Review, Professors Alan Schwartz and Ian Ayres from Yale Law School did exactly that, also in terms of the in regards to the terms of use of Facebook. So they tried to elicit information regarding the terms to which consumers were most confused about, meaning that they had wrong perceptions about what was in those terms. So, for example, related to Aaron's really interesting paper. So, for example, to what extent do consumers understand what "buy now" means? Maybe more in a sense of a binary choice or other types of terms and then disclose in a bit of a warning box type thing only those terms, up to three or five, to which consumers are not only confused about it but also terms that have less
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	We turn now to a panel discussion, followed by participation from the audience, both in-person and online, to cover first how to determine what copyright- related terms and conditions are important to communicate to consumers in the online environment, and then we'll talk about and then we'll discuss how best to ensure that license terms related to copyright are clearly and effectively communicated. Our panelists will share a variety of different perspectives from industry and academia. I invite them each to introduce themselves quickly, and then let them give any initial thoughts about how to determine what terms are important to consumers. And then we'll go ahead and talk a little bit about ensuring copyright-	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	And in a recent paper at The Stanford Law Review, Professors Alan Schwartz and Ian Ayres from Yale Law School did exactly that, also in terms of the in regards to the terms of use of Facebook. So they tried to elicit information regarding the terms to which consumers were most confused about, meaning that they had wrong perceptions about what was in those terms. So, for example, related to Aaron's really interesting paper. So, for example, to what extent do consumers understand what "buy now" means? Maybe more in a sense of a binary choice or other types of terms and then disclose in a bit of a warning box type thing only those terms, up to three or five, to which consumers are not only confused about it but also terms that have less less rights that they understand.
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	We turn now to a panel discussion, followed by participation from the audience, both in-person and online, to cover first how to determine what copyright- related terms and conditions are important to communicate to consumers in the online environment, and then we'll talk about and then we'll discuss how best to ensure that license terms related to copyright are clearly and effectively communicated. Our panelists will share a variety of different perspectives from industry and academia. I invite them each to introduce themselves quickly, and then let them give any initial thoughts about how to determine what terms are important to consumers. And then we'll go ahead and talk a little bit about ensuring copyright- related license terms are communicated clearly and	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	And in a recent paper at The Stanford Law Review, Professors Alan Schwartz and Ian Ayres from Yale Law School did exactly that, also in terms of the in regards to the terms of use of Facebook. So they tried to elicit information regarding the terms to which consumers were most confused about, meaning that they had wrong perceptions about what was in those terms. So, for example, related to Aaron's really interesting paper. So, for example, to what extent do consumers understand what "buy now" means? Maybe more in a sense of a binary choice or other types of terms and then disclose in a bit of a warning box type thing only those terms, up to three or five, to which consumers are not only confused about it but also terms that have less less rights that they understand. So terms that are actually if consumers
8	We turn now to a panel discussion, followed by participation from the audience, both in-person and online, to cover first how to determine what copyright- related terms and conditions are important to communicate to consumers in the online environment, and then we'll talk about and then we'll discuss how best to ensure that license terms related to copyright are clearly and effectively communicated. Our panelists will share a variety of different perspectives from industry and academia. I invite them each to introduce themselves quickly, and then let them give any initial thoughts about how to determine what terms are important to consumers. And then we'll go ahead and talk a little bit about ensuring copyright-	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	And in a recent paper at The Stanford Law Review, Professors Alan Schwartz and Ian Ayres from Yale Law School did exactly that, also in terms of the in regards to the terms of use of Facebook. So they tried to elicit information regarding the terms to which consumers were most confused about, meaning that they had wrong perceptions about what was in those terms. So, for example, related to Aaron's really interesting paper. So, for example, to what extent do consumers understand what "buy now" means? Maybe more in a sense of a binary choice or other types of terms and then disclose in a bit of a warning box type thing only those terms, up to three or five, to which consumers are not only confused about it but also terms that have less less rights that they understand.

	93		95
1	too optimistic a perception, those are the terms that	1	portrayed as a sale or some sort of implied license, who
2	need to be disclosed.	2	knows what it is that consumers think that they're
3	So there's different types of going about it,	3	getting when they get into one of these agreements, which
4	but in but in terms of implementing things and I'm	4	gets to the third point of just underscoring the
5	happy to elaborate more on this later it has to be	5	importance of actually testing things.
6	done in terms of an experiment or some field studies, as	6	As the last panel got into in some detail and
7	has been done in several areas.	7	as this recurring theme we've gotten to today, it's one
8	MS. ALLEN: Thank you.	8	thing to think about sort of what do we think that this
9	B.J.?	9	term means, what can we extrapolate from our own
10	MR. ARD: So, good afternoon, everyone. I'm	10	experiences versus what is the average consumer actually
11	B.J. Ard, and I'm a Ph.D. candidate at Yale Law School	11	thinking when they interact with one of these retailers,
12	and a resident fellow at the Yale Information Society	12	one of these platforms, download some of these works.
13	Project. And there are three interrelated points that I	13	And if they think they're getting a certain set of
14	want to put out there. And the first is that it's	14	rights, that they're actually not, then that becomes a
15	important to think about the different types of	15	concern.
16	enforcement mechanisms we're dealing with as we look at	16	And as we're trying to devise disclosures that
17	copyright licenses. It may be that sometimes we're	17	inform them of what they are or aren't getting, again,
18	specifying sort of the limits of the license itself so	18	testing needs to be done to understand, okay, so we've
19	that if the user is exceeding those boundaries, they're	19	finally distilled it down to this set of terms, that
20	in the terrain of infringing activity, and we bring to	20	maybe these are the ones that they're overly optimistic
21	bear copyright statutory damages and other remedial	21	about and they didn't, were buried in the boilerplate of
22	mechanisms.	22	the license, but now that we've disclosed them, has that
23	It may be that we're dealing with sort of	23	made a difference, do they actually understand what's
24	standard boilerplate contractual terms, the sorts of	24	changed.
25	things that we see all throughout e-commerce, but that if	25	And this is the sort of thing that if we're
	94		96
1	we're in if we're looking at breach, then we're	1	going to move outside of the sort of formalism of, okay,
2	talking about something like, you know, a breach of	2	it's in this thing that you had to click or you had to
3	contract suit or termination of their services, a	3	scroll through to the actual question of what did people
4	different set of usually lesser remedies than what we'd	4	understand, I think we'll get closer to the actual
5	be looking at in copyright.	5	realities of what's going on in the marketplace and what
6	And then we just have things that are going to	6	consumers understand they're getting.
7	be enforced mechanically by the service. If there's a	7	MR. GOMULKIEWICZ: Yeah, Bob Gomulkiewicz from
8	technological protection measure or a DRM of some sort	8	the University of Washington School of Law, and I really,
9	that doesn't allow for certain sorts of copying or	9	in my scholarship, draw not only on being on academic for
10	sharing, the users may be disappointed once they come to	10	15 years but also before being an academic I was a
11	realize that, but it's a sort of automatic enforcement.	11	practicing lawyer for 15 years. So in my writing, I try
12	What they're losing out on is limited to some degree by	12	to pull together insights from both of those worlds. And
13	what it is that they paid for this good or service. And	13	I've been writing about software licenses, I think for a
14	it's going to become actually rather salient at the time	14	couple of decades now, and probably I'm best known for
15	that this comes up.	15	coining the phrase "the license is the product," which is
16 17	The second point that I want to make is that as	16	what I hear a lot of you saying in this in these
17	we're trying to figure out which terms to disclose, a lot	17	conversations today.
18	hinges on what the baselines of understanding are for the	18	And I'm really pleased to be part of this
19 20	consumers. So we might think, well, okay, to the extent that we're talking about infringing activities, what are	19 20	conversation so that people understand what the product
20 21	the limits of sort of fair use or how many copies I can	20	is that they're getting. So I think this is a timely
21	meles or so forth. Maybe consumers understand the	21	topic and it's one I know that the software industry has

- 22 make or so forth. Maybe consumers understand the
- 23 baselines of copyright law, but we could put an asterisk
- 24 there because oftentimes it seems they don't. 25 But then to the extent that things have been
- industries are wrestling with that now. So I just want to make a few opening

been dealing with for a long time. And it's, I think,

very instructional for me to see that all copyright

22

23

24

	97		9
1	observations about this idea of trying to get information	1	decade, I proposed a EULA that would be performed by
2	to consumers about what the product is, what the license	2	Steve Ballmer. Now, that would get some interest, or a
3	is. And my first plea is actually to lawyers, and that's	3	EULA performed by Bill Gates. Now that would be that
4	not to give up on drafting simpler licenses. I think in	4	would be interesting. But we have we actually have
5	some ways the tone today and the tone I hear among	5	the tools. Businesspeople have the tools to do
6	practitioners and also among academics is that lawyers	6	communication more effectively. They do it all the time.
7	have to draft licenses that are hard to read in law.	7	That's their job. And, so, why are we giving end-user
8	And I don't think that's the case. I think	8	licenses a pass on that? I don't think that we
9	that we actually can draft licenses that are more user-	9	necessarily should.
10	friendly. And one project that I did several years ago	10	Some people have mentioned usability testing.
11	was to take the most venerable open-source license, the	11	That's another thing that's well known in most industries
12	good, new general public license which is a lengthy,	12	as a way to improve readability. And then just the
13	complex, difficult license to read. And I wrote it into	13	second thing I'll say in my before we get to the panel
14	a simple form, a one-page license.	14	discussion, I think the way that you get people who don't
15	So it can be done. We actually as lawyers have	15	read the licenses to understand more about them is you
16	to dedicate ourselves to actually doing it. And I think	16	create a conversation about the licenses to energize
17	as Florencia pointed out in her presentation, if we frame	17	people to talk about the terms. Not all of us read every
18	licenses the right way, then at least some people will	18	single book, but a lot of us read book reviews. We rely
19	read them, and those that choose to read them will get	19	on other commentators to unearth the terms that are
20	more out of it.	20	important.
21	I think the other thing about simple licensing	21	So journalists should be commenting on
22	to point out is actually something that John Bergmayer	22	licensing as much as they're commenting on software.
23	mentioned, is that in some ways we don't take simple	23	Scholars, we're particularly bad at this. Scholars are
24	licenses that seriously. I think Florencia actually	24	always writing about new cases, but why aren't scholars
25	pointed that out in her presentation. People think that	25	writing about critiquing licenses and license approaches?
	98		10

1 if it sounds legalistic then it has more sticking -- or 2 just more gravitas to it. And the other concern is that 3 if you write something that's simple that somehow it 4 won't be enforceable or you'll be held liable if there's 5 a corner case, as John pointed out. 6 So I think we have a ways to go culturally, and 7 maybe courts have a ways to go in actually enforcing 8 simple licensing for those lawyers that actually can do 9 it. Courts should be able to follow up on that and make 10 sure that that approach is actually enforceable. 1 11 And then the second thing I'll say about that 1 12 is it's not just about the lawyers. We need to be 1 13 engaging the businesspeople, if we are serious about 1 14 making licenses more user-friendly. My experience with 1 15 working with businesspeople in the software industry is a 1 16 lot of them do have a passion for presenting terms in a 1 17 simple way. 1 18 And, so, it's not just about the lawyers. In 1 19 fact, it's kind of sad that we're mainly in a group of 1 20 lawyers and lobbyists here. Right, we should be engaging 20 2 21 with businesspeople, and a lot of them have the tools to 22 22 do this well. People in corporate communication, they 23 know how to make things interesting and entertaining. 23 24 24 Let's access those resources. 25 25 When I was at Microsoft, I was there for over a

1	decade, i proposed a LOLA that would be performed by
2	Steve Ballmer. Now, that would get some interest, or a
3	EULA performed by Bill Gates. Now that would be that
4	would be interesting. But we have we actually have
5	the tools. Businesspeople have the tools to do
6	communication more effectively. They do it all the time.
7	That's their job. And, so, why are we giving end-user
8	licenses a pass on that? I don't think that we
9	necessarily should.
10	Some people have mentioned usability testing.
11	That's another thing that's well known in most industries
12	as a way to improve readability. And then just the
13	second thing I'll say in my before we get to the panel
14	discussion, I think the way that you get people who don't
15	read the licenses to understand more about them is you
16	create a conversation about the licenses to energize
17	people to talk about the terms. Not all of us read every
18	single book, but a lot of us read book reviews. We rely
19	on other commentators to unearth the terms that are
20	important.
21	So journalists should be commenting on
22	licensing as much as they're commenting on software.
23	Scholars, we're particularly bad at this. Scholars are
24	always writing about new cases, but why aren't scholars

)	8		

	100
1	Why aren't there nongovernment organizations that are
2	dedicated to really making sure that licenses are
3	friendly and explaining that getting that information out
4	there to consumers so it doesn't just have to be the
5	consumer reading. Other people can make that information
6	available and provide that commentary, and thanks to the
7	internet, that information will be available.
8	MS. ALLEN: Thank you, Bob.
9	And, Brian, if you could introduce yourself and
10	tell us a little bit about your thoughts on how to
11	determine what terms are important to consumers.
12	MR. SCARPELLI: Thank you. Hi, everyone.
13	Great to be here. My name is Brian Scarpelli, and I'm
14	the I'm Senior Policy Counsel at ACT, the App
15	Association. We are a trade association based here in
16	Washington representing about 5,000 small and medium-
17	sized software development companies and app developers.
18	If this were just a week later, I could hold it
19	up, but we have an economic report that we issue every
20	year about the status of the industry, so I thought I'd
21	include a few stats from that report that, you know,
22	basically, you know, we're this is it's going
23	somewhere, but this is an industry, our app industry,
24	that's powering \$143 billion ecosystem that's created
25	over 100,000 jobs over just the last couple of years.

99

	101		103
1	And it's you know, there's that exponential growth	1	practices guide. And, so we try to promote that with our
2	that's creating jobs and good for good for all of us	2	members and continue to work on voluntary approaches such
3	here.	3	as that, but, you know, dialogues such as these I think
4	The licensing regime, the way that licenses are	4	are valuable, and continued study, and partnering on
5	purchased, is a foundation of that growth. And it's	5	education would probably be the path forward that I think
6	something that our members rely upon to grow their	6	we'd recommend.
7	businesses and create more jobs. And, so, I just you	7	Thanks.
8	know, we should I want to make sure we don't get too	8	MS. ALLEN: Thank you, Brian.
9	far ahead of ourselves, and this is similarly themed to	9	Allan?
10	some of the panelists from earlier in the event. We're	10	MR. ADLER: I'm Allan Adler. I'm General
11	looking to ensure that we're really responding to a	11	Counsel and Vice President for Government Relations with
12	demonstrated consumer harm before we take any sort of	12	the Association of American Publishers, which represents
13	government action at all because we don't want to mess up	13	our nation's book publishers. As Susan knows, I'm here
14	this great growth that our industry is experiencing.	14	to take a little bit more of a hard line towards this
15	And as you can tell, I'm not we are not	15	exercise here.
16	convinced that the case has been made for that. We're	16	There were two words I would have expected to
17	not like again, like the panelists earlier mentioned,	17	have heard by now, and I guess since I haven't, I may as
18	we're just not universally, we are not hearing about	18	well say them myself. Caveat emptor, let the buyer
19	massive outrage from consumers and damage being caused	19	beware. That has been a general rule in the marketplace
20	based on misunderstanding of the copyright terms. These	20	for centuries, throughout the history of commerce, that
21	are pretty in our view, you know, I'm not trying to	21	has always bumped up against the question of what is an
22	even be glib but just stating clearly that is	22	appropriate role for government to play in restricting
23	copyrighted, that it is a license and not a purchase,	23	behavior in the marketplace.
24	those sorts of straightforward terms. And I would second	24	We favor competitive marketplaces, and what
25	that the simpler the better is advisable, exist in many	25	we're talking about now, which are conditions in which

102

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1	license in licenses today.
2	And, so, you know, I don't want to I don't
3	want to have us I don't think it's I don't think
4	it's constructive to be in the situation of proving a
5	negative. So what is broken here? And let's define that
6	and have a real problem statement that there's consensus
7	around before undertaking something like a multi-
8	stakeholder approach or some other more serious action
9	from the government.
10	I guess I don't want to be completely negative
11	either, though. I think that there is there is a
12	great amount there's merit to examining these what
13	terms are most effective and ideally that will that
14	will translate into even greater understanding of
15	copyright licenses and terms by consumers, and education
16	is a big component of that. So I would argue that that's
17	that's a that's a pretty critical role, including
18	from the U.S. Government to consumers.
19	Just for our own part, I realize it's targeted
20	at our members, so developers, but not consumers. We've
21	come up with we've tried to play our part in causing -
22	- causing or helping our members put more clear copyright
23	and terms forward and how to and protecting their
24	copyrights, same with trademarks. And so we've developed
25	a guide for our members that is a voluntary best-

products are being offered online, are competitive terms, every bit as much as pricing of the goods themselves is a competitive term. I find it extraordinary that we basically move quickly past the notion that these people who are offering their goods online have spoken to consumers, albeit they've done so in EULAs, they've done so in terms of service, and we've moved past that to essentially excuse people for not bothering to read that and saying it's okay, we need to do something more affirmative for them. And I think that that's a real problem. It bumps up against something that we all know is true with respect to works that are involved with copyright rights. And that is that licensing has always been the means of exercising one's rights of copyright, but there's always been this tension and this unresolved, ultimately for some folks, issue of the extent to which a license agreement for a copyrighted work, for use of a copyrighted work, must strictly reflect consistency with the terms of statutory copyright law. And we know the courts have basically said that freedom to contract generally, as long as contracts are not contracts of adhesion, if they don't shock conscionability, basically you are allowed to vary terms

in contract agreements that underlie your licensing of

03

	105		107
1	your works, so long as the usual elements of contractual	1	conditions, other than pricing, with respect to how those
2	agreement are present, so long as there's mutual assent,	2	books are offered, particularly in digital formats for
3	people understand the terms that are involved. And I'm	3	online downloading or access.
4	afraid that this exercise is one that's going to bump up	4	And we have a more complicated problem, as I
5	against that question because ultimately what's at issue	5	mentioned, because I think the people in Ben's industry,
6	here is not the public's lack of understanding of the	6	although they're in fierce competition with each other,
7	licenses; it's the public's lack of understanding of	7	they tend to be fairly homogenous in the sense they're
8	copyright.	8	producing the same kind of works and they're competing to
9	And there's no surprise about that given the	9	the audience to see which works will be more popular with
10	recent debates about copyright and the different	10	the audience.
11	perspectives that have been taken by various stakeholder	11	I represent publishers who are in a sectoral
12	communities about what certain key aspects and key terms	12	nature all in very distinct businesses. Trade publishing
13	of copyright law mean. I found it rather extraordinary,	13	is as different from educational publishing as
14	though, that, you know, in this willingness to sort of	14	educational publishing is from professional and scholarly
15	let the consumer off the hook, he has an explanation from	15	publishing. And each one of them would have very
16	the vendor about the terms and conditions under which the	16	different concerns about the kind of terms and conditions
17	product is being offered, but it's okay. Too complicated	17	they want to be certain that their customers are aware if
18	to read, so we're not going to focus on that.	18	they're going to be accessing and using those works in
19	I remember working on the statute that was	19	digital format, and especially if they're going to be
20	enacted by Congress to enhance the authority of the	20	accessing them and downloading them from online.
21	Consumer Product Safety Commission with respect to safety	21	These problems also reflect the fact that what
22	notices required for children's products. And one	22	we're talking about here are competitive market terms.
23	interesting part of the proposed regulation would have	23	This is exactly the area in which, as some of you may
24	had to have had a notice requirement placed on each and	24	know, some major publishers got into trouble with the
25	every children's product. And people began to wonder, as	25	U.S. Justice Department's Antitrust Division several

105

1 a practical matter, how do you do that? How would you 2 fit that on there in a way that would be practical, that 3 would be readable, that would be comprehensible and still 4 comply with the law? 5 And, ultimately, ironically, in this context, 6 the response from the Consumer Product Safety Commission 7 was to agree to a proposal from most of the affected 8 stakeholders that said, well, what if we just put the 9 notices on the vendor's website, isn't that giving 10 sufficient notice to consumers? Isn't that better than 11 trying to actually place the notice on each and every 12 product that falls into the consumer's hands? And it 13 seemed to be a reasonable way of working at that issue. 14 For the industry that I represent, we have some 15 of the same issues that Ben Sheffner told you about, the 16 motion picture industry, only we have them in a little 17 bit more complicated version. Publishers of trade books, 18 works of best-selling fiction and nonfiction, do not sell 19 generally directly to the public. And, therefore, they 20 don't have a transactional relationship with the public. 21 They are wholesalers who typically have their 22 books marketed to the public through a series of 23 distributors. And there are various questions as to the 24 relationships that different publishers have with their 25 distributors regarding who actually sets terms and

1 years ago because they were working with distributors, 2 essentially taking the same approach to the way in which 3 distributors would work with them in pricing the goods 4 and services for the marketplace. And the government 5 found that approach to violate antitrust restrictions, 6 basically because they ended up having the same kinds of 7 policies, despite the fact that they didn't actually 8 negotiate them together. 9 This is an issue that I think points out the 10 fact that there are other areas of law here that raise

11 great complexity for this, much more complex than we've 12 heard people sort of acknowledge so far. 13 The other aspect of these type of notices is 14 that they constitute commercial speech, which is 15 protected by the First Amendment. And vendors in the 16 marketplace typically get to be able to decide on what 17 kind of commercial speech they want to offer in 18 connection with the goods and services they offer to 19 convince consumers to become customers. 20

Now, of course, that doesn't mean they could 21 lie about their products. It doesn't mean that they 22 could engage in deceptive practices when they market 23 their goods, but it does mean that the issue can be very 24 much more complicated than people think it is. 25

I just want to mention this quickly. There was

107

108

	109		111
1	a Supreme Court decision last month some of you may have	1	MS. ALLEN: Thank you, Allan. We appreciate
2	been familiar with. It's called Expressions Hair Design	2	your statements. I think our question now, we can turn
3	vs. Schneider. And what the case was about was a statute	3	to the panel. In the interest of time to just see if
4	enacted in New York that basically distinguished what was	4	anyone anecdotally, by way of observation, has any
5	called differential pricing practices in the sense of	5	thoughts about how to determine what terms might matter
6	merchants who preferred that their customers purchase	6	to consumers. And then we'll go again to the discussion
7	their goods with cash rather than with credit cards,	7	on how to ensure that such terms are clearly
8	because then the merchant would have to provide fees to	8	communicated.
9	the credit card service provider. And, so, in doing	9	PROF. MAROTTA-WURGLER: I will say something
10	that, typically what merchants would do is offer a	10	briefly because unfortunately I have to leave at 4:00.
11	discount to the customer if they pay in cash rather than	11	So in terms of what observationally I think might matter
12	purchasing with a credit card.	12	to consumers, I'd like to resist a temptation because my
13	Well, unfortunately, this New York statute	13	message, I think, I think has been several times, which
14	prohibited the language that a merchant could use if they	14	is we don't really know yet. We need to ascertain that.
15	said we want to reimpose a surcharge for credit card	15	And that would address both Brian's and Allan's issues.
16	purchases that is not imposed for cash purchases. The	16	So Brian rightfully said, well, what's broken,
17	New York statute was construed by the Second Circuit	17	right? Before we decide to regulate something the
18	Court of Appeals as basically outlawing one version of	18	same question is, well, disclosure has been designed to
19	describing a particular practice that could be allowed	19	solve all sorts of information asymmetries, and the goal
20	under another description of that practice, but the	20	is I guess the purpose is to correct through
21	practice itself was exactly the same. The difference	21	information some type of misperception, and the harm is
22	between whether or not you offered a discount for cash	22	that that misperception might be leading consumers to
23	purchases and you charge more to the customer for the	23	overconsume something. So we need to in trying to
24	credit card purchase.	24	ascertain whether there's a harm, we in trying to
25	Here's what Chief Justice Roberts said about	25	ascertain what must be disclosed, if anything, we will
	110		112
1	that. "The Court of Appeals concluded that Section 518	1	address the question of whether there is a harm at all.

that. "The Court of Appeals concluded that Section 518
posed no First Amendment problem because the law
regulated conduct, not speech. In reaching this
conclusion, the Court of Appeals began with the premise
that price controls regulate conduct alone. And,
therefore, a law regulating the relationship between two

7 prices regulates speech no more than a law regulating a 8 single price. And, therefore, that particular statute

2

3

4

5

6

9 was simply a conduct regulation rather than a speech

10 regulation." 11 Well, a unanimous Supreme Court, with the 12 opinion written by the Chief Justice, said, "But Section 13 518 is not a typical price regulation. Such a regulation 14 would simply regulate the amount that a store could 15 collect. This law tells merchants nothing about the 16 amount they are allowed to collect from a cash or credit 17 card. What the law does is regulate how sellers may 18 communicate their prices. Accordingly, we cannot accept 19 the conclusion that this statute is nothing more than a 20 mine-run price regulation. In regulating the 21 communication of prices rather than the prices 22 themselves, this law regulates speech." 23 And that's the same proposition, I would

- 24 propose to you, about the kinds of things we're
- 25 discussing today.

2 So if there is a misperception about a term 3 that would cause consumers to overestimate the utility of 4 a product, maybe because they wish they could put it in 5 their will and now they can, and that means a lot to 6 them, but this is something that we can ascertain through 7 research. There's -- this has been done in other 8 contexts, and there's roadmaps. A disclosure regulation 9 has been studied -- has been going on since the '70s but 10 has been studied empirically for a while now, so we know 11 something about that. 12 So I would urge instead of us trying to 13 brainstorm about whether -- what should be disclosed, we 14

need to test the particular related set of terms that 15 might -- that might be candidates for disclosure. And 16 that will lead us to understand what is broken. 17

And, second, related to Allan's point, it might lead us also to understand the extent to which that particular term is competitive or not. So a term is competitive -- subject to competition if it affects -- if consumers are acting on it. So price tends to be salient in the sense that consumers usually understand price and they will shop based on price.

There's some -- there are some terms in fine print that are salient, and there are some terms that are

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

114

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

4/18/2017

1	nonsalient, either because they're not read or sometimes	1
2	they're not understood. Consumers tend to be over-	2
3	optimistic about particular sets of terms. Nonsalient	3
4	terms are not subject to market competition. If they're	4
5	not subject to market competition, they're not going to	5
6	reflect this ideal bargain between what sellers want to	6
7	offer and consumers want to receive, or they might not	7
8	even reflect a willingness to pay.	8
9	Again, we need to understand whether a	9
10	particular product is or term is salient or not. And,	10
11	again, we can we can test and measure the extent to	11
12	which a term is subject to market competition or not by	12
13	measuring the extent to which consumers understand that.	13
14	So, three things can be answered by doing more	14
15	work in this area if we want a roadmap about what to	15
16	disclose. One is to understand what it is to be what	16
17	we need to disclose, we need to understand those terms	17
18	that are subject to lead to consumer overconsumption.	18
19	This defines the harm, and it also tends to reveal that	19
20	that term is not subject to market competition. So	20
21	that's basically and the answer is just because it's	21
22	in a contract doesn't mean that it causes harm or that	22
23	it's subject to competition. We need to find that out.	23
24	Thanks.	24
25	MS. ALLEN: Does anyone else have anything to	25

1 say briefly? 2 MR. ARD: So one thing that I appreciate about 3 Allan's comments bringing out is this tension between the 4 confusion over what's in the contract or is the confusion 5 over copyright law, haven't we disposed of these things 6 by licenses for the past hundred years or more? 7 And part of the reason that this has become 8 more complicated and perhaps confusing is that when the 9 Copyright Act of '76 was laid out, when we did most 10 copyright-related or IP-related deals early in the 10 11 11 history of intellectual property, we were talking about 12 12 deals between relatively sophisticated parties, between 13 13 publishers and retailers and so forth. 14 By the time something was in the theater or hit 14 15 the shelves, consumers were buying the ticket or buying 15 16 16 their personal copy. Once we hit digital copies, things 17 17 changed because now consumers were creating copies, have 18 the ability, even in the process of using the work 18 19 oftentimes, and had the capability to create copies 19 20 intentionally or not. And it fell onto them to 20 21 21 understand, okay, what are my rights and 22 responsibilities, some of which may be laid out in the 22 23 statute, which is not necessarily user-friendly, some of 23 24 24 which may be laid out in these licenses. 25 25 And while it's tempting sometimes to say the

	-
1	user should simply read the license and it's on them to
2	understand it, it's not clear that users would
3	necessarily understand the nuances of what's conveyed in
4	there, and it's not clear that that's always going to be
5	a great use of time. One thing that I wish Lorrie Cranor
6	were here to discuss is some research she had done on
7	privacy policies at one point.
8	And this was some years ago, where she added up
9	the amount of time it would take for people using
10	reasonable estimates to read all of the privacy policies
11	they encountered in a year. And when she converted that
12	into a measure of labor hours, her estimate in that paper
13	was that it would be something approaching the gross
14	product of Florida's economy for a year, the number of
15	labor hours involved in reading this.
16	And, so, we get to this question of, okay, in
17	lieu given the lack of technical or legal
18	understanding that consumers have and given the sheer
19	mass of words that they have to confront if we expected
20	them to read this, how are we to convey the relevant and
21	salient information without forcing people to engage in
22	wasteful or potentially fruitless sorts of exercises.
23	MR. GOMULKIEWICZ: Yeah, so, just a couple
24	comments. One, that's why I am relentless in saying that

nents. One, that's why I am relentless in saying that let's not just accept the fact that these licenses have

110	5
to be so long so that you have to spend your entire life	
reading them. But, secondly, I think more important is	
to energize people to shine lights on those terms	
journalists, scholars, NGOs because you're right,	
people really it's unrealistic to expect people to	
read all the terms.	
So we need people to shine the spotlight on the	
terms so that, yes, then let the market decide. We don't	
have to sit in this room and decide what consumers want.	
Let's see what first, the consumers have to know about	
it. I agree with Florencia, but then we'll see, what do	
people in the market care about.	
But the second thing, I want to link this to	
comments that several people have made about endorsement.	
So I do think that consumers care about what the license	
says, but they also care about whether they're going to	
be sued if they breach those terms. That they care a lot	
about.	
And, so, I think there it's interesting to look	
at some work that Mark Lemley did a few years ago. He	
wrote an article in the Minnesota Law Review called	

"Terms of Use." And one of Mark's insights was that when people were wringing their hands about software end-user licenses, people thought that the big source of litigation was going to be business-to-consumer

120

.

		1
1	litigation, and that didn't turn out to be the case.	1
2	Most end-user license cases are B2B, or business-to-	2
3	business, cases.	3
4	And the reason for that is has already been	4
5	pointed out here, is that if some if a business makes	5
6	a decision to sue a consumer, especially in this age of	6
7	internet shaming, then that's you have to make a big,	7
8	tough decision about whether it's worth the PR risk to	8
9	sue a consumer over a term.	9
10	And, of course, consumers know this. So that's	10
11	not that's not to say that we shouldn't push for terms	11
12	to be easier to read and fair, but on the other hand,	12
13	there aren't there aren't a lot of cases because	13
14	businesses do have to think long and hard about whether	14
15	they're going to pick on a consumer or lending a copy or	15
16	giving away a copy in a will. Is somebody really going	16
17	to sue if somebody lends or gives something away in a	17
18	will.	18
19	And then the final thing I want to say is that	19
20	I think one important thing I learned from Aaron's work	20
21	is that consumers can start to learn about the way things	21
22	work in the real world. If you would have asked	22
23	consumers two decades ago, when I started writing about	23
24	end-user licenses, about whether you can copy, they would	24
25	have all said, yes, you can copy. And now I think	25

118

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

117

1	Aaron's work shows that people now understand that just
2	because you have something in electronic form doesn't
3	mean that you can copy it. So that's been two decades'
4	worth of work of trying to educate people on the way this
5	works. So I do have some confidence that consumers can
6	learn.
7	MS. ALLEN: So I'm mindful of the time, and I
8	want to give time for everyone in the audience to ask
9	questions or have a discussion as well. Florencia, I
10	know you have to go. Does anyone specifically have any
11	questions for Florencia quickly?
12	(No response.)
13	MS. ALLEN: Okay. Thank you so much for your
14	participation.
15	MS. MAROTTA-WURGLER: Thank you.
16	MS. ALLEN: We greatly appreciate it.
17	Does anyone in the audience have questions?
18	Jonathan?
19	MR. BAND: So it seems to me that context makes
20	a big difference, and thinking back to Ben's comments
21	earlier when he talked about how, you know, buying is a
22	metaphor
23	MS. ALLEN: And could you introduce yourself,
24	too, as well?
25	MR. BAND: Okay. So I'm Jonathan Band, and I

1	was saying that context makes a big difference, and when
2	Ben before was talking about how the word "buy" is a
3	metaphor, I think it to some extent depends on the
4	context in which the word "buy" uses. So you can imagine
5	at least two different situations. Sometimes you have
6	you have a product advertised, let's say, an e-book on
7	Amazon, for example, and then the only choice is buy,
8	right? It's buy or not buy. And, so, conceivably, "buy"
9	in that context means one thing.
10	But if you go to iTunes and you are looking at
11	movies, you usually have the option of buying or renting.
12	And then what's interesting there is that you scroll
13	down, they explain very clearly exactly what renting
14	means, right? I mean, they say renting means, you know,
15	you have to, you know, access it within 30 days, and once
16	you access it, you have to finish watching it in 24
17	hours. Very clear exactly what renting means.
18	But they don't tell you anywhere what buying
19	means. And, you know, so I think in terms of how we look
20	at this, it is kind of interesting that they thought that
21	there was a need to clarify what rent means but not what
22	buy means. And especially one could certainly imagine,
23	you know, when you're you have a one option is
24	renting, and the other option is buying. Renting, I
25	think everyone sort of understands everyone

understands means short-term. Buying you assume is pe

Buying you assume is permanent, right? That's the -- isn't that right, that's the difference between buying a car and renting a car, right? When you rent the car, you obviously have to return it or, you know, you're going to be paying more every day, whereas if you're buying the car, you pay for it and, you know, you get to drive it until, you know, it stops driving and you can sell it.

So the point is that of these -- the context makes a huge difference in terms of these -- how we understand these terms, and it could be that, you know, that's an added layer of complexity that we need to be aware of.

MS. ALLEN: Thank you very much. Does anyone else either, in the audience or online as well, if you want to chat in a question. MR. FISHER: Could I just react to that, to

that comment? And some of -- some of the response to that -- some of the reason for that may go to who sets the rules in that situation, whether those rules are set by the -- by the content provider or set by the retailer. If rules are set by the retailer, it's much easier for them to enumerate those rules on their site, and they're more consistent.

4/18/2017 . . .

121		123
MR. MITCHELL: That provides a nice Mark's	1	MR. SHEFFNER: Ben Sheffner with the Motion
comment provides a nice segue to, I guess, my comment.	2	Picture Association. And something Jonathan Band just
MS. ALLEN: John, could I interrupt you? I'm	3	said actually reminded me of a point that I didn't have
sorry.	4	time to make when I was on the panel a little while ago.
MR. MITCHELL: Oh, I'm John Mitchell. And I	5	It's true, as Jonathan said, that I said, and I believe
was reminded of some of the more prominent disclosures	6	this, that "buy" is in some sense a metaphor that use to
that were very clear, very conspicuous, impossible to	7	describe these transactions that we're used to describing
escape, and were simply wrong, which I think provides	8	from the real world. But it's also true I want to
perhaps more harm to the consumer than not saying	9	sort of try to disabuse everybody of the notion that
anything about it at all. The very first EULA to reach	10	"buy" necessarily means the obtaining of a physical
the Supreme Court was, of course, in the Bobbs-Merrill	11	object.
case that said you may not sell this book for less than a	12	Even in the old-fashioned world, we still use
dollar, and if you do, it's infringement. And the	13	"buy" all the time to refer to something that to sort
Supreme Court said to hell with that.	14	of obtaining a service or obtaining access to something.
And yet people probably, you know, would have	15	I you know, I hit the "buy" button on an airline's
been reluctant to do that, and somebody with Mazey's	16	website all the time. Obviously, I'm not obtaining an
power there bucked that system. Foreign-made copies of	17	actual physical seat; I'm essentially buying a license
textbooks that had stamped on there "not for sale in the	18	that entitled that entitles me to sit on the airplane
United States." You couldn't escape it. And the Supreme	19	from point A to point B.
Court, a couple of years back, said, hey, of course you	20	And lest you think that this is simply a point
can; the Copyright Act says you can.	21	that, you know, big copyright owners are making, I want
Forget the EULA; Copyright Act trumps the EULA.	22	to quote from something that I read last night while I
Not for rental on DVDs. I didn't see many of them, but I	23	was preparing for this event. This is from the Internet
did get samples of retailers saying I I'm a rental	24	Policy Task Force white paper, where they're actually
store, and this DVD says not for rental. You can ignore	25	quoting a submission by the Center for Democracy
122		124
that. It's it purports to be a licensing term. Some	1	Center for Democracy and Technology, which is often at
most of my litigation right now involves B2B	2	odds with copyright owners like those that we represent.
relationship where the copyright owner is trying to	3	And here's what they say in quote: "Consumers
impose, as a matter of right under copyright, something	4	often buy access to large libraries of content via
that the Copyright Act actually denies them.	5	subscriptions or buy cloud-based services in which they
But coming to Mark's point Mark Fisher	6	have an ongoing relationship with the provider, rather
the I think the real key is whether that language is	7	than conducting a one-time transaction that feels like a
coming from the copyright owner or from someone other	8	'single' purchase." And I completely agree with that. I
than the copyright owner. So a video store could tell	9	mean, again, people in common parlance use the term "buy"
their customer, no, not for rental, or, yes, as long as	10	not just to obtaining a physical object but to buying a
you get it back to me in seven days, you can rent it.	11	license or buying the right to do certain things.
They have that power if they're the owner of the DVD to	12	MS. ALLEN: Thank you very much. We appreciate
authorize their renters to sub-rent or not.		
The convright owner has no such nower if	13	all of your comments. Do we have anyone on the internet?
The copyright owner has no such power if	13 14	all of your comments. Do we have anyone on the internet? No.
they're not the owners of that copy. So from a consumer		No. Okay, I'll give the panelists one last
they're not the owners of that copy. So from a consumer perspective, the prohibition or the license may look the	14	No. Okay, I'll give the panelists one last opportunity for a quick last thought before we turn it
they're not the owners of that copy. So from a consumer perspective, the prohibition or the license may look the same, but coming back to I think Bob made the point	14 15 16 17	No. Okay, I'll give the panelists one last
they're not the owners of that copy. So from a consumer perspective, the prohibition or the license may look the same, but coming back to I think Bob made the point of, you know, who is going to sue me. It may make a	14 15 16 17 18	No. Okay, I'll give the panelists one last opportunity for a quick last thought before we turn it over to our next presentation. Do you have any final thoughts?
they're not the owners of that copy. So from a consumer perspective, the prohibition or the license may look the same, but coming back to I think Bob made the point of, you know, who is going to sue me. It may make a really big difference if I as a consumer breach a term	14 15 16 17 18 19	No. Okay, I'll give the panelists one last opportunity for a quick last thought before we turn it over to our next presentation. Do you have any final thoughts? MR. ADLER: Yeah. Just to give you an example
they're not the owners of that copy. So from a consumer perspective, the prohibition or the license may look the same, but coming back to I think Bob made the point of, you know, who is going to sue me. It may make a really big difference if I as a consumer breach a term that says I cannot rent it and the damages are going to	14 15 16 17 18 19 20	No. Okay, I'll give the panelists one last opportunity for a quick last thought before we turn it over to our next presentation. Do you have any final thoughts? MR. ADLER: Yeah. Just to give you an example of the complexity of this, a lot of what we heard from
they're not the owners of that copy. So from a consumer perspective, the prohibition or the license may look the same, but coming back to I think Bob made the point of, you know, who is going to sue me. It may make a really big difference if I as a consumer breach a term that says I cannot rent it and the damages are going to be the cost of a rental versus statutory damages under	14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	No. Okay, I'll give the panelists one last opportunity for a quick last thought before we turn it over to our next presentation. Do you have any final thoughts? MR. ADLER: Yeah. Just to give you an example of the complexity of this, a lot of what we heard from some of the previous panelists was connected to consumer
they're not the owners of that copy. So from a consumer perspective, the prohibition or the license may look the same, but coming back to I think Bob made the point of, you know, who is going to sue me. It may make a really big difference if I as a consumer breach a term that says I cannot rent it and the damages are going to be the cost of a rental versus statutory damages under the Copyright Act, which will bankrupt me.	14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	No. Okay, I'll give the panelists one last opportunity for a quick last thought before we turn it over to our next presentation. Do you have any final thoughts? MR. ADLER: Yeah. Just to give you an example of the complexity of this, a lot of what we heard from some of the previous panelists was connected to consumer expectations in the marketplace. And I think that
they're not the owners of that copy. So from a consumer perspective, the prohibition or the license may look the same, but coming back to I think Bob made the point of, you know, who is going to sue me. It may make a really big difference if I as a consumer breach a term that says I cannot rent it and the damages are going to be the cost of a rental versus statutory damages under the Copyright Act, which will bankrupt me. So just making that little	14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	No. Okay, I'll give the panelists one last opportunity for a quick last thought before we turn it over to our next presentation. Do you have any final thoughts? MR. ADLER: Yeah. Just to give you an example of the complexity of this, a lot of what we heard from some of the previous panelists was connected to consumer expectations in the marketplace. And I think that particularly in the case of the Federal Trade Commission,
they're not the owners of that copy. So from a consumer perspective, the prohibition or the license may look the same, but coming back to I think Bob made the point of, you know, who is going to sue me. It may make a really big difference if I as a consumer breach a term that says I cannot rent it and the damages are going to be the cost of a rental versus statutory damages under the Copyright Act, which will bankrupt me. So just making that little MS. ALLEN: Thank you.	14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	No. Okay, I'll give the panelists one last opportunity for a quick last thought before we turn it over to our next presentation. Do you have any final thoughts? MR. ADLER: Yeah. Just to give you an example of the complexity of this, a lot of what we heard from some of the previous panelists was connected to consumer expectations in the marketplace. And I think that particularly in the case of the Federal Trade Commission, one of the abiding concerns is an understanding of what
they're not the owners of that copy. So from a consumer perspective, the prohibition or the license may look the same, but coming back to I think Bob made the point of, you know, who is going to sue me. It may make a really big difference if I as a consumer breach a term that says I cannot rent it and the damages are going to be the cost of a rental versus statutory damages under the Copyright Act, which will bankrupt me. So just making that little	14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	No. Okay, I'll give the panelists one last opportunity for a quick last thought before we turn it over to our next presentation. Do you have any final thoughts? MR. ADLER: Yeah. Just to give you an example of the complexity of this, a lot of what we heard from some of the previous panelists was connected to consumer expectations in the marketplace. And I think that particularly in the case of the Federal Trade Commission,

20

21

22

23

24

25

exact work.

So all of these things go into shaping consumer

expectations, and I'm not sure that it's very easy to

come up with any kind of consensus mapping in any

particular context, let alone across different types of

copyrighted works, different industries, different

sectors within industries about what consumer

4/18/2017

	125		127
1	actually exists expects in a particular marketplace	1	expectations are with respect to what they actually get
2	transaction.	2	when they engage in an online transaction that is
3	The case of books is particularly interesting	3	designed to give them access and use of a particular
4	with respect to that. The term "book," by the way, does	4	copyrighted work.
5	not appear in the Copyright Act to describe a	5	MS. ALLEN: Thank you, Allan. I'm afraid we
6	copyrightable work because a book is simply the vessel,	6	really do have to go, but thank you all for your
7	the container, the format. It is the embodied literary	7	participation today.
8	work that is, in fact, protected by copyright law and	8	And next up is Catie Rowland from the U.S.
9	generates the rights.	9	Copyright Office with a presentation on the recent
10	So when e-books came along, we found ourselves	10	report.
11	with a different kind of vessel or format or container	11	1
12	for that embodied literary work. And we also discovered	12	
13	that e-books would give the reader capacities with	13	
14	respect to the use of that literary work that didn't	14	
15	exist when that literary work the exact same literary	15	
16	work was embodied in a hard copy print book. And	16	
17	that's what these discussions really are all about.	17	
18	The curious thing, however, is is that there's	18	
19	two different flows of ideas with respect to how these	19	
20	types of disclosures would work. There are some people	20	
21	who are very determined to see that e-books should give	21	
22	them exactly the same abilities that they have with	22	
23	respect to that embodied literary work as the hard copy	23	
24	print does, right? They want to be able to alienate the	24	
25	particular copy of the work. They want to be able to own	25	
	126		128
1	it, and owning it means they have complete dispositional	1	PRESENTATION: SOFTWARE ENABLED CONSUMER PRODUCTS STUDY
2	authority over subsequent treatment of that particular	2	MS. ROWLAND: Hello. I'd like to thank the
3	book.	3	Internet Policy Task Force for inviting us here to talk
4	But at the same time, we're also hearing from	4	about our software enabled consumer product study that
5	people that they want acknowledgment of the additional	5	the Copyright Office conducted over the past year and a
6	capacities that an e-book has beyond those of a print	6	half or two years, about. It's a little bit different
7	book, that it can be moved from one platform to another,	7	than what we've been talking about thus far in this
8	that it can be used remotely and even simultaneously by	8	conference. So, thus far, we've been talking about all
9	multiple readers. These are all very interesting facts	9	sorts of software and access to copyrightable works.
10	that create different kinds of consumer expectations.	10	Software-enabled consumer products are a whole different
11	The library community, in some respects, would like to	11	ball game, where perhaps unlike what was discussed
12	see e-books treated like print books in terms of the way	12	before, the license might not be the product, but the
13	they can lend those books to library constituents.	13	product might be the product with a license.
14	We understand that and we think it makes sense,	14	So the background of this is all about the
15	but from the publisher's perspective, e-books are a very	15	Copyright Act, and this is my representation of kind of
16	different kind of creature when you're talking about		the movement of the Copyright Act throughout the years.
17	lending it to individuals as compared to the situation		At first, it was just maps, charts, and books; went to
18	you'd have when you're lending a hard copy of the same	18	photographs, sound recordings, and audiovisual works; and
10	avact work	10	as tashing logy shanged so did the protection for

- 19 as technology changed, so did the protection for 20 copyrighted works.
- 21 And for software, it's been protected since the
- 22 '60s or so, originally as books. And in kind of a
- 23 strange way to fit it in is under the rule of doubt, back
- 24 in the '60s. And originally it was reviewed as the
- 25 standalone application, so things like Microsoft Word or

32 (Pages 125 to 128)

131

1	something like that or an operating system something	1
2	that's pretty easy for everyone to understand what	2
3	software is being used for.	3
4	Then as the years passed, we've gone to a whole	4
5	different range of software uses, where now it's nearly	5
6	ubiquitous. So, now, you find it in your smartphone and	6
7	your appliances and your medical devices, and this has	7
8	caused a lot of discussion in the copyright arena.	8
9	This actually has been the subject of the	9
10	Copyright Office's review for many years now. As an	10
11	aside, the Copyright Office does something called the	11
12	triennial 1201 rulemaking process, which is not the	12
13	subject of this study, but this is where a lot of our	13
14	issues popped up. So this is something that you're all,	14
15	I'm sure, fully familiar with where you have TPMs that	15
16	protect certain copyrighted content.	16
17	In the past, we have noticed at the Copyright	17
18	Office that these TPMs are going far beyond what was	18
19	originally contemplated. So originally when we had the	19
20	DMCA 1201 process, it was much more limited. And in	20
21	recent years, it's gone all the way to tractors, which	21
22	everyone's probably heard about, to smartphones and	22
23	jailbreaking, and to things like pacemakers and your car.	23
24	And, so, in light of this, the Senate took	24
25	note, and they asked us at the Copyright Office to do a	25

130

1 1 study. And in October of 2015, we got a letter from you really paying for. 2 2 Senators Grassley and Leahy, asking us to look into this So we had a bunch of different kind of 3 3 kind of amorphous category of everyday products. And 4 4 they noticed that there -- that copyright has impacted so 5 5 many things that perhaps the everyday consumer does not 6 6 realize. 7 7 So your tractor, your smartphone, your 8 refrigerator, you might not know that there's copyrighted 8 9 9 software in there doing things that perhaps before might 10 have been purely mechanical. And these are things that 10 11 11 can be protected by a copyright's exclusive rights and 12 limitations and exceptions, and it's a whole different 12 everyday products. 13 13 world of the law that a lot of people who are dealing 14 with the stuff are probably not familiar with. 14 15 I think as Allan was mentioning earlier, there 15 16 16 are -- there's a lot of copyright stuff that would be 17 17 good for the consumers to understand so that they know 18 what is going on with what -- the products they're using, 18 19 as well as just things like books and motion pictures, 19 products. 20 20 which everyone has traditionally understood come along 21 21 with copyright issues. 22 So the Senate asked us to study this in an 22 23 effort to better understand and evaluate how our 23 24 24 copyright laws enable creative expression, foster 25 25 innovative business models, and allow legitimate uses in

129

L	the software enabled environment. They asked us to give
2	recommendations to see if possibly there should be
3	legislative efforts and to see if copyright should be
1	treated different or copyright should treat software
5	enabled products differently than it should be treated
5	with generally software.
7	Now, here's a caveat. We did not study
3	software generally. That was not our mandate. We did
)	not try to figure out kind of broad software copyright
)	issues. We were limited very specifically to this
l	category of everyday products, which if you were involved
2	in our study, you realize is a little bit difficult to
3	define. It's hard to figure out what is an everyday
1	product. And our study actually determined that there
5	was no specific definition that we could use for this
5	group of software, that there is no legislative
7	definition that we could recommend.
3	Instead, we looked at kind of the commonalities
Ð	of things that people looked at when they thought of
)	something as an everyday product. So we looked at things
l	like is the software something that comes with the
2	product; are you buying the product really for the
3	software, or is it really more of a mechanical thing that
1	might have been used before that is now kind of
5	integrated with software; and the price point, what are

132

guideposts to look at. And we did that because not only did the Senate ask us to do it but also because we -once we did the study, we realized that copyright law is actually uniquely situated to help protect both the owners and the consumers in the genre of everyday products because you have all sorts of exceptions and limitations as well, like mergers, scenes a faire, the idea/expression dichotomy, and those are all things that are actually pretty uniquely pretty well used with As a side note, and which is probably of interest to you with the licensing issues, is that licensing really kind of almost took over our study, even though we were not trying to go over software generally or licensing generally, we did realize that licensing was a very, very important part of the software enabled

So we heard all about how it's a common practice for price differentiation and management and flexible distribution methods, so it was very important for the copyright owners. But then we heard like you all were hearing about the consumer concerns, about the confusion. They didn't know what they were buying, they

	133		135
1	didn't know if they were licensing it, what their	1	And what we saw in the study is that there was
2	restrictions were, so there was that concern as well.	2	concern about the reselling, but we actually didn't see a
3	And then we got into a whole other can of worms	3	whole lot of examples of licenses for the software that
4	about state contract law because while copyright law is	4	was embedded in everyday products. There was some with
5	very important, there's state contract law, which is kind	5	B2B and a kind of institutional/industrial licenses, but
6	of layered over it. And we had a lot of discussion about	6	not really a whole lot there for the consumer products,
7	preemption, which we heard a little bit about today;	7	which was what we were focused on.
8	breach of contract, conditions versus covenants, consent	8	And from what we saw, and we kind of looked at
9	on clickwrap and shrinkwrap and fair use.	9	Vernor and we kind of looked at Krause, which were those
10	And the state contract law issues were very,	10	two kind of different ways to look at licensing, and we
11	very interesting and, for better or worse, also entwined	11	tried to see how it could apply to this resale of your
12	with software generally. So it was very difficult for us	12	everyday product. And looking at our guideposts, which I
13	to separate, you know, state contract should apply just	13	mentioned earlier, you know, why are you buying this
14	to everyday products or should only apply for software	14	product? Is it for the software? Is it that kind of
15	generally or how that worked. So that was actually quite	15	incidental? Does the software come at the same time
16	difficult for us, so we were unable to really kind of	16	you're buying the product? What kind of control do you
17	parse that issue, although we were able to kind of look	17	have over the product? Does the you know, in the
18	at it with the copyright context.	18	Krause case, they talked about did the owner of the
19	Just to give you a little bit of a flavor of	19	copyright maintain control of that software and did they
20	some of the things we talked about, which I think some of	20	really were they able to kind of come and get it
20	the people in the room are familiar with, we had a pretty	20	whenever.
22	spirited debate about if you had a contract term that	22	So based on that, we looked at the first sale
23	limited debute about if you had a contract term that limited fair use, so you buy or you license a product and	23	doctrine and determined that we think that it should
23	it has you cannot make something that would otherwise	24	protect consumers in many cases with this embedded
25	be considered a fair use, would that run afoul of the	25	software. So that was one thing that we felt like the
25	be considered a fair use, would that full about of the	25	software. So that was one time that we felt like the
	134		136
1	Copyright Act, or would it be just a breach of contract.	1	law did not need to be changed if you looked at the law
2	We did not actually come to resolution of that in our	2	in the way we looked at the law, and the first sale,
3	study because it goes beyond the scope of everyday	3	Section 109 in the Copyright Act should be okay.
4	products, but it is a very interesting area and was	4	The next issue was about repair, security,
5	something that the Copyright Office had not really spent	5	research, and interoperability. So, again, you have all
6	a whole lot of time thinking about before it coming up.	6	these issues that are kind of some of them are the
7	So it's actually a fascinating, interesting part of the	7	ownership issue, so like Section 117 has some ownership
8	copyright law, if you're interested in that.	8	issues and only applies to owners in certain cases. And
9	So we had a report. It came out last December.	9	then you have more broad limitation and exceptions
10	And although we didn't hear a lot about the concern about	10	issues. So for the idea expression of dichotomy, fair
11	recelling and disposition so I should we say we kind of	11	use mergers scenes a faire those to us really seemed

- 11 reselling and disposition, so I should we say we kind of 11 12 lumped all of our findings into certain categories, so we 12
 - 13 heard about reselling, repair, tinkering, security, 14 research, interoperability. So those were kind of the 15 main categories that we heard about of concern. 16 So the first one we heard about was from
 - 17 resell, and can you -- if you have your car and it has 18 some sort of software embedded in it, can you resell your 19 car, does it come with the software, how does that work. 20 And there are two kind of lines of cases that are of 21 interest here. There's one called Vernor and one Krause,
 - 22 and they all deal with whether or not you license -- a
 - 23 license is going to work or not, if a license is a
 - 24 license or if a license is kind of an ownership
 - 25 situation.

ıd use, mergers, scenes a faire, those to us really seemed very well situated to handle a lot of these issues. 13

So, for example, if you have interoperability, so you're trying to create something that works, you know, with another product, there is case law that says that reverse engineering can be a fair use. And in that case, we felt like the law was pretty well aligned and would be well aligned with having the interoperability issues with these kind of products.

20 Same with repair and security research, although security research is not that -- there's not a 22 whole lot of law on it. We really do believe that that is something that would fall within the purview of these existing exemptions and limitations, and we didn't really 25 feel there was a need to have any legislative

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

23

24

1	recommendations. Also, the problem being is how you	
2	define "everyday products." So happily for us we were	
3	able to find a solution to that.	
4	And then again the licensing was implicated	
5	throughout everything, and we realized how important the	
6	licensing paradigm is to the content owners and how they	
7	distribute all of their works. And it was an interesting	
8	study because unlike having your normal Copyright Office	
9	stakeholders come in, we had kind of a different cast of	
10	characters.	
11	We had some people who we see a lot, but we	
12	also saw a lot of kind of repair people, people who may	
13	be more in our 1201 context versus more of our other kind	
14	of study. So it was something in which a lot of the	
15	discussion was based on what can you do with something	
16	you think you own. So it does tie back to a lot of	
17	issues that were discussed in kind of the "buy now"	
18	issues where what do you own? You think you buy the car,	
19	but do you really buy do you own the car, do you own	
20	your software in the car, what is happening there?	
21	And at the Copyright Office, we felt	
22	comfortable that at this point in time there was no need	
23	for any sort of legislative fix to this and that the	
24	way we construe it, which we believe is properly, that	
25	you would have some pretty good exemptions and	

16

17

18

19

20

21

137

1 limitations that would help you out with using the 1 2 2 products that you buy on an everyday basis. 3 3 Now, this is limited to this category of 4 4 everyday products. And we didn't really extrapolate to 5 5 software generally, but it is something that is happening 6 6 more and more. And as you all know, there is now 7 7 software basically everywhere, and it's kind of a dynamic 8 situation where we have decided that, you know, because 8 9 9 there was not a lot of evidence of current licenses in 10 10 these kind of products that it was something that we 11 11 didn't really need to go any further on. 12 12 I believe the Internet Policy Task Force also 13 13 found similar -- had similar findings, and so we were 14 comfortable with that. And until there's a change in the 14 15 market, we don't feel like we need to do any more study 15 16 16 on this area. But that was our study in a nutshell. And 17 really led to this meeting. 17 thank you. 18 18 But, you know, we heard a fair bit of 19 19 20 20 21 21 22 22 23 23 24 24 25 25

1 DISCUSSION: WHAT ARE THE NEXT STEPS? 2 MR. MORRIS: Thanks very much to Catherine. 3 I'm John Morris with NTIA, and my job is to bring some 4 coherence and conclusion -- I'm not sure consensus -- but 5 at least some coherence to the day. You know, we were 6 very pleased that the Copyright -- that Catherine and the 7 Copyright Office could join us because although, as she 8 said, what they were looking at is a little bit 9 different, I really do think it illustrates that many of 10 the same issues that we were talking about arise in other 11 contexts, that it's not just the context that we've been 12 focused on. 13 You know, this section is discussion, what are 14 the next steps. You know, before getting into kind of my 15 thinking, our thinking on next steps, let me just

generally say that if folks were unable to get their comments in earlier because we ran a fairly fast schedule, the next kind of half-hour discussion is a time when, you know, we'll welcome, you know, folks to weigh in and kind of say points that you hadn't been able to say before.

22 I do have, you know, a number of questions that 23 I'd like to kind of lay out and get reactions to. The 24 point of this always has been to figure out what, if 25 anything, the government could do to contribute and to

help in this area and to kind of improve the situation. You know, we never -- we've never been, you know, looking to impose or propose government regulation to solve a problem here. We've really been trying to, you know, ask stakeholders, is there work that you can do that perhaps we can facilitate or convene, but is there work that you can do to help address some of the concerns here.

And, I mean, let me go back in history. I know that at least a few of you were with Shira and me as we traveled from Nashville to Los Angeles, I think up to the Bay Area a couple of years ago in some of the workshops that we had that led to the white paper recommendation and discussion of first sale. And as we said, you know, in those meetings, there was actually more consensus in those meetings as we traveled around the country than there is today, even though it's those meetings that

consensus, which we summarized as saying, you know, it does not appear that consumers have a clear understanding whether they own or license the products and services they purchase online, due in part to the length and opacity of most EULAs, the labeling of the buy button, and the lack of clear and conspicuous information regarding ownership status on websites.

139

	141
1	So to kind of answer, I suppose, I think maybe
2	Brian in the last panel had really raised, well, you
3	know, what's broken, what's the problem we're trying to
4	solve. Well, that is actually the problem that we heard,
5	and there was a fair bit of consensus. And, so, that's
6	the problem that we're kind of asking, is there something
7	we should do.
8	Now, I do appreciate we certainly appreciate
9	that, you know, this was, gosh, two whole years ago,
10	and a lot's changed in two years. We do work on internet
11	time, and the marketplace really, in fact, has evolved.
12	Streaming services are much more dominant than they were
13	even two years ago. And, so, you know, we fully
14	appreciate that it may be that something that was more of
15	a concern two years ago maybe is less of a concern today.
16	So, I mean, it's not that we heard something and are
17	doggedly going to say we have to solve the problem of two
18	years.
19	But, I mean, one thing I'd like to kind of
20	tease out, and let me kind of throw out a perhaps almost
21	provocative question, perhaps mainly to the content
22	folks, to Allan, Ben, others, but really to the room,
23	because it's striking to me that two years ago, when we
24	were discussing the first sale doctrine and discussing
25	consumer understanding of what rights they had when they

1	downloaded an MP3, there were two very prominent
2	different reasons to be concerned about consumer
3	understanding.
4	And we've talked a great deal about the first
5	one, and we've talked very little about the second one.
6	And I just want to kind of put the second one on the
7	table and get your reaction. The first reason that we
8	heard that consumer understanding was important was what
9	we've talked a lot about today: consumer expectations,
10	is there, you know, something unfair, is you know, are
11	consumers, you know, fully understanding what they're
12	acquiring, do we need to make sure that they understand
13	what they're getting before they before they purchase.
14	And I think, you know, I continue to think that's still a
15	very important issue, and we can talk a little bit more.
16	But the other issue that we hear in our road
17	trips in 2015 was that consumer understanding was
18	important to help continue to address the broad question
19	of piracy, that consumers perhaps would download an MP3
20	and would not necessarily understand, well, what can I do
21	with this MP3, what are my rights with this MP3, can I
22	give it away.
23	And, so, I mean, I think that there is and
24	certainly has been years I think there is still a kind
25	of a strong consensus that improving consumer education,

1	consumer understanding of copyright issues is a positive
2	thing in terms of addressing priority, certainly USPTO
3	and NTIA support efforts to have more digital literacy
4	taught in high schools, taught, you know, in the
5	educational system to try to help consumers understand,
6	well, what are the limits of what they can do.
7	But today, we heard, you know, very little
8	about a little bit but very little about and even
9	some resistance to the idea that at the point of sale
10	might be an opportunity to increase consumer
11	understanding of copyright terms from a piracy
12	perspective. So kind of my one question I'd like to just
13	toss out, if anyone's willing to just offer a reaction
14	is, you know, is that kind of still a concern, or has the
15	market so moved to streaming that we really don't need to
16	worry about kind of piracy of downloaded goods and things
17	like that.
18	So, I mean, does anyone anyone willing to
19	take my go for it, and introduce yourself, please.
20	MR. MITCHELL: Okay, John Mitchell again. I
21	don't want to get more than my fair share, but I sort of
22	cut my teeth on copyright dealing with piracy, but we
23	worked at it both in music and then eventually in VHS
24	tapes. And then when it came to DVD, one of the
25	remarkable things that happened is that when DVDs were

remarkable unings that happened is that when

144
priced so low at wholesale that you end up with Redbox
renting them for a dollar, it put the pirates out of
business, that is, who's going to pay five bucks, which
was I think the going street price for a VHS pirated
copy of a VHS, when you could watch the movie from
Redbox. And that was thanks to the first sale doctrine.
I think as we get into the digital delivery of
goods and we end up with an inaccessible copy, not
because of any legal restraint but because it's on my
hard drive and not yours, and I want you to see it, and
the only way I can technologically do it now is to make a
copy because I don't want to give you my laptop, I think
that really does create some barriers.
And I think if consumers believe they have less
rights on alienation than they actually do, there will be
even greater reluctance to engage in commerce where their
inability to send things downstream is affected. But
flipping that and looking at the copyright the
constitutional purpose of copyright to increase broad

dissemination, the danger is when we go to pure access, that's always priced as a brand new hard copy book in a

sense, to borrow that non-copyright-term book. And I

- should parenthetically indicate software is in the same thing. You can license software, you can buy software,
- thing. You can license software, you can buy softwjust like you can license its -- they're both literary

24

25

enforce them using the means that Congress had already

provided. And I think that part of that is this notion

that somehow or another there are at least segments of

4/18/2017

	145		14
1	works.	1	the population that feel that it is an appropriate
2	The people who depend on secondary markets for	2	position to take that their actions are justified because
3	used clothing, used shoes, used cars, are seeing a	3	they're unhappy with what the marketplace offers.
4	dwindling of that secondary market for works that are	4	MR. MORRIS: So
5	more and more accessible only to people who are willing	5	MR. ADLER: So we'd just like to make sure
6	to pay that top dollar. And I think we as a society need	6	that, you know, we're ultimately considering that aspect
7	to be mindful of that and encouraging ways for people to	7	of this as well and we don't end up being in a position
8	be able to gain access.	8	where consumer expectations and consumers' perspectives
9	The reason that e-books are different is not a	9	on the way in which people vend their goods and services
10	legal one. It's a problem of physics and electronics.	10	in the marketplace somehow justify them in engaging in
11	It's perfectly legal for me to lend, sell, or give away	11	extra-legal activity with respect to them.
12	my e-book, as long as I get rid of the physical device	12	MR. MORRIS: So certainly let me make super
13	that it's on. I'm the owner of a lawfully made copy if I	13	crystal clear that I personally individually and I think
14	downloaded that copy. As I impolitely mentioned to	14	the IPTF Department of Commerce doesn't at all think that
15	MaryBeth Peters eons ago, if you get hit in the head with	15	kind of the situation I identified of lack of consumer
16	a hard drive, it hurts a lot more than a CD. And I think	16	understanding is a justification, but, I mean, honestly,
17	the same is true for e-books, the hard drive will hurt	17	we have worked NTIA and PTO over the years to, yo
18	more than a hard copy book. But we need to not squelch	18	know, to further efforts to try to reduce piracy because,
19	that opportunity.	19	in fact, we both both of our agencies and the
20	And I'll confess that with my group OmniCube,	20	Department of Commerce very strongly believe that
21	we're trying to work on breaking that physics and	21	piracy should not happen.
22	electronics barrier so that you can, in fact, do the	22	And, I mean, I think, you know, Aaron's
23	equivalent of taking a slice of your hard drive that has	23	research that started out this morning, you know, there
24	that is that copy and moving it to someone else in a	24	are certainly critiques of it, and I don't mean to and
25	way that's faithful to the Copyright Act, but we do risk	25	I suspect Aaron wouldn't say that it's the last word on
	146		14
1	shutting off a huge millions of people who can't buy	1	anything, but I think one thing that Aaron's critiques
2	new and giving them basically little choice but the	2	suggest and Lorrie Cranor's critiques in other areas, not
3	piracy, as the only market in which they can affordably	3	copyright areas, you know, Florencia's research, I think
4	acquire the goods.	4	also, do suggest that that consumers can learn,
5	MR. MORRIS: Great. Thank, John.	5	consumers can gather information.
6	Does anyone else want to weigh in?	6	Now, as to whether it actually makes a
7	MR. ADLER: I'm sure you didn't mean this,	7	difference in behavior, as to whether it makes a
8	John, but the thing that's somewhat disturbing about the	8	difference in long-term piracy, you know, I think a lot
9	way in which you proposed the second interest is that it	9	of people have said, you know, there needs to be more
10	involves a kind of a rationalization of piracy. The	10	work. But, I mean, I just want to kind of push to say
11	unhappy consumer is somewhat justified in violating the	11	not that we or certainly I, you know, do not believe that
12	rights of individuals and violating law because they	12	it's it is any way a legitimate excuse for piracy.
13	believe that the marketplace is not fair to them, that	13	It's really just, I think the question I was
14	the marketplace isn't meeting their expectations.	14	really more raising is is it a missed opportunity for
15	And I know you don't you can't carry that	15	improving consumer understanding. And that's really al
16	argument too far, but on the other hand, I am concerned	16	I was, you know, trying to raise, because, honestly, you
17	about that what it presents overall in the larger	17	know, I do think some in the content community in the
18	context of the way in which copyright rights are	18	2015 roundtables kind of expressed that view. And that'
19	exercised by those who have them ultimately, you know, we	19	one of the reasons we kind of came into this
20	have not been able to figure out how to improve the	20	conversation.
21	ability to enforce rights in a meaningful way in an	21	But, you know, so I certainly didn't want to
22	environment that increasingly made it more difficult to	22	suggest what you suggested.

suggest what you suggested.
MR. ADLER: I appre

MR. ADLER: I appreciate that. For anyone who's interested in seeing sort of a real-world example of this kind of debate and the yin and yang, you should

24

25

	149		151
1	read articles about Sci-Hub, a situation where people	1	totally private license negotiation, and the government's
2	undoubtedly, unquestionably in the eyes of federal court,	2	not trying to stick our nose into it, but if there's
3	violated the law and violated the rights of copyright	3	anything that we can do to facilitate a conversation
4	owners in scientific journal articles but nevertheless	4	about how to improve consumer understanding, we'd be
5	have met with the rationalization on some campuses and	5	interested in helping.
6	some libraries and elsewhere in the scientific community	6	But so that's a slightly provocative point.
7	about the importance of universal access to those	7	Anyone want to, you know, throw tomatoes or eggs at me,
8	materials, sort of being capable of justifying the	8	or comment otherwise?
9	situation.	9	Go ahead Aaron. And introduce yourself.
10	MR. MORRIS: So let me shift a little bit, but	10	PROF. PERZANOWSKI: I'm Aaron Perzanowski,
11	I think I'm going to toss out another slightly	11	Professor of Law at Case Western University. I had sort
12	provocative idea because really to some extent my goal is	12	of a point of information and hopefully clarification
13	to is to urge you guys to keep talking to each other	13	that relates to this particular point. We heard and
14	and ultimately, not necessarily in the next 14 minutes,	14	I'm sorry if I'm unable to attribute this in the blur of
15	but ultimately in the next few months to invite you to	15	wonderful people that we've heard from today but I
16	continue to let us know if there's any role that we as	16	heard some conversation earlier today pointing out that
17	the Department of Commerce can play.	17	there are hundreds, if not thousands, of different
18	But let me again be a little bit provocative	18	licenses that have been negotiated between copyright
19	and say that in listening to presentations up here I did	19	holders, content owners, and retailers and platforms.
20	hear just a little bit of finger pointing of saying, oh,	20	And I think that's an important bit of complexity to
21	it's not my problem, it's those people's problem. And I	21	raise.
22	heard it in two directions. You know, we heard from some	22	I don't quite understand how that relates to
23	of the platforms that, well, gosh, it's those content	23	the consumer-facing licenses that we're worried about
24	people over there who have all these complicated	24	here today. I've spent a fair amount of time looking at
25	licenses, and we can't really possibly understand them	25	the iTunes license, for example, all 20,000 words of it.
	150		152

1	and I certainly couldn't explain them to consumers.	1
2	And I heard the, you know, content people say,	2
3	well, gosh, it's those platform people that control the	3
4	page, which both all of that's true. And, so, I don't	4
5	challenge the truth of anyone's statements, but there is	5
6	a little bit of, you know, again, is there a missed	6
7	opportunity to improve consumer understanding that if the	7
8	platforms and the content community were interested,	8
9	totally on their own, or with government, you know,	9
10	support to talk about that issue, to see is there	10
11	something.	11
12	I mean, certainly, none of us want to go and go	12
13	down what I know is an unwinnable battle of trying to	13
14	force people who make user interfaces to make their user	14
15	interfaces the way some government lawyer wants it to be.	15
16	I realize that that's not what we're talking about, and	16
17	that's not what the content companies, I think, would say	17
18	to the industry, to the platforms.	18
19	But the other side is that is that, I mean,	19
20	I do think that there is some evidence, and I'll raise a	20
21	question about whether more research needs to happen in a	21
22	minute, but, I mean, there is some evidence that	22
23	consumers don't have as robust an understanding as they	23
24	could, and is there an opportunity for platforms and	24
25	content owners to talk more. And I appreciate that's a	25

And within the United States, there's one agreement, right? There's one license.

3 Amazon, similarly, does not have a different 4 license depending on the content holder, right? Each --5 their MP3 store has a license; their Kindle bookstore has 6 a license. So I'm not quite seeing how that -- what I'm 7 sure is a very real problem of complexity in the licenses 8 negotiated between copyright holders and the platforms 9 relates to the consumer-facing licenses that at least I'm 10 concerned with trying to explain in simpler and shorter terms.

So if anybody can kind of fill me in there, it would be really helpful.

MR. MORRIS: Anyone else want to jump in? Okay, seeing none, fair warning, I'm going to raise another kind of general topic for questions, but then that will only take a moment and then open it if anyone has been wanting to say something or respond to something that was said two hours ago, your chance will be in a moment.

But -- so the other -- one other thing that 22 we've heard a number of times from folks today, you know, 23 both some of the academics, I think, you know, Greg 24 Barnes suggested that Aaron's study was too limited. So 25 the question, you know, do we need to do more research.

4/18/2017

	153		155
1	And the "we" is not we, the government, necessarily one	1	studies on other forms of distribution, streaming and
2	way or another but we as a community, you know, and what	2	all, there might still be, you know, even in that area
3	kind of more research, you know, would be worth doing,	3	some kind of lack of understanding of what your consumer
4	and, you know, would any of your companies or any of your	4	options are. So, I mean, I do certainly think that I
5	associations, if you represent associations or companies,	5	mean, certainly, we appreciate that there's an awful lot
6	you know, be interested in participating. So, I mean,	6	we don't know, but John, were you trying to jump in
7	just to kind of let me toss out that question as much	7	earlier? And then Jonathan.
8	a question to ask for an answer now but also a question	8	MR. BERGMAYER: Hello. Okay, John Bergmayer
9	for, you know, folks to think about after today, to see	9	from Public Knowledge. I guess one piece of research
10	if there's anything that they'd like to do.	10	that I think would be interesting, and I know that some
11	But, I mean, certainly, if there are any	11	has been done and, you know, maybe people can point me to
12	academics or anyone else who wants to jump in on research	12	it, is just about the economic value of the rights that
13	that would be worthwhile doing.	13	people are not buying. So, for instance, you know,
14	Matt.	14	publishers often point out that the cost of production of
15	MR. SCHRUERS: Hi, Matt Schruers with CCIA. I	15	a book is more the production of the actual work and not
16	you know, there is a lot of research that I wish I had	16	the paper and the trucks. So, therefore, you shouldn't
17	a budget to commission from the association but I don't.	17	expect a huge discount, but if people, when they're
18	But I would like to observe that I feel like the	18	buying an e-book or acquiring fewer rights, you know, you
19	conversation today identified lots of critical unanswered	19	would expect them to pay less.
20	questions, just sort of standard, I think, research	20	And, you know, if I'm buying fewer legal
21	questions that any in any area we would do research,	21	entitlements when I'm buying something, I should pay
22	like are the results of Aaron's study reproduceable, do	22	less. And to what extent, like, that is actually
23	they vary in different contexts.	23	reflected in actual marketplace prices and, you know, the
24	We had some interesting conversation during the	24	actual economic value that people place on these things.
25	break about contexts where we probably know results are	25	MR. MORRIS: Yeah, I mean, certainly to me it

154

1 1 different. You know, I pointed out, for example, that does, and I think one of the most interesting little data 2 2 most of us know we can't resell a plane ticket, but it's points from Aaron's study is the last slide or two where 3 3 not because we read the terms of use on Travelocity or -he suggested that perhaps, again in a non-real-world 4 4 and where does that understanding come from? I feel like setting, people might pay more to get a larger bundle of 5 5 there are a lot of areas like this where we probably want rights. 6 6 to start figuring out why consumers have better Anyone else want to jump in on -- oh, yes, I'm 7 7 sorry, Jonathan Band. understandings in some contexts than others. 8 And I don't know where to start there, but I 8 MR. BAND: Yes, I'm still Jonathan Band. 9 9 feel like those are the kinds of questions that we want The -- just to echo what others have said about the 10 to start answering, perhaps before necessarily 10 importance of research, I think it's even all the more 11 11 prescribing anything here, because there are a lot of critical to really understand this issue of, you know, 12 12 unknown unknowns that probably need consideration before 13 13 we chart a policy course, or at least that would be my 14 suggestion. 14 15 15 MR. MORRIS: Certainly responding individually, mean, so right now, you know, when you buy your 16 16 I couldn't agree more. I think there is an awful lot 17 17 that we don't know, and my perception is that, I mean, 18 the online marketplace, which isn't clearly going to 18 buying the whole product. 19 be -- you know, it's clearly continuing to overtake the 19 20 20 physical marketplace in terms of distribution of content 21 21 is likely to get more complex, not less complex, in terms 22 of new options, new possibilities and things like that. 22 23 And, so, I mean, although Aaron's study, you 23 24 24 know, I think was more focused on the idea of downloading 25 25 a piece of content, you know, my guess is that if you did

156

consumer expectations and notice and because part of -it really resonates, especially given what Catherine was saying in the software enabled consumer products area. I

refrigerator and you buy your car, you don't receive a license typically for the software. Right now, you're

But, you know, I'm sure within ten years that's not going to be the case. And, so, we need to really get ahead of the curve, you know, because -- you know, because, you know, it's sort of -- in a sense, you could say, well, it's bad enough now, but we're only talking about, you know, the \$10 e-book purchase on Amazon or the \$2 rental on iTunes, right? I mean, we're talking about

out that I don't anticipate that the answers that I

	157		159
1	relatively small things now, small dollar value.	1	showed you all today play out the same in every context.
2	But when we're talking about the you know,	2	I'm going to violate the rule that I just sort of put on
3	the \$20,000 Nissan or the, you know, \$100,00 Tesla, it's	3	the table and say, you know, like, in the video game
4	going to make a much bigger difference, and it's going to	4	industry, for example, what I suspect is that consumers,
5	be much more controversial, and so we should I really	5	in part because of price point and in part because of the
6	think it's necessary to try to get ahead of the curve and	6	role that resale plays in that market, are much more
7	really understand what's going on and how to handle	7	sophisticated in their understanding of what rights they
8	you know, try to wrap our hands around this issue now	8	acquire when they buy digital goods.
9	when it's relatively simple, rather than in ten years	9	I would imagine tentatively that that's true in
10	when it's going to be much, much more complicated.	10	the app space as well, but I don't know, I could be
11	MR. MORRIS: Agreed.	11	wrong, you know, what do I know? I need to go out and
12	Aaron?	12	figure out the answers to those questions, and I would
13	MR. PERZANOWSKI: Yeah, Aaron Perzanowski	13	encourage those with better access to data than I have,
14	again. I just wanted to kind of echo that point. I	14	right I'm operating on a shoestring law professor here
15	mean, one of the things that I think is really important	15	trying to do empirical research that is not free, might
16	in terms of ongoing research is thinking about how some	16	not even be cheap other people have access to this
17	of these same issues play out when it comes to internet	17	data.
18	of things, devices, other kinds of software enabled	18	There are companies that I think are much
19	products because they are the indicators to consumers	19	better positioned to do this sort of work. You know, it
20	that they should expect the same sort of suite of legal	20	would be really great if they would publish what they
21	rights, I think is even stronger than what I presented	21	know on this question as well. And that's probably
22	earlier today, and we're already seeing examples	22	asking for too much, but I think it would really help
23	undermining those expectations.	23	move the conversation forward.
24	So I'm not implying causation here by any	24	I don't think that I have, you know, done sort
25	means, but just a couple weeks after the Copyright Office	25	of the definitive study here. I hope what I've done is
	158		160
1		1	
1 2	158 study was published that we just heard about, John Deere put out a license for their tractors, right, and that	1 2	160 the first, and that's really all I can hope for. MR. MORRIS: Allan?
	study was published that we just heard about, John Deere		the first, and that's really all I can hope for.
2	study was published that we just heard about, John Deere put out a license for their tractors, right, and that	2	the first, and that's really all I can hope for. MR. MORRIS: Allan?
2 3	study was published that we just heard about, John Deere put out a license for their tractors, right, and that license is very clear about who owns the software that	2 3	the first, and that's really all I can hope for. MR. MORRIS: Allan? MR. ADLER: I was just going to mention, I
2 3 4	study was published that we just heard about, John Deere put out a license for their tractors, right, and that license is very clear about who owns the software that makes that machine operate. So I think we're already	2 3 4	 the first, and that's really all I can hope for. MR. MORRIS: Allan? MR. ADLER: I was just going to mention, I didn't want to let this go past without mentioning this,
2 3 4 5	study was published that we just heard about, John Deere put out a license for their tractors, right, and that license is very clear about who owns the software that makes that machine operate. So I think we're already moving in a direction where we're getting kind of	2 3 4 5	 the first, and that's really all I can hope for. MR. MORRIS: Allan? MR. ADLER: I was just going to mention, I didn't want to let this go past without mentioning this, because as I was reading some things in anticipation of
2 3 4 5 6	study was published that we just heard about, John Deere put out a license for their tractors, right, and that license is very clear about who owns the software that makes that machine operate. So I think we're already moving in a direction where we're getting kind of explicit claims about ownership that are inconsistent	2 3 4 5 6	 the first, and that's really all I can hope for. MR. MORRIS: Allan? MR. ADLER: I was just going to mention, I didn't want to let this go past without mentioning this, because as I was reading some things in anticipation of this panel, I was surprised to see what is being
2 3 4 5 6 7	study was published that we just heard about, John Deere put out a license for their tractors, right, and that license is very clear about who owns the software that makes that machine operate. So I think we're already moving in a direction where we're getting kind of explicit claims about ownership that are inconsistent with reasonable consumer expectations. In terms of other work that I think needs to be done here, longitudinal data, I think, would be really	2 3 4 5 6 7	the first, and that's really all I can hope for. MR. MORRIS: Allan? MR. ADLER: I was just going to mention, I didn't want to let this go past without mentioning this, because as I was reading some things in anticipation of this panel, I was surprised to see what is being characterized now as an arms race among social media platforms to adopt buy buttons and the reasons that were offered for that. Several articles that I read talked
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	study was published that we just heard about, John Deere put out a license for their tractors, right, and that license is very clear about who owns the software that makes that machine operate. So I think we're already moving in a direction where we're getting kind of explicit claims about ownership that are inconsistent with reasonable consumer expectations. In terms of other work that I think needs to be done here, longitudinal data, I think, would be really valuable. I suspect that the survey that I showed you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	the first, and that's really all I can hope for. MR. MORRIS: Allan? MR. ADLER: I was just going to mention, I didn't want to let this go past without mentioning this, because as I was reading some things in anticipation of this panel, I was surprised to see what is being characterized now as an arms race among social media platforms to adopt buy buttons and the reasons that were offered for that. Several articles that I read talked about the extent to which Facebook, Pinterest, Instagram,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	study was published that we just heard about, John Deere put out a license for their tractors, right, and that license is very clear about who owns the software that makes that machine operate. So I think we're already moving in a direction where we're getting kind of explicit claims about ownership that are inconsistent with reasonable consumer expectations. In terms of other work that I think needs to be done here, longitudinal data, I think, would be really valuable. I suspect that the survey that I showed you all today would have looked really different five years	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	the first, and that's really all I can hope for. MR. MORRIS: Allan? MR. ADLER: I was just going to mention, I didn't want to let this go past without mentioning this, because as I was reading some things in anticipation of this panel, I was surprised to see what is being characterized now as an arms race among social media platforms to adopt buy buttons and the reasons that were offered for that. Several articles that I read talked about the extent to which Facebook, Pinterest, Instagram, Twitter, and platforms like that are now looking at what
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	study was published that we just heard about, John Deere put out a license for their tractors, right, and that license is very clear about who owns the software that makes that machine operate. So I think we're already moving in a direction where we're getting kind of explicit claims about ownership that are inconsistent with reasonable consumer expectations. In terms of other work that I think needs to be done here, longitudinal data, I think, would be really valuable. I suspect that the survey that I showed you all today would have looked really different five years ago, and depending on what happens next in this process	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	the first, and that's really all I can hope for. MR. MORRIS: Allan? MR. ADLER: I was just going to mention, I didn't want to let this go past without mentioning this, because as I was reading some things in anticipation of this panel, I was surprised to see what is being characterized now as an arms race among social media platforms to adopt buy buttons and the reasons that were offered for that. Several articles that I read talked about the extent to which Facebook, Pinterest, Instagram, Twitter, and platforms like that are now looking at what they're calling social buy buttons.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	study was published that we just heard about, John Deere put out a license for their tractors, right, and that license is very clear about who owns the software that makes that machine operate. So I think we're already moving in a direction where we're getting kind of explicit claims about ownership that are inconsistent with reasonable consumer expectations. In terms of other work that I think needs to be done here, longitudinal data, I think, would be really valuable. I suspect that the survey that I showed you all today would have looked really different five years ago, and depending on what happens next in this process or other processes, it's going to look real different	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	the first, and that's really all I can hope for. MR. MORRIS: Allan? MR. ADLER: I was just going to mention, I didn't want to let this go past without mentioning this, because as I was reading some things in anticipation of this panel, I was surprised to see what is being characterized now as an arms race among social media platforms to adopt buy buttons and the reasons that were offered for that. Several articles that I read talked about the extent to which Facebook, Pinterest, Instagram, Twitter, and platforms like that are now looking at what they're calling social buy buttons. And the interesting reason that they seem to be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	study was published that we just heard about, John Deere put out a license for their tractors, right, and that license is very clear about who owns the software that makes that machine operate. So I think we're already moving in a direction where we're getting kind of explicit claims about ownership that are inconsistent with reasonable consumer expectations. In terms of other work that I think needs to be done here, longitudinal data, I think, would be really valuable. I suspect that the survey that I showed you all today would have looked really different five years ago, and depending on what happens next in this process or other processes, it's going to look real different five years from now.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	the first, and that's really all I can hope for. MR. MORRIS: Allan? MR. ADLER: I was just going to mention, I didn't want to let this go past without mentioning this, because as I was reading some things in anticipation of this panel, I was surprised to see what is being characterized now as an arms race among social media platforms to adopt buy buttons and the reasons that were offered for that. Several articles that I read talked about the extent to which Facebook, Pinterest, Instagram, Twitter, and platforms like that are now looking at what they're calling social buy buttons. And the interesting reason that they seem to be doing it is because given their existing capabilities to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	study was published that we just heard about, John Deere put out a license for their tractors, right, and that license is very clear about who owns the software that makes that machine operate. So I think we're already moving in a direction where we're getting kind of explicit claims about ownership that are inconsistent with reasonable consumer expectations. In terms of other work that I think needs to be done here, longitudinal data, I think, would be really valuable. I suspect that the survey that I showed you all today would have looked really different five years ago, and depending on what happens next in this process or other processes, it's going to look real different five years from now. I think it would play out you know, I'm	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	the first, and that's really all I can hope for. MR. MORRIS: Allan? MR. ADLER: I was just going to mention, I didn't want to let this go past without mentioning this, because as I was reading some things in anticipation of this panel, I was surprised to see what is being characterized now as an arms race among social media platforms to adopt buy buttons and the reasons that were offered for that. Several articles that I read talked about the extent to which Facebook, Pinterest, Instagram, Twitter, and platforms like that are now looking at what they're calling social buy buttons. And the interesting reason that they seem to be doing it is because given their existing capabilities to tailor and target customized advertising towards their
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	study was published that we just heard about, John Deere put out a license for their tractors, right, and that license is very clear about who owns the software that makes that machine operate. So I think we're already moving in a direction where we're getting kind of explicit claims about ownership that are inconsistent with reasonable consumer expectations. In terms of other work that I think needs to be done here, longitudinal data, I think, would be really valuable. I suspect that the survey that I showed you all today would have looked really different five years ago, and depending on what happens next in this process or other processes, it's going to look real different five years from now. I think it would play out you know, I'm always careful to try to focus my comments here on kind	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	the first, and that's really all I can hope for. MR. MORRIS: Allan? MR. ADLER: I was just going to mention, I didn't want to let this go past without mentioning this, because as I was reading some things in anticipation of this panel, I was surprised to see what is being characterized now as an arms race among social media platforms to adopt buy buttons and the reasons that were offered for that. Several articles that I read talked about the extent to which Facebook, Pinterest, Instagram, Twitter, and platforms like that are now looking at what they're calling social buy buttons. And the interesting reason that they seem to be doing it is because given their existing capabilities to tailor and target customized advertising towards their constituents, they're eager to promote what they're
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	study was published that we just heard about, John Deere put out a license for their tractors, right, and that license is very clear about who owns the software that makes that machine operate. So I think we're already moving in a direction where we're getting kind of explicit claims about ownership that are inconsistent with reasonable consumer expectations. In terms of other work that I think needs to be done here, longitudinal data, I think, would be really valuable. I suspect that the survey that I showed you all today would have looked really different five years ago, and depending on what happens next in this process or other processes, it's going to look real different five years from now. I think it would play out you know, I'm always careful to try to focus my comments here on kind of verifiable, empirical claims because fundamentally	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ \end{array} $	the first, and that's really all I can hope for. MR. MORRIS: Allan? MR. ADLER: I was just going to mention, I didn't want to let this go past without mentioning this, because as I was reading some things in anticipation of this panel, I was surprised to see what is being characterized now as an arms race among social media platforms to adopt buy buttons and the reasons that were offered for that. Several articles that I read talked about the extent to which Facebook, Pinterest, Instagram, Twitter, and platforms like that are now looking at what they're calling social buy buttons. And the interesting reason that they seem to be doing it is because given their existing capabilities to tailor and target customized advertising towards their constituents, they're eager to promote what they're calling impulse-purchase moments. That seems to me to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	study was published that we just heard about, John Deere put out a license for their tractors, right, and that license is very clear about who owns the software that makes that machine operate. So I think we're already moving in a direction where we're getting kind of explicit claims about ownership that are inconsistent with reasonable consumer expectations. In terms of other work that I think needs to be done here, longitudinal data, I think, would be really valuable. I suspect that the survey that I showed you all today would have looked really different five years ago, and depending on what happens next in this process or other processes, it's going to look real different five years from now. I think it would play out you know, I'm always careful to try to focus my comments here on kind of verifiable, empirical claims because fundamentally that's where this conversation needs to be. It's not	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ \end{array} $	the first, and that's really all I can hope for. MR. MORRIS: Allan? MR. ADLER: I was just going to mention, I didn't want to let this go past without mentioning this, because as I was reading some things in anticipation of this panel, I was surprised to see what is being characterized now as an arms race among social media platforms to adopt buy buttons and the reasons that were offered for that. Several articles that I read talked about the extent to which Facebook, Pinterest, Instagram, Twitter, and platforms like that are now looking at what they're calling social buy buttons. And the interesting reason that they seem to be doing it is because given their existing capabilities to tailor and target customized advertising towards their constituents, they're eager to promote what they're calling impulse-purchase moments. That seems to me to present these issues in a much higher relief with respect
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	study was published that we just heard about, John Deere put out a license for their tractors, right, and that license is very clear about who owns the software that makes that machine operate. So I think we're already moving in a direction where we're getting kind of explicit claims about ownership that are inconsistent with reasonable consumer expectations. In terms of other work that I think needs to be done here, longitudinal data, I think, would be really valuable. I suspect that the survey that I showed you all today would have looked really different five years ago, and depending on what happens next in this process or other processes, it's going to look real different five years from now. I think it would play out you know, I'm always careful to try to focus my comments here on kind of verifiable, empirical claims because fundamentally that's where this conversation needs to be. It's not about our presumptions, our assumptions, what we think	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ \end{array} $	the first, and that's really all I can hope for. MR. MORRIS: Allan? MR. ADLER: I was just going to mention, I didn't want to let this go past without mentioning this, because as I was reading some things in anticipation of this panel, I was surprised to see what is being characterized now as an arms race among social media platforms to adopt buy buttons and the reasons that were offered for that. Several articles that I read talked about the extent to which Facebook, Pinterest, Instagram, Twitter, and platforms like that are now looking at what they're calling social buy buttons. And the interesting reason that they seem to be doing it is because given their existing capabilities to tailor and target customized advertising towards their constituents, they're eager to promote what they're calling impulse-purchase moments. That seems to me to present these issues in a much higher relief with respect to the welfare of consumers than some of the issues that
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\end{array} $	study was published that we just heard about, John Deere put out a license for their tractors, right, and that license is very clear about who owns the software that makes that machine operate. So I think we're already moving in a direction where we're getting kind of explicit claims about ownership that are inconsistent with reasonable consumer expectations. In terms of other work that I think needs to be done here, longitudinal data, I think, would be really valuable. I suspect that the survey that I showed you all today would have looked really different five years ago, and depending on what happens next in this process or other processes, it's going to look real different five years from now. I think it would play out you know, I'm always careful to try to focus my comments here on kind of verifiable, empirical claims because fundamentally that's where this conversation needs to be. It's not about our presumptions, our assumptions, what we think consumers know, or what we suppose consumers believe. If	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array} $	the first, and that's really all I can hope for. MR. MORRIS: Allan? MR. ADLER: I was just going to mention, I didn't want to let this go past without mentioning this, because as I was reading some things in anticipation of this panel, I was surprised to see what is being characterized now as an arms race among social media platforms to adopt buy buttons and the reasons that were offered for that. Several articles that I read talked about the extent to which Facebook, Pinterest, Instagram, Twitter, and platforms like that are now looking at what they're calling social buy buttons. And the interesting reason that they seem to be doing it is because given their existing capabilities to tailor and target customized advertising towards their constituents, they're eager to promote what they're calling impulse-purchase moments. That seems to me to present these issues in a much higher relief with respect to the welfare of consumers than some of the issues that we've been discussing where there already seems to be a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	study was published that we just heard about, John Deere put out a license for their tractors, right, and that license is very clear about who owns the software that makes that machine operate. So I think we're already moving in a direction where we're getting kind of explicit claims about ownership that are inconsistent with reasonable consumer expectations. In terms of other work that I think needs to be done here, longitudinal data, I think, would be really valuable. I suspect that the survey that I showed you all today would have looked really different five years ago, and depending on what happens next in this process or other processes, it's going to look real different five years from now. I think it would play out you know, I'm always careful to try to focus my comments here on kind of verifiable, empirical claims because fundamentally that's where this conversation needs to be. It's not about our presumptions, our assumptions, what we think consumers know, or what we suppose consumers believe. If you want to make a claim about that, you need to go ask	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ \end{array} $	the first, and that's really all I can hope for. MR. MORRIS: Allan? MR. ADLER: I was just going to mention, I didn't want to let this go past without mentioning this, because as I was reading some things in anticipation of this panel, I was surprised to see what is being characterized now as an arms race among social media platforms to adopt buy buttons and the reasons that were offered for that. Several articles that I read talked about the extent to which Facebook, Pinterest, Instagram, Twitter, and platforms like that are now looking at what they're calling social buy buttons. And the interesting reason that they seem to be doing it is because given their existing capabilities to tailor and target customized advertising towards their constituents, they're eager to promote what they're calling impulse-purchase moments. That seems to me to present these issues in a much higher relief with respect to the welfare of consumers than some of the issues that we've been discussing where there already seems to be a fair amount of experience and some degree of settled
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	study was published that we just heard about, John Deere put out a license for their tractors, right, and that license is very clear about who owns the software that makes that machine operate. So I think we're already moving in a direction where we're getting kind of explicit claims about ownership that are inconsistent with reasonable consumer expectations. In terms of other work that I think needs to be done here, longitudinal data, I think, would be really valuable. I suspect that the survey that I showed you all today would have looked really different five years ago, and depending on what happens next in this process or other processes, it's going to look real different five years from now. I think it would play out you know, I'm always careful to try to focus my comments here on kind of verifiable, empirical claims because fundamentally that's where this conversation needs to be. It's not about our presumptions, our assumptions, what we think consumers know, or what we suppose consumers believe. If you want to make a claim about that, you need to go ask them. So it's sort of a put up or shut up time when it	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\end{array} $	the first, and that's really all I can hope for. MR. MORRIS: Allan? MR. ADLER: I was just going to mention, I didn't want to let this go past without mentioning this, because as I was reading some things in anticipation of this panel, I was surprised to see what is being characterized now as an arms race among social media platforms to adopt buy buttons and the reasons that were offered for that. Several articles that I read talked about the extent to which Facebook, Pinterest, Instagram, Twitter, and platforms like that are now looking at what they're calling social buy buttons. And the interesting reason that they seem to be doing it is because given their existing capabilities to tailor and target customized advertising towards their constituents, they're eager to promote what they're calling impulse-purchase moments. That seems to me to present these issues in a much higher relief with respect to the welfare of consumers than some of the issues that we've been discussing where there already seems to be a fair amount of experience and some degree of settled practice.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	study was published that we just heard about, John Deere put out a license for their tractors, right, and that license is very clear about who owns the software that makes that machine operate. So I think we're already moving in a direction where we're getting kind of explicit claims about ownership that are inconsistent with reasonable consumer expectations. In terms of other work that I think needs to be done here, longitudinal data, I think, would be really valuable. I suspect that the survey that I showed you all today would have looked really different five years ago, and depending on what happens next in this process or other processes, it's going to look real different five years from now. I think it would play out you know, I'm always careful to try to focus my comments here on kind of verifiable, empirical claims because fundamentally that's where this conversation needs to be. It's not about our presumptions, our assumptions, what we think consumers know, or what we suppose consumers believe. If you want to make a claim about that, you need to go ask	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ \end{array} $	the first, and that's really all I can hope for. MR. MORRIS: Allan? MR. ADLER: I was just going to mention, I didn't want to let this go past without mentioning this, because as I was reading some things in anticipation of this panel, I was surprised to see what is being characterized now as an arms race among social media platforms to adopt buy buttons and the reasons that were offered for that. Several articles that I read talked about the extent to which Facebook, Pinterest, Instagram, Twitter, and platforms like that are now looking at what they're calling social buy buttons. And the interesting reason that they seem to be doing it is because given their existing capabilities to tailor and target customized advertising towards their constituents, they're eager to promote what they're calling impulse-purchase moments. That seems to me to present these issues in a much higher relief with respect to the welfare of consumers than some of the issues that we've been discussing where there already seems to be a fair amount of experience and some degree of settled

40 (Pages 157 to 160)

abandonment on mobile devices, where although consumers

25

	101		
1	would be happy to use buy buttons on these social	1	
2	platforms that they're always on anyway, they become	2	
3	impatient with the checkout process.	3	I
4	So I would suggest to people like Professor	4	t
5	Perzanowski that as that checkout process is addressed, I	5	I
6	think this issue of the use of buy buttons in the social	6	C
7	media platform context where it's not limited only to the	7	t
8	focus on copyrighted works but the behavior of consumers	8	S
9	and the platforms and vendors of goods in a much broader	9	١
10	context is going to be a very rich area to mine.	10	C
11	MR. MORRIS: Thanks, Allan.	11	0
12	So I'm going to reserve the last word for me,	12	
13	but anyone want to get a last word in before I give a	13	t
14	last word? Quickly.	14	ł
15	MR. MITCHELL: Yes, I'll do this quickly. I	15	-
16	was thinking that we've I think identified maybe not	16	
17	all identified, the distinction between disclosing EULA	17	١
18	terms but as a license agreement and full disclosure of	18	
19	functionality. A couple of decades ago, I warned of	19	١
20	automated agreements and restraint of trade. This was	20	I
21	coming from an antitrust standpoint, that once your bots	21	i
22	are talking to each other, you could be held liable if	22	i
23	they're agreeing to an antitrust violation.	23	1
24	As we automate more and more and our devices	24	C
25	know what we want and anticipate our needs and do certain	25	C

161

1 things, consumers may be more and more out of the 1 2 2 equation of clicking on a "I agree" button. They don't 3 3 need disclosure of the licensing terms; they need 4 4 disclosure of the functionality -- is this going to work 5 5 the way I intend it to? -- because the technology itself 6 6 may be enforcing this whether they agree or not. Just 7 7 that last comment. 8 8 9 9 10 10 11 11 12 12 13 13 14 14 15 15 16 16 17 17 18 18 19 19 20 20 21 21 22 22 23 23 24 24 25 25

2	MR. MORRIS: Well, I mean, one last comment
3	I'll make really is a riff off of that, and in part,
ŀ	that's to reassure folks in this room that the IPTF is
5	not picking on you, that, in fact, we are looking at
5	consumer understanding in a number of contexts, including
7	the cyber security context. We have an ongoing multi-
8	stakeholder process specifically trying to figure out
)	ways to try to improve consumer understanding of the
)	cyber security implications of internet of things
	devices.
2	So, I mean, I think the point you just made
3	that, I mean, we really all of us, I think, will be
ŀ	better off in the ecosystem if we try to keep and try to
5	trying to keep consumer understanding in mind.
5	Shira, before I say thank you's, anything you
7	want to add?
8	MS. PERLMUTTER: I guess I would only say I
)	want to absolutely make sure we're crystal clear on a few
)	points that I think we've mentioned a few times. And one
	is that we're really through this conversation not trying

CLOSING REMARKS. WRAP-UP

in any way to address the freedom to set terms of licenses but just looking at how those terms are

communicated, and, again, with the point being that there

could be benefits from greater clarity, first of all for

consumers, in understanding what they can and can't do, but also potentially to copyright owners because, as John was suggesting, there could be fewer acts of infringement if people understand what is not permitted in a clearer way. And overall, what we're looking at is is there a nonregulatory way to improve this situation, but J

a nonregulatory way to improve this situation, but I think the thing that's been most clear to me from the whole conversation is how difficult it is even to approach that question, first of all without adequate data, but also at a time when this is such a moving target with such fast-changing circumstances. So I think both John and I were struck by how different the context is today than when we first started hearing about this issue just two years -- two or three years ago.

6 MR. MORRIS: Great. Thank you. Bear with me 7 for 30 more seconds, because I'd like to just first say 8 thank you to the very critical staff of the Global 9 Intellectual Property Academy, the folks who actually run 10 this specific facility. So, Nadine Herbert, Jamie Day, 11 and Capris Barnes have been instrumental in a lot of the 2 behind-the-scenes work.

And then let me thank Shira's team at PTO, Shira and David Carson and Susan Allen and Linda Quigley, and my folks within NTIA, Luis Zambrano, Charlie Franz,

163

164

	165
1	Steven Yushko and others. And, in particular, to Susan
2	and Linda and Luis who really were instrumental in
3	crafting this panel and in contacting all the speakers.
4	So thank you very much to all of you for participating,
5	and, you know, we look forward to the conversation that
6	follows. And if you have more ideas about how we might
7	contribute, we'd be happy to hear about it, but thanks
8	very much.
9	(Applause.)
10	(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 5:07
11	p.m.)
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22 23	
23	
24	
25	

4/18/2017 [166]

				[100]
A	71:12 74:22 75:3,9	active 19:2	advantage 14:9	45:14 104:18
	75:11 76:2 79:19	actively 74:17	advertised 83:13	105:2 152:1
Aaron 18:25 34:18	85:23 87:23,25	activities 94:20	88:3 119:6	161:18
37:3 39:4 44:22	98:24 107:3	activity 93:20	advertisement	agreements 5:7
47:1 60:16 147:25	119:15,16 123:14	147:11	83:22	45:15,16,18,18
151:9,10 157:12	124:4 127:3 128:9	acts 81:2 164:3	advertisements	53:8,14,18 54:4
157:13	144:20 145:8	actual 10:4 24:5	87:24	71:17 74:25 95:3
Aaron's 92:14	149:7 159:13,16	45:12 58:23 82:11	advertising 22:12	104:25 161:20
117:20 118:1	access-based 14:12	82:14 86:9 96:3,4	27:5,6 48:13 80:10	ahead 90:21 101:9
147:22 148:1	14:17	123:17 155:15,23	80:25 84:24 85:7	151:9 156:21
152:24 153:22	accessed 55:5	125:17 155:15,25	85:12 86:22 89:14	157:6
154:23 156:2	accesses 76:8	ad 66:14 67:10 82:5	160:15	Aires 70:24
abandonment	accessible 145:5	AdChoices 66:4,25	advisable 101:25	airline's 123:15
160:25	accessing 44:24	add 163:17	advocacy 36:8	airplane 123:18
abiding 124:24	107:18,20	added 115:8 120:13	affairs 3:6 55:8	aisles 43:17
abilities 125:22	accompanied 12:9	adding 19:18	affect 72:25,25	Alan 92:8
ability 3:15 15:1	account 41:19	addition 18:5 52:12	affirmative 26:19	albeit 48:25 104:6
18:1 26:20,21	accuracy 31:8	73:6 82:17 84:25	27:14 29:3 86:15	album 58:7
32:11 37:6,18 86:7	accurate 22:16,23	89:10	104:10	alert 70:8,10
114:18 146:21	23:8 25:21 31:4,4	additional 30:14	Affordability 44:5	Alexa 17:20 46:16
able 38:4 43:12	31:5 39:18	32:22 34:13 45:5	affordably 146:3	69:22,25
51:10,23 65:23	accurately 30:2	88:13 89:4 126:5	afoul 133:25	ALEXANDRIA
84:25 98:9 108:16	57:21 88:22	address 7:11 19:7	afraid 105:4 127:5	1:18
125:24,25 133:17	accustomed 49:18	49:4 72:3 77:3	afternoon 3:2,4 41:4	alienate 125:24
135:20 137:3	achieve 80:8	81:5 83:15 111:15	47:20 90:4 93:10	alienation 144:15
139:20 145:8	acknowledge 75:14	112:1 140:7	age 23:18 29:24,25	aligned 136:17,18
146:20	76:21 108:12	142:18 163:22	117:6	Allan 103:9,10
Abroad 70:24	acknowledgment	addressed 7:1 71:2	agencies 147:19	111:1 127:5
absence 34:7	126:5	83:10 161:5	AGENDA 2:3	130:15 141:22
absolutely 17:18	acquire 19:17 25:18	addressing 143:2	ago 6:19 21:16	160:2 161:11
163:19	33:22 34:1 49:6	addressing 143.2 adds 31:16	45:24 57:23 97:10	Allan's 111:15
academia 90:17	146:4 159:8	adequate 164:10	108:1 115:8	112:17 114:3
91:8	acquired 26:4	adequately 43:3	116:20 117:23	alleged 85:25
academic 4:21 96:9	acquiring 22:19	adhesion 104:23	123:4 140:11	Allen 3:2 90:3 93:8
96:10	25:13 142:12	adjourned 165:10	141:9,13,15,23	100:8 103:8 111:1
academics 71:19	155:18	Adler 103:10,10	145:15 152:19	113:25 118:7,13
97:6 152:23	acquisition 23:5	124:19 146:7	158:12 161:19	118:16,23 120:15
153:12	act 8:6,13 64:21	147:5 148:23	164:15	121:3 122:24
Academy 164:19	81:1,6,15 100:14	160:3	agree 20:2 58:21	124:12 127:5
accept 110:18	114:9 121:21,22	admission 49:14	72:11 75:14,18,25	164:24
115:25	122:5,22 125:5	admittances 77:24	76:22 106:7	allow 11:25 94:9
acceptable 50:25	122.3,22 123.3	adopt 78:5 160:8	116:11 124:8	130:25
access 4:12 11:20	136:3 145:25	adopted 84:15	154:16 162:2,6	allowed 104:24
13:3,25 14:19,22	acting 81:17,21	adopted 84.15 ads 66:5,6,14,19	agree's 79:17	109:19 110:16
14:25 15:5,6 22:7	112:21	67:1,4,7 88:11	agreed 15:21 66:23	alluded 16:24 54:16
23:6 37:12,16 38:3	action 16:7,7 85:15	Ads-Here 67:4	75:21 86:11,14	55:23
38:5,7 43:19,24	101:13 102:8	advance 63:2	157:11	allusion 80:16
44:12 49:22,23	actions 85:10,11	Advanced 86:19,19	agreeing 161:23	alternative 44:24
50:11 53:4 54:18	89:13 147:2	87:2	agreement 12:10,11	Amazon 10:24
54:24 55:3,24 58:3	07.13 147.2	07.2	agi cement 12.10,11	AIIIaLUII 10.24
	l	I	I	<u> </u>

				[167]
21:17 22:5 24:22	68:9,10 100:14,17	93:7 108:10 148:2	association 35:24,25	107:17 120:14
38:22 50:10 53:1,7	100:23 159:10	148:3 154:5	36:1 41:8 47:21,24	awareness 42:18,21
53:11,24 54:3,8	Appeals 109:18	aren't 3:12 43:7	47:25 48:1 100:15	awful 154:16 155:5
57:11 60:3 119:7	110:1,4	50:24 76:19 85:10	100:15 103:12	Ayres 92:8
152:3 156:24	appear 125:5	95:17 99:24 100:1	123:2 153:17	Ayres J2.0
Amazon.com 9:9	140:20	117:13,13	associations 18:6	B
53:23 57:15	appeared 65:6,7,7,8	arena 129:8	52:25 153:5,5	B 55:3,5 123:19
Amendment 108:15	65:10	argue 102:16	assume 120:2	B.J 93:9,11
110:2	appears 41:21	argued 22:4	assume 120.2 assumptions 61:6	B2B 117:2 122:2
America 36:1	Applause 165:9	argument 41:20	158:19	135:5
American 103:12	Apple 38:21 53:1,10	42:1 55:10 146:16	asterisk 94:23	back 3:13,19 24:17
amorphous 130:3	53:24,24 54:3,7	arms 160:7	asymmetries 111:19	25:11 46:22,24
amount 7:9 91:5	58:10	arrangements 14:23	attach 33:16	47:9 51:5,18 54:25
102:12 110:14,16	appliances 129:7	article 19:14,18 20:2	attached 31:6 74:9	56:8,10 60:21
115:9 151:24	application 128:25	116:21	attempt 42:12	67:19 86:13 87:19
160:21	applied 9:14	articles 149:1,4	attempting 51:15	118:20 121:20
analysis 10:11	applies 40:10 136:8	160:9	attention 63:24 64:8	122:11,17 128:23
Analyst 62:3	apply 7:16 9:15 10:9	ascertain 111:14,24	65:25 84:10	137:16 140:8
analyze 27:3	11:9,11 40:7 83:3	111:25 112:6	attentiveness 31:18	background 7:5
analyzed 7:1	133:13,14 135:11	aside 129:11	attorney 46:4	11:8 128:14
analyzing 58:17	appreciate 49:20,24	asked 26:3 27:10	attractive 34:6	bad 99:23 156:23
Android 65:1 67:19	111:1 114:2	33:4,7,23,23 61:1	attribute 151:14	balance 40:2
67:21,25 68:4	118:16 124:12	62:10 66:15,20,23	audience 35:11 73:5	ball 128:11
anecdotally 111:4	141:8,8,14 148:23	80:14 117:22	90:9 107:9,10	Ballmer 99:2
Angeles 140:10	150:25 155:5	129:25 130:22	118:8,17 120:16	Band 118:19,25,25
announced 14:4	appreciation 42:18	129:25 150:22	audio 63:25 83:19	123:2 156:7,8,8
answer 30:19,19	approach 91:13	asking 33:12 68:4	84:23	bankrupt 122:22
35:13 59:22 65:17	98:10 102:8 108:2	130:2 141:6	audiovisual 128:18	barely 72:5 74:23,23
65:23 67:6,11,12	108:5 164:10	159:22	author 8:7,8	bargain 113:6
113:21 141:1	approaches 99:25	aspect 108:13 147:6	author's 8:11	bargained 41:24
153:8	103:2	aspects 4:22 90:6	authority 8:15	Barnes 10:24 35:23
answered 30:16	approaching 115:13	105:12	105:20 126:2	41:6,7 152:24
113:14	appropriate 16:8	assent 72:9 75:15,17	authorize 37:18	164:21
answering 154:10	49:9 103:22 147:1	77:5 105:2	122:13	barrier 145:22
answers 30:21	approximated 24:5	asserting 89:14	authors 42:1,3,11	barriers 144:13
158:25 159:12	approximates 57:17	assertions 15:7	45:7	barring 15:9
anticipate 158:25	apps 9:10 67:20,23	assessment 22:9	authorship 9:5 12:1	base 44:19
161:25	68:1,5,6,8,11,15	83:23	automate 161:24	Baseball's 86:18
anticipation 160:5	68:18	assigned 8:8	automated 161:20	based 13:15,17
antitrust 107:25	APRIL 1:13	assistance 46:14	automatic 94:11	14:15 16:1 30:9
108:5 161:21,23	Ard 93:10,11 114:2	68:4	available 11:24 14:1	42:25 64:13 90:7
antivirus 73:14	area 40:25 78:3	assistant 17:20	33:21 52:24 54:22	100:15 101:20
anybody 79:14	81:11 85:10,14	70:15	84:4 100:6,7	112:23 135:22
152:12	89:15 91:4 107:23	assistants 17:23	average 29:9 30:12	137:15
anyone's 143:13	113:15 134:4	70:1,4 87:22	31:5 33:10 73:7,8	baselines 94:18,23
150:5	138:16 140:1,11	associate 34:7	95:10	basic 81:1 82:18
anyway 161:2	153:21 155:2	associated 40:15	AVOD 48:13	83:3,14
app 65:1,3,7,8,13,20	156:14 161:10	42:7 48:7 66:12	avoid 81:9 88:16	basically 65:19
67:22,25 68:5,5,8	areas 40:24 62:5,9	71:3 82:10	aware 19:16 41:1	73:18 75:1,13,18
,				
	1	1	1	۱ <u>ــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــ</u>

				[168]
75:23,25 76:10	best 5:2,6 18:22	122:17	Brian 100:9,13	98:13,15,21 99:5
100:22 104:4,21	29:20 39:7 51:24	Bobbs-Merrill	103:8 111:16	busy 41:3
104:24 108:6	51:24 52:2 90:13	121:11	141:2	button 15:12 22:5
109:4,18 113:21	96:14	Boggs 80:2	Brian's 111:15	24:12,14,20 25:16
138:7 146:2	best- 102:25	boilerplate 87:15	brick-and-mortar	25:24 26:12 31:2,6
basics 80:16	best-selling 106:18	93:24 95:21	11:18 48:3	41:21 42:5,6,7,9
basis 20:3 23:21	better 7:12 30:23	book 7:15,18 8:17	Brief 6:5 89:23	50:16,17,25 56:4,5
32:25 43:5 51:7	31:1 46:5,5 65:21	9:8 10:15,16,18,19	briefly 26:10 45:21	56:13,16,17,18
138:2	69:13 101:25	10:20 11:2,6,21	111:10 114:1	57:20 60:11
battle 150:13	106:10 130:23	14:14 21:19 22:7	bring 93:20 139:3	123:15 140:23
Bay 140:11	133:11 154:6	24:6,12,13,16,24	bringing 114:3	162:2
bear 21:2 93:21	159:13,19 163:14	32:7,8 45:18 59:21	brings 16:10	buttons 160:8,12
164:16	betterment 89:7	99:18,18 103:13	broad 80:6 131:9	161:1,6
bears 54:15 61:12	beware 103:19	121:12 125:4,6,16	136:9 142:18	buy 2:7,7 8:17 10:15
began 105:25 110:4	beyond 28:3 126:6	126:3,7 144:21,22	144:19	15:12 19:15,16,17
beginning 3:21	129:18 134:3	145:18 155:15	broadcast 83:2	21:1,1 22:5 23:12
10:17,25 49:16	big 36:9 39:4 44:5	books 9:6 12:4	broader 161:9	24:12,15,16,19
72:1	55:16 67:15	21:23,24 23:15,24	broadly 22:20	25:16,23 26:5,12
behave 25:20 31:12	102:16 116:24	27:22 34:3 41:10	broken 102:5	27:16,20 28:5,25
91:3	117:7 118:20	44:9 106:17,22	111:16 112:16	30:24 31:2,6 40:13
behavior 32:23	119:1 122:19	107:2 125:3	141:3	40:16 41:21 42:5,7
64:14,15 67:19	123:21	126:12,13 128:17	Brothers 53:12	42:8 43:14 49:6,9
68:25 78:16,17	bigger 157:4	128:22 130:19	brought 16:11 85:15	49:10,11,13 50:16
103:23 148:7	Bill 99:3	bookshelf 10:21,22	bucked 121:17	50:17,24 56:4,15
161:8	billion 48:17 55:3,4	bookstore 8:17	bucks 58:8 144:3	56:17,18,21 57:13
behind-the-scenes	55:5,6 100:24	10:15,21 11:23	budget 69:12 153:17	57:20 58:20,21,22
164:22	billions 55:25 59:12	152:5	Buenos 70:24	58:25 59:19 60:11
beliefs 31:8	binary 92:17	borrow 78:4 144:22	build 47:7	60:20,20,25 67:4
believe 13:16 19:17	bit 6:12 24:17 25:11	borrowed 56:24	built 61:6 87:23	82:8 87:13 92:16
26:4,14,23 30:6	35:9,19 40:2 46:14	bother 75:20	bump 105:4	119:2,4,7,8,8,8,22
41:23 50:23 51:23	59:14 62:11,14	bothering 104:8	bumped 103:21	123:6,10,13,15
52:5,5,6 61:1 64:5	71:14,20 72:3 74:5	bothers 74:22 76:22	bumps 104:12	124:4,5,9 133:23
123:5 136:22	90:21 92:18	bots 161:21	bunch 58:9 59:11	137:17,18,19
137:24 138:12	100:10 103:14	bottom 25:2 75:2	65:11 68:1,6 132:2	138:2 140:23
144:14 146:13	104:2 106:17	77:4	bundle 156:4	144:24 146:1
147:20 148:11	128:6 131:12	bought 37:21 38:7	buried 95:21	156:15,16 159:8
158:20	133:7,19 139:8	44:3 58:7 59:21	business 7:22 14:11	160:8,12 161:1,6
believes 52:1	140:18 141:5	68:3 88:7	15:4 17:2 37:17,22	buy-button 49:4
Ben 35:25 52:8	142:15 143:8	boundaries 93:19	38:4 47:22 48:10	buyer 103:18
106:15 119:2	149:10,18,20	box 72:10 92:18	48:17,21,24 49:1	buyers 55:15 73:1
122:25 123:1	150:6 151:20	brain 63:18	49:19 52:16,17	buying 19:22 37:5
141:22 Barr's 107:5 118:20	bits 10:7	brainstorm 112:13	80:7 117:3,5	37:15 38:2 43:7
Ben's 107:5 118:20	Bixby 46:17	brand 68:20,21,22	130:25 144:3	49:13,15 50:2
beneficial 74:4 benefit 4:10 81:9	Blu-ray 54:19 blue 66:3	144:21 broach 04:1 2	business-to-117:2	55:24 61:5 114:15 114:15 118:21
benefits 14:1 42:4	blur 151:14	breach 94:1,2 116:17 122:19	business-to-consu 116:25	
49:24 50:3 163:25	BMG 85:15 86:10	133:8 134:1	businesses 101:7	119:11,18,24 120:2,4,7 123:17
Bergmayer 35:22	boards 60:3	break 89:21 153:25	107:12 117:14	120:2,4,7 123:17 124:10,11 131:22
36:6 97:22 155:8,8	Bob 96:7 100:8	breaking 145:21	businesspeople	132:25 135:13,16
50.0 71.22 155.0,0	DUD 70.7 100.0	DICARING 14J.21	susmesspeople	152.25 155.15,10
	I		Ι	l

|--|

Carson 3.11 0.3,0	CEO 47:20	chimed 45:25	162:2	commentary 100:6
Carson 5 :11 6:3,6	century 49:16	105:25	26:5 76:3 79:17	151:8 162:7 163:2
cars 55:12 145:3	centuries 103:20	children's 105:22	clicking 15:12 25:6	120:19 121:2,2
carrying 51:22	Center 123:25 124:1	109:25 110:12	67:1	comment 55:20
carry 44:10 146:15	85:22 Contar 122:25 124:1	Chief 3:5 62:23	clicked 25:5,7 66:21	161:21
carries 58:25	CDs 9:6 12:5 85:16	161:3,5	click-stream 73:17	122:6,8,17 134:6
Carnegie-Mellon 62:19	145:16	checkout 76:24	76:9,20,22,22 96:2	55:13 56:8,9 62:4
carefully 73:20	CD 43:21 59:21 86:2	check 27:13 57:14	74:16,18 75:12,18	coming 36:9 51:18
careful 46:5 158:16	CCIA 153:15	cheaper 24:25 44:6	72:10 73:16,25	138:14
	103:18 131:7	cheap 159:16	click 12:12 22:5	comfortable 137:22
care 116:12,15,16 116:17	caveat 52:19 72:6	chat 120:17	154:18,19	158:23
cards 77:23 109:7	causing 102:21,22	charts 128:17	111:7 119:13	131:21 157:17
	causes 113:22	chart 30:10 154:13	90:22 101:22	81:19 94:15
109:12,15,24 110:17	caused 101:19 129:8	Charlie 164:25	86:11 89:15 90:14	comes 21:22,24 27:6
,	cause 81:7 112:3	charges 88:13	73:9 74:20 83:12	154:4
card 77:4,21 109:9	causation 157:24	charge 8:18 109:23	clearly 27:11 61:21	135:15,20 137:9
156:16	Catie 127:8	characters 137:10	clearer 164:4	130:20 134:2,19
137:18,19,20	156:13	characterized 160:7	164:8	102:21 126:22
129:23 134:17,19	Catherine 139:2,6	74:11	158:3 163:19	38:18 86:6 94:10
capturing 32:14 car 120:4,4,5,7	131:11 138:3	characteristics	140:20,24 147:13	25:10 35:2,6,12
capturing 32:14	29:25 130:3	72:5 80:20 87:3	119:17 121:7	17:11,14 24:17
Capris 164:21 captures 73:18	category 29:22,24	changes 28:3 38:3	102:22 115:2,4	come 14:17 15:2,3
	29:23 134:12,15	141:10	84:9 88:1,15	58:177:16
126:6	categories 23:22,23	128:19 136:1	25:12 41:20 46:18	colloquial 57:20
capacities 125:13	catalogs 53:15	95:24 114:17	clear 17:3 23:4	collect 110:15,16
capable 149:8	cataloged 45:5	47:11 67:9 85:21	clauses 38:11 60:23	coining 96:15
capability 114:19	0	8		
capabilities 160:14	catalog 44:1 53:14	changed 43:23	class 89:13	coherence 139:4,5
candidates 112:15	casual 58:6	138:14	19:10 163:25	64:17
candidate 93:11	cast 137:9	67:19 80:21	clarity 15:22 16:4	cognitive 63:16
154:2 164:1	110:16	change 64:14,15	clarify 119:21	codified 8:12
146:15 149:25	cash 109:7,11,16,22	chance 35:12 152:19	clarification 151:12	coauthors 72:20
61:21 75:16 146:1	135:24 136:8	challenged 88:10	claims 82:6 158:6,17	coauthor 19:13
31:25 34:9 50:7	117:2,3,13 134:20	150:5	claiming 37:12	co-director 62:21
can't 10:10 22:25	85:13 87:20 99:24	challenge 87:9	158:21	cloud-based 124:5
campuses 149:5	cases 32:9 68:16	CFPB 78:5	82:16,16,18 84:21	cloud 50:9,10
160:17,24	151:11 156:20	cetera 53:1,7,12	claim 23:2,6 57:24	clothing 145:3
calling 88:14 160:12	135:18 136:15,17	155:4,5,25	cited 50:16	86:17 87:1,8 163:1
129:11 134:21	124:23 125:3	153:11 154:15	81:17 164:12	closing 2:21 59:5
109:2,5 116:21	117:1 121:12	148:21 150:1,12	circumstances	closer 96:4
38:10 57:11 84:15	98:5 101:16 109:3	147:12,24 148:11	Circuit 109:17	closely 25:1
called 12:9 23:10	44:21 68:19 97:8	142:24 143:2	CinemaNow 49:17	closed 86:20
57:4 72:23	37:20 39:20 40:13	119:22 141:8	28:11	60:13 84:21
call 10:2,2 27:9 44:1	case 19:1 27:7 29:19	certainly 7:6 84:3	Chris 21:8 22:10	close 14:13 27:9
C	carts 57:12	136:8 161:25	choose 64:15 97:19	clock 60:15
-	cart 57:11,14 160:24	129:16 134:12	choices 22:17	clients 80:4,7
bytes 10:7	164:24	107:17 124:11	146:2	clickwraps 76:19
buys 50:4	61:14,17,20	94:9 95:13 105:12	54:17 92:17 119:7	clickwrap 133:9
156:18	34:18 35:2 41:2 47:17 52:7 60:14	certain 9:14 42:9 72:7 86:8 88:18	choice 13:25 24:1 26:9,22 31:20	76:8
155:13,18,20,21				clicks 75:3,8 76:2,4

				[170]
commentators	compact 32:13	106:4	conduct 110:3,5,9	84:9 88:15 121:7
99:19	compact 32.15 companies 37:15	complying 80:8	conducted 5:4 128:5	140:24
commenters 19:24	38:13 43:4 46:16	component 39:4	conducting 124:7	constantly 73:10
commenting 99:21	48:7 73:12,19 80:5	78:17 102:16	conference 7:5	constituents 126:13
99:22	100:17 150:17	components 39:8	128:8	160:16
comments 21:10	153:4,5 159:18	comprehend 64:21	confess 145:20	constitute 108:14
114:3 115:24	company 8:9 37:11	67:16 85:1	confidence 4:14	constitutional
116:14 118:20	37:14,17,21 38:2,3	comprehensible	30:21 118:5	144:19
124:13 139:17	38:5,17,20,20	85:5 106:3	configure 67:10	construct 61:7
158:16	70:14 76:1 81:12	comprehension 66:3	confront 115:19	constructive 102:4
commerce 1:5 17:4	87:2 88:5	69:17 79:10,19	confuse 52:6	construe 137:24
17:8 71:1 81:3	compare 28:25	85:8	confused 50:24	construed 109:17
103:20 144:16	compared 54:24	computer 18:9 57:5	54:15 92:6,12,20	consultations 3:25
147:14,20 149:17	55:4,6 59:15	58:10 62:18 86:25	confusing 50:17	4:6
Commerce's 3:11	126:17	computer-readable	51:1 114:8	consume 16:23
6:8	comparing 27:20	69:20,25 70:18	confusion 30:14	43:12
commercial 11:16	compensation 8:21	conceivably 119:8	41:22 45:7 114:4,4	consumer 1:7 2:13
17:7 108:14,17	competing 107:8	concentrated 73:15	132:25	2:15,18 4:22 5:5
commission 17:14	competition 89:3	concept 36:16,22	Congress 105:20	6:20 14:9,15 15:11
62:24 80:17,24	107:6 112:20	38:10	146:23	16:12 18:8,11
81:12 87:9 88:4	113:4,5,12,20,23	concern 95:15 98:2	conjunction 88:3	22:14,21 23:7 28:1
105:21 106:6	competitive 73:15	133:2 134:10,15	connected 124:21	32:23 36:7 37:4
124:23 153:17	103:24 104:1,3	135:2 141:15,15	connecting 41:12	38:4,15,24 40:5,7
commitment 63:1	107:22 112:19,20	143:14	connection 1:7 6:22	40:9 41:22 43:3
committed 79:8	competitors 87:22	concerned 142:2	52:3 108:18	44:14 45:6 49:10
common 78:9 124:9	complain 59:25 60:6	146:16 152:10	conscionability	51:11,16,17,17,21
132:20	complained 44:22	concerns 4:6 107:16	104:24	52:3 53:3 62:6,11
commonalities	60:5	124:24 132:24	consensus 12:16	70:25 71:7,8,10
131:18	complaining 60:5	140:7	102:6 126:22	79:11 80:11 81:8,8
commonplace 17:17	complaint 85:25	concessions 42:14	139:4 140:14,19	82:23 83:15,25
communicate 5:1	complaints 59:17	conclude 5:8 30:2	141:5 142:25	84:17 86:1 87:4,17
15:23 17:12 18:22	complete 126:1	79:13	consent 12:13 86:10	88:2,20,25 89:7,10
39:15 61:8 90:11	completely 68:20	concluded 4:9 7:1	86:16 88:5,10	90:6 91:2 95:10
110:18	102:10 124:8	16:2 110:1	133:8	100:5 101:12
communicated	completion 31:17	conclusion 16:2	conservative 33:4	105:15,21 106:6
83:19 90:15,22	complex 27:24	19:8,9 27:24 57:24	consider 24:7 33:21	113:18 117:6,9,15
111:8 163:24	45:11 57:23 97:13	110:4,19 139:4	43:3 54:8 77:2	121:9 122:15,19
communicating	108:11 154:21,21	conclusions 6:17	91:21	124:21,25 126:10
2:16 51:13 78:15	complexity 108:11	10:14 21:12 41:19	considerable 34:5	126:20,25 128:1,4
90:1	120:13 124:20	42:25	consideration	128:10 130:5
communication	151:20 152:7	condition 24:19	154:12	132:24 135:6
17:3 62:14 98:22	complicated 11:5	30:13	considerations	141:25 142:2,8,9
99:6 110:21	105:17 106:17	conditional 23:6	18:11	142:17,25 143:1
communications	107:4 108:24	conditions 7:23	considered 81:16	143:10 146:11
2:13 71:10 80:5	114:8 149:24	11:14 13:7,10,15	133:25	147:8,15 148:15
communities 105:12	157:10	15:8 18:15 29:1	considering 147:6	150:7 151:4 155:3
community 126:11	complications 11:7	87:16 90:11	consistency 104:19	156:12,14 158:7
148:17 149:6	complied 79:2	103:25 105:16	consistent 120:25	163:6,9,15
150:8 153:2	comply 78:23,24	107:1,16 133:8	conspicuous 25:12	consumer-facing

4/18/2017 [171]

				[171]
151:23 152:9	148:4,5 150:1,23	71:17 73:4,9 74:19	8:14,16,24,25 9:2	copyright-related
consumer's 51:3	154:6 157:19	75:16 76:3 92:23	9:18,21,23 10:4,8	114:10
82:2 83:16,21 86:9	158:20,20 159:4	94:3 104:22,25	10:20,23 11:2,4,6	copyright's 130:11
86:15 106:12	160:19,25 161:8	113:22 114:4	11:15,20 12:5,7,25	copyrightable 125:6
consumers 2:17 4:7	162:1 164:1	133:4,5,8,10,13,22	13:2 14:15,16,16	128:9
4:10 5:1 6:21 7:12	consummates 15:11	134:1	15:3 22:6 31:6	copyrighted 1:9
11:25 13:9,16,24	contacting 165:3	contracts 70:25	36:16,20,22,23,23	6:23 10:1 16:14,18
15:9,10,15,19,21	contained 85:17	73:25 74:3 75:7	50:6,8 58:19	17:6 41:13 52:4
16:3,15 17:4,12,17	container 125:7,11	79:15 91:3 104:22	114:16 117:15,16	54:18 101:23
17:22,25 18:1,15	contemplated	104:23	117:24,25 118:3	104:18,19 126:24
18:22 19:10,17,20	129:19	contractual 78:20	122:15 125:16,23	127:4 128:20
21:18,20,21 22:4,9	content 4:12 16:23	78:25 79:11 93:24	125:25 126:18	129:16 130:8
22:11,16,22 23:2,8	22:7 41:10,23 42:2	105:1	144:5,8,12,21	129.10 130.8
23:11,22 24:1	42:9,15 43:13,17	contradictions	144.5,8,12,21 145:13,14,18,24	copyrights 10:1
25:12,17,20,22	44:5,24 47:10	41:20	copying 94:9	58:23 102:24
	48:11,12 49:9,21		copyright 2:5,16	corner 66:5,6 98:5
26:11,13,18 29:18	48:11,12 49:9,21 49:22,24,25 50:2	contradictory 42:6 contribute 17:7		-
31:8,11 33:15 34:5	<i>, ,</i>		3:18,19 4:2 5:3,12	corporate 98:22
34:13,16 37:2,13	50:11,14,19 51:5,6	42:13 139:25	6:1,15 7:21,24,24	Corporation 88:9
38:14,23 39:6,9,15	51:7,21 120:22	165:7	8:6,8,13,15,20,22	correct 30:19,21
39:23 40:1,12,16	124:4 129:16	control 135:16,19	9:1,3,11,11,12,24	67:6,11,12 92:25
42:3,19 43:6 44:4	137:6 141:21	150:3	11:9 13:6,8,11,13	111:20
44:7,15,20 47:10	148:17 149:23	controls 110:5	13:13,18,20 14:8	correctly 65:17,23
49:10,15,18,20	150:2,8,17,25	controversial 157:5	18:6,16 27:12	correspond 73:17
50:1,24 51:14,14	151:19 152:4	convene 140:6	36:15,24 40:4,7	73:24
54:15,17 55:2,7	154:20,25	Convenience 43:13	45:12 53:25 54:5	Cortana 46:17
60:25 75:25 78:15	content- 86:14	conversation 16:21	58:20,21 90:1,14	cost 58:22 122:21
78:22 79:7 81:10	content-protective	34:14 58:7 96:19	93:17,21 94:5,23	155:14
81:16 82:13,15	85:17 86:2	99:16 148:20	96:23 101:20	costly 79:18
84:10 85:16 86:4	context 5:7 6:24 7:6	151:3,16 153:19	102:15,22 104:13	costs 83:24
87:10 88:7,12,23	43:25 69:17 79:8	153:24 158:18,23	104:15,20 105:8	couldn't 121:19
89:6 90:2,12,20	84:3 87:10 91:17	159:23 163:21	105:10,13 114:5,9	150:1 154:16
91:3,16,20 92:2,5	106:5 118:19	164:9 165:5	121:21,22 122:3,4	Counsel 5:12 41:8
92:6,12,15,19,22	119:1,4,9 120:10	conversations 78:3	122:5,8,9,14,22	100:14 103:11
92:25 94:19,22	126:23 133:18	96:17	123:21 124:2	counterintuitively
95:2 96:6 97:2	137:13 139:11	converted 115:11	125:5,8 127:9	32:9
100:4,11 101:19	146:18 159:1	convey 115:20	128:5,15,16 129:8	country 23:20
102:15,18,20	161:7,10 163:7	conveyed 115:3	129:10,11,17,25	140:15
104:6 106:10	164:13	convince 108:19	130:4,16,21,24	couple 22:14 37:10
108:19 111:6,12	contexts 15:14 77:6	convinced 47:10,11	131:3,4,9 132:5,23	41:15 87:19 96:14
111:22 112:3,21	82:25 84:24 112:8	101:16	133:4,18 134:1,5,8	100:25 115:23
112:22 113:2,7,13	139:11 153:23,25	copies 4:8 7:13 8:3	135:19 136:3	121:20 140:11
114:15,17 115:18	154:7 163:6	8:10 9:6,13 12:2,4	137:8,21 139:6,7	157:25 161:19
116:9,10,15	continue 37:24	13:1,23 15:1,9,20	143:1,11,22	course 4:5 13:5
117:10,21,23	88:20 103:2	15:25 16:5,16	144:18,19 145:25	27:23 35:12 54:25
118:5 124:3	142:14,18 149:16	19:12,21 21:17	146:18 148:3	69:23 80:24 89:11
130:17 132:7	continued 103:4	27:11 34:2 94:21	149:3 151:18	108:20 117:10
135:24 140:20	continues 17:1	114:16,17,19	152:8 157:25	121:11,20 154:13
142:11,19 143:5	continuing 154:19	121:17	164:2	court 109:1,18
144:14 147:8	contract 13:17 71:3	copy 4:13 7:18,20	copyright- 90:10,21	110:1,4,11 121:11

4/18/2017 [172]

				[172]
courts 79:18 98:7,9	44:17 52:18 56:1	50:24 56:11	101:12	developed 61:4 65:3
104:21	107:17 108:19	deceiving 40:1	demonstrates 50:23	65:4 67:20,25
covenants 133:8	109:6	December 134:9	denied 26:15	102:24
cover 4:3 53:14	customized 160:15	deception 27:8	denies 122:5	developers 100:17
90:10	cut 143:22	81:19 82:24 88:16	dense 71:18 73:9	102:20
covered 51:10,11	cutting 17:16	deceptive 50:17	Department 1:5	development 100:17
covering 53:15	cyber 163:7,10	51:1 81:2,15,16	3:11 6:8 147:14,20	develops 45:14
cowrote 21:8	CyLab 62:20	82:4,17 84:7 88:11	149:17	device 10:6 26:9,21
crafting 165:3		108:22	Department's	31:19 44:12 85:23
Cranor 62:17 63:5	D	decide 39:5 57:13	107:25	86:3 88:4,8 145:12
115:5	D 2:1	108:16 111:17	departments 91:9	devices 5:5 13:2
Cranor's 148:2	damage 101:19	116:8,9	depend 65:2 145:2	15:4,5 21:18 37:16
create 41:13 45:22	damages 6:9 93:21	decided 67:24 138:8	depending 15:3	37:18 85:18 86:2
99:16 101:7	122:20,21	decision 25:20 81:11	43:15 45:11 77:15	129:7 157:18
114:19 126:10	danger 144:20	81:18,22 83:12	152:4 158:12	160:25 161:24
136:14 144:13	data 21:13 25:15	109:1 117:6,8	depends 65:25	163:11
created 23:9,12	32:14 46:6 61:11	decisions 22:22	83:12 119:3	devise 95:16
100:24	73:17 156:1 158:9	32:24 64:13	describe 39:5 54:11	dialogues 103:3
creates 11:4	158:23 159:13,17	decrease 17:23	54:14 60:24 123:7	dichotomy 132:10
creating 101:2	164:11	27:19 47:4	125:5	136:10
114:17	David 5:11 21:7	dedicate 97:16	described 13:22	dictionary 49:5
creation 3:16	41:7 45:23 46:21	dedicated 47:7	88:22	didn't 29:7 31:15
creative 7:13 130:24	50:1 52:10 164:24	100:2	describing 109:19	32:4 33:5,13 39:24
creativity 3:20	David's 46:13	deemed 81:7 82:12	123:7	44:2 58:21 60:11
creature 126:16	day 17:18 120:6	84:7	description 109:20	66:8 95:21 108:7
credit 77:4 109:7,9	139:5 164:20	Deere 158:1	descriptively 30:6	117:1 121:23
109:12,15,24	days 47:9 119:15	defender 56:16	design 21:12 28:12	123:3 125:14
110:16	122:11	define 102:5 131:13	39:4 62:13 109:2	132:25 133:1
critical 72:24 82:1,7	DC-based 36:7	137:2	designed 23:16	134:10 135:2
83:22 84:6,12 85:6	deal 29:11 79:8	defined 36:20 38:11	25:10 54:1 67:21	136:24 138:4,11
86:4 102:17	82:22,25 91:9	defines 113:19	68:18 111:18	146:7 148:21
153:19 156:11	134:22 142:4	definitely 47:15	127:3	160:4
164:18	dealers 48:6	definition 49:6	designers 28:11	diesel 22:25
critiques 147:24	dealing 83:9 93:16	81:18 131:15,17	designing 2:11	dieting 68:5
148:1,2	93:23 96:22	definitive 159:25	54:10 63:4	differ 11:17 18:17
critiquing 99:25	130:13 143:22	degree 94:12 160:21	designs 54:3,3	83:17
crux 88:24	deals 44:7 114:10,12	delayed 71:4	desirable 52:6	difference 30:25
crystal 147:13	debate 7:7 133:22	deleted 21:17	desire 34:12	32:4 50:21 55:17
163:19	148:25	delighted 80:12,18	desktop 57:7	67:15 95:23
culturally 98:6	debates 105:10	delivered 4:9	despite 68:23 108:7	109:21 118:20
curious 125:18	Deborah 80:1,1,7	delivery 144:7	detail 95:6	119:1 120:3,11
current 24:22 54:14	89:19	demand 48:13,14,23	detailed 12:23 73:22	122:19 148:7,8
55:8 71:8 138:9	decade 23:1 46:18	49:11 62:25	details 25:11	157:4
currently 33:8 37:7	71:16 73:9 99:1	demands 14:9	determine 4:17	differences 7:20
47:23 71:6	decades 96:14	Democracy 123:25	90:10,19 100:11	24:23
curve 156:21 157:6	117:23 118:3	124:1	111:5	different 4:22 6:4
customer 109:11,23	161:19	demographic 73:23	determined 125:21	7:22 11:10,19
122:10	deceive 51:16	demographics 29:21	131:14 135:23	13:14,14,24 14:18
customers 12:19	deceived 44:16	demonstrated	develop 51:16 61:9	23:22,24 24:2,11

4/18/2017 [173]

29:22 38:17 39:1	85:14 86:20,21,24	78:18 79:4,13	137:7	69:23 72:8 86:22
45:13,16,18 50:3,3	87:4,10,21 90:1	80:21,25 82:18,20	distributed 9:1,5,7	94:24 97:8,23 99:8
53:15,15 61:7,8	107:2,19 114:16	83:5,6,8,14 84:9	distribution 4:3 8:8	99:14 101:8,13
62:12 65:4,6,11	143:3 144:7 159:8	84:14,16,23 85:2,7	8:23 9:1,22 10:3	102:2,2,3,3,10
66:17 67:9 68:6,18	DiMA 41:8 52:13	85:12 90:6 91:1,10	11:10,12,17 13:23	102:2,2,3,5,10
68:24 69:6 73:13	direct 52:17,21 53:2	95:16 121:6	32:20 132:22	111:14 116:8
75:1 78:7,14 81:5	direction 158:5	125:20	154:20 155:1	119:18 138:15
82:25 83:4 89:5	directions 86:13	discount 109:11,22	distributors 41:9	143:15,21 144:12
90:5,16 93:3,15	149:22	155:17	106:23,25 108:1,3	146:15 147:7,24
94:4 105:10	directly 52:22	discover 70:5	disturbing 146:8	150:4,23 151:22
106:24 107:13,16	106:19	discovered 125:12	disturbingly 34:8	153:17 154:8,17
119:5 125:11,19	director 3:6 62:19	discuss 4:16 36:11	diverse 80:4	155:6 156:16
126:10,16,23,24	70:23	40:4 90:13 115:6	Division 107:25	158:25 159:10,24
126:24 128:6,10	disabuse 123:9	discussed 6:15 37:3	divisions 48:5	162:2
120:24 128:0,10	disagree 20:2	128:11 137:17	DMCA 129:20	dot-com 78:4 82:20
131:4 132:2	disagreed 15:13	discussing 17:9	doctrine 4:2 6:11,16	83:5 84:8 88:17
135:10 137:9	66:24	46:20 87:14	7:2,3,6,8 8:1,12,25	double-digit 49:2
139:9 142:2 145:9	disappears 9:2	110:25 141:24,24	9:17 10:9 19:4,6	double-digit 49.2 doubt 128:23
159.9 142.2 145.9	disappointed 94:10	160:20	135:23 141:24	download 9:21
153:23 154:1	disclose 38:14 39:6	discussion 2:9,16,20	135.25 141.24 144:6	10:23 16:5 19:12
158:11,13 164:13	85:24 86:1,11 91:7	5:9 6:11,19,24	doctrines 40:6,21	34:10 65:8,13
differential 109:5	91:15 92:4,18	20:3 35:1,10 47:16	doesn't 10:5,24 15:2	86:20 95:12
differentiation	94:17 113:16,17	54:7 62:10 80:13	38:17 55:14 59:3	142:19
132:21	disclosed 89:2 91:11		72:11 91:6,6 94:9	downloaded 36:22
		90:1,5,8 99:14 111:6 118:9 129:8	,	
differently 11:20	91:14,25 93:2		100:4 108:20,21	85:19 86:1,8,25
25:20 31:12 32:24 131:5	95:22 111:25 112:13	133:6 137:15	113:22 118:2 147:14	87:1 142:1 143:16 145:14
differs 21:22 45:11	disclosing 87:3 91:5	139:1,13,18 140:13		
difficult 36:25 97:13	161:17	discussions 4:24	doggedly 141:17 doing 5:5 7:11 8:21	downloading 9:8,9,9 107:3,20 154:24
	disclosure 2:11 37:4		8	
131:12 133:12,16		125:17 disk 32:13	56:8 60:12 63:10	downloads 40:23 downstream 144:17
146:22 164:9	39:18,19 40:9		67:14 91:17 97:16	
digital 2:5,12,17	63:22,23 64:12,18	disks 54:19	109:9 113:14	draft 97:7,9
3:20 4:4 6:1 7:8	64:21,24 69:18,23	Disney 53:11	130:9 153:3,13	drafting 97:4 draw 41:18 84:10
9:7,10,15,19 11:4	70:6,7,9,10 71:4	dispose 8:16	160:14	96:9
11:10,16,17 14:10 14:16 15:24 16:18	72:5,7,8 75:4,5 76:3,6 77:10 78:4	disposed 114:5	dollar 33:2,10,17	
		disposition 134:11	121:13 144:2	drawn 78:22 drew 21:13
17:1 19:18,19	79:15,20 80:11	dispositional 126:1	145:6 157:1 dollars 56:6 58:22	drive 43:15 120:8
21:21 23:15 24:12	82:1,3 84:8,22	disputed 12:20	dollars 56:6 58:22	
24:13,23,24 25:18	85:1 87:17 88:1,12 88:16,17 91:1	disrupt 47:13 dissemination 89:4	domain 69:10 dominant 141:12	144:10 145:16,17 145:23
26:12,16,23 29:2	,	144:20		
32:8,10 34:1,17	111:18 112:8,15 161:18 162:3,4	distilled 95:19	don't 3:5 7:15 9:15	driving 120:8 DRM 94:8
35:23 36:8,10,16	<i>,</i>		11:5 12:18,20	
36:21 38:17 40:10	disclosures 2:15	distinct 36:17	16:19 18:4 22:17	DRM-free 38:6
41:8,10,23 42:9,15	18:9 62:12,13,15	107:12	30:17,18 33:14	drop 27:22 29:2
43:23 44:5,18 48:3	63:4,6,8,9,13,17	distinction 161:17	39:21 44:25 45:8	drops 29:3,16
48:9,11,15,16	67:18 69:3,3,6,11	distinguishable	46:23,23 47:5	drug 69:5
49:15,16,18,20,24	69:21,24,25 70:18	76:11	49:22 51:15 52:5,5	due 7:21,21 51:7
50:6,8,25 62:13	72:14,15 75:2 77:8	distinguished 109:4	52:17 54:9,9 60:3	140:22
63:4 70:1 84:3	77:12 78:6,8,10,14	distribute 8:3,10	60:23,25 61:10	DULANY 1:17
				<u> </u>

				[174]
duty 79:12	100:24 163:14	empirical 71:6,22	enjoy 43:12	et 53:1,7,12
DVD 43:21 50:4,12	edge 17:16 39:20	158:17 159:15	ensure 24:3,3 88:21	EULA 12:10,17,24
50:13 59:21	educate 118:4	empirically 79:22	90:13 101:11	39:8,10,18,25
121:25 122:12	education 23:20	112:10	111:7	40:16 46:22 73:7
143:24	37:4 38:25 102:15	emptor 103:18	ensures 89:3	73:17 74:16,18
DVDs 9:6 12:5	103:5 142:25	enable 130:24	ensuring 87:9 90:21	76:8,14,24 87:16
54:19 121:23	educational 107:13	enabled 2:18 128:1	enter 11:23 15:24	99:1,3 121:10,22
143:25	107:14 143:5	128:4 131:1,5	16:4 19:11 45:16	121:22 161:17
dwindling 145:4	effect 29:17 77:15	132:18 156:14	entering 75:19 77:2	EULAs 12:22 13:7
dynamic 47:11	effective 63:11,14	157:18	entertaining 98:23	15:8 17:21 40:8
138:7	69:12 72:16 79:14	enacted 105:20	entertainment	45:24,25 73:3,24
	83:8 84:16 102:13	109:4	35:24 47:21,22,25	76:1,9,21 77:10
E	effectively 78:15	encounter 66:1	48:4,16	104:6 140:23
E 2:1	90:15,23 99:6	encountered 30:13	enthusiasm 17:22	Europe 17:11
e- 27:21	effectiveness 71:4,8	115:11	entire 29:10 53:14	European 17:13
e-book 7:16,18,19	72:16 79:20	encountering 64:18	116:1	evaluate 62:13
10:23 11:19 23:25	effects 40:24 72:13	encourage 159:13	entirely 29:19 45:13	130:23
24:9 26:6 31:23	78:20 79:9	encouraging 77:21	entitled 8:14,21	evaluated 75:6 90:7
119:6 126:6	effort 130:23	145:7	15:22 19:15 27:12	evaluates 81:23
145:12 155:18	efforts 131:3 143:3	end- 5:6	33:8 123:18	Evaluating 2:11
156:24	147:18	end-user 12:9 71:16	entitlements 155:21	63:4
e-books 28:6 29:1	eggs 151:7	99:7 116:23 117:2	entitles 123:18	evaluation 63:10,15
29:14 125:10,13	Eigen 91:18	117:24	entity 8:7	event 21:7 53:22
125:21 126:12,15	either 23:15 37:18	ended 108:6	entwined 133:11	59:13 101:10
145:9,17	45:9 76:20 86:12	endorsement 116:14	enumerate 120:24	123:23
e-commerce 80:9	102:11 113:1	endorsements 85:12	environment 7:9	eventually 53:6
93:25	120:16	ends 10:21	9:16 44:11 45:11	143:23
eager 160:16 earlier 55:5 60:22	elaborate 93:5	energize 99:16	46:4 90:12 131:1	everybody 47:8
	electronic 48:10,22	116:3	146:22	123:9
69:21 101:10,17 118:21 130:15	70:18 71:1 118:2	enforce 79:18 88:20	eons 145:15	everyday 130:3,5
135:13 139:17	electronically 70:2	146:21,23	episodes 55:4	131:11,13,20
151:16 155:7	electronics 145:10	enforceable 79:16	equally 42:20	132:7,12 133:14
157:22	145:22	98:4,10	equation 162:2	134:3 135:4,12
early 114:10	elements 81:24 105:1	enforced 94:7 enforcement 89:3	equivalent 145:23 escape 75:16 121:8	137:2 138:2,4 everyone's 57:1
easier 38:14,24	elicit 91:10 92:11	93:16 94:11	121:19	129:22
117:12 120:23	eligible 9:11	enforcer 80:25	especially 15:11	evidence 12:19
easily 45:4	else's 64:8	enforcing 98:7	49:8 79:4 107:19	15:18 23:2 27:8
easy 12:24 84:19,20	EMA 52:1,13	162:6	117:6 119:22	71:21 72:9 77:9,21
126:21 129:2	email 56:25 57:4	engage 16:17 108:22	156:13	138:9 150:20,22
echo 156:9 157:14	87:25	115:21 127:2	essentially 30:9 35:7	evolve 17:1
economic 3:16	embedded 5:4 36:18	144:16	104:8 108:2	evolved 141:11
13:17 100:19	40:5,8 134:18	engaged 24:3 48:9	123:17	evolving 13:22
155:12,24	135:4,24	engaging 98:13,20	establish 17:4 52:2	73:10
economics 71:1	embodied 125:7,12	147:10	established 9:3 51:5	exact 59:20 65:24
72:23	125:16,23	engineering 62:18	establishing 5:6	125:15 126:19
economy 3:20	emergency 77:23	62:21 136:16	estate 54:8	exactly 22:11 53:23
115:14	emerging 40:25	enhance 105:20	estimate 115:12	58:18 68:7 88:24
ecosystem 41:12	emissions 55:13	enhancing 4:15	estimates 115:10	92:9 107:23
			1	1

4/18/2017 [175]

109:21 119:13,17	126:10,21 127:1	Expressions 109:2	faire 132:9 136:11	159:12 163:8
125:22	142:9 146:14	expressly 26:14	fairly 107:7 139:17	figures 54:22
examine 42:2	147:8 156:12	extended 4:3	faithful 145:25	figuring 75:20 154:6
examining 102:12	157:23 158:7	extensive 3:25	fall 136:23	file 11:20
example 9:8 14:2,21	expected 103:16	extensively 19:3	falls 15:16 106:12	files 57:7
14:24 15:4 16:25	115:19	extent 72:20 73:16	false 27:5,6 89:14	fill 152:12
17:11 21:20 22:3	expecting 22:18	73:25 78:14 92:15	falsifiable 27:25	filled 81:20
23:25 33:25 38:25	expects 125:1	94:19,25 104:17	familiar 3:12 56:24	final 37:22 40:3 45:2
41:19 43:7 53:9	experience 11:25	112:18 113:11,13	57:1,8,9,12 109:2	59:5 117:19
58:4 62:6 78:20,25	18:8 43:22 44:18	119:3 149:12	129:15 130:14	124:17
81:10 92:14,15	58:5 59:9 80:6	155:22 160:10	133:21	finally 5:8 18:13
119:7 124:19	90:7 98:14 160:21	external 42:13	family 15:6	25:21 47:1 52:8
136:13 148:24	experienced 49:2	extra-legal 147:11	fan 44:19	64:12 78:19 79:22
151:25 154:1	57:18	extraordinary 104:3	fans 41:12	95:19
159:4	experiences 12:3,4	105:13	far 31:3,7 52:11	finance 91:9
examples 56:25 63:9	82:23 95:10	extrapolate 58:6	101:9 108:12	financial 80:4 91:10
66:22 85:9 135:3	experiencing 101:14	95:9 138:4	128:7,8 129:18	find 20:6 53:20
157:22	experiment 59:6	extremely 76:12	146:16	65:17 70:15 76:7
exceeding 93:19	93:6	81:4	fascinating 80:20	76:17 82:5 84:20
exception 27:14	experimenting	eyes 149:2	134:7	91:16 104:3
53:20	46:16 78:6		fast 27:6 60:20	113:23 129:6
exceptions 38:19	experiments 52:20	F	139:17	137:3
68:17 130:12	77:22	Facebook 92:10	fast-changing	findings 25:14 71:21
132:8 136:9	expertise 62:9	160:10	164:12	72:19 74:12 75:1
exchange 13:25	experts 69:9	facilitate 17:4 140:6	favor 37:1 103:24	134:12 138:13
exclusive 7:25 8:3	explain 42:12,19	151:3	fed 62:9	finds 77:15
8:22 9:12,24	119:13 150:1	facility 164:20	federal 62:24 80:17	fine 60:19 71:5,15
130:11	152:10	fact 7:17 14:8 27:13	80:24 81:11 88:4	72:2,3,21 77:5
excuse 104:8 148:12	explained 39:9	40:11 44:15 49:20	124:23 149:2	88:12 112:24
executive 47:23,24	explaining 6:25 7:3	69:5 86:1,4 87:3	feel 12:3 136:25	finger 149:20
exemptions 136:24	21:11 100:3	98:19 107:21	138:15 147:1	finish 119:16
137:25	explains 19:20	108:7,10 115:25	153:18 154:4,9	firms 74:10
exercise 18:20	explanation 105:15	125:8 141:11	feels 124:7	first 4:2 6:8,11,16
103:15 105:4	explicit 158:6	145:22 147:19	fees 109:8	7:2,3,5,7 8:1,11,23
exercised 146:19	explore 16:6,11	163:5	fell 114:20	8:24 9:16 10:8
exercises 115:22	18:11	factors 42:13 44:13	fellow 93:12	13:20 14:5 19:4,5
exercising 104:15	explored 17:10	68:24	felt 56:10 135:25	22:14 27:18 28:10
exist 44:2 51:15,16	exploring 15:17	facts 67:20 68:9,11	136:17 137:21	31:21 35:7 36:10
59:3 76:21 101:25	exponential 101:1	68:14 86:8 126:9	fewer 29:23,24 75:3	36:12 40:6 45:6
125:15	expose 46:7	fail 42:14	75:8 155:18,20	48:18 62:17 63:22
existing 136:24	exposed 66:11	fails 41:19 43:3	164:3	68:3 70:10 71:24
160:14	exposure 29:5	failure 85:24,25	fiction 106:18	72:18,19 87:1
exists 125:1	exposures 29:13	fair 19:25 94:21	fictitious 23:10	90:10 93:14 97:3
expect 40:16 64:17	express 32:2,21	117:12 133:9,23	field 78:10,12 93:6	108:15 110:2
116:5 155:17,19	expressed 4:6 31:9	133:25 136:10,16	fields 18:9 90:7	116:10 121:10
157:20	32:16,18 148:18	140:18 141:5	fierce 107:6	128:17 134:16
expectations 15:10	expressing 15:13	143:21 146:13	figure 34:15 80:22	135:22 136:2
61:3 82:15 83:15	expression 130:24	151:24 152:15	94:17 131:9,13	140:13 141:24
83:16 124:22	136:10	160:21	139:24 146:20	142:4,7 144:6
			l	l

[176]

	1	I	1	1
160:1 163:25	138:12 150:14	framework 62:15	G	160:14
164:10,14,17	Force's 3:18	framing 72:13 77:15	gain 145:8	gives 7:6 27:25
Fisher 35:24 47:19	forced 76:21	78:20 79:9,9,21	gained 64:14	33:16 67:22
47:20 120:18	forcing 115:21	frankly 27:9 28:12	game 48:6 65:4,9,10	117:17
122:6	Foreign-made	29:7	65:13,15 86:23	giving 14:15 18:1
fit 106:2 128:23	121:17	Franz 164:25	128:11 159:3	21:4 43:1 99:7
fitness 22:2	forever 84:5	free 8:17,18 47:10	games 48:2 73:13	106:9 117:16
five 43:11 44:13	Forget 121:22	71:19 74:8 88:11	86:21	146:2
46:12 92:19 144:3	fork 43:16	159:15	Gates 99:3	glances 76:13
158:11,14	form 9:6 14:16 17:6	freedom 104:22	Gateway 88:9	glib 101:22
fix 63:24 137:23	70:18 71:3 73:4	163:22	gather 148:5	Global 164:18
flavor 133:19	75:17 91:2 97:14	freeware 74:7	general 41:7 53:19	go 8:16 10:10,15,25
flexibilities 14:10	118:2	frequently 12:19,22	97:12 103:10,19	35:23 36:2 44:23
flexibility 39:12	formalism 96:1	friend 26:6 31:24,25	152:16	47:19 49:23 57:15
51:23	format 32:4 50:2	40:17 68:3,5	generally 52:15,23	60:2 64:18 67:10
flexible 81:4 132:22	84:19 107:19	friendly 97:10 100:3	54:6 81:6 104:22	75:17 76:5 80:22
flip 85:2	125:7,11	friends 15:6	106:19 131:6,8	80:23 90:20 98:6,7
flipping 144:18	formats 49:10 107:2	front 24:6 66:13	132:16,17 133:12	111:6 118:10
floor 5:11	formed 3:13	86:12	132:10,17 133:12	119:10 120:20
Florencia 70:21	forms 23:6 72:7	fruitful 5:9	139:16	126:20 127:6
71:9 79:25 89:20	155:1	fruitless 115:22		132:16 138:11
90:24 97:17,24	formulas 91:12	FTC 69:1,2,8 81:1	generated 14:6 generates 125:9	140:8 143:19
116:11 118:9,11	formulating 36:15	81:23 82:5,11,21	generous 74:21	144:20 150:12,12
Florencia's 148:3	forth 15:8 63:20	83:23 84:15 85:9	genre 132:7	151:9 158:21
Florida's 115:14	94:22 114:13	85:14,24 86:19	George 21:17	159:11 160:4
flows 125:19	Forty-five 67:3	87:8 88:10 89:10	getting 15:19,23	goal 4:13 7:11 76:5
focus 23:23 64:19	forward 4:18 5:10	89:12	26:14,16 36:13,24	111:19 149:12
71:17 72:16,18	12:18 15:18 34:14	FTC's 78:4 81:19	38:15 56:11,12	goals 80:8
84:9 105:18	63:17 102:23	82:18,20 83:1 84:7	59:7,8,17,20 74:8	goes 37:17 76:4 84:1
158:16 161:8	103:5 159:23	84:8 85:6,11 87:16	87:5,18 95:3,13,17	134:3
focused 21:11 31:18	165:5	88:15,17,19 89:3	96:6,20 100:3	going 12:8 21:11
66:2 72:1 73:2	forward-looking	fueling 45:6	139:14 142:13	32:24 35:6,7,17
135:7 139:12	17:16	fulfilling 79:11	159.14 142.15	37:12 42:23,24
154:24	foster 130:24	full 25:21 161:18	gift 26:8 43:9	46:4 52:20 53:18
focusing 71:15	found 26:11 28:24	fully 129:15 141:13	gifting 29:4	54:25 55:9,11,13
folders 57:6	30:10 32:1 33:2	142:11	give 8:18 10:13 13:2	56:16 57:13 59:12
folks 21:5 104:17	59:19 65:19 68:13	fun 38:10	14:19 15:1,5 17:25	60:15 61:14 63:11
139:16,19 141:22	68:22 71:22 77:22	function 76:2,3	26:8,17,24 35:20	64:19 75:9 83:17
152:22 153:9	85:24 105:13	functionality 161:19	36:4 38:6 60:16	84:4 87:19 89:21
163:4 164:19,25	108:5 125:10	162:4	70:14 83:7 90:19	93:3 94:6,14 96:1
follow 98:9	138:13	functions 60:21	97:4 118:8 124:15	96:5 100:22 105:4
followed 90:5,8	foundation 101:5	fundamental 36:11	124:19 125:13,21	105:18 107:18,19
following 16:2 19:23	four 19:24 24:11	fundamentally	124.19 125.15,21	112:9 113:5 115:4
35:9	84:15	158:17	127.5 151.1 133:19 142:22	116:16,25 117:15
follows 6:7 47:9	fourth 24:18	further 16:7 47:16	144:12 145:11	117:16 120:6
165:6	Fox 53:9	83:7 86:13 138:11	161:13	122:18,20 129:18
food 62:7 77:24	frame 77:15 97:17	147:18	given 14:22 26:1	130:18 134:23
force 3:12,13 4:9	framed 74:13 78:21	furthest 14:12	91:13 105:9	141:17 144:3,4
123:24 128:3	79:5	future 16:24	115:17,18 156:13	149:11 152:15
			113.17,10 130.13	
	I	1	1	1

[177]

154:18 156:20	102:12 108:11	happen 21:23 28:5	143:7 149:22,22	holding 39:25
157:4,4,7,10	115:5 142:4 146:5	66:21,23,24	150:2 151:13,15	home 17:20 47:22
158:13 159:2	159:20 164:16	147:21 150:21	151:16 152:22	48:1,4,15,16,19
160:3 161:10,12	greater 4:14 41:24	happened 143:25	158:1	58:11,11
162:4	81:13 102:14	happening 34:16	hearing 4:20,21	homogenous 107:7
gold 79:17	144:16 163:25	44:25 137:20	101:18 126:4	honest 29:19 30:19
Gomulkiewicz 96:7	greatly 118:16	138:5	132:24 164:14	honestly 147:16
96:7 115:23	green 3:19,23	happens 27:16,17	held 3:25 98:4	148:16
good 3:2,4 4:17 27:8	Greg 35:23 41:5,7	28:25 56:5 75:23	161:22	Hoofnagle 21:8
28:19 29:2 32:10	47:17 49:21 59:14	77:11 158:12	hell 121:14	hook 105:15
32:22 39:19 40:16	59:23 152:23	happily 137:2	Hello 36:6 46:17	hope 159:25 160:1
47:15,19 51:13,20	Greg's 52:25	happy 40:3 60:13	80:12 128:2 155:8	hopeful 34:14
67:13,13 68:21	grill 59:6	93:5 161:1 165:7	help 7:12 17:4 18:10	hopefully 18:10
90:4 93:10 94:13	gross 115:13	harbor 39:17	37:2 72:15 132:6	20:5 59:24 84:18
97:12 101:2,2	group 36:8 98:19	hard 7:18,20 9:6,13	138:1 140:1,7	151:12
130:17 137:25	131:16 145:20	11:20 12:4 14:16	142:18 143:5	hosting 52:11
goods 11:12 19:18	groups 89:14	15:18 28:20 31:6	159:22	hot 70:13
26:12,18 40:14	grow 101:6	35:3,16 53:16	helpful 76:20 77:8	hotel 81:12,14
54:19 104:2,5	growing 44:20 45:1	54:19 61:17 97:7	82:21 152:13	hours 115:12,15
108:3,18,23 109:7	grown 48:24 49:1	103:14 117:14	helping 16:16	119:17 152:19
143:16 144:8	73:8	125:16,23 126:18	102:22 151:5	house 49:23
146:4 147:9 159:8	growth 3:16 49:2	131:13 144:10,21	helps 80:7	households 73:12
161:9	101:1,5,14	145:16,17,18,23	Herbert 164:20	huge 27:22 91:5
Google 9:10 17:20	guess 29:20 41:14	hard-and- 27:5	here's 30:11 31:25	120:11 146:1
46:17	80:13 102:10	harder 24:7	66:17 109:25	155:17
gosh 141:9 149:23	103:17 111:20	hardware 37:23	124:3 131:7	human 58:13
150:3	121:2 154:25	harm 101:12 111:21	hesitate 60:2	human-beingness
gotten 59:21 95:7	155:9 163:18	111:24 112:1	Hewlett-Packard	58:16
govern 7:15 25:3	guests 81:14	113:19,22 121:9	87:20	hundred 114:6
80:9,17	guidance 83:7 88:17	harmful 82:13	hey 121:20	hundreds 53:7,17
government 101:13	guide 81:20 102:25	hasn't 35:12	Hi 62:2 71:12 90:25	151:17
102:9,18 103:11	103:1	hate 47:12	100:12 153:15	hurt 145:17
103:22 108:4	guidelines 17:11,13	haven't 53:17	high 26:13,19 62:25	hurts 145:16
139:25 140:3	84:8	103:17 114:5	143:4 160:24	hygiene 77:22
150:9,15 153:1	guideposts 132:3	he's 19:3,5,7	higher 25:8 160:18	hyperlink 76:23
government's 151:1	135:12	head 145:15	highest 91:24 92:1	hyperlinks 76:20
governments 17:10	guys 149:13	hear 5:3 20:1 85:1	highly 73:9,15 74:4	hypotheses 68:19
governs 11:14		96:16 97:5 134:10	77:17	
grade 77:21	H H	142:16 149:20	hinges 94:18	
grading 30:10	hadn't 139:20	165:7	history 103:20	I'd 35:3 71:17 72:2
granted 18:20	Hair 109:2	heard 4:6 15:7 16:1	114:11 140:8	74:24 100:20
graphic 39:4	half 48:20 68:8,9	16:21 35:8,21 36:5	hit 56:12 59:18	111:12 128:2
graphics 54:10	128:6	52:12,12 60:22	60:11 114:14,16	139:23 141:19
Grassley 130:2	half-hour 139:18	81:25 103:17	123:15 145:15	143:12 164:17
gratification 43:11	hand 20:4 117:12	108:12 124:20	hitting 56:4	I'll 25:10 38:9 45:2
gravitas 98:2	146:16	129:22 132:20,23	hold 39:21 100:18	47:1,14,14 49:5
great 29:11 37:11,22	handle 136:12 157:7	133:7 134:13,15	holder 45:12 152:4	58:7 60:13 70:19
38:1 51:16 89:18	hands 106:12	134:16 140:18	holders 151:19	71:14,20 72:6,8,16
100:13 101:14	116:23 157:8	141:4,16 142:8	152:8	72:18 90:24 98:11
			l	

[178]

99:13 124:15	ignore 121:25	improvement 25:22	98:15 100:20,23	37:14 42:3,9 56:23
145:20 150:20	illegally 34:11	improving 6:20	100:23 101:14	instant 43:11
161:15 163:3	illustrate 22:1	142:25 148:15	106:14,16 107:5	instilling 4:13
I'm 3:5 8:17 18:18	illustrates 139:9	impulse-purchase	150:18 159:4	instincts 40:12
34:13 35:17 36:6,9	imagine 13:8 21:15	160:17	industry's 14:6	institutional/indu
36:9,18 37:1 40:3	63:21 68:2 119:4	in-person 90:9	inevitably 12:8	135:5
41:7 53:18 56:16	119:22 159:9	inability 144:17	inferior 22:19	institutions 80:4
56:17 58:12,12,16	immediate 49:22	inaccessible 144:8	influence 44:14	instructional 96:23
59:4 60:5,17 61:14	immediately 43:12	incident 21:16	83:11	instrumental 164:21
62:3 63:11 64:19	impact 68:24	incidental 135:15	inform 95:17	165:2
77:3 80:12,18 89:2	impacted 130:4	incidents 21:25	information 4:10	insubstantial 26:18
89:17 91:4 93:4,10	impacting 3:14	include 17:2 46:1,6	11:8 17:25 18:3	integrated 131:25
93:11 96:14,18	impatient 161:3	73:5 100:21	22:16,21 23:8	intellectual 36:19
100:13,14 101:15	implementing 93:4	includes 77:2	25:21 39:23,24,25	73:6 80:3 114:11
101:21 103:10,10	implicated 137:4	including 4:1,11	46:2 62:11 64:11	164:19
103:13 105:3	implicating 9:22,23	41:10 62:12 65:12	64:13 67:23 68:16	intend 162:5
118:7,25 121:3,5	implications 163:10	73:13 84:2 102:17	70:5 73:23 77:3,4	intentionally 114:20
121:24 123:16,17	implied 95:1	163:6	78:15 79:6 82:17	interact 26:2 35:14
126:21 127:5	implying 157:24	income 23:18	84:6,20 87:11 91:6	95:11
129:15 139:3,4	impolitely 145:14	inconsistent 158:6	92:11 93:12 97:1	interest 18:7 69:2
145:13 146:7	import 84:9	increase 33:10 47:4	100:3,5,7 111:19	99:2 111:3 132:14
149:11 151:10,14	importance 95:5	143:10 144:19	111:21 115:21	134:21 146:9
151:14 152:6,6,9	149:7 156:10	increased 75:4,24	140:24 148:5	interested 31:9 91:4
152:15 155:20,21	important 5:1 8:2,2	76:6 79:15	151:12	134:8 148:24
156:6,8,19 157:24	11:9 22:13 39:6,8	increases 33:11	Informative 2:10	150:8 151:5 153:6
158:15 159:2,14	39:10 42:17 44:4	increasing 45:6 72:5	62:1	interesting 27:17
161:12	44:13 45:3 46:1,6	increasingly 146:22	informed 64:16	30:15 32:1 41:17
I've 16:24 19:8 22:7	51:2 53:5 64:6	incredible 7:9	72:23	74:12 77:14,20
41:6 45:5 47:21	69:10 89:16 90:11	incredibly 82:21	infringement	78:19 87:7 92:14
53:21 63:6,20	90:20 91:15,16,22	incur 88:13	121:13 164:3	98:23 99:4 105:23
70:10 71:14,15,21	92:5 93:15 99:20	independent 45:14	infringing 93:20	116:19 119:12,20
96:13 151:24	100:11 116:2	indicate 12:13	94:20	125:3 126:9
159:25	117:20 132:18,22	144:23	inherent 87:12	133:11 134:4,7
Ian 92:8	133:5 137:5 142:8	indicates 43:5	initial 90:19	137:7 153:24
icon 66:3,4,12,15,16	142:15,18 151:20	indication 76:17	initiatives 78:2	155:10 156:1
66:22,25 67:15,16	157:15 158:24	indicators 157:19	79:23	160:13
idea 39:7 51:20	importantly 79:22	individual 63:21	injury 81:8 82:11,14	Interestingly 29:16
60:20,22 69:20	impose 122:4 140:3	82:6	innovation 3:20	interests 70:25
97:1 136:10 143:9	imposed 18:15	individual's 57:24	innovative 130:25	80:19 81:14 89:7
149:12 154:24	109:16	individually 53:8	input 5:10	interface 28:12
idea/expression	impossible 121:7	147:13 154:15	insight 18:10	interfaces 150:14,15
132:10	impression 82:1,4	individuals 41:12,23	insights 96:12	International 3:6
ideal 113:6	impressions 82:10	126:17 146:12	116:22	internet 3:11,16
ideally 76:4 102:13	improve 19:21	industries 14:14	Instagram 160:10	10:3 54:23 56:23
ideas 37:11 125:19	28:16,23 99:12	96:24 99:11	install 86:14	66:7 80:3 82:23
165:6	140:1 146:20	126:24,25	installment 3:10	88:1,11 100:7
identical 68:10	150:7 151:4 163:9	industry 14:13 18:6	instance 87:21	117:7 123:23
identified 147:15	164:7	47:9 48:6,8 52:9	155:13	124:13 128:3
153:19 161:16,17	improved 79:20	54:20 90:17 96:21	instances 32:19	138:12 141:10
	l	l	l	l

[179]

			1	
157:17 163:10	142:15,16 150:10	131:13 132:20	41:3 50:6 51:2	37:15,16 38:16,25
interoperability	156:11 157:8	134:7 138:7	149:13 163:14,15	39:3,14,21 40:24
134:14 136:5,13	161:6 164:15	139:11 140:16	keeps 51:17	41:16 45:24 49:12
136:18	issued 6:18 37:22	141:16,23 144:9	key 25:14,15 37:3	50:5,7 51:14 53:22
interpreted 81:5	86:18	145:10,11,13	41:11 69:8,14	53:22 55:12 56:14
interrelated 93:13	issues 3:14,18,22	147:25 148:12,13	78:17 82:14	56:22 57:18,20
interrupt 121:3	6:15,17 13:6 16:12	149:21,21,23	105:12,12 122:7	58:4,6,13,25 59:1
interrupted 65:9	17:8 39:3 40:9,10	150:3 154:2,19	kind 11:22 16:7	59:2,4,5,9,13,15
intervention 28:9	41:3 81:21 82:24	156:10,22,23	21:11 25:14 27:3	59:16,18,19,23,24
introduce 18:24	83:9 84:24 85:6	157:3,4,6,9,10	28:1 30:20 31:7	60:11,25 63:13
35:17 62:16 90:18	106:15 111:15	158:13,18,22,24	34:15 38:25 39:12	66:8 70:12 71:19
100:9 118:23	129:14 130:21	161:7	41:16 45:5,21	71:25 74:8,25
143:19 151:9	131:10 132:14	item 2:3 36:20	46:21 57:3,8 59:14	75:12,19 79:3 81:5
introduced 30:14	133:10 136:6,8,10	iTunes 9:9 53:7 58:8	60:20 61:7 85:23	82:9,21 83:11,19
introductory 45:24	136:12,19 137:17	119:10 151:25	89:9 98:19 107:8	83:23 84:3,13,18
46:13	137:18 139:10	156:25	107:16 108:17	85:3,5,6,11,22
intuitive 57:24	143:1 157:17		119:20 125:11	87:2,6,24 88:5,14
inventing 59:3	160:18,19	J	126:16,22 128:15	88:18 89:5,6,8,13
investigation 86:20	it's 6:25 10:3,25	jailbreaking 129:23	128:22 130:3	89:14,15,15 91:5
invite 90:17 149:15	11:1,3,8,22 12:17	Jamie 164:20	131:9,18,24 132:2	94:2 96:21 98:23
invited 68:1 69:4	12:24 14:7,16	January 19:14	132:15 133:5,16	100:21,22 101:1,8
inviting 128:3	18:16 19:16,25	job 3:16 51:13 99:7	133:17 134:11,14	101:21 102:2
involved 21:6 48:10	23:3 24:14 27:24	139:3	134:20,24 135:5,8	103:3 104:12,21
62:6 63:10 83:18	28:7 30:19 36:17	jobs 100:25 101:2,7	135:9,10,14,16,20	105:14 107:24
104:13 105:3	38:2,14 39:9,17,19	John 35:22 41:2,15	136:6,19 137:9,12	111:14 112:10
115:15 131:11	41:18 45:2 46:11	45:20,25 52:12	137:13,17 138:7	116:10 117:10
involves 122:2	46:12,18 50:25	97:22 98:5 121:3,5	138:10 139:14,18	118:10,21 119:14
146:10	51:1,2 52:5 53:5	139:3 143:20	139:20,23 140:1	119:15,19,23
involving 1:9 6:23	53:16 54:6 57:3,12	146:5,8 155:6,8	141:1,6,19,20	120:5,7,8,12
13:23 15:24 16:13	57:17,20 58:1,2,24	158:1 164:2,13	142:6,24 143:12	121:15 122:18
42:5 52:4	59:5 60:2 63:25,25	join 35:7 139:7	143:14,16 146:10	123:15,21 130:8
IP-related 114:10	64:5,6 66:4,4	Jonathan 118:18,25	147:15 148:10,18	130:17 132:25
iPad 11:3	67:13 69:10,15	123:2,5 155:7	148:19,25 152:12	133:1,13 135:13
iPhone 58:10,10	70:11 74:4 75:2,21	156:7,8	152:16 153:3,7	135:17 136:15
IPTF 147:14 163:4	76:9,9,11 77:1	jot 41:15	155:3 157:14	138:6,8 139:5,13
ironically 106:5	80:20 81:20 87:7	journal 149:4	158:5,16	139:14,19,19,22
isn't 7:5 8:21 13:5	89:1 93:14 94:11	journalists 99:21	Kindle 11:3 152:5	140:2,2,4,8,13,18
18:2,21 21:23 22:6	94:14 95:7 96:2,21	116:4	kinds 13:1 14:18	140:19 141:3,9,13
39:19 49:19,19	96:22 98:12,18,19	jump 152:14 153:12	15:5 38:13,18,23	142:10,10,11,14
106:9,10 120:3	100:22 101:1,5	155:6 156:6	60:24 75:1 83:20	143:4,7,14 146:15
146:14 154:18	102:3,4,19 104:9	Justice 107:25	108:6 110:24	146:19 147:6,18
issue 4:1,17 10:11	105:7,17 109:2	109:25 110:12	126:10 154:9	147:22,23 148:3,8
12:15 13:5 40:5	113:21,23 114:25	justification 147:16	157:18	148:9,11,16,17,21
44:5,15 49:4 60:7	115:1,2,4 116:5,19	justified 146:11	knew 31:12	149:16,22 150:2,6
82:7,14,22 87:15	117:8 119:8	147:2	know 3:5,24 16:15	150:9,13 151:7
89:9 100:19	120:23 121:13	justify 147:10	27:5 28:18,21 29:6	152:22,23,25
104:17 105:5	122:1 123:5,8	justifying 149:8	30:17,18 31:24	153:2,3,4,6,9,16
106:13 108:9,23	126:21 128:6,21		33:14 36:3,8,9,13	153:25 154:1,2,8
133:17 136:4,7	129:5,21 130:12	$\frac{\mathbf{K}}{\mathbf{L} + \mathbf{C} +$	36:15,19 37:3,10	154:17,19,24,25
		keep 21:15 26:20		

[700]

	1		1	
155:2,6,10,11,13	70:22,23,23 71:1	legal 27:24 38:10	12:9 22:7 24:13,15	77:18
155:18,20,23	72:22 80:3,15,21	39:16 40:6,21	24:18,20 25:3	liking 45:25
156:11,15,19,21	81:1 89:9 92:7,9	54:23 57:23 59:1	26:15 27:17,21	limitation 8:2 136:9
156:21,22,24	93:11 94:23 96:8	62:15 77:17 78:21	28:6 30:13,15,20	limitations 50:4
157:2,3,8 158:15	97:7 104:20	80:6,9 91:8 115:17	51:6 58:19 71:17	86:12 87:12
158:20 159:3,10	105:13 106:4	144:9 145:10,11	74:25 75:14 86:24	130:12 132:9
159:11,11,19,21	108:10 110:2,6,7	155:20 157:20	90:14,22 93:18	136:24 138:1
159:24 161:25	110:15,17,22	legalistic 79:5,7 98:1	95:1,22 96:15 97:2	limited 8:23 41:17
165:5	114:5 116:21	legalisting 79:6	97:11,12,13,14	41:18 85:17 94:12
Knowledge 35:23	125:8 130:13	legally 39:2 79:16	99:25 101:23	129:20 131:10
36:7 155:9	132:5 133:4,4,5,10	legible 85:4	102:1 104:17	133:23 138:3
knowledgeable 13:9	134:8 136:1,1,2,15	legislative 131:3,16	115:1 116:15	152:24 161:7
known 60:1 66:4	136:17,22 146:12	136:25 137:23	117:2 122:16	limits 51:3 93:18
68:20 86:6 96:14	149:3 151:11	legitimate 44:25	123:17 124:11	94:21 143:6
99:11	159:14	47:3,8 130:25	128:12,13 133:23	Linda 164:24 165:2
knows 36:18 50:11	lawfully 8:14 55:5	148:12	134:22,23,23,24	line 36:2 43:8 66:12
50:12 95:2 103:13	145:13	Lemley 116:20	134:24 140:21	66:15,16,17,25
Krause 134:21	laws 11:9 80:17	lend 8:18 26:6,7,16	144:24,25 151:1	67:9 77:4 103:14
135:9,18	88:20 89:12	26:23 31:23,25	151:25 152:2,4,5,6	lines 28:22 67:8
155.7,10	130:24	32:11 34:1 40:17	156:17 158:2,3	134:20
L	lawyer 39:7 58:16	126:13 145:11	161:18	link 12:12 25:3,5,6,7
L.A 77:24	96:11 150:15	lending 8:5 29:4	license-based 17:2	84:20 116:13
lab 63:10 68:2 72:21	lawyers 39:5 97:3,6	31:19 32:12	licenses 87:16 93:17	list 66:17
labeling 140:23	97:15 98:8,12,18	117:15 126:17,18	96:13 97:4,7,9,18	listen 12:6 58:11
labels 45:15 69:5,5,5	98:20	lends 41:21 42:22	97:24 98:14 99:8	64:1 69:24
labor 115:12,15	lay 139:23	117:17	99:15,16,25 100:2	listener 84:25
Laboratory 62:20	layer 120:13	length 140:22	101:4 102:1,15	listening 149:19
lack 42:18,21 105:6	layered 133:6	lengthy 12:23 17:21	105:7 114:6,24	literacy 143:3
105:7 115:17	lead 41:23 42:10	97:12	115:25 116:24	literally 60:16
140:24 147:15	45:4 112:16,18	lens 27:3,4	117:24 135:3,5	literary 125:7,12,14
155:3	113:18	lesser 22:19 94:4	138:9 149:25	125:15,15,23
laid 114:9,22,24	leading 3:25 6:13	lessons 72:12 78:5	151:18,23 152:7,9	125.15,15,25
land 82:11	7:10 111:22	lest 123:20	163:23	literature 25:8
language 23:12	League 86:18	let's 7:2 11:13 36:2	licensing 7:22 11:13	litigation 116:25
24:17 25:12 81:4	Leahy 130:2	43:6 52:8 55:24	45:10 49:11 51:9	117:1 122:2
109:14 122:7	learn 13:21 54:3	98:24 102:5	97:21 98:8 99:22	little 6:19 15:17 28:3
laptop 144:12	78:3 117:21 118:6	115:25 116:10	101:4 104:14,25	28:13 29:17 30:10
large 14:19 71:6	148:4	119:6	101.4 104.14,25	35:9,19 38:19 40:1
72:24 73:14 84:17	learned 38:21 53:21	letter 86:17 87:1,8	132:17,17 133:1	46:14 56:19 59:14
124:4	64:11 72:12 78:5	130:1	135:10 137:4,6	62:14 65:4 72:3
largely 31:4	117:20	level 4:7 44:17	162:3	89:12 90:21
larger 146:17 156:4	lease 8:5	levels 13:24	lie 108:21	100:10 103:14
latest 3:10 43:6	leave 26:7 46:7	leverages 61:3	lied 55:13	106:16 122:23
54:22	49:23 62:25	liable 39:25 98:4	lieu 115:17	123:4 128:6
law 4:2 6:15 7:21,24	111:10	161:22	life 116:1	131:12 133:7,19
9:3 18:16 19:1,2	leaving 26:25	libraries 43:19,24	light 129:24	139:8 142:5,15
19:15 21:10 27:5	led 3:17 10:14	124:4 149:6	lights 116:3	143:7,8,8 146:2
27:12 36:15,24	140:12,17	library 126:11,13	liked 65:14	149:10,18,20
38:12 42:18,21	left 27:20	license 5:7 6:21 12:9	likelihood 34:4	150:6 156:1
,				150.0 150.1
	1	I	1	<u> </u>

				[181]
	I	I	I	[101]
live 43:16	Los 140:10	32:21 51:3	71:11 90:25 111:9	123:10 126:1
lively 20:3 90:4	lose 37:18	making 11:24 14:7	118:15	146:23 157:25
loaded 86:3	losing 94:12	22:16,18,23 43:10	Martian 24:10	meant 58:8 66:9
lobbyists 98:20	lot 21:16 24:7 36:14	63:2 72:10,15	MaryBeth 145:15	measurable 34:12
local 43:15,21	40:6,11 41:6,14	84:10 98:14 100:2	mass 115:19	measure 24:8 31:14
Lodge 80:1,12	47:7 56:23 71:19	122:23 123:21	massive 27:19 43:19	31:21 33:19 73:11
long 14:20 26:20	79:9 85:10 94:17	management 86:21	43:24 101:19	73:25 94:8 113:11
29:8 44:11 46:1	96:16 98:16,21	86:24 87:4 132:21	Masters 62:21	115:12
59:4 61:5 69:24	99:18 112:5	mandate 131:8	material 25:19	measures 24:4
73:7,20 74:1,19	116:17 117:13	manner 79:5	34:10 81:17,22,25	measuring 75:11
79:15 96:22	124:20 129:8,13	mapping 126:22	83:11 84:7 86:3,25	113:13
104:22 105:1,2	130:13,16 133:6	maps 128:17	materiality 24:4,8	mechanical 130:10
116:1 117:14	134:6,10 135:3,6	March 83:6	31:10,22 33:19	131:23
122:10 145:12	136:12,22 137:11	Marginally 30:23	materials 53:4	mechanically 94:7
long-term 4:13	137:12,14,16	Mark 35:24 47:18	149:8	mechanisms 93:16
148:8	138:9 142:9	47:20 52:7 59:14	Matt 153:14,15	93:22
longer 38:7 50:5	145:16 148:8	116:20 122:6	matter 31:11 75:16	media 19:18 23:5,10
61:21	153:16 154:5,11	Mark's 52:25	78:17 79:9 83:2	23:24 24:2 25:18
longitudinal 158:9	154:16 155:5	116:22 121:1	106:1 111:5,11	33:22 35:24 36:17
look 3:14 5:10 41:25	164:21	122:6	122:4	36:21 38:17 39:1
42:24 45:15,18	lot's 141:10	markedly 31:1	Mazey's 121:16	40:10 41:8 49:15
60:15 72:20,22	lots 29:10 70:16	market 23:14 25:1	mean 39:2 55:14	80:5 83:2,3,4
76:16 93:16	153:19	52:6 72:22,25 73:2	58:24 59:4,11 82:8	86:19,19 87:2
116:19 119:19	loud 70:2	89:4 92:24 107:22	85:2 105:13	88:21 89:5 160:7
122:16 130:2	love 23:2	108:22 113:4,5,12	108:20,21,23	161:7
132:3 133:17	low 69:12 76:12	113:20 116:8,12	113:22 118:3	median 33:10 74:18
135:10 158:13	144:1	138:15 143:15	119:14 124:9	76:12
165:5	lower 30:22	145:4 146:3 159:6	140:8 141:16,19	mediating 17:24
looked 5:5 12:15	lowers 31:17,17	marketed 106:22	142:23 143:18	medical 129:7
63:15 64:2 66:3	lowest 27:14 30:12	marketplace 2:6	146:7 147:16,22	medium 83:1
68:11 131:18,19	loyal 44:19	4:14,23 6:2 13:22	147:24 148:10	medium- 100:16
131:20 135:8,9,22	LP 86:19	14:8 17:1,5 22:17	150:12,19,22	meeting 1:11 3:10
136:1,2 158:11	Luis 62:2 164:25	22:20 23:10 24:5	153:6,11 154:17	6:7 16:6 18:14
looking 3:22 17:15	165:2	32:23 33:16 34:1	154:23 155:4,5,25	62:4 69:4 140:17
18:2 29:12 37:22	lump 75:1	34:17 37:6,9 45:1	154:25 155:4,5,25	146:14 165:10
57:5 64:20,25	lumped 134:12	47:3,8 48:15,16,17	163:2,12,13	meeting's 16:9
67:18 81:24 84:13	iumpeu 154.12	48:19 54:14 85:21	meaning 44:1 49:8	meetings 6:14
94:1,5 101:11	M	96:5 103:19,23	52:17 59:1 67:16	140:14,15,16
119:10 135:12	machine 158:4	108:4,16 124:22	75:8,15 92:12	melds 80:19
139:8 140:2	machines 21:14	125:1 141:11	meaningful 41:18	members 35:14 48:9
144:18 151:24	mail 57:1,4	146:13,14 147:3	146:21	52:23 59:16 60:8
160:11,23 163:5	mailbox 57:2	140.13,14 147.3	means 4:3 9:7,18	101:6 102:20,22
163:23 164:6	main 41:20 134:15	155:23	11:15 12:7 33:22	101:0 102:20,22
looks 12:18 19:16	maintain 135:19	marketplaces	44:24 59:1 60:25	memo 58:17
	major 41:9 45:15,17	103:24		
74:6 Lorrio 62:17.24	46:15,16 48:5		61:2 64:3 72:16	men 30:2 mention 89:11
Lorrie 62:17,24	52:14,15 86:18	markets 73:13,15	82:3 92:16 95:9	
63:2 70:20 72:14 77:0 80:20 115:5	107:24	145:2 Manatta 70:21	104:14 112:5	108:25 160:3
77:9 89:20 115:5	majority 14:6 32:2	Marotta- 70:21	119:9,14,14,17,19	mentioned 6:7 21:8
148:2	majority 17.0 32.2	MAROTTA-WU	119:21,22 120:1	46:21 59:23 69:22
	l	l	l	l

97:23 99:10	150:22	157:11 160:2	N	negotiated 53:8
101:17 107:5	minutes 6:25 28:13	161:11 163:2	N 2:1	151:18 152:8
135:13 145:14	29:11 35:6 43:16	164:16	Nadine 164:20	negotiating 45:13
163:20	45:24 56:15 57:23	mortgage 69:5	name 8:24 35:18	negotiation 54:7
mentioning 130:15	149:14	motion 14:13,24	41:7 62:2 77:3	151:1
160:4	misleading 82:5,7,9	35:25 45:17 52:9	100:13	negotiations 53:10
menu 38:13,22	82:13	52:14,14,15 53:5	Napster 47:9	53:15
merchant 109:8,14	misleads 25:16	106:16 123:1	Nashville 140:10	neither 28:11
merchants 35:25	81:16	130:19	nation's 103:13	net 82:1,4
47:21,25 109:6,10	misled 44:16	motivated 64:10	native 85:12	Netflix 14:21
110:15	misperception	motivates 44:4,7	nature 4:11 11:19	network 7:8
mergers 132:9	111:21,22 112:2	motivation 71:25	16:4 19:11 61:8	networks 91:20
136:11	misperceptions	motivations 43:3	77:19 83:12	never 15:2 24:7
merit 102:12	25:19 31:10 42:13	move 10:5 34:14	107:12	140:2,2
Merriam-Webster	misquote 59:24	35:15 46:3 47:2	nearly 129:5	nevertheless 149:4
49:5	missed 148:14 150:6	96:1 104:4 159:23	necessarily 7:16	new 11:25 14:10
mess 101:13	mistake 29:7	moved 104:7 126:7	9:15 12:24 18:2	36:16 37:18 38:18
message 51:11,20	misunderstand	143:15	99:9 114:23 115:3	44:11 49:19 66:13
60:3 81:24 111:13	39:18	movement 128:16	123:10 142:20	70:13,22 77:25
messages 22:12 57:3	misunderstanding	movie 8:9 11:21	149:14 153:1	88:21 97:12 99:24
messaging 1:7 4:22	101:20	29:22,24,25 48:5	154:10	109:4,13,17
6:20 16:13 18:8,12	Mitchell 121:1,5,5	49:12,13 50:4,7,8	necessary 14:1 52:5	144:21 146:2
52:3 62:6 81:23	143:20,20 161:15	53:2 56:7 144:5	85:8 157:6	154:22,22
83:20	MLB 86:19,20 87:2	Movielink 49:17	need 6:3 16:3,6,14	newer 44:2
met 149:5	mobile 160:25	movies 23:15,25	17:15,19,25 19:10	newfangled 57:2
metaphor 57:17	mock-up 67:25	28:7 29:17,20 32:8	22:22 38:7 39:12	NGOs 116:4
60:21 118:22	model 14:15 15:4	34:4 41:10 50:25	39:16 40:25 51:14	nice 121:1,2
119:3 123:6	38:4	54:24 55:6,25	51:23 52:2 61:8	nicely 46:11
metaphors 57:8	models 7:22 11:17	119:11	63:14 74:3 75:22	night 123:22
methods 132:22	11:18 14:12,17,25	moving 145:24	84:16 92:3 93:2	Nissan 157:3
metric 32:14	17:3 23:5 63:16	158:5 164:11	98:12 104:9	Noble 10:24
Michael 63:20	130:25	MP3 32:12 142:1,19	111:14,23 112:14	non-copyright-term
Microsoft 87:21	modem 88:2,3	142:21,21 152:5	113:9,17,17,23	144:22
98:25 128:25	modifications 40:19	MP3s 27:14 28:7	116:7 119:21	non-real-world
middle 48:21 65:6,9	moment 21:3 52:21	29:15	120:13 136:1,25	156:3
mild 32:2	54:22 55:25	MPAA 60:8	137:22 138:11,15	nonfiction 106:18
mildly 17:24	152:17,20	MSIT 62:21	142:12 143:15	nongovernment
millions 55:12,15	moments 160:17	multi- 4:18 102:7	145:6,18 152:25	100:1
58:22 146:1	money 12:5 14:7	163:7	154:12 156:20	nonlegal 39:13
mind 16:20 51:2	33:13 37:8 49:8	multiple 126:9	158:21 159:11	nonregulatory
163:15	58:14	music 9:9 14:5,6,11	162:3,3	164:7
mindful 46:8 118:7	month 109:1	17:21 23:15,24	needed 83:15 88:2,7	nonsalient 113:1,3
145:7	months 149:15	32:8,11 33:24 34:4	needs 28:20 84:25	normal 58:13,15
minds 18:17	moral 77:16 78:21	40:22 41:10 43:25	91:11,14 95:18	137:8
mine 161:10	morning 147:23	44:1,2,3,8 45:14	148:9 150:21	nose 151:2
mine-run 110:20	Morris 139:2,3	85:15,19,23 86:5,9	158:8,18 161:25	Notably 9:16 82:4
Minnesota 116:21	146:5 147:4,12	143:23	negative 32:15,17	note 42:3 53:5
minority 72:23	149:10 152:14	mutual 105:2	102:5,10	129:25 132:13
minute 10:13 54:13	154:15 155:25		negotiate 108:8	noted 87:1,8
			•	·

4/18/2017 [183]

notes 41:6,15 59:15	observationally	offline 56:25 57:18	104:5 107:3,20	outside 96:1
notice 19:19,19	111:11	oftentimes 94:24	120:17 127:2	outweighed 81:9
24:19 25:2,10,24	observations 97:1	114:19	140:22 154:18	over-113:2
28:9,10,19 29:6	observe 153:18	oh 36:22 59:18	opacity 140:23	overall 28:1 55:8
31:1 39:1 45:4,8	obtain 7:14 12:7	80:14 121:5	open 4:20 35:10	146:17 164:6
45:22 46:3,10,24	15:20 16:16 19:21	149:20 156:6	57:5 152:17	overconsume
47:2 50:19 64:20	53:4	okay 37:24 58:1	open-ended 28:17	111:23
65:2,2,3,5,12,16	obtained 9:18 41:24	67:17 71:14 80:14	open-source 97:11	overconsumption
65:20,24,25 67:21	obtaining 54:17,18	90:3 94:19 95:18	opening 50:2 96:25	113:18
84:17 105:24	55:24 56:7 123:10	96:1 104:9 105:17	opens 11:24	overestimate 42:21
106:10,11 156:12	123:14,14,16	114:21 115:16	operate 25:25 158:4	112:3
noticeable 85:4	124:10	118:13,25 124:15	operated 52:22	overestimated 42:10
noticed 63:23 66:7	obtains 11:15	136:3 143:20	operating 129:1	overestimation
129:17 130:4	obvious 9:21 28:15	152:15 155:8	159:14	42:22
notices 46:20 65:1	obviously 36:10	old 44:1	operational 3:14	overly 95:20
105:22 106:9	53:17 54:17 56:1	old-fashioned 17:18	opinion 110:12	oversight 42:16
108:13	57:1,7,15 58:5	57:1,4 123:12	opportunities 14:10	overtake 154:19
noticing 64:24	60:14 81:20 82:8	omission 84:5 86:3	opportunity 4:23	overview 2:5,15 6:1
notion 25:16 104:4	82:24 83:16 85:20	OmniCube 145:20	12:11 21:4 26:1	35:20 36:4 80:11
123:9 146:24	87:13 88:6 89:6	on-screen 85:1	124:16 143:10	owner 7:24 8:13,15
NTIA 3:17 21:6	120:5 123:16	once 8:25 70:17	145:19 148:14	8:20,22 9:12,13
52:11 62:3 139:3	occasional 51:8	94:10 114:16	150:7,24	13:13,13,18 50:6,8
143:3 147:17	occurrence 42:12	119:15 132:5	opposed 32:13	50:12 53:25 54:5
164:25	October 130:1	161:21	opt 67:7	122:3,8,9,12,14
nuances 115:3	odds 15:10 124:2	one-off 56:3	optimistic 22:8 93:1	135:18 145:13
nudge 78:7,12	Off-microphone	one-page 97:14	95:20 113:3	owner's 9:1,24
number 3:22 4:6,21	55:20	one-time 55:19,22	option 34:6 119:11	owners 13:20 14:8
6:14 7:25 9:20	offer 13:14 37:7	124:7	119:23,24	122:15 123:21
14:17,19 21:25	70:16 81:24 83:22	one's 104:15	options 4:20 11:25	124:2 132:7,23
24:2 26:18 27:22	108:17,18 109:10	ones 91:25 92:4	154:22 155:4	136:8 137:6 149:4
28:18 44:20 51:7	113:7 143:13	95:20	order 51:19 83:15	150:25 151:19
72:24 73:13 74:20	offered 13:24 24:13	ongoing 37:14 38:8	85:23 86:10 88:5,6	164:2
76:4,10 77:23	51:6 54:1 83:14	124:6 157:16	88:10 91:23	ownership 4:13 8:4
85:18,18 88:14	104:1 105:17	163:7	ordinary 15:10	15:1,16 27:23 34:7
115:14 139:22	107:2 109:22	online 1:9 2:6 3:9	organization 36:3	49:6 51:4 57:23
152:22 163:6	160:9	4:9,14,23 6:2,22	organizations 18:7	58:19 134:24
numbers 48:2 55:9	offering 51:21 72:25	7:14 9:15,23 11:21	100:1	136:7,7 140:25
numerous 38:11	81:25 104:5	11:24 12:7 13:19	organizing 21:7	158:6
60:23	offerings 14:18	13:22 15:20 16:13	originally 128:22,24	ownership-based
nutrition 62:7 69:5	offers 14:11 50:3	16:16,25 17:5,7	129:19,19	23:5
nutshell 138:16	147:3	18:5 23:14 41:9,11	Orwell's 21:18	owning 12:1 16:22
NYU 70:23	Office 1:16 5:4 40:4	41:22 43:18,23	ought 18:21 38:4	126:1
	127:9 128:5	45:1 47:3,6,8 48:4	39:8	owns 158:3
0	129:11,18,25	52:4,25 54:18 55:4	outcome 16:20	
object 58:3 83:18	134:5 137:8,21	56:17 59:24,25	36:24	P
123:11 124:10	139:7 157:25	66:11 71:3,7 73:3	outcomes 42:6	p.m 165:11
obligation 37:13	Office's 129:10	82:24 83:2,8,19	outlawing 109:18	p.s 85:10,20 86:7
77:19 78:21	Officer 3:6	84:16 88:22 90:10	outlining 21:12	pacemakers 129:23
observation 111:4	officers 57:10	90:12 91:20 104:1	outrage 101:19	packaging 86:13,14
	-	•		·

[184]

page 2:3 24:11 29:8	participating 153:6	24:15 25:4 26:15	71:10 83:21 89:1	phrase 96:15
29:12 53:23 54:1	165:4	27:10,11,22 28:18	93:1 154:17	physical 11:12 14:2
66:13 67:7 73:21	participation 4:15	29:2,8,11,21,23,25	perceptions 2:13	21:23,24 24:24
75:2,12 76:24	90:9 118:14 127:7	30:11,12,16 31:5	34:16 77:18 82:15	32:6 36:17,20
150:4	particular 6:10 8:13	31:22 32:21 33:1	90:6 92:13	40:14 42:2,7,20
pages 19:19 24:21	8:24 9:2 10:20	33:12,20,23 35:8	perfect 33:15	43:14 44:6,9 48:3
26:2 60:2 73:7	11:6 15:13 16:19	36:21 37:4,7,17	perfectly 145:11	48:19 57:9,16 58:3
paid 27:19 58:8,14	16:20 25:17 29:8	39:17,19,21 40:25	performance 30:5	58:19 59:21 61:4
58:18 59:8 94:13	31:15 36:15 53:20	44:21 45:25 46:19	49:14	83:17 123:10,17
pair 68:19	53:25 54:1,11 56:5	47:3 54:2,23 55:23	performed 30:11	124:10 145:12
pairs 68:18	69:18 70:14 73:21	56:2 59:7 60:10	99:1,3	154:20
Palm 87:23	73:23 74:11 75:25	61:1,4 63:17 64:18	performs 31:1	physically 3:9
panel 4:24 13:20	78:18,25,25 79:8	64:20 65:2,12,20	period 6:12 14:23	physics 145:10,21
19:24 35:3,7,14	79:11,23 85:19	65:21,22,25 66:8	Perlmutter 3:4,5	pick 117:15
61:22 74:13 90:4,8	91:22 109:19	66:11,25 67:5,11	163:18	picking 163:5
95:6 99:13 111:3	110:8 112:14,19	67:12,16 68:13	permanent 120:2	picture 14:13 36:1
123:4 141:2 160:6	113:3,10 125:1,25	69:4,15 71:5,24	permanently 56:7	45:17 52:9,14,15
165:3	126:2,23 127:3	72:2,3,20,24 74:17	permit 9:17	66:13 106:16
panelists 35:2 90:16	151:13 165:1	96:3,19 97:18,25	permitted 164:4	123:2
101:10,17 124:15	particularly 74:13	98:22 99:10,14,17	person 124:25	pictures 14:24 53:6
124:21	84:23 99:23 107:2	100:5 104:4,8	personal 58:5 70:4,8	130:19
paper 3:19,21,23	124:23 125:3	105:3,25 107:5	70:15 77:2 87:21	piece 154:25 155:9
4:19 6:8,13,18 7:2	parties 114:12	108:12,24 115:9	114:16	Pinterest 160:10
7:11 12:16 13:22	partner 80:2	115:21 116:3,5,5,7	personally 47:21	pioneers 80:6
16:2 19:3,8 21:7	partnering 103:4	116:12,14,23,24	64:7 147:13	piracy 47:4 142:19
27:3 57:22 92:7,14	parts 34:13 39:10	118:1,4 121:15	perspective 38:10	143:11,16,22
115:12 123:24	pass 40:16 99:8	124:9 125:20	38:16 39:13,14	146:3,10 147:18
140:12 155:16	passed 129:4	126:5 130:13	42:16 52:8 56:20	147:21 148:8,12
paperback 7:15	passion 98:16	131:19 133:21	60:10 64:16 80:7	pirated 144:4
11:6 24:16	patches 14:2	137:11,12,12	83:1 122:16	pirates 144:2
papers 3:19 4:1	PATENT 1:16	145:2,5,7 146:1	126:15 143:12	place 15:14 106:11
paradigm 137:6	path 14:12 64:17	147:9 148:9 149:1	perspectives 2:10	155:24
parameters 74:21	103:5	149:24 150:2,3,14	62:1,9,12 90:17	placed 105:24
parenthetically	Patton 80:2	151:15 155:11,13	105:11 147:8	placement 84:19
144:23	pause 6:5	155:17,24 156:4	Perzanowski 18:25	places 29:16 65:22
parlance 85:6 124:9	pay 4:8 10:16 12:5	159:16 161:4	18:25 19:13 20:2,5	plain 49:8
parse 133:17	33:1,3,6,7,9 58:2	164:4	21:2 35:5,9,11,21	plane 154:2
part 7:21,21 10:13	64:8 65:25 109:11	people's 30:20	50:16 55:9,20	planning 62:4
37:13 80:13 87:8	113:8 120:7 144:3	67:19 68:25 71:23	57:21 60:19 61:16	platform 45:12 54:5
96:18 102:19,21	145:6 155:19,21	149:21	61:19 151:10,10	56:6 126:7 150:3
105:23 114:7	156:4	perceived 50:22	157:13,13 161:5	161:7
132:18 134:7	paying 4:12 15:15	percent 25:6 26:22	Perzanowski's	platforms 13:19
140:22 146:24	26:6 56:6 88:23	27:8 32:12,13	19:23 83:10	14:5 18:6 39:1
156:12 159:5,5	120:6 132:1	43:25 66:25 67:3,5	Peters 145:15	47:6 52:25 53:4
163:3	payment 49:8	67:11,11,12 73:8	Ph.D 93:11	56:18 83:4 95:12
participant 19:2	Pebble 37:20	74:22 76:11,20	philosophy 92:3	149:23 150:8,18
participants 15:21	Pennsylvania 19:15	percentage 26:13,24	phone 68:4 77:3	150:24 151:19
68:2,8,10	21:10	27:6 34:5	phonorecords 10:1	152:8 160:8,11
participated 3:24	people 16:23 18:7	perception 28:1	photographs 128:18	161:2,9
	l	l	l	l

[185]

play 9:10 65:13	154:13	pragmatically 37:2	136:17 137:25	problem 17:24 43:2
68:24 102:21	policy-wise 36:9	pre- 9:14	prevailing 14:14	46:10 58:24 59:3
103:22 149:17	pollution 23:3	prebuttal 55:10	prevent 8:20	69:22 102:6
157:17 158:15	pop 67:1	precaution 81:13	previous 124:21	104:11 107:4
159:1	popped 129:14	preemption 133:7	price 13:25 24:21,22	110:2 137:1 140:4
played 85:19	popular 14:24 68:22	prefer 31:23,24 37:8	33:10,10 110:5,8	141:3,4,6,17
playing 17:21 41:11	107:9	preference 32:3,9	110:13,20 112:21	145:10 149:21,21
65:9	populated 68:1	32:12,17,18	110:13,20 112:21	152:7
plays 29:15 159:6	population 78:13	preferences 22:21	132:21 144:4	problems 45:5,6
plea 97:3	147:1	23:7 31:22 32:5,21	152:21 111.1	71:2 107:21
please 3:3 61:22	portability 44:8	32:25 33:2 67:10	priced 44:6 144:1,21	proceeding 46:8
143:19	49:21	70:8 91:19	prices 25:1 110:7,18	process 4:19 7:2
pleased 87:6 89:17	portion 17:6 25:17	preferred 36:13,24	110:21,21 155:23	16:19 63:17
96:18 139:6	portrayed 95:1	109:6	pricing 83:25 84:1	114:18 129:12,20
point 21:14,15 22:1	posed 110:2	premise 110:4	104:2 107:1 108:3	158:12 161:3,5
22:15,25 23:4	posited 65:1	preparing 7:10	104.2 107.1 100.5	163:8
35:11 38:9 40:3	position 147:2,7	53:22 59:13	primary 16:23	processes 158:13
42:23 45:2 47:1,2	position 147.2,7 positioned 66:5	123:23	80:24	processing 73:14
47:15 57:22 60:22	159:19	prerequisite 82:12	principle 9:3 60:23	proclaimed 87:24
94:16 95:4 97:22	positive 32:15,16	prescribing 154:11	principles 83:3	produced 3:18
112:17 115:7	143:1	present 39:6 72:8	print 71:5,15 72:2,4	producing 107:8
120:10 122:6,17	possessing 12:2	105:2 160:18	72:21 77:5 83:2	product 19:19 26:2
123:3,19,19,20	possessing 12.2 possession 8:16 49:6	presentation 2:5,7,9	88:12 112:25	29:12 37:23 57:25
131:25 137:22	possibilities 154:22	2:18 6:1,4 19:23	125:16,24 126:6	83:13 86:14 96:15
139:24 143:9	possibility 5:6	21:1 35:1 57:22	126:12	96:19 97:2 105:17
151:6,12,13	possible 27:14 33:5	63:1 71:4 84:18	prior 84:11 87:5,11	105:21,25 106:6
155:11,14 157:14	possibly 131:2	97:17,25 124:17	priority 143:2	106:12 112:4
158:24 159:5	149:25	127:9 128:1	privacy 18:9 62:6,20	113:10 115:14
160:23 163:12,24	potential 3:15 31:10	presentations 2:10	62:21 63:7 64:25	119:6 128:4,12,13
pointed 39:4 41:7	potentially 115:22	4:22,24 62:1 82:6	65:5,12,16,20	128:13 131:14,20
44:23 62:5 97:17	164:2	84:11 89:20 90:5	67:20,23 68:9,11	131:22,22 133:23
97:25 98:5 117:5	power 121:17	149:19	68:14,16,21,23	131.22,22 133.23
154:1	122:12,14	presented 50:15,18	69:3 70:15,25 71:7	136:15 156:18
pointing 42:12	powering 100:24	54:16 63:21 78:24	71:8 80:3,9 81:11	product's 86:12
149:20 151:16	PowerPoint 20:6	157:21	81:13 115:7,10	production 155:14
points 13:25 25:15	PR 117:8	presenter 18:25	privacy- 63:7 68:19	155:15
64:19 65:6 71:23	practical 80:7 106:1	70:21	privacy-protected	products 2:18 21:22
84:1,6 93:13 108:9	106:2	presenters 62:10	68:15	24:22 40:7 43:14
139:20 156:2	practice 80:19 81:6	presenting 72:10	private 3:15 151:1	44:6 83:24 87:10
163:20	81:15 85:15	98:16	privileges 51:4	87:13,23 88:21
poisoning 77:24	109:19,20,21	presents 146:17	probably 14:11,13	89:5 104:1 105:22
policies 71:7 84:3	132:21 160:22	President 47:20	22:2 44:22,23 45:2	108:21 128:1,10
108:7 115:7,10	practices 5:6 48:24	103:11	46:12 54:2 55:11	130:3,18 131:5,11
policy 3:6,11,14,20	52:3 81:2 103:1	presumptions	55:21 58:21,22	132:8,12,19
3:22 6:15 36:11,14	108:22 109:5	158:19	59:4 83:18 96:14	133:14 134:4
37:10 38:9 42:24	practicing 96:11	pretty 25:5 28:8	103:5 121:15	135:4,6 136:19
62:3,19 81:19	practitioners 83:7	31:3 38:19 101:21	129:22 130:14	137:2 138:2,4,10
100:14 123:24	97:6	102:17 129:2	132:13 153:25	140:21 156:14
128:3 138:12	pragmatic 39:14	132:11,11 133:21	154:5,12 159:21	157:19
	1			
	1	1	1	1

				[186]
PROF 55:20 60:19	protection 9:11	88:2 101:23 109:6	92:23 96:3 103:21	rates 26:19 27:15
63:5 71:11 90:25	22:15 88:20 89:10	109:24 124:8	105:5 111:2,18	rating 68:23
111:9 151:10	94:8 128:19	140:22 142:13	112:1 115:16	rationalization
professional 28:11	protections 71:8	156:24	120:17 141:21	146:10 149:5
107:14	protective 68:20	purchased 4:8 21:19	142:18 143:12	reach 121:10
professor 18:25	86:15	22:1 43:13 44:9,12	148:13 150:21	reached 16:1
19:1,13,23 20:2,4	provide 13:3 16:3	47:12 86:5 101:5	152:25 153:7,8,8	reaching 110:3
35:5,8,11,21 50:16	18:10 19:10 25:11	purchaser 29:22	159:21 164:10	react 19:24 35:8
55:9 57:21 62:18	37:12 39:22 62:11	purchasers 42:2	questions 4:25 11:5	76:16 120:18
70:22 83:10	100:6 109:8	55:19,19,23 59:25	15:3 23:13,21 26:3	reaction 35:20 36:4
151:11 159:14	provided 82:17,19	purchases 26:17,20	28:17 30:5,8 35:10	37:9 142:7 143:13
161:4	87:11 146:24	26:24 41:22 42:7	35:13 60:13 65:15	reactions 2:9 35:1
Professors 92:8	provider 109:9	42:15,20 44:14	65:18,24 66:16,20	139:23
program 16:10	120:22 124:6	56:3 109:16,16,23	83:14 106:23	reacts 76:14
62:22 70:24	providers 51:5,6,8	purchasing 22:6	118:9,11,17	read 12:6,11,12,19
progress 4:18	provides 7:24 8:13	25:20 32:24 83:12	139:22 152:16	12:24 17:20 25:8
prohibited 109:14	121:1,2,8	109:12	153:20,21 154:9	26:8 28:20 49:5
prohibition 122:16	proving 102:4	pure 144:20	159:12	63:25 69:7 70:1,4
prohibits 81:2	provisions 15:8	purely 22:14 130:10	quick 59:25 64:22	71:5,18,24 72:2,3
project 21:5 71:7	provocative 141:21	purports 122:1	67:22 124:16	72:20 74:23 75:8
93:13 97:10	149:12,18 151:6	purpose 16:5 111:20	quickly 90:18 104:4	76:10,17 77:1,11
proliferation 89:13	proximity 84:21	144:19	108:25 118:11	77:18 78:23 79:1,4
prominent 84:17	Ps 84:15	purposes 9:16 18:19	161:14,15	84:17,18 97:7,13
88:6 121:6 142:1	PTO 5:12 21:6	73:4	Quigley 164:24	97:19,19 99:15,17
prominently 86:11	52:11 147:17	pursue 44:23	quintessential 73:3	99:18 104:8
promote 103:1	164:23	purview 136:23	quite 6:12 29:18	105:18 113:1
160:16	public 1:11 3:25 4:5	push 117:11 148:10	31:2 133:15	115:1,10,20 116:6
promotional 81:25	6:14 8:4,11 18:6	put 13:2 17:23 24:6	151:22 152:6	117:12 123:22
pronounced 29:13	35:23 36:7 49:14	33:1 46:11 56:19	quiz 65:4	149:1 154:3 160:9
properly 51:12	52:24 59:17 62:19	57:14 63:14,16,20	quo 47:13	readability 99:12
137:24	97:12 106:19,20	65:22 67:15,21	quote 123:22 124:3	readable 106:3
property 36:19 73:6	106:22 155:9	69:11,20 70:17	quoting 123:25	reader 74:2,4
80:3 114:11	public's 105:6,7	72:6 85:9,22 93:14	1	125:13
164:19	publish 159:20	94:23 102:22	R	readers 76:16 126:9
proposal 46:12	published 19:14	106:8 112:4 142:6	race 23:19 160:7	readership 72:6
106:7	21:9 71:2 158:1	144:2 158:2,22	raise 41:5 108:10	75:5,9,24 76:5,18
propose 110:24	publisher 8:9	159:2	148:16 150:20	reading 24:7 46:22
140:3	publisher's 126:15	putting 28:13	151:21 152:16	46:24 69:22 79:19
proposed 99:1	publishers 45:19	Putting 2 0110	raised 3:23 41:3	100:5 115:15
105:23 146:9	48:6 103:12,13	Q	141:2	116:2 160:5
proposition 12:21	106:17,24 107:11	qualifies 84:22	raising 148:14	reads 12:17 76:14
110:23	107:24 114:13	quantify 30:4	ran 139:17	77:5 79:15
protect 81:13	155:14	quarter-century 9:4	range 129:5	ready 3:2 90:3
129:16 132:6	publishing 14:14	question 14:25	rank 91:22 92:1	real 17:24 33:12
135:24	107:12,13,14,15	16:14 18:21 22:13	ranks 91:24	54:8 59:10 72:22
protected 108:15	pull 96:12	25:8 26:5 27:15,18	rare 12:17	102:6 104:11
125:8 128:21	purchase 22:18 43:6	31:9 33:4 39:16	rate 25:6 27:7,7	117:22 122:7
130:11	43:10,17,21 44:8	42:11 59:15 63:22	30:22 31:17 72:5	123:8 152:7
protecting 102:23	81:18,22 87:5,11	64:24 85:3 91:7	160:24	158:13
r				
	1	1	1	1

[187]

	1	1	1	
real-world 148:24	reasons 9:20 10:14	regards 92:10	46:13 163:1	reproduction 10:7,9
realities 96:5	11:18 22:14 43:11	regime 101:4	remedial 93:21	require 75:15,25
reality 34:17	52:1 142:2 148:19	regimes 71:4	remedies 94:4	required 77:5
realize 3:15 94:11	160:8	region 23:19	remember 21:16	105:22
102:19 130:6	reassure 163:4	regular 43:5	105:19	requirement 105:24
131:12 132:17	receive 42:4 83:24	regulate 110:5,14,17	reminded 121:6	requirements 51:9
150:16	113:7 156:16	111:17	123:3	requiring 72:9
realized 62:8 132:5	received 88:4	regulated 110:3	remixes 6:8	75:17 76:18
137:5	recess 89:23	regulates 110:7,22	remotely 21:17	resale 9:17 27:1,9
really 10:11 11:14	recipient's 10:6	regulating 110:6,7	50:12 126:8	135:11 159:6
18:2 21:11,19 22:6	recognize 63:7	110:20	removal 22:1	research 2:7,9,14
23:2 26:19 27:24	recognized 38:12	regulation 105:23	removed 10:20 60:9	21:1 35:1 41:19,25
36:23,25 41:18	recommend 103:6	110:9,10,13,13,20	rent 56:4 119:21	43:4,5 47:15,16
49:9 50:20,24	131:17	112:8 140:3	120:4 122:11,20	62:14 66:7 70:25
51:13,20 59:3	recommendation	regulations 80:9	rental 8:5 48:12	71:2,10 77:14 91:8
60:17 61:15 65:16	140:12	reimpose 109:15	121:23,24,25	112:7 115:6
69:10,22,23 70:17	recommendations	reinvent 18:4 38:17	122:10,21 156:25	134:14 136:5,20
72:1,8,11 75:20	3:22 6:18 42:25	relate 13:6,11 32:23	rentals 14:22	136:21 147:23
79:18 83:6,22 84:8	131:2 137:1	related 63:8 67:23	renters 122:13	148:3 150:21
85:4 91:6,6 92:14	reconcile 34:15	73:6 84:24 85:22	renting 16:22 49:12	152:25 153:3,12
96:8,18 100:2	reconvene 89:22	90:11,14,22 92:14	119:11,13,14,17	153:16,20,21
101:11 111:14	record 8:9 43:20	112:14,17	119:24,24 120:4	155:9 156:10
116:5 117:16	45:15	relates 84:6 151:13	144:2	157:16 159:15
122:19 125:17	recordings 128:18	151:22 152:9	repair 40:18,18,19	researching 53:21
127:6 131:22,23	recruited 66:10	relating 4:25 6:16	134:13 136:4,20	resell 15:1 26:7,18
132:1,15 133:16	recurring 95:7	16:13 86:8	137:12	50:5,7 134:17,18
134:5 135:6,20	red 74:14	Relations 103:11	repeat 44:17 56:1	154:2
136:11,22,24	Redbox 144:1,6	relationship 21:22	repeated 29:13 85:7	reselling 29:4 31:19
137:19 138:4,11	redistribution 9:18	52:18 53:3 57:25	replaced 25:23	134:11,13 135:2
139:9 140:4,17	15:9	106:20 110:6	replicate 25:1	reserve 19:1 161:12
141:2,11,22	reduce 77:23 147:18	122:3 124:6	report 60:9 69:7	resident 93:12
143:15 144:13	160:24	relationships 21:20	100:19,21 127:10	residing 11:3
148:13,14,15	refer 123:13	21:21 51:17 52:22	134:9	resist 111:12
149:12,25 152:13	reference 82:19	106:24	represent 35:19	resistance 143:9
156:11,13,20	referenced 83:5	relative 43:9	36:3 52:13 53:1	resolution 134:2
157:5,7,15 158:9	reflect 104:19	relatively 14:23	106:14 107:11	resonates 156:13
158:11,24 159:20	107:21 113:6,8	52:21 114:12	124:2 153:5	resources 98:24
159:22 160:1	reflected 24:4,21	157:1,9	representation	respect 9:2,13 13:6
163:3,13,21 165:2	88:19 155:23	releasing 7:10	128:15	40:22 42:14,20
reason 10:11 38:3	reflection 22:23	relentless 115:24	representative	104:13 105:21
43:11 68:12 114:7	23:7	relevant 17:3 18:11	23:17,17,19	107:1 125:4,14,19
117:4 120:20	refrigerator 130:8	42:18 64:7 115:20	representatives	125:23 127:1
142:7 145:9	156:16	relief 160:18	13:19 18:5	147:11 160:18
160:13	refund 84:2	reluctance 144:16	representing 100:16	respects 11:11
reasonable 18:17	regard 40:12	reluctant 121:16	represents 36:3 41:9	126:11
106:13 115:10	regarding 91:19	rely 99:18 101:6	103:12	respond 29:18 60:13
124:25 158:7	92:11 106:25	remainder 48:21	reproduce 9:25	152:18
reasonably 81:8,17	140:25	remarkable 143:25	reproduceable	responded 26:25
81:21	regardless 69:9	remarks 2:4,21 3:1	153:22	respondent 30:7

				[188]
non Jorta 22.14		146.21 140.2	110.01.05.110.10	compon 6:10 95:2
respondents 23:14	reviewing 80:16 81:23	146:21 149:3	112:21,25 113:10	screen 6:10 85:3
25:7 26:1,22 30:5		155:12,18 156:5	115:21 salt 46:4	screening 23:13,21 screens 46:19
31:18 33:3,9 34:9 50:18	reviews 99:18	157:21 159:7		
	RIAA 14:4	risk 117:8 145:25	same 78:1	scroll 75:23 76:25
responding 14:9	rich 73:3 161:10	road 16:17 142:16	sample 23:16	96:3 119:12
101:11 154:15	rid 145:12 riff 163:3	roadmap 113:15	samples 78:13 121:24	searching 70:12
response 25:6 26:19 27:15 29:9 106:6	right 6:10 8:1,3,9,10	roadmaps 112:8 Roberts 109:25	sanity 27:13	74:17 seat 3:3 123:17
118:12 120:19	8	robust 150:23	satisfied 55:8,15	
responses 29:4	8:23 9:2,22,25 10:9 22:24 23:3,24	role 7:7 41:11 79:10	87:5	second 11:2,4 25:19 43:2 46:10 56:15
responsibilities	24:6,25 26:4,16,23	102:17 103:22	saved 57:6	60:17 72:17 74:2
114:22	27:10,19,24 28:4	149:16 159:6	saved 37.0 saw 24:15 25:22	94:16 98:11 99:13
responsibility 64:9	28:10,15,20 29:11	room 18:19 54:2	26:11 27:14 29:17	101:24 109:17
i v	30:5,7,11,13,17	77:23 78:10 116:9		112:17 116:13
responsible 39:21 rest 16:10 35:14		133:21 141:22	30:16,21 31:5 34:3 50:15 65:20 68:13	142:5,6 146:9
41:3	31:2,6,10,13,25	163:4		,
41:5 restaurant 77:21,22	32:10,19 33:5,8,11 33:13,14 34:1,5	roughly 23:19	135:1,8 137:12 saying 50:1 58:1	secondary 145:2,4 secondly 116:2
restraint 144:9	40:13 45:1 46:15	roundtables 19:3	60:10 88:5,19	seconds 29:6 60:16
161:20	46:25 61:2,16,17	148:18	96:16 104:9	74:18 77:1 164:17
restricted 86:7	63:5 65:8 66:2	Rowland 127:8	115:24 119:1	section 8:5,12 9:25
restricting 103:22	74:12 75:22,22	128:2	121:9,24 140:19	46:7 81:1 83:3
restrictions 6:22	76:7,11,13 77:12	rule 53:19 103:19	149:20 156:14	110:1,12 136:3,7
108:5 133:2	79:14 97:18 98:20	128:23 159:2	says 15:12 37:23	139:13
restrictive 92:23	111:17 116:4	rulemaking 129:12	55:7 116:16	sector-specific
result 27:25 30:24	119:8,14 120:2,3,4	rules 7:14 9:14	121:21,25 122:20	89:12
31:3 42:4 53:7	122:2,4 124:11	16:17 18:16	136:15	sector's 3:15
results 10:7 26:10	125:24 152:2,4	120:21,21,23,24	scale 30:9 32:15	sector al 107:11
27:4,13,21,21	156:15,17,25	run 48:2 59:6 60:17	52:21	sectors 89:15 126:25
28:24,24 29:13,14	158:2 159:14	69:16 133:25	scaled 30:7,8	security 62:20
34:3 67:9 153:22	rightfully 111:16	164:19	Scarpelli 100:12,13	134:13 136:4,20
153:25	rights 7:25 8:3 9:12	running 59:4	scenes 132:9 136:11	136:21 163:7,10
retail 47:23 52:16	9:24 15:23 22:18	Tunning 57.4	schedule 139:18	see 6:9 7:25 17:12
74:6,10	22:20 25:13,18,23	S	Schneider 109:3	26:12,19 27:19,22
retailer 47:23 51:8	26:3,14 30:1 31:11	sad 98:19	scholarly 107:14	28:14 29:1,3,13,15
51:19 120:22,23	31:15 32:3,17,22	safe 39:17	scholars 99:23,23,24	32:11,20 34:5 37:5
retailers 48:3,3,4,4	33:6,17,20 34:7,9	safety 105:21,21	116:4	41:11 44:17,25,25
51:13,15,16 52:13	34:13 36:8,19 37:7	106:6	scholarship 96:9	47:13 63:10 65:3,6
80:5 95:11 114:13	37:15 38:11,13,18	sale 4:2 6:9,11,16	School 70:23,23	65:21 66:4,5,6,14
121:24 151:19	38:23 41:24 42:8	7:2,3,6,8 8:1,4,11	92:9 93:11 96:8	66:16 67:10 68:11
retailing 48:1	42:10,19 49:7,18	8:23,25 9:17 10:8	schools 143:4	68:23 69:11 73:15
rethinking 36:14	50:19,22 51:6	19:4,5 36:10,12	Schruers 153:15,15	74:5,9,15 75:5,5,9
return 84:2 120:5	59:20 70:14,16	40:6 48:11 95:1	Schwartz 92:8	75:23 85:2 93:25
reveal 113:19	73:6 85:14 86:5,21	121:18 135:22	Sci-Hub 149:1	96:23 107:9 111:3
revenues 14:7	86:24 87:4 89:14	136:2 140:13	science 18:9 62:18	116:10,11 121:23
reverse 136:16	92:21 95:14	141:24 143:9	scientific 149:4,6	125:21 126:12
review 19:15 21:10	104:13,15 114:21	144:6	scope 134:3	131:2,3 135:2,11
60:2 92:8 116:21	125:9 130:11	sales 47:4 84:2	score 31:5	137:11 144:10
129:10	141:25 142:21	86:20 87:10	scored 32:15	150:10 153:9
reviewed 128:24	144:15 146:12,18	salient 75:4 94:14	scores 30:12	160:6
	,10			
	1	1	1	<u> </u>

[1	8	9]

	•		•	
seeing 145:3 148:24	54:23 55:3 83:24	57:11,12 73:2	97:14,21,23 98:3,8	social 83:2 91:20
152:6,15 157:22	88:22 89:5 94:3	82:23	98:17 157:9	160:7,12 161:1,6
seen 24:10,12,13,14	108:4,18 124:5	short 14:23 15:16	simpler 97:4 101:25	society 93:12 145:6
37:20 53:17 70:7	140:21 141:12	19:19 24:19 25:10	152:10	software 2:18 5:5
70:10,11	147:9	25:24 28:9,10 29:5	simplified 38:22	14:2 37:23 40:5,8
segments 146:25	set 6:24 15:8 22:10	31:1,3 45:3,7,8,23	39:14,22,24 63:19	40:14,15 49:10
segue 121:2	22:18,19 23:13	46:3,10,24 47:2	63:20 77:11	71:16,16 73:3,12
select 68:12,14	38:11 61:3,6 70:8	50:19 56:14 84:5	simplifying 72:13	74:25 85:17 86:2,6
selected 24:10	94:4 95:13,19	short-notice 29:1	79:21	86:15,25 96:13,21
selecting 68:4	112:14 120:21,22	short-term 120:1	simply 49:13 56:2	98:15 99:22
self-selected 29:21	120:23 163:22	shorten 77:11	60:6,23 110:9,14	100:17 116:23
sell 8:15,17 38:14	sets 52:13 106:25	shortening 72:13	115:1 121:8	128:1,4,9,21 129:3
40:17 43:25 44:1,2	113:3 120:20	79:20	123:20 125:6	129:5 130:9 131:1
106:18 120:9	setting 72:21 156:4	shorter 79:3 152:10	simulation 33:15	131:4,6,8,9,16,21
121:12 145:11	settings 78:8	shorthand 61:10	simultaneously	131:23,25 132:16
sell-through 48:10	settled 160:21	shouldn't 117:11	126:8	132:18 133:12,14
48:22	seven 30:8,9 122:11	155:16	single 11:5 29:5	134:18,19 135:3
sellers 72:25 110:17	sex 23:17	show 28:7	61:10 99:18 110:8	135:14,15,19,25
113:6	shaming 117:7	showed 26:2 58:9	124:8	137:20 138:5,7
selling 85:16 87:21	shaping 126:20	66:13 158:10	Siri 46:17	144:23,24,24
Senate 129:24	share 16:12 59:22	159:1	sit 116:9 123:18	156:14,17 157:18
130:22 132:4	64:22 67:17 69:9	shown 82:14	site 120:24	158:3
Senators 130:2	90:16 143:21	shows 53:6 54:24	sites 51:22 74:7	Software-enabled
send 144:17	shared 85:20	56:1 65:24 67:14	sitting 10:4,24 57:7	128:10
Senior 5:11 100:14	sharing 94:10	118:1	situated 132:6	sold 8:25 23:1 24:12
sense 10:13 13:17	She's 70:22 71:6	shrinkwrap 133:9	136:12	55:12
17:19 27:25 30:20	sheer 51:7 115:18	shut 37:25 158:22	situation 102:4	solution 137:3
33:16 69:18 77:16	Sheffner 35:25	shutting 146:1	120:21 126:17	solutions 17:15,19
77:17,17 91:11,21	52:10 55:21	shy 60:4	134:25 138:8	solve 111:19 140:3
92:16 107:7 109:5	106:15 123:1,1	sic 10:1	140:1 147:15	141:4,17
112:22 123:6	shelf 10:16 44:3	side 74:13 81:15	149:1,9 164:7	somebody 13:3,4
126:14 144:22	shelves 114:15	89:10 132:13	situations 119:5	50:4 53:20 60:14
156:22	shift 23:4 24:14 28:5	150:19	six 52:14 76:8	64:8 74:2 117:16
separate 53:10	149:10	sides 15:21	sized 100:17	117:17 121:16
133:13	shifts 28:5	significant 18:8	skill 20:5	somebody's 74:7
separately 88:2	shine 116:3,7	25:22 28:5,24 29:3	slice 145:23	somewhat 31:24
series 2:10 26:3 62:1	Shira 3:5 6:3 140:9	30:24,25 31:3	slide 33:18 156:2	146:8,11
106:22	163:16 164:24	40:15 50:21 87:3	slides 28:7 71:13	song 11:19 43:7,8
serious 98:13 102:8	Shira's 6:7 164:23	89:1	slightly 149:11	70:13
seriously 97:24	shock 53:19 104:23	significantly 17:8	151:6	songs 58:9
served 62:23	shocking 79:3	31:16 33:11 38:20	small 28:19 40:19	Sony 85:15 86:10
server 10:5,5,24	shoes 145:3	49:1	52:21 73:14 74:20	sophisticated
servers 37:25	shoestring 159:14	similar 12:3 29:1,15	78:13 100:16	114:12 159:7
service 33:25 48:7	shook 30:20	42:14 57:4 138:13	157:1,1	sorry 60:17 61:15
50:10 83:13 94:7	shop 23:10 40:19	138:13	smaller 26:24	77:3 121:4 151:14
94:13 104:7 109:9	74:17 112:23	similarly 79:1 88:9	smart 37:21 78:6	156:7
123:14	shoppers 23:14	101:9 152:3	smartphone 129:6	sort 23:10 24:2
services 13:14,23	73:16 74:16 76:13	simple 45:8,10,22	130:7	25:11 27:12,23
14:19 16:25 49:7	shopping 32:6,7	45:22 51:10,11	smartphones 129:22	30:4 32:14 36:17

				[190]
38:15 54:13 55:10	spends 74:2 76:25	statistically 28:4	40:13 157:21	success 30:16
57:3,13 58:15,24	spent 6:11 7:9 28:13	30:23 50:21	strongly 31:23	succinctly 60:24
59:2,2,6,12 61:11	47:22 76:12 134:5	statistics 59:11	147:20	sudden 39:23 58:9
67:4 85:2 89:8	151:24	stats 100:21	struck 164:13	sue 117:6,9,17
93:18,23 94:8,11	spirited 133:22	status 47:13 100:20	structure 79:7	122:18
94:21 95:1,8,25	splits 48:21	140:25	struggle 46:11	sued 116:17
96:1 101:12	spoke 59:13	statute 105:19 109:3	students 63:9 64:25	sufficient 87:11,17
105:14 108:12	spoken 104:5	109:13,17 110:8	67:20	106:10
119:25 123:9,13	Spotify 14:21	110:19 114:23	studied 112:9,10	sufficiently 72:24
134:18 137:23	spotlight 116:7	statutory 6:9 7:25	studies 64:22 72:18	suggest 44:15 45:7
143:21 148:24	squelch 145:18	93:21 104:20	78:11,13 93:6	148:2,4,22 161:4
149:8 151:11	Squire 80:2	122:21	155:1	suggested 4:19
153:20 156:22	staff 164:18	step 58:15 60:8	studio 8:10	17:11,13 44:16
157:20 158:22	stakeholder 4:19	steps 2:20 5:9 29:10	studios 45:17 48:5,5	148:22 152:24
159:2,19,24	102:8 105:11	139:1,14,15	52:14,15,23 53:2,9	156:3
sorted 23:22 24:9	163:8	stereo 58:11	study 2:19 5:4 19:16	suggesting 164:3
sorts 11:25 13:7	stakeholders 16:11	Steve 99:2	21:12 23:9 41:17	suggestion 154:14
22:9 69:6 70:3	16:22 106:8 137:9	Steven 165:1	41:20,25 42:24,25	suggests 19:18
93:24 94:9 101:24	140:5	stick 151:2	43:2 50:15 64:25	suit 94:3
111:19 115:22	stakes 89:16	sticking 98:1	66:2,10,19 67:17	suite 157:20
128:9 132:8	stamped 121:18	stock 43:22	70:24 72:19 75:7	summarize 26:10
sound 128:18	standalone 128:25	stop 35:3,16 61:14	77:25 78:19 83:10	41:16
sounds 98:1	standard 71:3,24	61:17	103:4 128:1,4	summarized 140:19
source 22:21 116:24	73:4 79:17 91:2	stops 120:8	129:13 130:1,22	summarizing 31:8
space 48:10 63:7	93:24 153:20	store 10:17 11:23	131:7,12,14 132:5	summary 67:22
80:18 159:10	standpoint 161:21	43:15,20 49:23	132:15 134:3	super 147:12
speak 62:14	Stanford 92:7	65:7,20 67:22,25	135:1 137:8,14	support 25:16 38:8
speaker 62:17 80:1	stark 21:19	68:8,9,10 110:14	138:15,16 152:24	38:8 48:8 143:3
speakers 69:21	start 7:3 16:21	121:25 122:9	153:22 154:23	150:10
165:3	35:22 90:24	152:5	156:2 158:1	supporter 36:10
speaking 41:15 43:4	117:21 154:6,8,10	stored 50:9,9	159:25	supporting 48:1
47:6 52:15,23	started 3:3 35:4	storefronts 43:23	studying 42:17	suppose 141:1
specializes 80:2	49:17 56:22	44:18	stuff 57:6 130:14,16	158:20
specific 4:16,25 5:7	117:23 147:23	story 29:15	sub-rent 122:13	supposedly 124:25
58:25 82:6 131:15	164:14	straightforward	subject 54:4,7 86:21	Supreme 109:1
164:20	starting 21:14,15 26:11 47:15	101:24 strongo 128:22	112:20 113:4,5,12 113:18,20,23	110:11 121:11,14 121:19
specifically 50:20 68:17 71:16	state 52:19 54:14	strange 128:23 strategic 80:8	129:9,13	surcharge 109:15
118:10 131:10	55:8 89:11 133:4,5	streaming 14:5	submission 123:25	sure 18:13,18 22:15
163:8	133:10,13	17:21 33:24 34:4,6	subscription 14:18	22:22 23:13 29:19
specifying 93:18	stated 6:17 52:1	85:21 141:12	14:20 16:25 48:13	36:6,18 39:17
spectrum 48:2	statement 81:19	143:15 155:1	48:20,25	58:16 60:5 61:19
speech 108:14,17	102:6	street 1:17 144:4	subscriptions 124:5	89:2 98:10 100:2
110:3,7,9,22	statements 82:9	strictly 104:19	subsequent 75:6	101:8 126:21
speeding 60:15	84:11 111:2 150:5	striking 141:23	126:2	129:15 139:4
speeding 00.15 spend 6:25 33:12,13	States 17:9 121:19	strings 74:9	substantial 17:6	142:12 146:7
37:8 73:21 74:1,18	152:1	strong 32:2,5,16,18	25:17 28:4 81:7	147:5 152:7
116:1	stating 101:22	142:25	substantially 17:23	156:19 163:19
spending 29:11	statistical 50:20	stronger 32:10	subtle 24:14	surpassed 48:18
r				I
	1	1	1	1

[191]

surprise 54:2 105:9	73:5 90:13,21	122:9	102:15,23 104:1,7	9:25 10:4,12 11:10
surprised 160:6	99:17 128:3	telling 39:22 85:16	104:20,24 105:3	11:13 12:22 13:22
surprising 12:22	142:15 150:10,25	tells 110:15	105:12,16 106:25	15:16 16:9 23:2
surrounding 16:12	talked 45:23 46:14	temporary 4:12	107:16,22 111:5,7	28:6 29:19 30:18
survey 23:14 25:7	77:9 91:1 118:21	23:6	111:11 112:14,24	32:22 39:10 40:24
25:25 28:17 29:10	133:20 135:18	temptation 111:12	112:25 113:3,4,17	42:17 44:3 46:2,8
31:15 65:13 72:21	142:4,5,9 160:9	tempting 114:25	116:3,6,8,17,22	46:12 50:8,9 52:5
91:20 158:10	talking 19:9 32:6,7	ten 29:10 46:12 58:8	117:11 119:19	55:16 57:25 60:19
surveyed 23:11	36:21 40:22 46:24	156:19 157:9	120:11,12 126:12	61:1,16 63:11
Susan 103:13	53:13,18 58:12,12	ten-minute 89:21	143:2,11 152:11	64:17 65:16 67:2,5
164:24 165:1	58:23 88:25 94:2	tend 44:14 45:7	154:3,20,21	74:3,3,13 76:5
suspect 55:18,21	94:20 103:25	77:12 107:7 113:2	157:16 158:8	82:7 89:8 97:3,8
56:9 147:25	107:22 114:11	tended 30:1	161:18 162:3	98:3 99:7,11,11
158:10 159:4	119:2 126:16	tends 112:21 113:19	163:22,23	100:24,24 101:2
suspected 22:8	128:7,8 139:10	tension 104:16	terrain 93:20	100:24,24 101:2
55:11	149:13 150:16	114:3	Tesla 157:3	102:10,17,17
SVOD 48:12	156:23,25 157:2	tentatively 57:13	test 22:11 67:24	110:23 113:21
Swift 43:7	161:22	159:9	68:18 69:10,15,15	115:4,24 117:7,10
switch 6:4 27:16	talks 58:13	term 36:23 49:9	69:17,17 78:9,13	117:11 118:3
symbols 63:8 64:4	tapes 143:24	50:25 55:24 60:20	112:14 113:11	120:2,3,13 125:17
system 46:22 86:22	target 160:15	78:25 84:5 95:9	tested 66:18 67:8	120.2,3,13 123.17 129:2 141:5
121:17 129:1	164:12	104:3 112:2,19,19	testimonials 85:13	129.2 141.3
143:5	targeted 102:19	113:10,12,20	testing 69:13,13	145:25 146:8
145.5	Task 3:12,13,17 4:9	117:9 122:1,19	78:6,17 79:22 95:5	143.25 140.8
Т	123:24 128:3	124:9 125:4	95:18 99:10	150:16,17,25
table 142:7 159:3	123.24 128.3	133:22	text 8:1	151:6,20 156:19
	130.12	1,2,2,44		
tag 66:12.15.16.17				
tag 66:12,15,16,17 66:25 67:8.9	taught 143:4,4	termination 94:3	textbooks 121:18	158:18 159:9,21
66:25 67:8,9	taught 143:4,4 Taylor 43:7	termination 94:3 terminology 61:6	textbooks 121:18 thank 6:3 34:18	158:18 159:9,21 160:1 163:4 164:8
66:25 67:8,9 tailor 160:15	taught 143:4,4 Taylor 43:7 teaching 70:24	termination 94:3 terminology 61:6 terms 2:16 4:25 6:21	textbooks 121:18 thank 6:3 34:18 35:5 41:1 47:17	158:18 159:9,21 160:1 163:4 164:8 theater 114:14
66:25 67:8,9 tailor 160:15 tailored 67:7	taught 143:4,4 Taylor 43:7 teaching 70:24 team 164:23	termination 94:3 terminology 61:6 terms 2:16 4:25 6:21 7:22 11:14 13:7,10	textbooks 121:18 thank 6:3 34:18 35:5 41:1 47:17 52:10,10 62:3 63:2	158:18 159:9,21 160:1 163:4 164:8 theater 114:14 theme 95:7
66:25 67:8,9 tailor 160:15 tailored 67:7 take 10:10,13,16	taught 143:4,4 Taylor 43:7 teaching 70:24 team 164:23 tease 141:20	termination 94:3 terminology 61:6 terms 2:16 4:25 6:21 7:22 11:14 13:7,10 13:11,14 15:7 17:3	textbooks 121:18 thank 6:3 34:18 35:5 41:1 47:17 52:10,10 62:3 63:2 63:5 70:19,20	158:18 159:9,21 160:1 163:4 164:8 theater 114:14 theme 95:7 themed 101:9
66:25 67:8,9 tailor 160:15 tailored 67:7 take 10:10,13,16 15:14 33:14 36:14	taught 143:4,4 Taylor 43:7 teaching 70:24 team 164:23 tease 141:20 technical 115:17	termination 94:3 terminology 61:6 terms 2:16 4:25 6:21 7:22 11:14 13:7,10 13:11,14 15:7 17:3 18:14,20,23 23:17	textbooks 121:18 thank 6:3 34:18 35:5 41:1 47:17 52:10,10 62:3 63:2 63:5 70:19,20 71:11,12 79:24,25	158:18 159:9,21 160:1 163:4 164:8 theater 114:14 theme 95:7 themed 101:9 there's 10:11,19
66:25 67:8,9 tailor 160:15 tailored 67:7 take 10:10,13,16 15:14 33:14 36:14 44:10 54:13 56:14	taught 143:4,4 Taylor 43:7 teaching 70:24 team 164:23 tease 141:20 technical 115:17 technological 94:8	termination 94:3 terminology 61:6 terms 2:16 4:25 6:21 7:22 11:14 13:7,10 13:11,14 15:7 17:3 18:14,20,23 23:17 23:18,18 25:3,5	textbooks 121:18 thank 6:3 34:18 35:5 41:1 47:17 52:10,10 62:3 63:2 63:5 70:19,20 71:11,12 79:24,25 89:17,19,19,22	158:18 159:9,21 160:1 163:4 164:8 theater 114:14 theme 95:7 themed 101:9 there's 10:11,19 16:3,6 17:24 18:18
66:25 67:8,9 tailor 160:15 tailored 67:7 take 10:10,13,16 15:14 33:14 36:14 44:10 54:13 56:14 67:6 75:8 81:13	taught 143:4,4 Taylor 43:7 teaching 70:24 team 164:23 tease 141:20 technical 115:17 technological 94:8 technologically	termination 94:3 terminology 61:6 terms 2:16 4:25 6:21 7:22 11:14 13:7,10 13:11,14 15:7 17:3 18:14,20,23 23:17 23:18,18 25:3,5 26:15 30:21 51:3	textbooks 121:18 thank 6:3 34:18 35:5 41:1 47:17 52:10,10 62:3 63:2 63:5 70:19,20 71:11,12 79:24,25 89:17,19,19,22 93:8 100:8,12	158:18 159:9,21 160:1 163:4 164:8 theater 114:14 theme 95:7 themed 101:9 there's 10:11,19 16:3,6 17:24 18:18 19:9 24:17 27:5
66:25 67:8,9 tailor 160:15 tailored 67:7 take 10:10,13,16 15:14 33:14 36:14 44:10 54:13 56:14 67:6 75:8 81:13 89:21 97:11,23	taught 143:4,4 Taylor 43:7 teaching 70:24 team 164:23 tease 141:20 technical 115:17 technological 94:8 technologically 144:11	termination 94:3 terminology 61:6 terms 2:16 4:25 6:21 7:22 11:14 13:7,10 13:11,14 15:7 17:3 18:14,20,23 23:17 23:18,18 25:3,5 26:15 30:21 51:3 54:10,10 56:24,24	textbooks 121:18 thank 6:3 34:18 35:5 41:1 47:17 52:10,10 62:3 63:2 63:5 70:19,20 71:11,12 79:24,25 89:17,19,19,22 93:8 100:8,12 103:8 111:1	158:18 159:9,21 160:1 163:4 164:8 theater 114:14 theme 95:7 themed 101:9 there's 10:11,19 16:3,6 17:24 18:18 19:9 24:17 27:5 36:19 38:7,10 39:4
66:25 67:8,9 tailor 160:15 tailored 67:7 take 10:10,13,16 15:14 33:14 36:14 44:10 54:13 56:14 67:6 75:8 81:13 89:21 97:11,23 101:12 103:14	taught 143:4,4 Taylor 43:7 teaching 70:24 team 164:23 tease 141:20 technical 115:17 technological 94:8 technologically 144:11 technologies 81:6	termination 94:3 terminology 61:6 terms 2:16 4:25 6:21 7:22 11:14 13:7,10 13:11,14 15:7 17:3 18:14,20,23 23:17 23:18,18 25:3,5 26:15 30:21 51:3 54:10,10 56:24,24 71:5,25 72:10,25	textbooks 121:18 thank 6:3 34:18 35:5 41:1 47:17 52:10,10 62:3 63:2 63:5 70:19,20 71:11,12 79:24,25 89:17,19,19,22 93:8 100:8,12 103:8 111:1 118:13,15 120:15	158:18 159:9,21 160:1 163:4 164:8 theater 114:14 theme 95:7 themed 101:9 there's 10:11,19 16:3,6 17:24 18:18 19:9 24:17 27:5 36:19 38:7,10 39:4 40:1 45:13 55:16
66:25 67:8,9 tailor 160:15 tailored 67:7 take 10:10,13,16 15:14 33:14 36:14 44:10 54:13 56:14 67:6 75:8 81:13 89:21 97:11,23 101:12 103:14 115:9 143:19	taught 143:4,4 Taylor 43:7 teaching 70:24 team 164:23 tease 141:20 technical 115:17 technological 94:8 technologically 144:11 technologies 81:6 Technologist 62:23	termination 94:3 terminology 61:6 terms 2:16 4:25 6:21 7:22 11:14 13:7,10 13:11,14 15:7 17:3 18:14,20,23 23:17 23:18,18 25:3,5 26:15 30:21 51:3 54:10,10 56:24,24 71:5,25 72:10,25 73:5 74:23 75:19	textbooks 121:18 thank 6:3 34:18 35:5 41:1 47:17 52:10,10 62:3 63:2 63:5 70:19,20 71:11,12 79:24,25 89:17,19,19,22 93:8 100:8,12 103:8 111:1 118:13,15 120:15 122:24 124:12	158:18 159:9,21 160:1 163:4 164:8 theater 114:14 theme 95:7 themed 101:9 there's 10:11,19 16:3,6 17:24 18:18 19:9 24:17 27:5 36:19 38:7,10 39:4 40:1 45:13 55:16 56:2,23 57:16
66:25 67:8,9 tailor 160:15 tailored 67:7 take 10:10,13,16 15:14 33:14 36:14 44:10 54:13 56:14 67:6 75:8 81:13 89:21 97:11,23 101:12 103:14 115:9 143:19 147:2 152:17	taught 143:4,4 Taylor 43:7 teaching 70:24 team 164:23 tease 141:20 technical 115:17 technological 94:8 technologically 144:11 technologies 81:6 Technologist 62:23 technology 14:11	termination 94:3 terminology 61:6 terms 2:16 4:25 6:21 7:22 11:14 13:7,10 13:11,14 15:7 17:3 18:14,20,23 23:17 23:18,18 25:3,5 26:15 30:21 51:3 54:10,10 56:24,24 71:5,25 72:10,25 73:5 74:23 75:19 76:1 77:1,16 78:21	textbooks 121:18 thank 6:3 34:18 35:5 41:1 47:17 52:10,10 62:3 63:2 63:5 70:19,20 71:11,12 79:24,25 89:17,19,19,22 93:8 100:8,12 103:8 111:1 118:13,15 120:15 122:24 124:12 127:5,6 128:2	158:18 159:9,21 160:1 163:4 164:8 theater 114:14 theme 95:7 themed 101:9 there's 10:11,19 16:3,6 17:24 18:18 19:9 24:17 27:5 36:19 38:7,10 39:4 40:1 45:13 55:16 56:2,23 57:16 58:24 70:5,9 72:6
66:25 67:8,9 tailor 160:15 tailored 67:7 take 10:10,13,16 15:14 33:14 36:14 44:10 54:13 56:14 67:6 75:8 81:13 89:21 97:11,23 101:12 103:14 115:9 143:19 147:2 152:17 takeaway 25:15	taught 143:4,4 Taylor 43:7 teaching 70:24 team 164:23 tease 141:20 technical 115:17 technological 94:8 technologically 144:11 technologies 81:6 Technologist 62:23 technology 14:11 46:15,16 48:7 80:6	termination 94:3 terminology 61:6 terms 2:16 4:25 6:21 7:22 11:14 13:7,10 13:11,14 15:7 17:3 18:14,20,23 23:17 23:18,18 25:3,5 26:15 30:21 51:3 54:10,10 56:24,24 71:5,25 72:10,25 73:5 74:23 75:19 76:1 77:1,16 78:21 78:24 79:1,17 82:8	textbooks 121:18 thank 6:3 34:18 35:5 41:1 47:17 52:10,10 62:3 63:2 63:5 70:19,20 71:11,12 79:24,25 89:17,19,19,22 93:8 100:8,12 103:8 111:1 118:13,15 120:15 122:24 124:12 127:5,6 128:2 138:17 146:5	158:18 159:9,21 160:1 163:4 164:8 theater 114:14 theme 95:7 themed 101:9 there's 10:11,19 16:3,6 17:24 18:18 19:9 24:17 27:5 36:19 38:7,10 39:4 40:1 45:13 55:16 56:2,23 57:16 58:24 70:5,9 72:6 72:12 75:17 77:8
66:25 67:8,9 tailor 160:15 tailored 67:7 take 10:10,13,16 15:14 33:14 36:14 44:10 54:13 56:14 67:6 75:8 81:13 89:21 97:11,23 101:12 103:14 115:9 143:19 147:2 152:17 takeaway 25:15 69:14 71:23	taught 143:4,4 Taylor 43:7 teaching 70:24 team 164:23 tease 141:20 technical 115:17 technological 94:8 technologically 144:11 technologies 81:6 Technologist 62:23 technology 14:11 46:15,16 48:7 80:6 80:20,23 124:1	termination 94:3 terminology 61:6 terms 2:16 4:25 6:21 7:22 11:14 13:7,10 13:11,14 15:7 17:3 18:14,20,23 23:17 23:18,18 25:3,5 26:15 30:21 51:3 54:10,10 56:24,24 71:5,25 72:10,25 73:5 74:23 75:19 76:1 77:1,16 78:21 78:24 79:1,17 82:8 83:7 84:2,13 87:3	textbooks 121:18 thank 6:3 34:18 35:5 41:1 47:17 52:10,10 62:3 63:2 63:5 70:19,20 71:11,12 79:24,25 89:17,19,19,22 93:8 100:8,12 103:8 111:1 118:13,15 120:15 122:24 124:12 127:5,6 128:2 138:17 146:5 163:16 164:16,18	158:18 159:9,21 160:1 163:4 164:8 theater 114:14 theme 95:7 themed 101:9 there's 10:11,19 16:3,6 17:24 18:18 19:9 24:17 27:5 36:19 38:7,10 39:4 40:1 45:13 55:16 56:2,23 57:16 58:24 70:5,9 72:6 72:12 75:17 77:8 77:14,20 78:19
66:25 67:8,9 tailor 160:15 tailored 67:7 take 10:10,13,16 15:14 33:14 36:14 44:10 54:13 56:14 67:6 75:8 81:13 89:21 97:11,23 101:12 103:14 115:9 143:19 147:2 152:17 takeaway 25:15 69:14 71:23 takeaways 69:8	taught 143:4,4 Taylor 43:7 teaching 70:24 team 164:23 tease 141:20 technical 115:17 technological 94:8 technologically 144:11 technologist 62:23 technology 14:11 46:15,16 48:7 80:6 80:20,23 124:1 128:19 162:5	termination 94:3 terminology 61:6 terms 2:16 4:25 6:21 7:22 11:14 13:7,10 13:11,14 15:7 17:3 18:14,20,23 23:17 23:18,18 25:3,5 26:15 30:21 51:3 54:10,10 56:24,24 71:5,25 72:10,25 73:5 74:23 75:19 76:1 77:1,16 78:21 78:24 79:1,17 82:8 83:7 84:2,13 87:3 87:15 90:1,11,14	textbooks 121:18 thank 6:3 34:18 35:5 41:1 47:17 52:10,10 62:3 63:2 63:5 70:19,20 71:11,12 79:24,25 89:17,19,19,22 93:8 100:8,12 103:8 111:1 118:13,15 120:15 122:24 124:12 127:5,6 128:2 138:17 146:5 163:16 164:16,18 164:23 165:4	158:18 159:9,21 160:1 163:4 164:8 theater 114:14 theme 95:7 themed 101:9 there's 10:11,19 16:3,6 17:24 18:18 19:9 24:17 27:5 36:19 38:7,10 39:4 40:1 45:13 55:16 56:2,23 57:16 58:24 70:5,9 72:6 72:12 75:17 77:8 77:14,20 78:19 80:16 82:4 83:17
66:25 67:8,9 tailor 160:15 tailored 67:7 take 10:10,13,16 15:14 33:14 36:14 44:10 54:13 56:14 67:6 75:8 81:13 89:21 97:11,23 101:12 103:14 115:9 143:19 147:2 152:17 takeaway 25:15 69:14 71:23	taught 143:4,4 Taylor 43:7 teaching 70:24 team 164:23 tease 141:20 technical 115:17 technological 94:8 technologically 144:11 technologies 81:6 Technologist 62:23 technology 14:11 46:15,16 48:7 80:6 80:20,23 124:1 128:19 162:5 teeth 143:22	termination 94:3 terminology 61:6 terms 2:16 4:25 6:21 7:22 11:14 13:7,10 13:11,14 15:7 17:3 18:14,20,23 23:17 23:18,18 25:3,5 26:15 30:21 51:3 54:10,10 56:24,24 71:5,25 72:10,25 73:5 74:23 75:19 76:1 77:1,16 78:21 78:24 79:1,17 82:8 83:7 84:2,13 87:3 87:15 90:1,11,14 90:20,22 91:19,19	textbooks 121:18 thank 6:3 34:18 35:5 41:1 47:17 52:10,10 62:3 63:2 63:5 70:19,20 71:11,12 79:24,25 89:17,19,19,22 93:8 100:8,12 103:8 111:1 118:13,15 120:15 122:24 124:12 127:5,6 128:2 138:17 146:5 163:16 164:16,18 164:23 165:4 thankfully 18:4	158:18 159:9,21 160:1 163:4 164:8 theater 114:14 theme 95:7 themed 101:9 there's 10:11,19 16:3,6 17:24 18:18 19:9 24:17 27:5 36:19 38:7,10 39:4 40:1 45:13 55:16 56:2,23 57:16 58:24 70:5,9 72:6 72:12 75:17 77:8 77:14,20 78:19 80:16 82:4 83:17 92:2 93:3 94:7
66:25 67:8,9 tailor 160:15 tailored 67:7 take 10:10,13,16 15:14 33:14 36:14 44:10 54:13 56:14 67:6 75:8 81:13 89:21 97:11,23 101:12 103:14 115:9 143:19 147:2 152:17 takeaway 25:15 69:14 71:23 takeaways 69:8 taken 24:22 33:6 41:6 105:11	taught 143:4,4 Taylor 43:7 teaching 70:24 team 164:23 tease 141:20 technical 115:17 technological 94:8 technologically 144:11 technologies 81:6 Technologist 62:23 technology 14:11 46:15,16 48:7 80:6 80:20,23 124:1 128:19 162:5 teeth 143:22 telephone 88:13	termination 94:3 terminology 61:6 terms 2:16 4:25 6:21 7:22 11:14 13:7,10 13:11,14 15:7 17:3 18:14,20,23 23:17 23:18,18 25:3,5 26:15 30:21 51:3 54:10,10 56:24,24 71:5,25 72:10,25 73:5 74:23 75:19 76:1 77:1,16 78:21 78:24 79:1,17 82:8 83:7 84:2,13 87:3 87:15 90:1,11,14 90:20,22 91:19,19 91:21,24 92:1,1,4	textbooks 121:18 thank 6:3 34:18 35:5 41:1 47:17 52:10,10 62:3 63:2 63:5 70:19,20 71:11,12 79:24,25 89:17,19,19,22 93:8 100:8,12 103:8 111:1 118:13,15 120:15 122:24 124:12 127:5,6 128:2 138:17 146:5 163:16 164:16,18 164:23 165:4 thankfully 18:4 thanks 6:6 21:4,5	158:18 159:9,21 160:1 163:4 164:8 theater 114:14 theme 95:7 themed 101:9 there's 10:11,19 16:3,6 17:24 18:18 19:9 24:17 27:5 36:19 38:7,10 39:4 40:1 45:13 55:16 56:2,23 57:16 58:24 70:5,9 72:6 72:12 75:17 77:8 77:14,20 78:19 80:16 82:4 83:17 92:2 93:3 94:7 98:4 101:1 102:6
66:25 67:8,9 tailor 160:15 tailored 67:7 take 10:10,13,16 15:14 33:14 36:14 44:10 54:13 56:14 67:6 75:8 81:13 89:21 97:11,23 101:12 103:14 115:9 143:19 147:2 152:17 takeaway 25:15 69:14 71:23 takeaways 69:8 taken 24:22 33:6 41:6 105:11 takes 75:3 76:2	taught 143:4,4 Taylor 43:7 teaching 70:24 team 164:23 tease 141:20 technical 115:17 technological 94:8 technologically 144:11 technologist 62:23 technology 14:11 46:15,16 48:7 80:6 80:20,23 124:1 128:19 162:5 teeth 143:22 telephone 88:13 television 17:22	termination 94:3 terminology 61:6 terms 2:16 4:25 6:21 7:22 11:14 13:7,10 13:11,14 15:7 17:3 18:14,20,23 23:17 23:18,18 25:3,5 26:15 30:21 51:3 54:10,10 56:24,24 71:5,25 72:10,25 73:5 74:23 75:19 76:1 77:1,16 78:21 78:24 79:1,17 82:8 83:7 84:2,13 87:3 87:15 90:1,11,14 90:20,22 91:19,19 91:21,24 92:1,1,4 92:9,10,11,13,17	textbooks 121:18 thank 6:3 34:18 35:5 41:1 47:17 52:10,10 62:3 63:2 63:5 70:19,20 71:11,12 79:24,25 89:17,19,19,22 93:8 100:8,12 103:8 111:1 118:13,15 120:15 122:24 124:12 127:5,6 128:2 138:17 146:5 163:16 164:16,18 164:23 165:4 thankfully 18:4 thanks 6:6 21:4,5 34:17 41:2 52:7	158:18 159:9,21 160:1 163:4 164:8 theater 114:14 theme 95:7 themed 101:9 there's 10:11,19 16:3,6 17:24 18:18 19:9 24:17 27:5 36:19 38:7,10 39:4 40:1 45:13 55:16 56:2,23 57:16 58:24 70:5,9 72:6 72:12 75:17 77:8 77:14,20 78:19 80:16 82:4 83:17 92:2 93:3 94:7 98:4 101:1 102:6 102:12 104:15
66:25 67:8,9 tailor 160:15 tailored 67:7 take 10:10,13,16 15:14 33:14 36:14 44:10 54:13 56:14 67:6 75:8 81:13 89:21 97:11,23 101:12 103:14 115:9 143:19 147:2 152:17 takeaway 25:15 69:14 71:23 takeaways 69:8 taken 24:22 33:6 41:6 105:11 takes 75:3 76:2 talk 10:12 11:8,13	taught 143:4,4 Taylor 43:7 teaching 70:24 team 164:23 tease 141:20 technical 115:17 technological 94:8 technologically 144:11 technologist 62:23 technology 14:11 46:15,16 48:7 80:6 80:20,23 124:1 128:19 162:5 teeth 143:22 telephone 88:13 television 17:22 53:6 54:24 55:3	termination 94:3 terminology 61:6 terms 2:16 4:25 6:21 7:22 11:14 13:7,10 13:11,14 15:7 17:3 18:14,20,23 23:17 23:18,18 25:3,5 26:15 30:21 51:3 54:10,10 56:24,24 71:5,25 72:10,25 73:5 74:23 75:19 76:1 77:1,16 78:21 78:24 79:1,17 82:8 83:7 84:2,13 87:3 87:15 90:1,11,14 90:20,22 91:19,19 91:21,24 92:1,1,4 92:9,10,11,13,17 92:19,20,22 93:1,4	textbooks 121:18 thank 6:3 34:18 35:5 41:1 47:17 52:10,10 62:3 63:2 63:5 70:19,20 71:11,12 79:24,25 89:17,19,19,22 93:8 100:8,12 103:8 111:1 118:13,15 120:15 122:24 124:12 127:5,6 128:2 138:17 146:5 163:16 164:16,18 164:23 165:4 thankfully 18:4 thanks 6:6 21:4,5 34:17 41:2 52:7 61:20 100:6 103:7	158:18 159:9,21 160:1 163:4 164:8 theater 114:14 theme 95:7 themed 101:9 there's 10:11,19 16:3,6 17:24 18:18 19:9 24:17 27:5 36:19 38:7,10 39:4 40:1 45:13 55:16 56:2,23 57:16 58:24 70:5,9 72:6 72:12 75:17 77:8 77:14,20 78:19 80:16 82:4 83:17 92:2 93:3 94:7 98:4 101:1 102:6 102:12 104:15 105:2,9 111:24
66:25 67:8,9 tailor 160:15 tailored 67:7 take 10:10,13,16 15:14 33:14 36:14 44:10 54:13 56:14 67:6 75:8 81:13 89:21 97:11,23 101:12 103:14 115:9 143:19 147:2 152:17 takeaway 25:15 69:14 71:23 takeaways 69:8 taken 24:22 33:6 41:6 105:11 takes 75:3 76:2 talk 10:12 11:8,13 16:24 19:4,5 21:5	taught 143:4,4 Taylor 43:7 teaching 70:24 team 164:23 tease 141:20 technical 115:17 technological 94:8 technologically 144:11 technologist 62:23 technology 14:11 46:15,16 48:7 80:6 80:20,23 124:1 128:19 162:5 teeth 143:22 telephone 88:13 television 17:22 53:6 54:24 55:3 56:1	termination 94:3 terminology 61:6 terms 2:16 4:25 6:21 7:22 11:14 13:7,10 13:11,14 15:7 17:3 18:14,20,23 23:17 23:18,18 25:3,5 26:15 30:21 51:3 54:10,10 56:24,24 71:5,25 72:10,25 73:5 74:23 75:19 76:1 77:1,16 78:21 78:24 79:1,17 82:8 83:7 84:2,13 87:3 87:15 90:1,11,14 90:20,22 91:19,19 91:21,24 92:1,1,4 92:9,10,11,13,17 92:19,20,22 93:1,4 93:6,24 94:17	textbooks 121:18 thank 6:3 34:18 35:5 41:1 47:17 52:10,10 62:3 63:2 63:5 70:19,20 71:11,12 79:24,25 89:17,19,19,22 93:8 100:8,12 103:8 111:1 118:13,15 120:15 122:24 124:12 127:5,6 128:2 138:17 146:5 163:16 164:16,18 164:23 165:4 thankfully 18:4 thanks 6:6 21:4,5 34:17 41:2 52:7 61:20 100:6 103:7 113:24 139:2	158:18 159:9,21 160:1 163:4 164:8 theater 114:14 theme 95:7 themed 101:9 there's 10:11,19 16:3,6 17:24 18:18 19:9 24:17 27:5 36:19 38:7,10 39:4 40:1 45:13 55:16 56:2,23 57:16 58:24 70:5,9 72:6 72:12 75:17 77:8 77:14,20 78:19 80:16 82:4 83:17 92:2 93:3 94:7 98:4 101:1 102:6 102:12 104:15 105:2,9 111:24 112:7,8,24 125:18
66:25 67:8,9 tailor 160:15 tailored 67:7 take 10:10,13,16 15:14 33:14 36:14 44:10 54:13 56:14 67:6 75:8 81:13 89:21 97:11,23 101:12 103:14 115:9 143:19 147:2 152:17 takeaway 25:15 69:14 71:23 takeaways 69:8 taken 24:22 33:6 41:6 105:11 takes 75:3 76:2 talk 10:12 11:8,13 16:24 19:4,5 21:5 36:21 43:5 53:16	taught 143:4,4 Taylor 43:7 teaching 70:24 team 164:23 tease 141:20 technical 115:17 technological 94:8 technologically 144:11 technologist 62:23 technology 14:11 46:15,16 48:7 80:6 80:20,23 124:1 128:19 162:5 teeth 143:22 telephone 88:13 television 17:22 53:6 54:24 55:3 56:1 tell 12:25 35:19 46:5	termination 94:3 terminology 61:6 terms 2:16 4:25 6:21 7:22 11:14 13:7,10 13:11,14 15:7 17:3 18:14,20,23 23:17 23:18,18 25:3,5 26:15 30:21 51:3 54:10,10 56:24,24 71:5,25 72:10,25 73:5 74:23 75:19 76:1 77:1,16 78:21 78:24 79:1,17 82:8 83:7 84:2,13 87:3 87:15 90:1,11,14 90:20,22 91:19,19 91:21,24 92:1,1,4 92:9,10,11,13,17 92:19,20,22 93:1,4 93:6,24 94:17 95:19 98:16 99:17	textbooks 121:18 thank 6:3 34:18 35:5 41:1 47:17 52:10,10 62:3 63:2 63:5 70:19,20 71:11,12 79:24,25 89:17,19,19,22 93:8 100:8,12 103:8 111:1 118:13,15 120:15 122:24 124:12 127:5,6 128:2 138:17 146:5 163:16 164:16,18 164:23 165:4 thankfully 18:4 thanks 6:6 21:4,5 34:17 41:2 52:7 61:20 100:6 103:7 113:24 139:2 144:6 161:11	$\begin{array}{c} 158:18 \ 159:9,21\\ 160:1 \ 163:4 \ 164:8 \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \textbf{theater} \ 114:14 \\ \textbf{theme} \ 95:7 \\ \textbf{themed} \ 101:9 \\ \textbf{there's} \ 10:11,19 \\ 16:3,6 \ 17:24 \ 18:18 \\ 19:9 \ 24:17 \ 27:5 \\ 36:19 \ 38:7,10 \ 39:4 \\ 40:1 \ 45:13 \ 55:16 \\ 56:2,23 \ 57:16 \\ 58:24 \ 70:5,9 \ 72:6 \\ 72:12 \ 75:17 \ 77:8 \\ 77:14,20 \ 78:19 \\ 80:16 \ 82:4 \ 83:17 \\ 92:2 \ 93:3 \ 94:7 \\ 98:4 \ 101:1 \ 102:6 \\ 102:12 \ 104:15 \\ 105:2,9 \ 111:24 \\ 112:7,8,24 \ 125:18 \\ 130:8,16 \ 133:5 \end{array}$
66:25 67:8,9 tailor 160:15 tailored 67:7 take 10:10,13,16 15:14 33:14 36:14 44:10 54:13 56:14 67:6 75:8 81:13 89:21 97:11,23 101:12 103:14 115:9 143:19 147:2 152:17 takeaway 25:15 69:14 71:23 takeaways 69:8 taken 24:22 33:6 41:6 105:11 takes 75:3 76:2 talk 10:12 11:8,13 16:24 19:4,5 21:5 36:21 43:5 53:16 56:15 57:6 60:19	taught 143:4,4 Taylor 43:7 teaching 70:24 team 164:23 tease 141:20 technical 115:17 technological 94:8 technologically 144:11 technologist 62:23 technology 14:11 46:15,16 48:7 80:6 80:20,23 124:1 128:19 162:5 teeth 143:22 telephone 88:13 television 17:22 53:6 54:24 55:3 56:1 tell 12:25 35:19 46:5 56:17 100:10	termination 94:3 terminology 61:6 terms 2:16 4:25 6:21 7:22 11:14 13:7,10 13:11,14 15:7 17:3 18:14,20,23 23:17 23:18,18 25:3,5 26:15 30:21 51:3 54:10,10 56:24,24 71:5,25 72:10,25 73:5 74:23 75:19 76:1 77:1,16 78:21 78:24 79:1,17 82:8 83:7 84:2,13 87:3 87:15 90:1,11,14 90:20,22 91:19,19 91:21,24 92:1,1,4 92:9,10,11,13,17 92:19,20,22 93:1,4 93:6,24 94:17 95:19 98:16 99:17 99:19 100:11	textbooks 121:18 thank 6:3 34:18 35:5 41:1 47:17 52:10,10 62:3 63:2 63:5 70:19,20 71:11,12 79:24,25 89:17,19,19,22 93:8 100:8,12 103:8 111:1 118:13,15 120:15 122:24 124:12 127:5,6 128:2 138:17 146:5 163:16 164:16,18 164:23 165:4 thankfully 18:4 thanks 6:6 21:4,5 34:17 41:2 52:7 61:20 100:6 103:7 113:24 139:2 144:6 161:11 165:7	$\begin{array}{c} 158:18 \ 159:9,21\\ 160:1 \ 163:4 \ 164:8 \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \textbf{theater} \ 114:14 \\ \textbf{theme} \ 95:7 \\ \textbf{themed} \ 101:9 \\ \textbf{there's} \ 10:11,19 \\ 16:3,6 \ 17:24 \ 18:18 \\ 19:9 \ 24:17 \ 27:5 \\ 36:19 \ 38:7,10 \ 39:4 \\ 40:1 \ 45:13 \ 55:16 \\ 56:2,23 \ 57:16 \\ 58:24 \ 70:5,9 \ 72:6 \\ 72:12 \ 75:17 \ 77:8 \\ 77:14,20 \ 78:19 \\ 80:16 \ 82:4 \ 83:17 \\ 92:2 \ 93:3 \ 94:7 \\ 98:4 \ 101:1 \ 102:6 \\ 102:12 \ 104:15 \\ 105:2,9 \ 111:24 \\ 112:7,8,24 \ 125:18 \\ 130:8,16 \ 133:5 \\ 134:21 \ 136:21 \end{array}$
66:25 67:8,9 tailor 160:15 tailored 67:7 take 10:10,13,16 15:14 33:14 36:14 44:10 54:13 56:14 67:6 75:8 81:13 89:21 97:11,23 101:12 103:14 115:9 143:19 147:2 152:17 takeaway 25:15 69:14 71:23 takeaways 69:8 taken 24:22 33:6 41:6 105:11 takes 75:3 76:2 talk 10:12 11:8,13 16:24 19:4,5 21:5 36:21 43:5 53:16	taught 143:4,4 Taylor 43:7 teaching 70:24 team 164:23 tease 141:20 technical 115:17 technological 94:8 technologically 144:11 technologist 62:23 technology 14:11 46:15,16 48:7 80:6 80:20,23 124:1 128:19 162:5 teeth 143:22 telephone 88:13 television 17:22 53:6 54:24 55:3 56:1 tell 12:25 35:19 46:5	termination 94:3 terminology 61:6 terms 2:16 4:25 6:21 7:22 11:14 13:7,10 13:11,14 15:7 17:3 18:14,20,23 23:17 23:18,18 25:3,5 26:15 30:21 51:3 54:10,10 56:24,24 71:5,25 72:10,25 73:5 74:23 75:19 76:1 77:1,16 78:21 78:24 79:1,17 82:8 83:7 84:2,13 87:3 87:15 90:1,11,14 90:20,22 91:19,19 91:21,24 92:1,1,4 92:9,10,11,13,17 92:19,20,22 93:1,4 93:6,24 94:17 95:19 98:16 99:17	textbooks 121:18 thank 6:3 34:18 35:5 41:1 47:17 52:10,10 62:3 63:2 63:5 70:19,20 71:11,12 79:24,25 89:17,19,19,22 93:8 100:8,12 103:8 111:1 118:13,15 120:15 122:24 124:12 127:5,6 128:2 138:17 146:5 163:16 164:16,18 164:23 165:4 thankfully 18:4 thanks 6:6 21:4,5 34:17 41:2 52:7 61:20 100:6 103:7 113:24 139:2 144:6 161:11	$\begin{array}{c} 158:18 \ 159:9,21\\ 160:1 \ 163:4 \ 164:8 \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \textbf{theater} \ 114:14 \\ \textbf{theme} \ 95:7 \\ \textbf{themed} \ 101:9 \\ \textbf{there's} \ 10:11,19 \\ 16:3,6 \ 17:24 \ 18:18 \\ 19:9 \ 24:17 \ 27:5 \\ 36:19 \ 38:7,10 \ 39:4 \\ 40:1 \ 45:13 \ 55:16 \\ 56:2,23 \ 57:16 \\ 58:24 \ 70:5,9 \ 72:6 \\ 72:12 \ 75:17 \ 77:8 \\ 77:14,20 \ 78:19 \\ 80:16 \ 82:4 \ 83:17 \\ 92:2 \ 93:3 \ 94:7 \\ 98:4 \ 101:1 \ 102:6 \\ 102:12 \ 104:15 \\ 105:2,9 \ 111:24 \\ 112:7,8,24 \ 125:18 \\ 130:8,16 \ 133:5 \end{array}$

151:2 152:1,2	39:11,15 40:22	119:19,25 121:8	thumbs- 28:13	17:17
153:10 155:5	47:5 57:8 60:6	122:7,17 123:20	thumbs-down 28:14	told 25:12 68:2
they'd 33:23 153:10	61:5,13 66:20,22	124:22 126:14	ticket 114:15 154:2	106:15
they'll 84:18	70:3,17 78:1 88:18	130:15 133:20	tickets 49:13	toll-free 88:14
they're 4:11 12:23	91:15 93:4,25 94:6	135:23 137:16,18	tie 137:16	tomatoes 151:7
12:23 15:15,19	94:25 95:5 98:23	139:9 140:10	time 6:12 7:10 10:10	tomorrow 17:17,18
17:10 18:1 19:22	110:24 113:14	141:1 142:14,14	14:5,23 29:9,12	tone 97:5,5
22:6,16 26:16	114:5,16 117:21	142:23,24 144:4,7	31:15,17 39:16	tools 71:10 98:21
27:11 37:5 49:11	124:11 126:20	144:12,14 145:6	41:17 46:13 47:7	99:5,5
49:12,13 51:7,15	128:25 129:23	145:16 146:24	48:18 56:14 60:18	top 145:6
51:21,22,22 54:16	130:5,9,10,19	147:13,14,22	61:5,9 63:2 70:10	topic 16:21 69:2
56:1 69:12 74:8,23	131:19,20 132:10	148:1,3,8,13,17	71:19 72:14 74:18	96:21 152:16
76:21 78:7,23 79:2	133:20 143:16,25	149:11 150:17,20	76:12,25 77:2,12	topics 18:18,19
79:5 82:21 83:16	144:17 154:22	151:20 152:23	87:1,22 94:14	toss 143:13 149:11
85:4,5 87:18 88:23	155:24 157:1,15	153:9,20 154:16	96:22 99:6 111:3	153:7
93:19 94:12 95:2	157:18 160:5	154:24 155:4,10	114:14 115:5,9	total 83:24
95:13,14,20 96:6	162:1 163:10	156:1,10 157:6,15	118:7,8 123:4,13	totally 37:1 150:9
96:20 99:22 107:6	think 12:18,20	157:21 158:4,8,9	123:16 126:4	151:1
107:7,8,18,19	14:20 19:25 21:19	158:15,19,24	134:6 135:15	touch 47:1
113:1,2,4,5 116:16	22:1,13 23:3 25:15	159:18,22,24	137:22 139:18	touched 45:21
117:15 120:24	26:15 27:4,25	161:6,16 163:12	141:11 151:24	tough 117:8
122:12,15 123:24	28:23 29:2,12 32:1	163:13,20 164:8	158:22 164:11	TPMs 129:15,18
130:18 142:11,13	34:8,9,12 36:13	164:12	timely 96:20	track 21:15 29:7
144:25 147:3	37:2,11 38:1,16,23	thinking 27:2 56:22	times 66:13 70:7	73:20,24
155:17 160:12,16	40:1,5,11,23,24,25	58:12 95:11	75:12,21 85:18	tracked 25:4
160:16,23,24	41:2,17,18 42:23	118:20 134:6	111:13 152:22	tractor 130:7
161:2,23	44:21 45:3,4,8,20	139:15,15 157:16	163:20	tractors 129:21
they've 9:7 35:8	45:23 46:8,11,20	161:16	timing 66:1 72:14	158:2
60:5 64:14 104:6,6	46:23,23 47:4,8,14	third 34:8 95:4	79:21	trade 47:24 48:1
thing 21:23 27:18,23	49:17 50:7 54:15	thought 28:14 39:19	tinkering 134:13	62:24 80:17,24
28:8,10,14 30:15	55:7 56:16,19,19	43:1,8 56:12 59:5	title 8:14 35:18	81:12 88:4 100:15
38:6 39:2 44:4,7	56:20,20 57:19,19	60:12 63:14 65:14	titles 24:2	106:17 107:12
44:14 53:21 57:3	57:21,25 58:5,16	67:1,3 71:17 72:2	today 4:16 6:19 9:16	124:23 161:20
57:11,16 58:14	58:20 59:7,8,22,23	74:7,24 84:11	15:17 16:10 17:9	TRADEMARK
59:6 67:4 69:19	60:12,21 61:5,10	100:20 116:24	18:7 19:5 21:5,10	1:16
75:10 92:18 95:8	61:11 64:5,6,7	119:20 124:16	34:14 40:4 49:18	trademarks 102:24
95:25 96:2 97:21	66:21 84:12 88:18	131:19	52:11 62:17,25	traditional 11:11,17
98:11 99:11,13	88:24 89:21 91:8	thoughts 41:14	63:3,12 69:21	54:19 72:7 77:7
114:2 115:5	92:23,24,24 93:15	90:19 100:10	81:25 83:10 87:14	79:13,16
116:13 117:19,20	94:19 95:2,8,8,13	111:5 124:18	95:7 96:17 97:5	traditionally 130:20
119:9 125:18	96:4,13,20,22 97:4	thousands 53:8,18	102:1 110:25	trained 28:12
131:23 135:25	97:8,8,16,21,24,25	151:17	127:7 133:7	tranche 24:10
141:19 143:2	98:6 99:8,14 102:3	three 23:22 25:15	140:16 141:15	transaction 10:18
144:24 146:8	102:3,11 103:3,5	31:14,18 32:3,17	142:9 143:7	10:19 11:1,2,22,22
148:1 152:21	104:11 107:5	32:19 45:5 48:23	151:15,16,24	12:8 15:11,24 28:2
164:8	108:9,24 111:2,11	55:4 64:19,22	152:22 153:9,19	54:12 61:7 124:7
things 7:17,19 24:8	111:13,13 116:2	92:19 93:13	157:22 158:11	125:2 127:2
33:19 36:12 37:2,3	116:15,19 117:14	113:14 164:15	159:1 164:14	transactional 48:11
37:8,19 38:1,8	117:20,25 119:3	throw 141:20 151:7	today's 3:10 7:11	48:22 106:20

4/18/2017 [192]

4/18/2017 [193]

				[193]
transactions 1:9 2:6	45:20 46:3 91:10	78:5,14 91:21	114:21 115:2,3	21:9 70:22 96:8
2:17 4:11 6:2,22	96:11 103:1 123:9	92:17 93:3,15	114:21 113:2,5	151:11
15:14 16:4,13,18	131:9 143:5	125:20 126:23	126:14 129:2	unknowledgeable
17:7 19:11 22:10	147:18 157:6,8	typical 27:7 110:13	130:17,23 142:12	13:9
25:4,18 26:4 42:5	158:16 163:9,14	typically 12:11 27:7	142:20 143:5	unknown 68:20
52:4 55:16 59:12	163:14	106:21 108:16	149:25 151:22	92:2 154:12
59:18 60:9,24 90:2	trying 45:21 82:25	109:10 156:17	156:11 157:7	unknowns 154:12
123:7	94:17 95:16 97:1		164:4	unquestionably
transfer 8:4 38:5	101:21 106:11	U	understanding 4:7	149:2
51:4 82:22	111:23,24 112:12	U.K 78:7,12	6:21 13:15 19:21	unrealistic 116:5
translate 102:14	118:4 122:3	U.S 1:16 5:3 14:6	23:12 25:23 38:16	unresolved 104:16
transmission 9:19	132:16 136:14	17:8 62:24 102:18	40:10 79:10 82:2	unusual 70:6,9
10:2,6 11:4 12:8	140:4 141:3	107:25 127:8	87:18 91:4 94:18	unwarranted 45:4
transmissions 4:4	145:21 148:16	ubiquitous 129:6	102:14 105:6,7	unwinnable 150:13
9:8 11:16 15:25	150:13 151:2	Uh 28:18	115:18 124:24	update 37:23
transmit 9:23	150:15 151:2	ultimately 78:16	140:20 141:25	updated 83:6
travel 68:6	159:15 163:8,15	104:16 105:5	142:3,8,11,17	upgrades 14:3
traveled 140:10,15	163:21	106:5 146:19	143:1,11 147:16	urge 112:12 149:13
Travelocity 154:3	TUESDAY 1:13	147:6 149:14,15	148:15 150:7,23	URLs 73:16,18,24
treat 131:4	turn 5:11 90:8 111:2	Ultra 50:10	151:4 154:4 155:3	usability 99:10
treated 60:4 126:12	117:1 124:16	UltraViolet 50:10	159:7 163:6,9,15	Usable 62:20
131:4,5	turned 39:20	unable 133:16	164:1	usage 51:4
treatment 126:2	turning 46:13	139:16 151:14	understandings	use 26:21 27:3 37:24
tremendous 47:7	turns 26:13 32:25	unanimous 110:11	154:7	41:21 42:8 49:7,7
tremendously 72:15	76:19 77:7	unanswered 153:19	understands 18:14	55:24 56:23,25
78:8	TV 58:11	unauthorized 40:19	76:14 119:25	58:1 61:10 70:5,12
trends 2:14 62:14	TVOD 48:11	uncovered 61:11	120:1	73:17 81:18,22
triangle 66:3	twenty 74:19	underestimate 42:4	understood 113:2	83:24 86:7,9 87:12
tricked 56:11	twice 67:13	42:19	130:20	91:19 92:10 94:21
tried 31:13,14,21	Twitter 160:11	underestimated	undertaking 102:7	104:18 109:14
33:19,20 41:14	two 3:18 6:12 10:13	42:8	undoubtedly 149:2	115:5 116:22
82:22 92:10	21:14 29:23 33:23	underlie 104:25	unearth 99:19	123:6,12 124:9
102:21 135:11	42:6 47:5 52:12	underlying 89:9	unfair 81:2,7,12	125:14 127:3
triennial 129:12	56:15 68:7 69:8	undermines 42:1	142:10	131:15 133:9,23
trip 43:15	72:19 103:16	undermining	unfamiliar 66:8	133:25 136:11,16
trips 142:17	110:6 117:23	157:23	unfortunately	154:3 161:1,6
trouble 107:24	118:3 119:5	underscoring 95:4	109:13 111:10	useful 4:25 6:25
trucks 155:16	125:19 128:6	understand 7:12,14	unhappy 60:1	70:3,17
true 28:6 42:20 45:9	134:20 135:10	11:9 15:15,19	146:11 147:3	usefulness 80:15
46:2 55:16 76:9	141:9,10,13,15,17	16:17 18:17 22:4,9	uniformly 53:16	user 5:7 28:12 73:23
77:6 104:12 123:5	141:23 142:1	30:1 39:15 50:1	unique 17:9 29:20	93:19 115:1
123:8 145:17	149:22 152:19	54:6 64:3,3,4,5	uniquely 132:6,11	150:14,14
150:4 159:9	156:2 164:15,15	69:16 83:25 84:19	Unit 78:12	user- 97:9
trumps 121:22	type 23:24 73:3	87:12 88:23 92:16	United 17:9 121:19	user-friendly 98:14
trust 17:5 64:6	92:18 108:13	92:21 94:22 95:18	152:1	114:23
truth 31:12 150:5	111:21	95:23 96:4,6,19	units 78:7	users 94:10 115:2
truthfully 88:22	typeface 28:19	99:15 105:3	universal 149:7	uses 119:4 129:5
truthfulness 80:25	types 45:16 68:6	112:16,18,22	universally 101:18	130:25
try 39:14 41:16	69:3,6 72:7 78:1,1	113:9,13,16,17	University 19:1,14	USPTO 3:7,17
v	, , ,			, ,
				•

				[194]
143:2	48:19,22 49:11,16	67:17 69:8,19,22	99:12,14 101:4	145:21 147:6
usual 25:9 105:1	50:19 122:9 159:3	69:23 70:13 73:1	106:2,13 108:2	150:16 151:23
usually 12:12 94:4	video-on-demand	75:20 76:5 93:14	111:4 117:21	156:23,25 157:2
112:22 119:11	48:20 49:1	94:16 96:25 101:8	118:4 125:4	157:22 158:4,5
utility 84:13 112:3	videos 22:2 44:9	101:13 102:2,3,10	126:12 128:23	163:19,21 164:6
utilize 88:3,7	view 15:13 22:15	107:17 108:17,25	129:21 136:2	we've 3:18 16:11
	26:1 46:19 50:14	109:15 113:6,7,15	137:24 144:11	37:14,20,24 47:6
V	82:18 84:7 87:16	116:9,13 117:19	145:25 146:9,18	47:11 52:12,12
valuable 34:10	88:15 89:3 101:21	118:8 120:17	146:21 147:9	60:17 63:15,15
103:4 158:10	148:18	123:8,21 125:24	148:12 150:15	81:25 90:4 95:7,18
value 22:20 33:2,17	viewpoints 20:1	125:25 126:5	153:2 162:5	95:22 102:20,21
155:12,24 157:1	views 16:12 18:18	142:6 143:21	163:22 164:5,7	102:24 104:7
variation 24:18	60:1 88:19	144:10,12 146:6	ways 21:20 22:19	108:11 128:7,8
variations 24:11	violate 108:5 159:2	148:10,21 150:12	28:15,23 30:14,16	129:4 139:11
varies 38:19	violated 149:3,3	151:7 152:14	30:18 31:13 68:18	140:2,4 142:4,5,9
variety 17:2 18:18	violating 146:11,12	154:5,9 156:6	81:5 97:5,23 98:6	151:15 152:22
20:1 90:16	violation 161:23	158:21 160:4	98:7 135:10 145:7	160:20 161:16
various 16:11 71:2	VIRGINIA 1:18	161:13,25 163:17	163:9	163:20
81:6 82:9 105:11	virtual 17:19	163:19	we'd 28:14 58:20	webpage 22:6
106:23	visit 73:20 74:12	wanted 3:7 24:2,3	94:4 103:6 147:5	webpages 54:3,4
vary 13:12 51:9,9	visited 68:9,10	25:1 30:4 68:5	151:4 165:7	website 67:5 69:8
78:8 91:16 104:24	visitors 73:19	69:20 89:11	we'll 4:21 5:8 13:19	106:9 123:16
153:23	visits 53:3 73:11,19	157:14	15:17 19:24,25	websites 52:22 53:3
vast 32:2	74:10,15 76:1	wanting 152:18	24:17 35:10,11,22	140:25
vend 147:9	visual 63:25 84:23	wants 150:15	46:18 61:9 80:22	week 100:18
vendor 13:12,12	VOD 48:11	153:12	90:12,13,20 96:4	weeks 157:25
70:16 105:16	voice-activated	warned 161:19	111:6 116:11	weigh 139:19 146:6
vendor's 106:9	46:14,22	Warner 53:11	139:19	welcome 2:4 3:1
vendors 108:15	Volkswagen 55:12	warning 92:18	we're 3:2 4:16,20	139:19
161:9	55:15,18	152:15	10:12 11:7 14:22	welcoming 3:7
venerable 97:11	Volkswagens 23:1	warrants 47:16	17:8 18:20 19:16	welfare 160:19
verifiable 158:17	voluntary 102:25	Washington 36:7	27:2,20 29:19 35:6	well-known 68:22
Vernor 134:21	103:2	96:8 100:16	35:7 36:7,11,21	went 43:20,20 61:1
135:9	vs 109:3	wasn't 37:22 39:20	39:22 40:21 41:16	128:17
version 24:16 38:6	VW 55:22	50:20 59:20	42:23,24 45:13	weren't 33:12 44:21
63:19 66:12		wasteful 115:22	46:20,24 53:13	56:11
106:17 109:18		watch 12:6 37:21	56:14 57:9,12	Western 19:1
versions 24:24,25	walk 10:16	86:22 144:5	58:23 59:2 60:8,15	151:11
65:5,11 66:17,18	Walmart 43:21	watching 3:9 56:7	61:10,14 75:9	what's 34:16 79:18
66:19	53:11	119:16	82:25 84:13 87:13	91:2 95:23 96:5
versus 48:25 50:2	Walmart/VUDU	way 3:13 4:18 7:4	88:25 89:21 90:3	105:5 111:16
59:9 95:10 122:21	53:1	11:10,11 16:23	93:16,17,23 94:1,1	114:4 115:3
133:8 137:13	want 11:21 12:6	17:12 23:3 24:4	94:1,17,20 95:16	119:12 141:3,3
vessel 125:6,11	13:16 16:20 18:13	29:18 31:21 33:5	95:25 98:19 99:23	157:7
VHS 143:23 144:4,5	22:15,17,24 26:10	33:20 34:15 52:23	100:22 101:10,11	wheel 18:5 38:18
viable 34:6	39:21 41:5 43:12	53:24 57:25 60:4	101:16,18 103:25	57:16
Vice 103:11	46:21,23,23 47:5	63:22 64:15 67:24	105:18 107:22	white 3:21 4:19 6:8
video 11:19,23 48:1	50:5 53:22 54:9,9	75:11 79:7,16,16	110:24 123:7	6:13,18 7:2,11
48:2,6,12,13,13,16	56:19 61:7 63:13	91:17 97:18 98:17	126:4 141:3,6	12:16 13:21 16:2

[195]	
-------	--

19:2,8 123:24				
19.2,0 123.24	148:10 155:15	wringing 116:23	57:13 116:4	18 1:13
140:12	158:8 159:19	write 58:17 98:3	119:23 120:5,6	1984 21:18
who's 144:3 148:24	162:4 164:22	writing 96:11,13	126:16,18 129:14	1988 54:25
wholesale 52:17	worked 72:19	99:24,25 117:23	134:8 135:16	1997 77:25
144:1	133:15 143:23	written 19:3 110:12	136:14 156:17	1999 49:18
wholesalers 106:21	147:17	wrong 30:7 67:2,5	you's 163:16	
wholly 31:4	working 12:16 51:8	92:13 121:8	you've 25:7 38:20	2
wide 17:2	71:6 91:18 98:15	159:11	41:2 57:18 70:7,11	2 156:25
widely 58:6	105:19 106:13	wrote 39:10,11	75:21	2,700 73:7 74:19
willing 29:4 33:3,9	108:1	97:13 116:21	younger 30:2	2:20 35:3,16
143:13,18 145:5	works 1:9 4:3,8 6:23	Wurgler 70:22	Your- 67:3	20 28:13 43:16
willingness 33:1	7:13 9:5,10 11:24	Wyndham 81:11	Yushko 165:1	20-page 58:17
105:14 113:8	12:1 14:19 15:20			20,000 151:25 157:3
wish 112:4 115:5	16:5,14,18 17:6	X	Z	200 76:13
153:16	19:12 28:15 36:15	X 2:1 59:1	Z 59:2	2007 85:14,20
Wogalter 63:20	36:23 38:21,22	Xbox 22:2	Zambrano 62:2,3	2010 3:13
women 29:25 30:1	41:13 44:12 52:4		70:20 79:25 89:19	2012 54:25 55:6
won't 53:19 54:2	52:24 54:1,18	Y	164:25	2013 3:19 6:14 83:6
59:24 98:4	95:12 104:13	Y 59:1	zero 30:8 54:25	2014 6:15
wonder 105:25	105:1 106:18	Yale 92:8 93:11,12	76:11	2015 48:25 54:21,21
wonderful 151:15	107:8,9,18 118:5	yang 148:25	Zev 91:18	55:2 130:1 142:17
word 56:20 57:20	126:24 128:9,18	yeah 45:25 96:7	zillion 70:7	148:18
58:1 60:23,25 61:9	128:20 136:14	115:23 124:19		2016 14:5 48:18,18
61:10 73:13 119:2	137:7 145:1,4	155:25 157:13	0	48:25 62:23
119:4 128:25	161:8	year 3:21 6:19 22:2	1	2017 1:13
147:25 161:12,13	workshop 69:7	48:25 69:1 100:20		22313-1450 1:18
161:14	workshops 140:11	115:11,14 128:5	1,000 74:21,22	23 76:20
wording 84:19	world 2:12 9:15	years 6:12 21:16	1,300 23:11	24 119:16
words 54:11 64:4	11:16 14:2 17:10	43:8 46:12 47:22	1,500 66:11	24-hour 14:21
67:14 69:16 74:19	44:10 56:3,25 57:9	49:3 55:4 87:19	1.4 25:6 10 43:16 48:17	27 67:5,10
103:16 115:19	57:18 59:10 61:4	96:10,11 97:10		29 74:18
151:25	62:13 63:4 117:22	100:25 108:1	58:17 156:24	2
work 3:11,18 8:7,11	123:8,12 130:13	114:6 115:8	100,00 157:3 100,000 100:25	$\frac{3}{224}$
9:23 10:1,8 14:16	worlds 96:12	116:20 121:20	100,000 100.23 106(1) 9:25	3 2:4
14:22 15:5 36:14	worms 133:3	128:6,16 129:4,10	100(1) 9.23 106(3) 8:5	3:14 89:22
37:12 43:4 47:7	worried 151:23	129:21 140:11	100 (3) 8.3 109 8:12 136:3	30 29:6 73:8 119:15
62:5 63:6 69:4	worry 143:16	141:9,10,13,15,18	109 8.12 130.3 11-point 28:21	164:17
71:14,22,23,23	worse 133:11	141:23 142:24	11-point 28.21 117 136:7	32 76:11
72:8,11 77:10,13	worth 42:17 46:4	147:17 156:19	1201 129:12,20	35 2:9 47:22
78:14 91:1,6,17	117:8 118:4 153:3	157:9 158:11,14	137:13	4
103:2 104:18,19	worthwhile 153:13	164:15,15	121 54:23	4.4 55:6
108:3 113:15	wouldn't 44:17	yin 148:25	121 54.25 128 2:19	4:00 111:10
114:18 116:20	45:10,22 147:25	York 66:13 70:22	139 2:20	40 26:22 43:8
117:20,22 118:1,4	wow 58:25	77:25 109:4,13,17	139 2.20 14 149:14	40 ,091 73:12
125:6,8,12,14,15	wrap 33:18 47:14	you'd 24:6 33:13	143 100:24	40,697 74:10,15
125:16,20,23,25	69:19 157:8	46:23,23 126:18	15 27:8 28:13 96:10	48 32:13
126:19 127:4	Wrap-Up 2:21	you'll 12:10,10 66:5 98:4	96:11	48-hour 14:22
134:19,23 140:5,6	163:1		163 2:21	48-8 55:4
141:10 145:21	wrestling 96:24	you're 9:21,23 33:8 37:15 39:25 45:21	103 2:21 17 74:22	49 74:16
		57.15 59.25 45.21		

		1	1	1
5				
5 33:13,14 43:16				
46:7 81:1 83:3				
5,000 100:16				
5:07 165:10				
50 43:25 67:11,12				
518 110:1,13				
55 32:12				
56 66:25				
6				
6 2:6 32:15,15,16,17				
60 60:16				
600 1:17				
60s 128:22,24				
62 2:10				
63 2:12				
65 29:24 30:1				
66 73:12				
7				
70s 112:9				
71 2:14				
76 114:9				
76.1 55:3				
70.1 55.5				
8				
8.4 55:5				
80 2:15 54:25				
9				
9-point 28:21				
90 2:17				
94 77:1				
98 55:1				
99 55:1				
	1	1	1	