

Connecticut Association of REALTORS®. Inc.

111 Founders Plaza, Suite 1101 East Hartford, CT 06108-3296 (860) 290-6601 ◆ (800) 335-4862

Fax: (860) 290-6615

Fax-on-demand: (800) 284-7849

www.ctrealtor.com

March 23, 2004

Federal Trade Commission Office of the Secretary Room 159-H (Annex D) 600 Pennsylvania Ave, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20580

Re: "CAN-SPAM Act Rulemaking, Project No. R411008," 69 Federal Register 48, 11775-11782 (March 11, 2004)

Dear Sir or Madam:

On behalf of the Connecticut Association of REALTORS®, I appreciate this opportunity to comment on the Federal Trade Commission's proposal on the Controlling the Assault of Non-Solicited Pornography and Marketing Act of 2003 (CAN SPAM Act). As a membership association representing approximately 15,000 Connecticut REALTORS®, we routinely use e-mail to communicate with members and therefore have a significant interest in the outcome of this rulemaking process.

While our association supports the Commission's efforts to control fraudulent, misleading and abusive unsolicited e-mails and e-mailing practices, we are concerned that the establishment of a Do-Not-E-mail Registry ("Registry") will penalize trade associations, membership organizations, and non-profits engaging in legitimate e-mail communications with members.

Our association commonly uses e-mail to inform members about industry and legislative developments as well as professional development courses, new products or services, meetings, and industry-related conventions typically offered to members. Many of the events, courses, products and services have a "preferred member" pricing structure if a price is charged at all. Such e-mails are an important part of our service as an association and transmit information that is expected as a benefit of membership. We believe that the establishment of a Registry will require the association to institute compliance measures which will result in some members not receiving notice of the benefits that their membership conveys and will ultimately impact members' perceptions of the value of association membership.

In addition to our concerns with communication restriction; that would be imposed by a Do-Not-E-mail Registry, we are also concerned with the significant threat to our members' privacy that could occur should the security of a Do-Not-E-mail Registry be breeched by spammers. As many computer security experts have indicated, the creation of an effective, secure and enforceable Do-Not-E-mail Registry is not as simple a task as creating a Do-Not-Call Registry and enforcement system. Unless carefully crafted and controlled, a Do-Not-E-mail Registry system could be used or "gamed" to identify and confirm the existence of legitimate e-mail addresses which then would be subjected to abusive spam e-mail. It would be ironic if the very system that is proposed to protect e-mail users were used to expose individuals and firms to the very abuses that supporters of a Registry believe will be eliminated by its creation.

If the FTC endeavors to establish a Do-Not-E-mail Registry, we believe much careful research and beta-testing is required <u>before</u> any Registry is implemented so that it not be a prime target for attacks by illegitimate spammers and unscrupulous computer hackers.

Given the challenges of creating a safe, secure and effective system, a Registry will not be an inexpensive undertaking. Since development and maintenance costs will most likely be borne by the users of the Registry, we believe that a Do-Not-E-mail Registry could have a significant economic impact on our association and members by imposing significant compliance costs. These expenses would be layered on top of compliance costs imposed last year when our association and members were subjected to several new federal regulations (Do-Not-Call regulations, Do-Not-Fax regulations and CAN SPAM provisions). These newly imposed compliance measures, which have greatly impacted the ordinary course of communication with members and clients, have yet to be absorbed. The imposition of additional and significant Registry compliance obligations would be truly problematic for our organization.





000413

P. . 'CARSOLAM & 'Taken King, Pr. Inc. No. J. 4.1000," 69 Federal Register 48, 11775-11782 (March 11, 2004) Page 2.

Once gair we arge you to closely consider whether the disputable consumer benefits of a Do-Net-E-mail Registry and the positional distribution privacy of a central depository of egitimate e-mail addresses outweigh the merous and costly compliance burdens on to decessionations, membership organizations con-profits and their member/client bases.

it should not interfere with the legitimate communication between members and their reciation. One aspect that is under consileration concern "affinity programs" offered to the members by associations. It should be remembered that this is but one aspect of membership and is offered not necessarily as a commercial venture but as a member services or benefit. Many affinity programs are not defended to generate income for associations but are offered as a member benefit.

Sincerely,

Robert J. Kennady Jr. Executive Vice President

Connecticut Association of REALTORS®, Inc.

cc: National Association of REALTORS®