

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION DECISIONS

FINDINGS, OPINIONS, AND ORDERS
JULY 1, 2020, TO DECEMBER 31, 2020

IN THE MATTER OF

ORTHO-CLINICAL DIAGNOSTICS, INC.

CONSENT ORDER, ETC. IN REGARD TO ALLEGED VIOLATIONS OF SECTION 5 OF THE FEDERAL
TRADE COMMISSION ACT

*Docket No. C-4723; File No. 192 3050
Complaint, July 8, 2020 – Decision, July 8, 2020*

This consent order addresses Ortho-Clinical Diagnostics, Inc.’s representations concerning its participation in the Privacy Shield framework agreed upon by the U.S. and the European Union. The complaint alleges that that Respondent violated Section 5(a) of the Federal Trade Commission Act by falsely representing that it was a certified participant in the EU-U.S. Privacy Shield Framework and that Ortho did not verify the truth of the Privacy Shield assurances in its privacy policy, either through a self-assessment or a third party compliance review. The consent order prohibits the Respondent from making misrepresentations about its membership in any privacy or security program sponsored by the government or any other self-regulatory or standard-setting organization, including, but not limited to, the EU-U.S. Privacy Shield framework and the Swiss-U.S. Privacy Shield framework.

Participants

For the *Commission*: *Kenneth H. Abbe* and *Stacy Procter*.

For the *Respondents*: *Gina M. Dunsmuir, Vice President and Associate General Counsel*.

COMPLAINT

The Federal Trade Commission (“FTC”), having reason to believe that Ortho-Clinical Diagnostics, Inc., a corporation, has violated the Federal Trade Commission Act (“FTC Act”), and it appearing to the Commission that this proceeding is in the public interest, alleges:

1. Respondent Ortho-Clinical Diagnostics, Inc., is a New York corporation with its principal office or place of business at 1001 US Route 202, Raritan, NJ 08869.
2. Respondent provides medical device and in vitro diagnostics services.
3. The acts and practices of Respondent as alleged in this complaint have been in or affecting commerce, as “commerce” is defined in Section 4 of the FTC Act.
4. Respondent has set forth on its website, <https://www.orthoclinicaldiagnostics.com/en-us/home/privacy-policy>, privacy policies and statements about its practices, including

Complaint

statements related to its participation in the EU-U.S. Privacy Shield framework agreed upon by the U.S. government and the European Commission.

Privacy Shield

5. The EU-U.S. Privacy Shield framework (“Privacy Shield”) was designed by the U.S. Department of Commerce (“Commerce”) and the European Commission to provide a mechanism for U.S. companies to transfer personal data outside of the EU that is consistent with the requirements of the European Union Directive on Data Protection. Enacted in 1995, the Directive sets forth EU requirements for privacy and the protection of personal data. Among other things, it requires EU Member States to implement legislation that prohibits the transfer of personal data outside the EU, with exceptions, unless the European Commission has made a determination that the recipient jurisdiction’s laws ensure the protection of such personal data. This determination is referred to commonly as meeting the EU’s “adequacy” standard.

6. To satisfy the EU adequacy standard for certain commercial transfers, Commerce and the European Commission negotiated the EU-U.S. Privacy Shield framework, which went into effect in July 2016. The EU-U.S. Privacy Shield framework allows companies to transfer personal data lawfully from the EU to the United States. To join the EU-U.S. Privacy Shield framework, a company must self-certify to Commerce that it complies with the Privacy Shield Principles and related requirements that have been deemed to meet the EU’s adequacy standard. Any company that voluntarily withdraws or lets its self-certification lapse must take steps to affirm to Commerce that it is continuing to protect the personal information it received while it participated in the program or delete or return the data collected. Companies must also respond promptly to inquiries and other requests for information from Commerce relating to the company’s adherence to the Privacy Shield Principles.

7. Companies under the jurisdiction of the FTC, as well as the U.S. Department of Transportation, are eligible to join the EU-U.S. Privacy Shield framework. A company under the FTC’s jurisdiction that claims it has self-certified to the Privacy Shield Principles, but failed to self-certify to Commerce, or failed to comply with the Privacy Shield Principles, may be subject to an enforcement action based on the FTC’s deception authority under Section 5 of the FTC Act.

8. Commerce maintains a public website, <https://www.privacyshield.gov/welcome>, where it posts the names of companies that have self-certified to the EU-U.S. Privacy Shield framework. The listing of companies, <https://www.privacyshield.gov/list>, indicates whether the company’s self-certification is current.

9. Respondent has disseminated or caused to be disseminated privacy policies and statements on the <https://www.orthoclinicaldiagnostics.com/en-us/home/privacy-policy> website, including, but not limited to, the following statements:

Complaint

EU-U.S. Privacy Shield

Ortho-Clinical Diagnostics, Inc. (and its parent/subsidiary company, Ortho-Clinical Diagnostics Bermuda Co. Ltd.) participates in and has certified its compliance with the EU-U.S. Privacy Shield Framework and the Swiss-U.S. Privacy Shield Framework. Ortho-Clinical Diagnostics, Inc. is committed to subjecting all personal data received from the European Union (EU) member countries and Switzerland, respectively, in reliance on each Privacy Shield Framework, to the Framework's applicable Principles. To learn more about the Privacy Shield Frameworks, and to view our certification visit the U.S. Department of Commerce's Privacy Shield List. <https://www.privacyshield.gov/list>.

10. Although Respondent obtained Privacy Shield certification in April 2017, that certification lapsed one year later, in 2018.

11. In August 2018, Commerce warned the company to take down its claims that it participated in Privacy Shield unless and until such time as it completed the recertification process. Respondent did not do so. While Respondent retained data it collected while it participated in Privacy Shield, it did not withdraw and affirm its commitment to protect such data.

12. After allowing its certification to lapse, Respondent continued to claim, as indicated in paragraph 9, that it participated in the EU-U.S. Privacy Shield framework.

13. The Privacy Shield Principles include Supplemental Principle 7, which requires any company that participates in Privacy Shield to verify, at least once a year, through self-assessment or outside compliance review, that the assertions it makes about its Privacy Shield privacy practices are true and that those privacy practices have been implemented. The verification statement must be signed by a corporate officer or the outside reviewer and is required to be made available on request to the FTC or Department of Transportation, whoever has unfair and deceptive practices jurisdiction over the company.

14. Respondent is under the jurisdiction of the FTC. During the 2017-18 period that Respondent was certified to participate in Privacy Shield, Respondent failed to comply with the requirement to obtain, through self-assessment or outside compliance review, an attested verification statement that the assertions it had made about its Privacy Shield privacy practices during the time it participated in the program were true and that those privacy practices had been implemented. Respondent failed to provide its attested verification statement to the FTC.

Count 1—Privacy Misrepresentation

15. As described in Paragraph 9, Respondent represented, directly or indirectly, expressly or by implication, that it is a current participant in the EU-U.S Privacy Shield framework.

Complaint

16. In fact, as described in Paragraphs 10-12, Respondent was not a current participant in the EU-U.S. Privacy Shield framework in 2018 and 2019. Respondent's certification lapsed in 2018, and it was not renewed. Therefore, the representation set forth in Paragraph 15 is false or misleading.

Count 2—Misrepresentation Regarding Verification

17. As described in Paragraph 9, Respondent represented that it complied with the EU-U.S. Privacy Shield framework principles.

18. In fact, as described in Paragraphs 13-14, Respondent did not comply with the EU-U.S. Privacy Shield framework principles. In particular, it failed to comply with the verification requirement in Privacy Shield Supplemental Principle 7. Therefore, the representation set forth in Paragraph 17 is false or misleading.

Count 3—Misrepresentation Regarding Continuing Obligations

19. As described in Paragraph 9, Respondent represented that it complied with the EU-U.S. Privacy Shield framework principles.

20. In fact, as described in Paragraph 11, Respondent has not affirmed to Commerce that it will continue to apply the principles to personal information that it received during the time it participated in the program. Therefore, the representation set forth in Paragraph 19 is false or misleading.

Violations of Section 5 of the FTC Act

21. The acts and practices of Respondent as alleged in this complaint constitute deceptive acts or practices, in or affecting commerce, in violation of Section 5(a) of the Federal Trade Commission Act.

THEREFORE, the Federal Trade Commission this eighth day of July, 2020, has issued this complaint against Respondent.

By the Commission, Commissioner Slaughter not participating.

Decision and Order

DECISION

The Federal Trade Commission (“Commission”) initiated an investigation of certain acts and practices of the Respondent named above in the caption. The Commission’s Bureau of Consumer Protection (“BCP”) prepared and furnished to Respondent a draft Complaint. BCP proposed to present the draft Complaint to the Commission for its consideration. If issued by the Commission, the draft Complaint would charge Respondent with violation of the Federal Trade Commission Act.

Respondent and BCP thereafter executed an Agreement Containing Consent Order (“Consent Agreement”). The Consent Agreement includes: 1) statements by Respondent that it neither admits nor denies any of the allegations in the Complaint, except as specifically stated in this Decision and Order, and that only for purposes of this action, it admits the facts necessary to establish jurisdiction; and 2) waivers and other provisions as required by the Commission’s Rules.

The Commission considered the matter and determined that it had reason to believe that Respondent has violated the Federal Trade Commission Act, and that a Complaint should issue stating its charges in that respect. The Commission accepted the executed Consent Agreement and placed it on the public record for a period of thirty (30) days for the receipt and consideration of public comments. Now, in further conformity with the procedure prescribed in Rule 2.34, the Commission issues its Complaint, makes the following Findings, and issues the following Order:

Findings

1. Respondent Ortho-Clinical Diagnostics, Inc., is a New York corporation with its principal office or place of business at 1001 US Route 202, Raritan, NJ 08869.
2. The Commission has jurisdiction over the subject matter of this proceeding and over Respondent, and the proceeding is in the public interest.

ORDER**Definitions**

For purposes of this Order, the following definition applies:

- A. “Respondent” means Ortho-Clinical Diagnostics, Inc., a corporation, and its successors and assigns.

Decision and Order

Provisions**I. Prohibition against Misrepresentations about Participation in or Compliance with Privacy Programs**

IT IS ORDERED that Respondent and its officers, agents, employees, and attorneys, and all other persons in active concert or participation with any of them, who receive actual notice of this Order, whether acting directly or indirectly, in connection with the advertising, marketing, promotion, offering for sale, or sale of any product or service must not misrepresent in any manner, expressly or by implication, the extent to which Respondent is a member of, adheres to, complies with, is certified by, is endorsed by, or otherwise participates in any privacy or security program sponsored by a government or any self-regulatory or standard-setting organization, including but not limited to the EU-U.S. Privacy Shield framework, the Swiss-U.S. Privacy Shield framework, and the APEC Cross-Border Privacy Rules.

II. Requirement to Meet Continuing Obligations Under Privacy Shield

IT IS ORDERED that Respondent and its officers, agents, employees, and attorneys, and all other persons in active concert or participation with any of them, who receive actual notice of this Order, whether acting directly or indirectly, in connection with the advertising, marketing, promotion, offering for sale, or sale of any product or service, must:

- A. affirm to the Department of Commerce, within ten (10) days after the effective date of this Order and on an annual basis thereafter for as long as it retains such information, that it will
 - 1. continue to apply the EU-U.S. Privacy Shield framework principles to the personal information it received while it participated in the Privacy Shield; or
 - 2. protect the information by another means authorized under EU (for the EU-U.S. Privacy Shield framework) or Swiss (for the Swiss-U.S. Privacy Shield framework) law, including by using a binding corporate rule or a contract that fully reflects the requirements of the relevant standard contractual clauses adopted by the European Commission; or
- B. return or delete the information within ten (10) days after the effective date of this Order.

III. Acknowledgments of the Order

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Respondent obtain acknowledgments of receipt of this Order:

- A. Respondent, within ten (10) days after the effective date of this Order, must submit to the Commission an acknowledgment of receipt of this Order.

Decision and Order

- B. For five (5) years after the issuance date of this Order, Respondent must deliver a copy of this Order to: (1) all principals, officers, directors, and LLC managers and members; (2) all employees having managerial responsibilities for conduct related to the subject matter of the Order and all agents and representatives who participate in conduct related to the subject matter of the Order; and (3) any business entity resulting from any change in structure as set forth in the Provision titled Compliance Report and Notices. Delivery must occur within ten (10) days after the effective date of this Order for current personnel. For all others, delivery must occur before they assume their responsibilities.
- C. From each individual or entity to which Respondent delivered a copy of this Order, Respondent must obtain, within sixty (60) days, a signed and dated acknowledgment of receipt of this Order.

IV. Compliance Report and Notices

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Respondent make timely submissions to the Commission:

- A. Ninety (90) days after the issuance date of this Order, Respondent must submit a compliance report, sworn under penalty of perjury, in which Respondent must: (a) identify the primary physical, postal, and email address and telephone number, as designated points of contact, which representatives of the Commission, may use to communicate with Respondent; (b) identify all of Respondent's businesses by all of their names, telephone numbers, and physical, postal, email, and Internet addresses; (c) describe the activities of each business; (d) describe in detail whether and how Respondent is in compliance with each Provision of this Order; and (e) provide a copy of each Acknowledgment of the Order obtained pursuant to this Order, unless previously submitted to the Commission.
- B. Respondent must submit a compliance notice, sworn under penalty of perjury, within fourteen (14) days of any change in the following: (1) any designated point of contact; or (2) the structure of Respondent or any entity that Respondent has any ownership interest in or controls directly or indirectly that may affect compliance obligations arising under this Order, including: creation, merger, sale, or dissolution of the entity or any subsidiary, parent, or affiliate that engages in any acts or practices subject to this Order.
- C. Respondent must submit notice of the filing of any bankruptcy petition, insolvency proceeding, or similar proceeding by or against Respondent within fourteen (14) days of its filing.
- D. Any submission to the Commission required by this Order to be sworn under penalty of perjury must be true and accurate and comply with 28 U.S.C. § 1746, such as by concluding: "I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the

Decision and Order

United States of America that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed on: _____” and supplying the date, signatory’s full name, title (if applicable), and signature.

- E. Unless otherwise directed by a Commission representative in writing, all submissions to the Commission pursuant to this Order must be emailed to Debrief@ftc.gov or sent by overnight courier (not the U.S. Postal Service) to: Associate Director of Enforcement, Bureau of Consumer Protection, Federal Trade Commission, 600 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20580. The subject line must begin: In re *Ortho-Clinical Diagnostics, Inc.*, FTC File No. 1923050, Docket No. C-4723.

V. Recordkeeping

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Respondent must create certain records for ten (10) years after the issuance date of the Order, and retain each such record for five (5) years. Specifically, Respondent must create and retain the following records:

- A. accounting records showing the revenues from all goods or services sold;
- B. personnel records showing, for each person providing services, whether as an employee or otherwise, that person’s: name; addresses; telephone numbers; job title or position; dates of service; and (if applicable) the reason for termination;
- C. all records necessary to demonstrate full compliance with each provision of this Order, including all submissions to the Commission; and
- D. a copy of each widely disseminated representation by Respondent making any representation subject to this Order, and all materials that were relied upon in making the representation.

VI. Compliance Monitoring

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that, for the purpose of monitoring Respondent’s compliance with this Order:

- A. Within ten (10) days of receipt of a written request from a representative of the Commission, Respondent must: submit additional compliance reports or other requested information, which must be sworn under penalty of perjury, and produce records for inspection and copying.
- B. For matters concerning this Order, representatives of the Commission are authorized to communicate directly with Respondent. Respondent must permit representatives of the Commission to interview anyone affiliated with Respondent who has agreed to such an interview. The interviewee may have counsel present.

Analysis to Aid Public Comment

- C. The Commission may use all other lawful means, including posing through its representatives as consumers, suppliers, or other individuals or entities, to Respondent or any individual or entity affiliated with Respondent, without the necessity of identification or prior notice. Nothing in this Order limits the Commission's lawful use of compulsory process, pursuant to Sections 9 and 20 of the FTC Act, 15 U.S.C. §§ 49, 57b-1.

VII. Order Effective Dates

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that this Order is final and effective upon the date of its publication on the Commission's website (ftc.gov) as a final order. This Order will terminate on July 8, 2040, or twenty (20) years from the most recent date that the United States or the Commission files a complaint (with or without an accompanying settlement) in federal court alleging any violation of the Order, whichever comes later; *provided, however*, that the filing of such a complaint will not affect the duration of:

- A. any Provision in this Order that terminates in less than twenty (20) years;
- B. this Order's application to any respondent that is not named as a defendant in such complaint; and
- C. this Order if such complaint is filed after the order has terminated pursuant to this Provision.

Provided, further, that if such complaint is dismissed or a federal court rules that Respondent did not violate any provision of the Order, and the dismissal or ruling is either not appealed or upheld on appeal, then the Order will terminate according to this Provision as though the complaint had never been filed, except that the Order will not terminate between the date such complaint is filed and the later of the deadline for appealing such dismissal or ruling and the date such dismissal or ruling is upheld on appeal.

By the Commission, Commission Slaughter not participating.

ANALYSIS OF CONSENT ORDER TO AID PUBLIC COMMENT

The Federal Trade Commission ("Commission") has accepted, subject to final approval, an agreement containing a consent order from Ortho-Clinical Diagnostics, Inc. ("Ortho" or "Respondent").

The proposed consent order ("proposed order") has been placed on the public record for thirty days for receipt of comments by interested persons. Comments received during this period

Analysis to Aid Public Comment

will become part of the public record. After thirty days, the Commission will again review the agreement and the comments received, and will decide whether it should withdraw from the agreement and take appropriate action or make final the agreement's proposed order.

This matter concerns alleged false or misleading representations that Ortho made concerning its participation in the Privacy Shield framework agreed upon by the U.S. and the European Union ("EU"). The Privacy Shield framework allows for the lawful transfer of personal data from the EU to participating companies. The framework consists of a set of principles and related requirements that have been deemed by the European Commission as providing "adequate" privacy protection. The principles include notice; choice; accountability for onward transfer; security; data integrity and purpose limitation; access; and recourse, enforcement, and liability. The related requirements include, for example, securing an independent recourse mechanism to handle any disputes about how the company handles information about EU citizens.

To participate in the framework, a company must comply with the Privacy Shield principles and self-certify that compliance to the U.S. Department of Commerce ("Commerce"). Commerce reviews companies' self-certification applications and maintains a public website, <https://www.privacyshield.gov/list>, where it posts the names of companies who have completed the requirements for certification. Companies are required to recertify every year in order to continue benefitting from Privacy Shield.

Ortho markets and sells medical devices and in vitro diagnostics services to the global clinical laboratory and immunohematology communities. It collects personal data from its suppliers and capital customers around the world, including from EU citizens. According to the Commission's complaint, from approximately September 2017 until March 2019, Ortho published on its website, <https://www.orthoclinicaldiagnostics.com/en-us/home/privacy-policy>, a privacy policy containing statements related to its participation in Privacy Shield.

The Commission's proposed three-count complaint alleges that Respondent violated Section 5(a) of the Federal Trade Commission Act. Specifically, the first count in the proposed complaint alleges that Respondent engaged in a deceptive act or practice by falsely representing that it was a certified participant in the EU-U.S. Privacy Shield Framework. The second count alleges that Ortho did not verify the truth of the Privacy Shield assurances in its privacy policy, either through a self-assessment or a third party compliance review, so its representation that it "complied with" the Privacy Shield principles was false. Finally, the third count alleges that Ortho failed to annually affirm to Commerce that Ortho will continue to apply the Privacy Shield Principles to personal data it received while it was part of the framework after it withdraws from Privacy Shield.

Part I of the proposed order prohibits the Respondent from making misrepresentations about its membership in any privacy or security program sponsored by the government or any other self-regulatory or standard-setting organization, including, but not limited to, the EU-U.S. Privacy Shield framework and the Swiss-U.S. Privacy Shield framework. Part II also specifically requires the Respondent to comply with the Privacy Shield requirement to continue to protect personal information received while in the framework.

Analysis to Aid Public Comment

Parts III through VI of the proposed order are reporting and compliance provisions. Part III requires acknowledgement of the order and dissemination of the order now and in the future to persons with responsibilities relating to the subject matter of the order. Part IV ensures notification to the FTC of changes in corporate status and mandates that the Respondent submit an initial compliance report to the FTC. Part V requires the Respondent to create certain documents relating to its compliance with the order for ten years and to retain those documents for a five-year period. Part VI mandates that the Respondent make available to the FTC information or subsequent compliance reports, as requested.

Part VII is a provision “sun-setting” the order after twenty years, with certain exceptions.

The purpose of this analysis is to aid public comment on the proposed order. It is not intended to constitute an official interpretation of the complaint or proposed order, or to modify in any way the proposed order’s terms.

Complaint

IN THE MATTER OF

WILLIAMS-SONOMA, INC.CONSENT ORDER, ETC. IN REGARD TO ALLEGED VIOLATIONS OF SECTION 5 OF THE FEDERAL
TRADE COMMISSION ACT

Docket No. C-4724; File No. 202 3025
Complaint, July 13, 2020 – Decision, July 13, 2020

This consent order addresses Williams-Sonoma, Inc.’s marketing, sale, and distribution of home products as made in the United States. The complaint alleges that Respondent violated Section 5(a) of the Federal Trade Commission Act by representing that its Goldtouch Bakeware products, Rejuvenation-branded products, and Pottery Barn Teen and Pottery Barn Kids-branded upholstered furniture products, including the materials and subcomponents used to make such products, are all or virtually all made in the United States although they are wholly imported or incorporate significant imported materials or subcomponents. The consent order prohibits Respondent from making U.S.-origin claims for its products unless either: (1) the final assembly or processing of the product occurs in the United States, all significant processing that goes into the product occurs in the United States, and all or virtually all ingredients or components of the product are made and sourced in the United States; (2) a clear and conspicuous qualification appears immediately adjacent to the representation that accurately conveys the extent to which the product contains foreign parts, ingredients or components, and/or processing; or (3) for a claim that a product is assembled in the United States, the product is last substantially transformed in the United States, the product’s principal assembly takes place in the United States, and United States assembly operations are substantial.

Participants

For the *Commission*: *Julia Solomon Ensor*.

For the *Respondents*: *Alex Schneider* and *Christie Grymes Thompson, Kelley Drye & Warren LLP*.

COMPLAINT

The Federal Trade Commission (“FTC” or “Commission”), having reason to believe that Williams-Sonoma, Inc., a corporation, also doing business as Williams Sonoma, Williams Sonoma Home, Pottery Barn, Pottery Barn Kids, Pottery Barn Teen, West Elm, Rejuvenation, Outward, and Mark & Graham (“Respondent” or “Williams-Sonoma”), has violated the provisions of the Federal Trade Commission Act, and it appearing to the Commission that this proceeding is in the public interest, alleges:

1. Respondent is a Delaware corporation, with its principal place of business at 3250 Van Ness Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94109.

2. Respondent has advertised, labeled, offered for sale, sold, and distributed home products to consumers, including cookware, furniture, light fixtures, linens, small electronics, and others. Respondent advertises these home products in stores and online, including, but not limited to, on its websites and social media platforms. Respondent offers for sale, sells, and distributes its products throughout the United States.