

The NetChoice Coalition

Promoting Convenience, Choice, and Commerce on The Net

Steve DelBianco, Executive Director
1401 K St NW, Suite 502
Washington, DC 20005
202-420-7482
www.netchoice.org



January 10, 2013

Senator Brian Frosh, Chairman
Senate Judicial Proceedings Committee
Maryland General Assembly
Annapolis, Maryland

RE: **Opposition to SB 29, Estates and Trusts – Administration of Internet-Based Accounts**

Dear Chairman Frosh and Members of the Committee:

On behalf of our member companies and their millions of online users, we urge that you not support SB 29 in its current form and at the present time.

Every day, some Maryland residents die without having given enough thought to what happens to their email accounts and online documents after they're gone. Often, their families and estate managers face a wide variety of company policies and conflicting state and federal laws. And the growing use of social media provides even more challenges and opportunities for grieving families.

However, the approach taken in SB 29 could cause more harm than good -- partly by giving estate representatives the power to disregard the express privacy choices of Maryland residents.

There are several reasons to consider more carefully the question of how families and estate managers may access the online communications of deceased persons.

First, there's the question of how online services can reconcile state disclosure mandates against existing federal privacy protections. As the committee knows, the Electronic Communications Privacy Act (ECPA) prevents online services from sharing the contents of communications unless they first obtain consent from the subscriber or sender.

There is an argument that executors stand in the shoes of the deceased and are thus entitled to access their accounts if consistent with the intent of the deceased and if necessary to fulfill the executors' duties. However, this argument is untested and mandating access by executors would raise new questions.

Beyond ECPA, there are many other key questions about how to manage and legislate in the area of access to the digital legacy of deceased Americans. For example:

- Some users choose their online services based on the strong privacy protections and data deletion policies in the *Terms of Service*. Shouldn't that be enough to indicate a user's wishes, or must the user also make affirmative choices about privacy and deletion options?
- Under what circumstances can the state authorize an executor to override privacy and deletion choices made by the user?

- Should online services be required to retain emails and documents for a minimum period -- despite the subscriber's express wishes to delete their account upon death?
- When must estate representatives obtain probate court orders to force online services to retain or divulge documents and communications?
- When states empower a representative to take control of an account, will that cause online services to violate their obligation to prevent unauthorized access?

Questions like these are what prompted the Uniform Law Commission (ULC) to create a special project to develop model state legislation for "Fiduciary Access to Digital Assets." This ULC project already has 18 pages of draft legislative language and is meeting next month in Washington to make further progress. ULC plans to complete its work within the next year.

This ULC project is focusing government and industry to address concerns of a growing number of your constituents, fed in part by media coverage like last weekend's Wall Street Journal article, "*Life and Death Online: Who Controls a Digital Legacy?*"

The Journal focused on the tragic example of a family managing the online legacy of their teenage daughter. While the article concerned a teenager, the majority of users are adults who expect their online privacy preferences to be respected—even after death. Today, social networks offer innovative options – like Facebook's "Memorialize" – that respect a user's privacy wishes while also letting their friends and family post messages and memories.

But creating a patchwork of conflicting state and federal laws will obstruct that kind of innovation by online services. Worse, these laws would empower an estate attorney to disregard the privacy wishes of the departed, which would impact the interests of all Maryland residents using any form of Internet communications or document storage.

We therefore urge that you not support SB 29 in its current form and at the present time. In addition to the present ULC project discussed above, there will undoubtedly be additional court decisions and discussions of federal privacy laws that will impact this issue.

For all these reasons, we believe it is best to defer consideration of SB 29 at this time. Thank you for considering our views. Please let me know if I can provide further information.

Sincerely,



Steve DelBianco
Executive Director, NetChoice

cc: Members of the Committee

NetChoice is a coalition of trade associations and e-Commerce businesses who share the goal of promoting convenience, choice and commerce on the Net. More information about NetChoice can be found at www.netchoice.org