

---

unique, which drives a need for a custom strategic plan—there is no generic answer. The Lane Powell team of highly-experienced practitioners in intellectual property and corporate matters has deep industry knowledge and is uniquely positioned to partner with clients to create tailored business strategies to help clients thrive and achieve longevity in an intense and fast-evolving Cannabis industry.

---

*Holly Johnston is Counsel to the Firm at Lane Powell and counsels*

*clients on strategically developing, managing, and monetizing their US and foreign intellectual property assets. She is an experienced patent attorney with a particular interest in partnering with clients to help translate patent assets into market advantage. She can be reached at 503.778.2185 or johnstonh@lanepowell.com.*

*Alex Harry is a Patent Agent at Lane Powell and assists the firm's Intellectual Property Team with patent preparation, prosecution and analysis. He has procured*

*patents for clients ranging from individual inventors to public corporations. He can be reached at 503.778.2030 or harrya@lanepowell.com.*

*Greg Wesner serves as Chair of Lane Powell's Intellectual Property Litigation Team and represents clients in patent, trademark and other IP litigation. He also counsels clients on IP strategy including strategic monetization programs for IP assets. He can be reached at 206.223.7272 or wesnerg@lanepowell.com.*



## Advertising

**Scott Dailard, Howard Morse, and Sarah Swain**

### Companies that Use Social Media and Endorsements Should Update Practices to Address Latest FTC Advice and Enforcement

The Federal Trade Commission (FTC) recently has updated guidance on use of endorsements in *The FTC's Endorsement Guides: What People Are Asking*, which address the use of social media and paid influencers to promote companies and products. Companies that encourage users to endorse their products should update their guidelines and training to account for this new guidance.

The FTC also announced enforcement action against individual influencers, hyped as the "FTC's First-Ever Complaint Against Individual Social Media Influencers." In fact, the targeted

influencers also were the owners of the company, not a typical endorser, which highlights the potential for actions against owners of closely-held companies that use social media individually to promote their company and company products.

### Updates Clarify What Constitutes an Endorsement and Compensation

The FTC requires that endorsers who are compensated, whether through money, discounts, free products, contest entries, or the like, or have some material connection to a company, such as a familial or employee relationship, disclose the connection to the brand or product being endorsed.

The updated FTC guidance clarifies that tagging a brand, even without further description or praise for the product, is an

endorsement requiring disclosure of material connections.

The FTC guidance also advises that it considers free travel and making a donation to a charity of the endorser's choice to be compensation that must be disclosed.

Additionally, if a company displays an average review rating, the FTC states that the company must disclose if any of the ratings were received from customers that received compensation, such as free or discounted products or contest entries in exchange for submitting a rating, on the theory that those customers are more likely to give positive reviews.

To avoid being held responsible for the actions of endorsers, companies should ensure that compensated influencers receive training regarding endorsement disclosures, including endorsers outside the United States if there is potential they will promote products to customers in the United States.

### Updates Advise That Some Common Disclosure Practices Are Not Adequate

The FTC is now advising that the hashtags #employee or

---

#ambassador may not be sufficient to convey the material connection between a company and an influencer. The FTC suggests the use of #XYZ-employee or #XYZ-ambassador (where XYZ is the company name) to make the relationship clear.

The FTC guidance also indicates it does not view adding “ad” to the end of a company name to be sufficient disclosure. For example: If a company is named “XYZ,” then #xyzad is not sufficient. The newest guidance similarly rejects the use of ambiguous terms and hashtags such as “Thanks”, “#collab” and “#Spon”, and warns influencers not to assume that their use of the “built-in” disclosure tools provided by social media networks will be sufficient. The updated guidance also includes some detailed recommendations for endorsements posted on Instagram and Snapchat, including directions to place disclosures above the “more” button, and warns influencers against relying on disclosures placed solely on a profile page.

### **Recent Enforcement Action Targeted Company Owners Based on Use of Social Media**

Earlier this month, the FTC announced its “first-ever complaint against social media influencers,” the owners of CSGOLotto, Inc., a company that operates the csgolotto.com Web site, enabling consumers to gamble using “skins,” collectible virtual items, as virtual currency, using the online multiplayer, first-person shooter game, Counter-Strike: Global Offensive, known as “CS: GO.”

In fact, the case *In re CSGOLotto, Inc.* was brought against both the company and its owners, who also were officers

of the company. The FTC alleged that they misrepresented that videos of the owners and others gambling on CSGO Lotto and their social media posts about CSGO Lotto reflected the independent opinions or experiences of impartial users of the service, by failing to disclose that they were owners and officers of the company. The FTC also alleged that the company paid other influencers to endorse the company without requiring the influencers to disclose that they were compensated. Such influencers were contractually prohibited from making “statements, claims or representations...that would impair the name, reputation and goodwill” of the company.

The FTC order against the company and its owners prohibits its future misrepresentations, requires disclosure of material connections, and requires the company to institute a compliance training and monitoring program and report annually to the FTC for 10 years. Violations of the order will subject both the company and its owners to civil penalties of more than \$40,000 per day.

It also is worth noting that, following up on letters sent to 90 social media influencers earlier in 2017 identifying specific posts that the FTC believed did not comply with its Endorsement Guides, the FTC sent a “warning letter” to 21 of the 90 influencers, during September, identifying recent posts that the FTC believes did not comply with the Guides. The letter requires the influencers to provide the FTC with information regarding material connections with each of the identified brands and the influencer’s plan to ensure that future social media posts have the proper disclosure. This effort could lead to additional enforcement actions.

### **Companies Are Required to Have “Reasonable” Training and Monitoring Programs for Compensated Influencers**

FTC guidance interprets the Endorsement Guides to require companies to have a “reasonable” training and monitoring program if a company induces others to provide endorsements for the company.

The scope of the “reasonable” training and monitoring required depends on the type of program being run by the company as well as the type of products or services being advertised.

For example, if a small company is seeking reviews from customers by offering future discounts, the FTC recommends that the company (1) tell the customer “in advance that they should disclose what they received” from the company and (2) that the company should condition the discount on the disclosure being made.

However, if a company has a network of compensated influencers that promote the company, the FTC expects a “reasonable” training and monitoring program to be more extensive. Similarly, if a company’s products or services are health or safety related, the FTC requires more extensive supervision from the company.

A 2016 enforcement action is instructive. Machinima, Inc., hired by Microsoft’s advertising agency as part of an Xbox One marketing campaign, was held responsible for paid influencers failing to adequately disclose their material connection to the advertising company within their social media content.

In 2016, the FTC issued an order prohibiting Machinima from misrepresenting that paid influencers

were independent or objective and failing to disclose material connections with the advertising company. Machinima also was required to implement a compliance monitoring system for paid influencers.

Neither Microsoft nor its advertising agency were subject to a similar FTC enforcement action, even though the agency identified both as responsible for the influencers' failure to disclose their material connection. The FTC appeared to credit the companies' training and monitoring programs and quick response to remedy the Machinima influencer materials after they discovered the lack of disclosures.

## Steps to Avoid Becoming a Target of FTC Enforcement

To avoid becoming a target for similar FTC enforcement, marketers should ensure that company training programs and materials provided to influencers reflect current agency guidance.

Companies also can look to the requirements imposed in previous FTC orders for instruction and (1) adopt written policies that will provide guidance to social media influencers and other endorsers of company products and services; (2) enter into signed agreements with endorsers who receive free products or other compensation requiring them to disclose that they are compensated in accordance with the company's policy, (3) train employees to review sponsored content and endorsements, (4) monitor endorsers to ensure they are disclosing material connections, and (5) terminate endorsers who do not disclose material connections.

---

*Scott Dailard advises clients in the areas of advertising, consumer protection, privacy and promotions, and on all issues and transactions relating to the collection and use of information about consumers. He counsels clients in many industries, including*

*leaders in telecommunications, digital media, consumer products, education, broadcast and cable television, energy and financial services.*

*Howard Morse is a partner and former chair of the antitrust and competition practice group at Cooley LLP in Washington, DC. He previously was a senior official at the FTC and regularly represents businesses before the FTC, Department of Justice, and State Attorneys General in investigations of alleged deceptive and unfair trade practices as well as antitrust matters.*

*Sarah Swain is an associate in the antitrust and competition practice group at Cooley LLP in Washington, DC. She is a former staff attorney at the FTC. Ms. Swain's practice focuses on government investigations, as well as corporate counseling, on a wide range of antitrust and consumer protection matters.*



## Right of Publicity

**Alan L. Friel and  
Stephanie A. Lucas**

### Tyson Winds Up for Knockout Blow against Boxing Hall of Fame

In a recent development, former boxing champ Mike Tyson is suing The Boxing Hall of Fame over the use of his name and likeness. The boxer's suit is a one-two Lanham Act/right-of-publicity combo. [*Mike Tyson v. The Boxing Hall of Fame, Inc., and Steven Lott,*

*U.S. Dist. Ct. of Nev., Case No. cv-02122, Filed August 8, 2017.]*

"Iron Mike" Tyson is a controversial sports figure who seems in equal parts loved and loathed by the public. Celebrated for a genuine world-class talent and derided for his behavior in and out of the ring, Tyson has a public profile that has generated decades of attention and, for certain people, profit.

The Boxing Hall of Fame, a Las Vegas-based organization, provoked a throw down with the

former champ when it began using his image and the moniker "Iron Mike" on T-shirts and other memorabilia. The Hall of Fame also allegedly made deals with third parties such as American Classics Apparel and Urban Outfitters to sell the merchandise.

In a complaint filed in the District of Nevada, Tyson claims three grounds for a suit against the Hall of Fame and its founder, Steve Lott: (1) his ownership of the federally registered trademark "Mike Tyson;" (2) his ownership of the nonregistered trademark "Iron Mike," which he claims is known to the general public as his nickname; and (3) statutory protections of his name and likeness that establish his "hard-earned right of publicity."