

Congress of the United States
House of Representatives

COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND REFORM

2157 RAYBURN HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING

WASHINGTON, DC 20515-6143

MAJORITY (202) 225-5051

MINORITY (202) 225-5074

<http://oversight.house.gov>

March 22, 2019

Jennifer Huddleston
Mercatus Center at George Mason University
3434 Washington Blvd., 4th Floor
Arlington, VA 22201

Dear Ms. Huddleston:

The Subcommittee on Economic and Consumer Policy invites you to testify at a hearing on Tuesday, March 26, 2019, at 2:00 p.m., in room 2154 of the Rayburn House Office Building.

The hearing will assess improving cybersecurity at credit reporting agencies. The Subcommittee plans to examine federal agencies' current authority to promote the improvement of data security, and recommendations to expand their authority to accomplish that goal.

The enclosed Witness Instruction Sheet provides information for witnesses appearing before the Committee. Please note the procedures for submitting written testimony at least two business days prior to the hearing. We ask that you please contact the Subcommittee by close of business on March 20, 2019, to confirm your attendance. If you have questions, please contact Subcommittee staff at (202) 225-5051.

Sincerely,



Raja Krishnamoorthi

Chairman

Subcommittee on Economic and Consumer Policy

Enclosure

cc: The Honorable Michael Cloud, Ranking Member

Witness Instruction Sheet
Governmental Witnesses

1. Witnesses should provide their testimony via e-mail to Josh Zucker, Clerk, at Joshua.Zucker@mail.house.gov, no later than 10:00 a.m. two business days prior to the hearing.
2. Witnesses should also provide a short biographical summary and include it with the electronic copy of testimony provided to the Clerk.
3. At the hearing, each witness will be asked to summarize his or her written testimony in five minutes or less in order to maximize the time available for discussion and questions. Written testimony will be entered into the hearing record and may extend to any reasonable length.
4. Written testimony will be made publicly available and will be posted on the Committee's website.
5. The Committee does not provide financial reimbursement for witness travel or accommodations. Witnesses with extenuating circumstances, however, may submit a written request for such reimbursements to Robin Butler, Financial Administrator, 2157 Rayburn House Office Building, at least one week prior to the hearing. Reimbursements will not be made without prior approval.
6. Witnesses with disabilities should contact Committee staff to arrange any necessary accommodations.
7. Please note that Committee Rule 16(b) requires counsel representing an individual or entity before the Committee or any of its subcommittees, whether in connection with a request, subpoena, or testimony, promptly submit the attached notice of appearance to the Committee.

For inquiries regarding these rules and procedures, please contact the Committee on Oversight and Reform at (202) 225-5051.

Truth in Testimony Disclosure Form

In accordance with Rule XI, clause 2(g)(5)*, of the *Rules of the House of Representatives*, witnesses are asked to disclose the following information. Please complete this form electronically by filling in the provided blanks.

Committee: House Committee on Oversight and Reform

Subcommittee: Subcommittee on Economic and Consumer Policy

Hearing Date: Tuesday, March 26, 2019

Hearing Subject:

Asses improving cybersecurity at credit reporting agencies.

Witness Name: Jennifer Huddleston

Position/Title: Research Fellow,

Witness Type: Governmental Non-governmental

Are you representing yourself or an organization? Self Organization

If you are representing an organization, please list what entity or entities you are representing:

The Mercatus Center

If you are a non-governmental witness, please list any federal grants or contracts (including subgrants or subcontracts) related to the hearing's subject matter that you or the organization(s) you represent at this hearing received in the current calendar year and previous two calendar years. Include the source and amount of each grant or contract. *If necessary, attach additional sheet(s) to provide more information.*

N/A

If you are a non-governmental witness, please list any contracts or payments originating with a foreign government and related to the hearing's subject matter that you or the organization(s) you represent at this hearing received in the current year and previous two calendar years. Include the amount and country of origin of each contract or payment. *If necessary, attach additional sheet(s) to provide more information.*

N/A

False Statements Certification

Knowingly providing material false information to this committee/subcommittee, or knowingly concealing material information from this committee/subcommittee, is a crime (18 U.S.C. § 1001). This form will be made part of the hearing record.

Jeanifer Diddleston
Witness signature

03/22/2019

Date

If you are a non-governmental witness, please ensure that you attach the following documents to this disclosure. Check both boxes to acknowledge that you have done so.

- Written statement of proposed testimony
- Curriculum vitae

*Rule XI, clause 2(g)(5), of the U.S. House of Representatives provides:

(5)(A) Each committee shall, to the greatest extent practicable, require witnesses who appear before it to submit in advance written statements of proposed testimony and to limit their initial presentations to the committee to brief summaries thereof.

(B) In the case of a witness appearing in a nongovernmental capacity, a written statement of proposed testimony shall include a curriculum vitae and a disclosure of any Federal grants or contracts, or contracts or payments originating with a foreign government, received during the current calendar year or either of the two previous calendar years by the witness or by an entity represented by the witness and related to the subject matter of the hearing.

(C) The disclosure referred to in subdivision (B) shall include—

- (i) the amount and source of each Federal grant (or subgrant thereof) or contract (or subcontract thereof) related to the subject matter of the hearing; and
- (ii) the amount and country of origin of any payment or contract related to the subject matter of the hearing originating with a foreign government.

(D) Such statements, with appropriate redactions to protect the privacy or security of the witness, shall be made publicly available in electronic form not later than one day after the witness appears.

THE IMPORTANCE OF AVOIDING UNINTENDED CONSEQUENCES WHEN DEFINING HARM FOR DATA SECURITY AND DATA PRIVACY

Jennifer Huddleston

Research Fellow, Mercatus Center at George Mason University

House Committee on Oversight and Reform, Subcommittee on Economic and Consumer Policy

March 26, 2019

Good afternoon, Chairman Krishnamoorthi, Ranking Member Cloud, and distinguished members of the Subcommittee on Economic and Consumer Policy.

My name is Jennifer Huddleston and I am a research fellow at the Mercatus Center at George Mason University. My research focuses primarily on the intersection of law and technology as well as issues surrounding data security and data privacy. Thank you for the opportunity to discuss some of the important issues surrounding data security and the role and ability of agencies to protect consumer information. This is an important policy conversation in light of the historic Equifax breach that occurred in 2017 as well as continuing conversations around data breaches and data privacy, and it is important that Americans consider the possible unintended consequences in such policy.

Today I would like to focus on the following three points:

1. Regulators should avoid an expansive theory of harm in their approach to data security.
2. The Federal Trade Commission (FTC) has been the main agency for enforcing data security and data privacy, and its flexible approach has allowed innovation to flourish while still redressing consumer harm.
3. Policy solutions should be narrowly tailored and should focus on the unique position of credit reporting agencies.

THE PROBLEMS OF AN OVERLY EXPANSIVE DEFINITION OF HARM

Breaches of personal information have led to financial, emotional, and even physical harm, but as a 2018 FTC workshop report notes, there is not agreement regarding whether and when the government should intervene when a breach has occurred.¹ Too often it is easy to rush to intervention as a result of worst-case-scenario thinking in the light of a scandal and promote a seemingly definitive solution that could actually create more unintended consequences than the problems that it solves.² So far, the United States has avoided such an approach to data security, but when emotions and tensions run high in light of scandals such as the Equifax breach, America risks a response that leads to serious consequences later.

¹ *FTC Informational Injury Workshop: BE and BCP Staff Perspective* (Washington, DC: Federal Trade Commission, October 2018).

² Adam Thierer, "The Pursuit of Privacy in a World Where Information Control Is Failing," *Harvard Journal of Law & Public Policy* 36, no. 2 (2013): 409-54.

An overly broad definition of information harm applied beyond carefully tailored requirements for specific narrow sectors as a result of headline-making data breaches could damage the information economy and America's innovation leadership. In contrast to the United States, the European Union has taken such an approach to data protection much to the detriment of innovation, competition, and growth in technology.³ Such regulations can lead to innovators believing that it is simply too risky to pursue new solutions that may run afoul of regulators and entrenched firms.⁴

An overly broad definition may also not reflect the realities of data usage and collection and the benefits consumers often receive. As Geoffrey Manne stated at the FTC workshop on informational injury, "If risk of injury were enough to constitute injury, literally everything, literally the existence of these businesses, would increase the risk of injury and therefore be actionable."⁵ Depending on the definitions of data and businesses, it is easy for a broad approach to include not just traditional data brokers, internet giants, or credit bureaus, but also main-street small businesses that happen to have customer information through loyalty programs or online presences.⁶

Not only can a broad definition of harm associated with the breach of personal information deter innovation, it can also be nearly impossible to enforce. As I noted in comments to the FTC on the issue of informational injury with my colleagues Chris Koopman, Adam Thierer, and Andrea O'Sullivan, "Opinions on what constitutes an adequate level of privacy are almost as varied as the personalities of the people who hold them, and these opinions evolve over time."⁷ A static system based on the current options and fear is unlikely to solve the problems it intends in the same way that a flexible system could allow private parties to find or create the solutions that best fit their needs.

THE FTC'S ROLE IN DATA SECURITY AND DATA PRIVACY

The United States currently lacks an agency directly tasked with the regulation of data security or data privacy. While various agencies have provided guidance on the proper handling of data in their covered sectors, the FTC has become the agency that handles such issues more generally.

In the past 17 years, the agency has brought 65 cases involving consumers' personal data generally and more than 100 cases involving financial privacy and credit reporting under the Fair Credit Reporting Act and the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act.⁸ This current approach stems largely from the FTC's Section 5 authority to protect consumers from unfair and deceptive trade practices and addresses each situation as it arises.

The FTC has taken an active role in addressing data breaches and other data security concerns. It has chosen to take a flexible approach that encourages innovative solutions to security problems and data-based innovation more generally. Beginning in the late 1990s, the agency brought cases under its deception authority against websites who were not adhering to their own posted privacy policies.⁹ In cases involving data breaches such as Wyndham and LabMD, the FTC has also relied on its unfairness authority.¹⁰

³ Adam Thierer, "How Attitudes about Risk & Failure Affect Innovation on Either Side of the Atlantic," *Plain Text*, June 19, 2015.

⁴ Andrea O'Sullivan, "How to Promote Data Privacy While Protecting Innovation," *The Bridge*, February 13, 2019.

⁵ *FTC Informational Injury Workshop*.

⁶ For a discussion of how an overly broad definition of covered entities can impact small businesses, see Will Rinehart, "Understanding the ADD Act," *American Action Forum*, January 17, 2019.

⁷ Christopher Koopman et al., "Informational Injury in FTC Privacy and Data Security Cases" (Public Interest Comment, Mercatus Center at George Mason University, Arlington, VA, October 27, 2017).

⁸ *Privacy & Data Security: Update: 2018* (Washington, DC: Federal Trade Commission, January 2018–December 2018).

⁹ The first such action was Federal Trade Commission, "Geocities," February 12, 1999, <https://www.ftc.gov/enforcement/cases-proceedings/982-3015/geocities>.

¹⁰ See *FTC v. Wyndham Worldwide Corp.*, 799 F.3d 236 (3d Cir. 2015), alleging unfairness based on a lack of cybersecurity for customer information; see also *LabMD, Inc. v. Federal Trade Commission*, No. 1:14-CV-810-WSD, 2014 WL 198716 (N.D. Ga. May

As a result of this case-by-case approach, the FTC has built a “common law of consent decrees” when it comes to data breaches and generally eschews more formal rulemaking or adjudication.¹¹ While this approach prevents many of the harms to innovation that could come from top-down rulemaking, it also lacks clear guidance for private actors who seek to remain compliant and creates uncertainty in what may arise if practices are challenged.¹² This lack of clarity has become an increasing issue in courts when entities challenge the FTC over its claims of unfairness or deception regarding data security. As Judge William S. Duffey Jr. stated when faced with LabMD data breach case, the FTC “ought to give [regulated parties] some guidance as to what you do and do not expect, what is or is not required. You are a regulatory agency. I suspect you can do that.”¹³

Still, in general, this flexible approach of ex-post case-by-case enforcement has resulted in balancing the need for consumer redress with the benefits of innovation.¹⁴ However, the FTC should strive to improve this approach through enforcement actions that develop a greater certainty around data security procedures that can protect consumers while continuing to avoid rigid, all-encompassing theories of harm that might actually deter future solutions and do little to nothing to improve the current state of data security.¹⁵

NARROWLY TAILORED SOLUTIONS IN LIGHT OF DATA BREACHES

Given the impracticalities and potential detriments of an overly broad theory of harm, there is still the possibility of narrowly tailored policy solutions to address the needs of particularly vulnerable data or persons.¹⁶ As opposed to a broad, comprehensive approach, this narrowly tailored response has allowed innovative and popular uses of data to occur while still providing additional protection the data most likely to cause harm if breached, such as medical and financial information.¹⁷ When considering how to address the potential concerns associated with credit reporting agencies, policymakers should be careful to contain such proposals to the specific circumstances of this industry.

Unlike most data interactions, consumers do not opt in and cannot opt out and pursue the services of other credit rating agencies. Similarly, the credit rating industry faces significant barriers to entry, so the regulatory impact on competition may be less significant if such regulations are tailored for this industry. Still, special caution should be paid to make sure that Congress does not grant unlimited, open-ended rulemaking authority to an agency, which could result in overly burdensome regulations beyond the credit reporting agencies.¹⁸

Regulation should not be seen as the only solution to data concerns even when dealing with such a specific area and sensitive information. Common law can play an important role when an individual can prove demonstrable harm, and this method has both adaptability and consistency well-suited to the current rapid pace of digital change.¹⁹ While current law has not yet established a legal duty around data handling or privacy, existing precedents regarding tort and contract law place courts in an

7, 2014), involving an unfairness claim based on the accessibility of data after an employee had installed file-sharing software resulting in the data being accessible to third parties.

¹¹ Gus Hurwitz, “Data Security and the FTC’s UnCommon Law,” *Iowa Law Review* 101 (2016): 955–1022.

¹² Jennifer Huddleston, “Unprecedented: The Issue of Agency Action by Consent Order on Innovation,” *Plain Text*, September 22, 2017.

¹³ See the closing arguments at 8, *LabMD, Inc., v. Federal Trade Commission*, No. 9357 (F.T.C. Sep. 16, 2015).

¹⁴ Koopman et al., “Informational Injury in FTC Privacy and Data Security Cases.”

¹⁵ Koopman et al.

¹⁶ Jennifer Huddleston, *Preventing Privacy Policy from Becoming a Series of Unfortunate Events* (Washington, DC: American Action Forum, 2019).

¹⁷ Huddleston, *Preventing Privacy Policy*.

¹⁸ Jennifer Huddleston, “New GAO Report Says It’s Time for Federal Data Privacy Legislation. But What Kind?,” *The Bridge*, February 25, 2019.

¹⁹ Jim Harper, “Remember the Common Law” (Cato Policy Report, Cato Institute, Washington, DC, March/April 2016).

appropriate position to determine when harm has occurred and when a duty has been reached without additional regulatory intervention.²⁰ Such an approach is more likely to be able to consider the specifics of the situation surrounding the breach, the information contained, and the reality of harm that may or may not have occurred as a result.

In addition to legislation and litigation, the importance of consumer choice and education should also not be neglected. While each of the 50 states has its own data breach notifications law, these laws vary both in terms of what information is covered and how and when affected consumers are to be informed, creating a complicated patchwork for both those companies experiencing a breach and consumers receiving notice.²¹ As with other concerns about the current approach mentioned in these remarks, providing clarity and certainty over data breaches could benefit both consumers and innovators.

Finally, America should not forget the role consumers themselves can play in encouraging greater data security for sensitive information. As I noted in a previous comment with my colleagues Adam Thierer and Anne Hobson to the Consumer Product Safety Commission regarding potential risks associated with emerging internet of things technology, “Consumers, when they know about poor data security practices, can be effective advocates for change.”²² Consumer choice, consumer trust, and reputational risks can be powerful forces for encouraging solutions to data security problems.²³ Agencies and policymakers can play a complementary and educational role that allows consumers to make their own choices of next steps rather than assuming that they know the choices that consumers should make.

Concerns and issues around data security and data privacy are likely to continue to be part of the policy discourse. It is important to recognize that the use of data has many benefits both to current consumers and future technology. In considering the appropriate redress to troubling breaches, policymakers should be cautious and narrowly tailor their responses so as not to accidentally eliminate future successes in their drive to stop current failures. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Huddleston
Research Fellow, Mercatus Center at George Mason University

²⁰ Koopman et al., “Informational Injury in FTC Privacy and Data Security Cases.”

²¹ Jennifer Huddleston, “Preventing Privacy Policy from Becoming a Series of Unfortunate Events,” *American Action Forum*, January 14, 2019.

²² Adam Thierer, Jennifer Huddleston, and Anne Hobson, “The Internet of Things and Consumer Product Hazards” (Public Interest Comment, Mercatus Center at George Mason University Arlington, VA, June 14, 2018).

²³ Thierer, Huddleston, and Hobson, “The Internet of Things.”

Jennifer Huddleston

Education

University of Alabama School of Law

Tuscaloosa, AL

Juris Doctorate May 2017

GPA: 3.445 Class rank: Top 50%

- *Alabama Civil Rights and Civil Liberties Law Review*, Junior Editor (Volume 7, 2015-2016), Executive Editor (Volume 8, 2016-2017)
- Best Paper, Children's Rights (Professor: Steven Hobbs), Spring 2016
- Best Paper, Family and the Constitution Seminar (Professor: Mark Brandon), Fall 2015
- L. Edward Bryant, Jr., National Health Law Transactional Moot Court Competition Team, Spring 2016; 3rd Place Team Memo
- Bench and Bar Legal Honor Society, Inducted Spring 2016; Active member and leader in Christian Legal Society and Federalist Society

Wellesley College

Wellesley, MA

Bachelor of Arts, 2009 Major in Political Science

Professional Certifications

Member in good standing, Alabama Bar Association (Admitted, May 2018)

Legal and Policy Experience

Mercatus Center at George Mason University

Arlington, VA

Research Fellow, October 2018-present

Legal Research Associate, Jul 2017-October 2018

- Conducted research related to various legal aspects of emerging and innovative technologies particularly administrative law, Section 230 and Internet moderation, autonomous vehicles, and artificial intelligence
- Authored or co-authored working papers, op-eds, and blogs related to such research
- Engaged with local and national media and policymakers to provide expert opinions related to such topics

Owens & Millsaps

Tuscaloosa, AL

Law Clerk, August 2015 - May 2016, August 2016-June 2017

- Assisted in drafting various motions for both state and federal cases including oppositions to motion for summary judgment
- Researched various elements related to a variety of civil matters in both state and federal court
- Assisted with organizing discovery, attending depositions, and other trial preparation

Beasley Allen

Montgomery, AL

Fraud Section, Law Clerk, June - August 2016

- Reviewed documents for multidistrict litigation related to antitrust case
- Researched and drafted memoranda regarding qui tam and whistleblower cases

Senate Judiciary Committee, Senator Jeff Sessions

Sub-committee on Immigration and the National Interest

Washington, DC

Law Clerk, May - June 2016

- Researched background memoranda regarding judicial nominees
- Researched policy and legislation and drafted memoranda related to immigration and national security issues

ABA Antitrust Section Janet D. Steiger Fellowship/Office of Alabama Attorney General Luther Strange

Law Clerk, Consumer Litigation Section, May - July 2015

- Assisted in the preparation of various cases related to consumer litigation by drafting complaints and consent judgments and reviewing documents
- Drafted sample legislation for consideration and researched impact of recent legislation

Academic Experiences and Honors

Federalist Society Faculty Conference/ American Association of Law Schools Annual Conference, Works-in-Progress Panel, *Disrupting Deference for Disruptive Technology*, Presenter, January 4, 2019
 State Policy Network, Annual Meeting, Autonomous Vehicles and Emerging Issues in Transportation Policy, Panelist, October 10, 2018
 Tech States 2018, What's Next for Transportation Innovation, Panelist, October 9, 2018
 Internet Law Works-in-Progress, The Erosion of Publisher Liability and the Future of Online Curation, Project-in-Progress Presentation (with Brent Skorup), March 24, 2018
 Mercatus Center Frederic Bastiat Fellowship, Fellowship Recipient, 2016-2017
 Institute For Humane Studies Fall Graduate Research Colloquia, Invited Presenter/Participant, October 2016
 Why The Freedom Project Matters: The Importance of Intellectual Diversity at Wellesley College, February 2014, Invited lecture given to fellows of the Wellesley College Freedom Project

Publications

Ryan Hagemann, Jennifer Skees, & Adam D. Thierer, *Soft Law for Hard Problems: The Governance of Emerging Technologies in an Uncertain Future*, forthcoming, COLO. TECH. L.J. (FORTHCOMING 2019).

Jennifer Huddleston, *Preventing Privacy Policy from Becoming A Series of Unfortunate Events*, Approaches to Regulating Technology, American Action Forum, March 2019.

Jennifer Huddleston, *An Analysis of Recent Federal Data Privacy Legislation Proposals*, Mercatus Policy Brief, March 2019.

Jennifer Huddleston, *Is 'soft law' the solution for tech policy problems?*, THE HILL, Mar. 18, 2019

Jennifer Huddleston, *The Freedom to Innovate and Eliminating Barriers for More Innovators*, written testimony submitted to U.S. House of Representatives, Committee on Energy and Commerce, Consumer Protection and Commerce subcommittee, March 6, 2019

Jennifer Huddleston, *Embracing Innovation in Micromobility*, Testimony before the Maryland House of Representatives Committee on Environment and Transportation, February 28, 2019

Jennifer Huddleston, *Don't Let Tech Headlines Lead to Panic-Induced Policies*, INSIDE SOURCES, Feb. 28, 2019

Jennifer Huddleston Skees, *A Cautionary Tale on Internet Freedom Carve-Outs*, THE HILL, Jan. 21, 2019.

Jennifer Huddleston Skees & Trace Mitchell, *Will Santa's Sleigh Be Autonomous Next Christmas?*, TRIBUNE NEWS SERVICE, Dec. 19, 2018.

Jennifer Huddleston Skees, *When Detroit Met Silicon Valley*, INSIDE SOURCES, Dec. 11, 2018.

Jennifer Huddleston Skees & Trace Mitchell, *New Scooter Lawsuits Threaten Innovation*, ORANGE COUNTY REGISTER, Nov. 16, 2018.

Jennifer Huddleston Skees, *Do D.C. Leaders Want More Innovative Transportation or Not?*, WASHINGTON EXAMINER, Nov. 16, 2018.

Jennifer Huddleston Skees, *Tech Is the New Scary Story, but Why?*, TRIBUNE NEWS SERVICE, Oct. 16, 2018.

Jennifer Huddleston Skees, *Lessons from the "Scooter Wars"*, INSIDE SOURCES, Sep. 26, 2018.

Jennifer Huddleston Skees, *Innovation is Key for Educational Equality*, TRIBUNE NEWS SERVICE, Aug. 15, 2018.

Robert Graboyes & Jennifer Skees, *The Promise of Telemedicine in Mississippi*, CLARION LEDGER, Aug. 4, 2018.

Michael Farren & Jennifer Huddleston Skees, *Re-imagine 'National Lampoon's Vacation' 30 Years Later, This Time With Autonomous Cars*, USA TODAY, July 21, 2018.

Brent Skorup & Jennifer Huddleston Skees, *Bringing Constitutional Doctrine into the Digital Age*, WASHINGTON TIMES, July 9, 2018.

Brent Skorup & Jennifer Huddleston Skees, *It's Not About Facebook, It's About the Next Facebook*, REAL CLEAR POLICY, June 1, 2018.

Jennifer Huddleston Skees & Andrea O'Sullivan, *Could the best Mother's Day gift be a driverless car?*, TRIBUNE NEWS SERVICE, May 10, 2018.

- Published in over 50 papers nationwide including the print edition of Chicago Tribune

Adam Thierer & Jennifer Skees, *Technology Makes Our Lives More Interesting, Convenient, and Safer*, INSIDE SOURCES, Apr. 30, 2018.

Christopher Koopman & Jennifer Huddleston Skees, *Pro: In the Name of Safety, They Should Allow Testing of Driverless Cars on Their Roads*, TRIBUNE NEWS SERVICE, Apr. 26, 2018.

Adam Thierer & Jennifer Huddleston Skees, *Despite News-Making Wrecks, Robocars Safer Than Our Cars*, INSIDE SOURCES, Feb. 21, 2018.

Jennifer Huddleston Skees & Andrea O'Sullivan, *Hate Doing Laundry? Embrace Permissionless Innovation*, INSIDE SOURCES, Feb. 1, 2018.

Michael Farren & Jennifer Huddleston Skees, *Understanding Oregon's Gas Fueled Technopanic*, INSIDE SOURCES, Jan. 18, 2018.

Adam Thierer & Jennifer Huddleston Skees, *Finding Our Humanity with AI*, U.S. NEWS, Jan. 2, 2018.

Anne Hobson & Jennifer Huddleston Skees, *All I Want For Christmas is Some Cyber Insurance*, R STREET, Dec. 22, 2017.

Andrea Castillo O'Sullivan & Jennifer Huddleston Skees, *No, Net Neutrality is Not a Women's Issue*, REAL CLEAR POLICY, Dec. 6, 2017.

Michael Farren & Jennifer Huddleston Skees, *Self-Driving Cars are Really Here and They Might Just Save Your Life*, INSIDE SOURCES, Nov. 29, 2017.

Adam Thierer & Jennifer Huddleston Skees, *Tennessee Needs to Clear Path for Driverless Cars*, KNOXVILLE NEWS SENTINEL, Oct. 1, 2017.

Jennifer Huddleston, Note, *Free Speech in the Age of Political Correctness: Removing Free Speech Zones on College Campuses to Encourage Civil Discourse*, 8 Ala. C.R. & C.L. L. Rev. 279 (2017).

Various technology policy blogs for The Bridge, Tech Liberation Front, and Plain Text, a complete list of which can be found at <https://medium.com/@jrhuddles> and <https://www.mercatus.org/jennifer-huddleston-skees>