Calendar No. 63

119TH CONGRESS *1st Session*	SENATE	REPORT 119–17

TRANSPARENCY IN CHARGES FOR KEY EVENTS TICKETING ACT

R E P O R T

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

ON

S. 281

APRIL 29, 2025.—Ordered to be printed

U.S. GOVERNMENT PUBLISHING OFFICE
59–010 WASHINGTON : 2025

SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

ONE HUNDRED NINETEENTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

TED CRUZ, Texas, *Chairman*

JOHN THUNE, South Dakota	MARIA CANTWELL, Washington
ROGER F. WICKER, Mississippi	AMY KLOBUCHAR, Minnesota
DEB FISCHER, Nebraska	BRIAN SCHATZ, Hawaii
JERRY MORAN, Kansas	EDWARD J. MARKEY, Massachusetts
DAN SULLIVAN, Alaska	GARY C. PETERS, Michigan
MARSHA BLACKBURN, Tennessee	TAMMY BALDWIN, Wisconsin
TODD YOUNG, Indiana	TAMMY DUCKWORTH, Illinois
TED BUDD, North Carolina	JACKY ROSEN, Nevada
ERIC SCHMITT, Missouri	BEN RAY LUJAN, New Mexico
JOHN CURTIS, Utah	JOHN W. HICKENLOOPER, Colorado
BERNIE MORENO, Ohio	JOHN FETTERMAN, Pennsylvania
TIM SHEEHY, Montana	ANDY KIM, New Jersey
SHELLEY MOORE CAPITO, West Virginia	LISA BLUNT ROCHESTER, Delaware
CYNTHIA M. LUMMIS, Wyoming	

BRAD GRANTZ, *Majority Staff Director*
LILA HARPER HELMS, *Democratic Staff Director*

Calendar No. 63

119TH CONGRESS } SENATE { REPORT
1st Session } { 119–17

TRANSPARENCY IN CHARGES FOR KEY EVENTS TICKETING ACT

APRIL 29, 2025.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. CRUZ, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, submitted the following

R E P O R T

[To accompany S. 281]

[Including cost estimate of the Congressional Budget Office]

The Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, to which was referred the bill (S. 281) to require sellers of event tickets to disclose comprehensive information to consumers about ticket prices and related fees, to prohibit speculative ticketing, and for other purposes, having considered the same, reports favorably thereon with amendments and recommends that the bill, as amended, do pass.

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of S. 281, the TICKET Act, is to require sellers of event tickets to implement a number of pro-consumer policies within the live event ticketing marketplace, including requirements to disclose comprehensive information up front to consumers about ticket prices and related fees, ban the sale of speculative event tickets, and provide refunds for certain canceled or postponed live events.

BACKGROUND AND NEEDS

Drip pricing is the practice of advertising only part of a product's price up front and revealing additional charges later as a consumer goes through the purchasing process. When drip pricing is used in the sale of event tickets, purchasers will likely experience additional mandatory charges or fees on their purchase, which are not disclosed to the consumer with the initial price. As a result of drip pricing, consumers may pay significantly more for an event ticket than the advertised price. A 2019 report by Consumer Reports found that at least 85 percent of Americans have encountered an unexpected or hidden fee for a service they had used in the past 2 years.[1]

The Federal Trade Commission (FTC) has long expressed concerns with drip pricing, noting that such advertisements deceptively lower consumers' estimates of how much they expect to (and will) pay for a product or service. In 2012, the FTC hosted a conference to examine drip pricing.[2] FTC staff made a recommendation for upfront pricing for hotels in a 2017 staff report.[3] The Department of Transportation requires airlines to advertise the full fare for air transportation.[4]

In 2018, the Government Accountability Office (GAO) studied the ticket market and concluded that, on average, 27 percent of the total price for a ticket is comprised of fees, and in some cases that percentage can climb as high as 75 percent. GAO further noted similar issues with drip pricing by both primary and secondary ticket sales, finding that of the events reviewed, in more than 60 percent of sales in the primary ticket market, consumers could ascertain the amount of fees only by: (1) selecting a seat; (2) clicking through one or two additional screens; (3) creating a user name and password (or logging in); and (4) clicking an icon labeled Order Details which displayed the ticket's face-value price and the fees. In the secondary market, GAO found that for 7 out of 11 websites, ticket fees were only disclosed at the very end of the purchase process.[5] This is one reason why GAO suggested Congress consider a requirement that the all-in-price should be disclosed to consumers up front.

In June 2019, the FTC held a workshop exploring the online event ticket marketplace. All workshop panelists that discussed event ticket fees—including participating ticket sellers—supported legislation or rulemaking to require that event ticket prices be inclusive of additional fees up front and deterring violators through strong enforcement with meaningful penalties.[6]

Studies show that consumers only look at the advertised or listed price when making purchase decisions; sellers are thereby incentivized to hide as many fees as possible to compete with other sellers.[7] Disclosing the all-in price up front allows consumers to

---

[1] Penelope Wang, "Protect Yourself From Hidden Fees," *Consumer Reports*, May 29, 2019 (*https://www.consumerreports.org/money/fees-billing/protect-yourself-from-hidden-fees-a1096754265/*).

[2] "The Economics of Drip Pricing," Federal Trade Commission, May 21, 2012 (*https://www.ftc.gov/news-events/events/2012/05/economics-drip-pricing*).

[3] Mary W. Sullivan, *Economic Issues: Economic Analysis of Hotel Resort Fees, Bureau of Economics*, Federal Trade Commission, January 2017 (*https://www.ftc.gov/system/files/documents/reports/economic-analysis-hotel-resort-fees/p115503_hotel_resort_fees_economic_issues_paper.pdf*).

[4] U.S. Department of the Transportation, Office of the Secretary, "Enhancing Airline Passenger Protections," 76 Fed. Reg. 23166 (April 25, 2011) (*https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/FR-2011-04-25/pdf/2011-9736.pdf*). Since 2011, the Department of Transportation has required airlines to advertise the "entire price" to be paid by the customer for air transportation.

[5] Government Accountability Office, *Event Ticket Sales: Market Characteristics and Consumer Protection Issues*, GAO–18–347, April 2018 (*https://www.gao.gov/assets/gao-18-347.pdf*).

[6] Federal Trade Commission, *"That's the Ticket" Workshop: Staff Perspective*, May 2020 (*https://www.ftc.gov/system/files/documents/reports/thats-ticket-workshop-staff-perspective/staffperspective_tickets_final-508.pdf*).

[7] Alexander Rasch et al., "Drip Pricing and Its Regulation: Experimental Evidence," *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, vol. 176 (August 2020), pp. 353–370 (*https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0167268120301189*).

shop more efficiently, by allowing them to effectively comparison shop and avoid spending more than they intended to.

In June 2023, the Subcommittee on Consumer Protection, Product Safety, and Data Security of the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation held a hearing on "Protecting Consumers from Junk Fees," which highlighted the need for legislative action, including in the event ticketing space.[8] Hidden fees are particularly common for event ticketing, where consumers often learn of additional fees after selecting a seat for a particular event and entering their information. Drip pricing is especially problematic for sports fans and concert goers who are shopping for a finite number of tickets with a deadline to buy their tickets before an event commences or sells out. These consumers are impeded by imperfect information and cannot adequately comparison shop—they risk losing out on making the best (i.e. lowest price) purchase before another buyer swoops in and buys the ticket instead. As a result of such hidden fees, and the confusion they inject into the purchasing process, consumers tend to buy more expensive products than they otherwise would have, such as a closer, pricier seat at a concert.[9] Additionally, competitors who choose to display such fees up front are at a competitive disadvantage as their prices appear to be more expensive at first glance. Legislation is needed to ensure that all competitors are held to the same standard and consumers are concretely protected from hidden fees.

In addition, S. 281 would include a prohibition on speculative tickets and certain mandatory refunds for ticket purchasers that reflect provisions of H.R. 3950 (118th Congress), which was passed by the U.S. House of Representatives on May 15, 2024.

SUMMARY OF PROVISIONS

S. 281, as amended, would do the following:

- Require ticket issuers, secondary market ticket issuers, or secondary market ticket exchanges to disclose the all-in price, which is the price inclusive of all ticket fees including service fees, order processing fees, delivery fees, facility charge fees, and taxes, among other charges.
- Require such disclosure for tickets for events, defined as any live concert, theatrical performance, sporting event, show, or similarly scheduled live activity, taking place in a venue with a seating or attendance capacity exceeding 200 persons that is open to the general public and is promoted, advertised, or marketed in interstate commerce or for which event tickets are generally sold or distributed in interstate commerce.
- Require such disclosure to occur (1) in any advertisement, marketing, or price list where a price is displayed; and (2) at the beginning of a transaction and throughout the ticket purchasing process.

---

[8] "Protecting Consumers From Junk Fees," hearing before the Subcommittee on Consumer Protection, Product Safety and Data Security of the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, 118th Congress, June 8, 2023 (*https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/CHRG-118shrg58145/pdf/CHRG-118shrg58145.pdf*).

[9] Tom Blake et al., "Price Salience and Product Choice," *Marketing Science*, vol. 40, no. 4 (May 19, 2021), pp. 619–636, available online by subscription (*https://doi.org/10.1287/mksc.2020.1261*). See also Shelle Santana et al., "Consumers' Reactions to Drip Pricing," *Marketing Science*, vol. 39, no. 1 (January 15, 2020), pp. 188–210, available online by subscription (*https://doi.org/10.1287/mksc.2019.1207*).

- Require ticket issuers, secondary market ticket issuers, or secondary market ticket exchanges to provide an itemized list of the base ticket price and each ticket fee.
- Prohibit ticket issuers, secondary market ticket issuers, or secondary market ticket exchanges from selling or offering for sale a ticket that a seller does not have actual or constructive possession of (also known as a speculative ticket).
- Permit ticket issuers, secondary market ticket issuers, or secondary market ticket exchanges to provide services to an individual to obtain an event ticket on behalf of an individual.
- Require ticket issuers, secondary market ticket issuers, or secondary market ticket exchanges to provide notice if a ticket that is being offered for sale is a resale ticket.
- Prohibit a ticket issuer, secondary market ticket issuer, or secondary market ticket exchange from stating that the ticket issuer, secondary market ticket issuer, or secondary market exchange is affiliated or endorsed by a venue, team, or artist unless an agreement has been executed or if the issuer or exchange has consent of the applicable venue, team, or artist.
- Prohibit a ticket issuer, secondary market ticket issuer, or secondary market ticket exchange from including the name of a venue, including any misspellings of any such name, in a domain name, or any subdomain thereof, in the URL of the issuer or exchange unless authorized by the owner of the venue.
- Require ticket issuers, secondary market ticket issuers, or secondary market ticket exchanges to provide refunds or replacement tickets for canceled or postponed events (except for postponements for causes beyond the reasonable control of the issuer) in certain circumstances.
- Require the Federal Trade Commission to submit to Congress a report on enforcement of the Better Online Ticket Sales Act of 2016 [10] within 6 months of enactment.
- Authorize the Federal Trade Commission to enforce violations of the Act.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

S. 281, the TICKET Act, was introduced on January 28, 2025, by Senator Schmitt (for himself and Senator Markey) and was referred to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate. On February 5, 2025, the Committee met in open Executive Session and, by voice vote, ordered S. 281 reported favorably with amendments.

118th Congress

S. 1303, the TICKET Act, was introduced on April 26, 2023, by Senator Cruz (for himself and Senator Cantwell) and was referred to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate. On July 27, 2023, the Committee met in open Executive Session and, by voice vote, ordered S. 1303 reported favorably with an amendment (in the nature of a substitute). On September 12, 2023, that bill was reported and placed on the Senate Calendar. On April 11, 2024, Senator Rounds was added as a cosponsor.

[10] Public Law 114–274.

H.R. 3950, a House companion bill to S. 1303, was introduced on June 9, 2023, by Representative Bilirakis (for himself and Representative Schakowsky) and was referred to the Committee on Energy and Commerce in the House of Representatives. Sixteen cosponsors were later added. H.R. 3950, as amended, passed its Committee with a recorded vote of 45–0 on December 6, 2023, and that bill passed the House on May 15, 2024. However, H.R. 3950 had significant differences from the Senate version of the TICKET Act. During the Senate Committee's markup, members decided to combine S. 1303 with H.R. 6568, the Speculative Ticketing Oversight and Prohibition Act, which adopted additional ticketing provisions, including a ban on speculative ticketing and guaranteed refunds.

ESTIMATED COSTS

In accordance with paragraph 11(a) of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate and section 403 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the Committee provides the following cost estimate, prepared by the Congressional Budget Office:

At a Glance

Commerce Legislation

As ordered reported by the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation on February 5, 2025

On February 5, 2025, the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation ordered reported 17 bills. This comprehensive document provides estimates for 5 of those bills.

All five bills would increase spending subject to appropriation. S. 281 and S. 314 would affect revenues; thus, pay-as-you-go procedures apply to those bills. CBO estimates that none of the bills would increase net direct spending or deficits in any of the four consecutive 10-year periods beginning in 2036. S. 281 contains private-sector mandates and S. 314 contains intergovernmental and private-sector mandates. Details of the estimated costs of each are discussed in the text.

Bill	Net Increase or Decrease (-) in the Deficit Over the 2025-2035 Period (Millions of Dollars)	Changes in Spending Subject to Appropriation Over the 2025-2030 Period (Outlays, Millions of Dollars)	Mandate Effects?
S. 99	0	2	No
S. 195	0	*	No
S. 245	0	*	No
S. 281	*	4	Yes
S. 314	*	4	Yes

* = between -$500,000 and $500,000.

Summary of legislation: On February 5, 2025, the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation ordered reported a total of 17 bills. This document provides estimates for 5 of those bills.

S. 99, S. 195, and S. 245 would require the Department of Commerce to study supply chains, promote music tourism, and establish a working group on cyber insurance; S. 281 and S. 314 would direct the Federal Trade Commission (FTC) to enforce new prohibitions related to ticket prices for live events and hotel prices.

Estimated Federal cost: The estimated costs do not include any effects of interactions among the bills. If all five bills were combined and enacted as a single piece of legislation, the estimated costs could be different from the sum of the separate estimates, although CBO expects that any differences would be small. The costs of the legislation fall within budget function 370 (commerce and housing credit).

Basis of estimate: For these estimates, CBO assumes that the bills will be enacted near the middle of fiscal year 2025 and that the estimated amounts will be appropriated each year. CBO estimates that all five bills would affect spending subject to appropriation and that S. 281 and S. 314 would affect revenues.

S. 99, Strengthening Support for American Manufacturing Act, would require the Department of Commerce to contract with the National Academy of Public Administration to study programs operated by the department that aim to improve the resilience of critical supply chains and provide technical assistance to U.S. manufacturers. The report would identify interagency gaps and duplicative responsibilities among offices and recommend improvements.

Using information from the Department of Commerce, CBO estimates that completing the study would cost $2 million over the 2025–2030 period, including employee and contracting costs. Any related spending would be subject to the availability of appropriated funds.

S. 195, American Music Tourism Act of 2025, would require the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Travel and Tourism to promote music tourism in the United States and periodically report to the Congress. In 2024, the Assistant Secretary received $3.5 million to carry out the requirements of the Visit America Act, a 2022 law to promote travel and tourism in the United States.

Using information about the Assistant Secretary's responsibilities under current law, CBO estimates that implementing the requirements in the bill would cost less than $500,000 over the 2025–2030 period. Any related spending would be subject to the availability of appropriated funds.

S. 245, Insure Cybersecurity Act of 2025, would require the National Telecommunications and Information Administration to establish an interagency working group on cyber insurance, composed of members from the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency, Department of Justice, Department of the Treasury, National Institute of Standards and Technology, and the FTC. The working group would be required to report to the Congress no later than one year after it forms.

Using information about the cost of similar working groups, CBO estimates that implementing the bill would cost less than $500,000 over the 2025–2026 period. Any related spending would be subject to the availability of appropriated funds.

S. 281, TICKET Act, would require companies that issue tickets or that sell tickets on the secondary market to clearly display the total price of any ticket, including itemizing any fees not included in the base ticket price. The bill also would prohibit entities from offering or advertising tickets that they do not possess, require entities to clearly disclose if a ticket is for re-sale, and direct ticket sellers to refund buyers if an event is cancelled. Those requirements would apply to live events at venues with an attendance capacity of 200 people or more. The FTC would enforce those requirements.

Based on the cost of similar provisions, CBO estimates implementing the bill would cost the FTC $4 million over the 2025–2030 period to issue guidance and to monitor and enforce violations. Any related spending would be subject to the availability of appropriated funds. In addition, CBO estimates that enacting the bill could increase civil penalty collections, which are recorded in the budget as revenues, by an insignificant amount.

S. 314, Hotel Fees Transparency Act of 2025, would require providers of short-term lodging and websites that advertise or offer such lodging to display upfront the full lodging price and each mandatory fee required to complete a booking. The FTC would enforce those requirements.

Based on the cost of similar provisions, CBO estimates implementing the bill would cost the FTC $4 million over the 2025–2030 period to issue guidance and to monitor and enforce violations. Any related spending would be subject to the availability of appropriated funds. In addition, CBO estimates that enacting the bill could increase civil penalty collections, which are recorded in the budget as revenues, by an insignificant amount.

Pay-As-You-Go considerations: CBO estimates that enacting S. 281 and S. 314 would each increase revenues by less than $500,000 over the 2025–2035 period; therefore, pay-as-you-go procedures apply to those bills.

Increase in long-term net direct spending and deficits: CBO estimates that none of the bills would increase net direct spending or deficits in any of the four consecutive 10-year periods beginning in 2036.

Mandates: Two of the bills ordered reported by the committee contain mandates, as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (UMRA).

S. 281, TICKET Act, would impose private-sector mandates as defined in UMRA on ticket sellers and resellers by requiring certain changes, including new refund policies to the ticketing process. CBO estimates the aggregate cost to comply with the mandates would be above the threshold established in UMRA for private-sector mandates ($206 million in 2025, adjusted annually for inflation).

Under the bill, if an event is cancelled, ticket sellers and resellers would be required to provide a refund of the full ticket price, including taxes and fees, to ticket purchasers. If an event is postponed, sellers and resellers would be required to provide customers either a full refund or a replacement ticket, if available, subject to the customer's preference. Sellers also would be required to disclose this refund policy. The bill allows for exceptions to this policy in cases where the cancellation or postponement is beyond the control of the ticket issuer, such as natural disasters. Based on discussions with industry sources, a substantial share of sellers and resellers already provide full refunds for cancelled events but few offer refunds for postponed events. Considerable uncertainty surrounds the ways that federal regulations might define what is within the control of the issuer in the event of a cancellation or postponement or what might constitute comparable replacement events. Given the large size of the industry and the amount of revenue generated by ticketed events, CBO estimates that the cost of this mandate would exceed the threshold for private-sector mandates.

S. 281 also would require ticket sellers and resellers to make certain up-front disclosures to consumers. They would need to disclose the ticket prices, including taxes and fees. Those disclosures would occur at the time a ticket is first displayed to a consumer and in any advertisements or marketing. The bill also would require ticket sellers and resellers to provide an itemized list of the base price and all fees. Information from industry sources indicates that most ticket sellers have already begun to provide the total cost to consumers in advance; thus, CBO expects the additional requirements in the bill to have small costs.

The bill also would require ticket resellers to disclose to consumers that they are resellers before any purchase is complete. Sellers and resellers would be prohibited from selling or advertising any ticket that the seller does not have actually or constructively possess. In certain instances, sellers also would be prohibited from revealing to consumers and using the name of venues, teams, artists, and events in their online domain names. CBO expects that those disclosures and prohibitions would impose minimal costs on the sellers.

The bill contains no intergovernmental mandates as defined in UMRA.

S. 314, Hotel Fees Transparency Act of 2025, would impose intergovernmental and private-sector mandates as defined in UMRA. CBO estimates that the cost to comply with those mandates would not exceed thresholds established in UMRA ($103 million and $206 million in 2025, respectively, adjusted annually for inflation).

The bill would preempt state and local laws governing the display of prices for short-term lodging. Although the preemptions would limit the application of state and local laws, it would impose no duty on state or local governments that would result in significant spending or loss of revenues.

The bill would require hotels, short-term rentals, online booking websites, and any other third-party temporary accommodation sellers to disclose upfront the total price of lodging, including any government-imposed fees. Information from industry sources and the FTC indicates that several lodging providers already comply with provisions in the bill. In addition, an FTC final rule, set to go into effect in April, will require short-term lodging sellers to disclose all associated fees to customers. CBO expects the cost for other entities to comply would be small because many providers already comply and those who do not already possess the fee information required to be displayed.

Estimate prepared by: Federal costs and revenues: David Hughes; Mandates: Grace Watson and Rachel Austin.

Estimate reviewed by: Justin Humphrey, Chief, Finance, Housing, and Education Cost Estimates Unit; Kathleen FitzGerald, Chief, Public and Private Mandates Unit; H. Samuel Papenfuss, Deputy Director of Budget Analysis.

Estimate approved by: Phillip L. Swagel, Director, Congressional Budget Office.

REGULATORY IMPACT STATEMENT

In accordance with paragraph 11(b) of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee provides the following evaluation of the regulatory impact of the legislation, as reported:

Number of Persons Covered

S. 281 would cover the following entities and any employees retained by them:

- Ticket issuers, as defined in the Better Online Ticket Sales Act of 2016;[11]
- Any person for which it is in the regular course of the trade or business of the person to resell or make a secondary sale of a ticket to an event (as the term "event" is defined in the Act);
- Any person for which it is in the regular course of trade or business of that person to operate a platform or exchange for advertising, listing, or selling resale tickets, on behalf of itself, vendors, or a secondary market ticket issuer; and
- The Federal Trade Commission.

Economic Impact

Based on industry sources, compliance costs associated with S. 281's requirements are expected to be minimal and would be heavily outweighed by the benefits to consumers. By increasing transparency in the event ticketing market, S. 281 would allow consumers to more effectively comparison shop and select the best-priced tickets. Therefore, the bill is expected to save consumers both time and money.

Privacy

S. 281 is not anticipated to impact the personal privacy of individuals.

Paperwork

S. 281 is not anticipated to generate any additional paperwork.

CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED SPENDING

In compliance with paragraph 4(b) of rule XLIV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee provides that no provisions contained in the bill, as reported, meet the definition of congressionally directed spending items under the rule.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

Section 1. Short title

This section would provide that the bill may be cited as the "Transparency In Charges for Key Events Ticketing Act" or the "TICKET Act".

Section 2. All-inclusive ticket price disclosure

This section would provide that it shall be unlawful for a ticket issuer, secondary market ticket issuer, or secondary market ticket exchange from offering an event ticket for sale unless that issuer: (1) clearly and conspicuously displays the total event ticket price—if a price is displayed—in any advertisement, marketing, or price list where the ticket is offered for sale; (2) clearly and conspicuously discloses to an individual who seeks to purchase an event ticket the total event ticket price at the time the ticket is first displayed to that individual and anytime thereafter during the pur-

[11] Public Law 114–274.

chasing process; and (3) provides an itemized list of the base event ticket price and each event ticket fee.

Section 3. Speculative ticketing ban

This section would provide that a ticket issuer, secondary market ticket issuer, or secondary market ticket exchange that does not have actual or constructive possession of an event ticket shall not sell, offer for sale, or advertise for sale such event ticket.

This section would further provide that a secondary market ticket issuer or exchange may sell, offer for sale, or advertise for sale, a service to an individual to obtain an event ticket on behalf of such individual if such issuer or exchange: (1) does not market or list the service as an event ticket; (2) maintains clear separation between the service and event tickets; and (3) discloses before the selection of the service that the service does not guarantee an event ticket.

Section 4. Disclosures

This section would provide that a ticket issuer, secondary market ticket issuer, or secondary market ticket exchange shall do the following:

- If an event ticket being sold is a resale, disclose to the consumer prior to purchase that such ticket is a resale and the issuer or exchange is engaged in the secondary sale of event tickets;
- Not state an affiliation or endorsement by a venue, team, or artist unless a partnership agreement has been executed or the issuer or exchange has the express written consent of such venue, team, or artist; and
- Not include the name of a venue, including any misspellings of any such name, in a domain name, or subdomain thereof, in the URL of the issuer or exchange, unless authorized by the owner of the venue.

Section 5. Refund requirements

This section would provide that if an event is canceled or postponed (except for a cause beyond the reasonable control of the issuer), a ticket issuer, secondary market ticket issuer, or secondary market ticket exchange shall provide the purchaser of an event ticket the following:

- If the event is canceled, a full refund for the total event ticket price;
- If the event is postponed less than 6 months and the original ticket is no longer valid, a replacement ticket, subject to availability; or
- If the event is postponed more than 6 months, at the option of the purchaser,
  - A full refund for the total event ticket price; or
  - If the original event ticket is no longer valid, a replacement event ticket.

Further, this section would require disclosure of the guarantee or refund policy of the ticket issuer, secondary market ticket issuer, or secondary market ticket exchange as well as information on how to obtain a refund of the total event ticket price.

Section 6. Report by the Federal Trade Commission on BOTS Act of 2016 enforcement

This section would require the FTC to submit a report to Congress within 6 months of enactment regarding the enforcement of the Better Online Ticket Sales Act of 2016.[12]

Section 7. Enforcement

This section would provide that a violation of this Act shall be treated as a violation of a rule defining an unfair or deceptive act or practice under section 18(a)(1)(B) of the Federal Trade Commission Act.

Section 8. Definitions

This section would define the key terms in the bill, including "artist", "base event ticket price", "Commission", "event", "event ticket", "event ticket fee", "optional product or service", "resale", "secondary market ticket exchange", "secondary market ticket issuer", "secondary sale", "ticket issuer", "total event ticket price", "URL", and "venue".

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

In compliance with paragraph 12 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee states that the bill as reported would make no change to existing law.

○

[12] Public Law 114–274.