Office of the Secretary

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION WASHINGTON, D.C. 20580

June 18, 2009

Mr. Christopher Chafe Executive Director Change to Win 1900 L Street, NW Suite 900 Washington, DC 20036

Re: In the Matter of CVS Caremark Corporation, File No. 072-3119, Docket No. C-4259

Dear Mr. Chafe:

Thank you for your letter commenting on the Federal Trade Commission's consent agreement in the above-entitled proceeding. Your letter was placed on the public record pursuant to Rule 4.9(b)(6)(ii) of the Commission's Rules of Practice, 16 C.F.R. § 4.9(b)(6)(ii), and was given serious consideration by the Commission.

Your letter commends the Commission for its action, and also presents comments and recommendations which the Commission addresses below.

You express concern that the proposed order may not lead to the timely correction of order violations that may occur while the order is in effect. You therefore ask the Commission tois inequired TJV/Sinft C880066.0000 TD(ct. Yo)Tj("on

arose during that period – the company could be in violation of the order and subject to civil monetary penalties of up to \$16,000 per violation. In sum, these provisions, which are consistent with numerous FTC data security orders, provide strong incentives for the company to take appropriate steps to correct security deficiencies during an assessment period.

You also ask the Commission to provide assessments, reports of orderurity

¹ Current Federal law (the recently enacted American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009) requires all health-related entities, including pharmacies, to notify customers of breaches of personal health information. In addition, 44 states have enacted laws requiring breach notification, some of which make public the fact that notifications have been made, and private entities routinely compile and publish information about breaches.