

# Congress of the United States

Washington, DC 20515

October 10, 2025

Bryan Seeley  
Chief Executive Officer  
College Sports Commission

Dear Mr. Seeley:

I write to express concern that the College Sports Commission (CSC) is unnecessarily restricting college athletes' ability to monetize their Name, Image, and Likeness (NIL) through NIL Go.

The CSC is an independent organization established in June following the approval of the landmark *House v. NCAA* settlement. Specifically, the CSC is tasked with enforcing new NIL rules created by the settlement, especially those pertaining to college athletes' deals with third-party "collectives:" entities that are affiliated with, but independent from, institutions that streamline NIL opportunities for athletes.

To fulfill its obligations, the CSC set up NIL Go, a Deloitte-built digital portal through which most NIL deals must pass. Using NIL Go, CSC will scrutinize every deal worth \$600 or more to ensure the deals are (1) commensurate with fair market value (FMV) and (2) for a "valid business purpose." The CSC may deny any deal that violates either of these conditions, with neutral arbitration the only recourse for an athlete that chooses not to resubmit with new deal terms. And if an athlete accepts even a single dollar of a deal for which the CSC has not approved, they risk compromising their eligibility.

While the *House* settlement and the CSC was designed to bring clarity and stability to the system, the actual implementation has been anything but. Within its first two weeks, the CSC issued a ban on athletes receiving payments from collectives that was quickly rolled back. In September, the CSC claimed it had cleared over 8,000 deals worth nearly \$80 million in value submitted through NIL Go—only to revise those numbers down to 6,000 and \$35 million, respectively, due to a "clerical error." Public reporting indicates that the CSC operates with a staff of only four full-time employees to scrutinize deals, investigate rules violations, and enforce punishment. And recently, the CSC announced it was standing up an anonymous "reporting tip line," effectively outsourcing enforcement and raising serious questions about its organizational capacity.

On top of the CSC's operational issues, there remain serious policy questions about the standards by which CSC is applying to deny deals. CSC recently stated that it had denied 332 deals worth roughly \$10 million. Taking that number into account, and considering the CSC's adjustment of the value of cleared deals down from \$80 million to \$35 million, we can conclude that at least \$35 million in deals are pending in NIL Go. Doing the math with the sparse information and data publicly available leads to a simple conclusion: athletes are not receiving CSC decisions in a timely manner, meaning many are being denied the perfectly valid NIL opportunities your organization claims to support.

The CSC's slow, inefficient, and inscrutable process is harming athletes who earned NIL deals and sowing new chaos in college athletics. It may also be fomenting an anticompetitive environment for athlete compensation by specifically chilling college athletes' ability to freely market their NIL. In fact, objectors to the *House* settlement cited precisely this risk; namely, that the CSC's ability to unilaterally deny NIL deals could usurp the market's role in determining the true FMV for college athletes' NIL. Although the judge overruled these objections in order to approve the settlement, she did not preclude future challenges to the CSC, including its rules and enforcement, on antitrust grounds.

As the Congress considers legislation that—to varying degrees—would codify provisions of the *House* settlement, the CSC, and its NIL Go system, it is vital that it obtain all the facts about the CSC's current operations and performance. Accordingly, I request responses to the following questions, and productions of the following documents, by November 1, 2025:

- Please provide the following information as of October 10, 2025:
  - Number of deals and each deal's value currently (1) submitted to NIL Go, but not cleared, (2) denied, (3) cleared, and (4) in neutral arbitration.
  - Average time it takes for CSC to clear or deny a deal once it has been submitted to NIL Go.
  - The CSC's staffing levels, including the number and roles of full-time employees and external employees (for instance, outside consultants or lawyers).
  - Number of reports to CSC's anonymous reporting tip line.
- Will CSC commit to maintaining a publicly-available dashboard on the CSC's website with the aforementioned data elements?
- For each deal that CSC has denied, please provide the following:
  - A de-identified copy of the deal, including the deal's total amount.
  - An explanation of why CSC denied the deal.
  - For deals that were denied because they failed to meet CSC's standard of fair market value (FMV), what value did CSC assign to the deal?
- Please provide copies of any internal standard operating procedures with which the CSC complies when processing NIL deals, including any documents that explain CSC's determination of FMV or "valid business purpose."

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,



---

Lori Trahan  
Member of Congress